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The notion of social justice in education involves examining how experiences are shaped in schools through interconnecting systems of socialisation. The focus of this inquiry centred on exploring mechanisms which challenge trainee teachers’ normalised assumptions of equality. Using a case study approach I investigated whether experiences prior to the training process or the instructional pedagogies employed had the greatest influence in the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

The study was carried out on a primary PGCE programme with a total of fifteen participants over two years. Through an interpretative paradigm the cyclical hermeneutic was employed to analyse participants’ critically reflective responses to their teacher development. Participants' prior experiences were captured and coded to determine an awareness of the ‘Other’, related to visible and invisible identity salience, and of equality issues. These data were available in the form of a semi structured questionnaire and autobiographical accounts. Throughout the programme participants' narrative reflections of the instructional pedagogies employed for social justice encounters were also coded to determine participants’ capacity to integrate the instruction in terms of considering the pupils they will teach. Further critical reflections identified which participants were capable of countering deficit stereotypes of pupils during teaching practice.

In contributing to knowledge in the field this study identifies that it is possible to predict ITT candidates’ propensity for social responsibility in the classroom. The analysis of data revealed that a trainee’s sense of responsibility towards ‘the other’ coupled with the level of criticality employed in their reflective practice is directly related to their capacity to become a socially responsible teacher. Coherent guidance and expectations employed through the instructional programme encouraged socially aware trainees to act upon this when teaching. This study confirms the need to closely examine the coherence of ITT programmes in guiding trainees’ social justice awareness.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives an overview of my thesis and its structure: it sets out the context for my study and situates my personal stance in the decision making process. To highlight how my ‘values and expectations influence the conduct and conclusions of the study’ (Maxwell, 2010: 281) I outline why this research was important to me and share how I came to decisions regarding the design and interpretation of the study. The original contribution of my study to the field is also introduced in this chapter.

1.1 Personal perspective

In all our lives there are defining moments and enduring questions. Searching for answers to my personal question through this PhD study has not only been a life defining moment for me but has shown me that what defines us is how we choose to act upon those moments. In undertaking this study I learnt as much about myself as I did about others. My question concerns how discrimination has become normalised in the English education system. As a woman from ‘working class’ roots with a northern accent, I have been acutely conscious of how others perceive and make judgements about me since I was young. I can pinpoint this to a single significant event in my early life: transferring schools from one side of a large city to the other, from back-to-back terraces on cobbled streets to a new housing estate on the edge of suburbia. In this new environment my language code identified me as working class in what was perceived a middle class school, and I believe that the teachers without exception relied on this marker as the sole identification of my cognitive ability. My response to this discriminatory stereotyping has shaped my personal and professional life. I later refused to attend grammar school, insisting on attending the local secondary modern to avoid the daily assault on my identity. I was already conscious of, if not educated in, an understanding that the stereotyped
assumptions by teachers as well as other pupils affect educational attainment. I have only begun to fully understand how this shaped my own educational career and professional life through undertaking this study.

My personal experiences as a young teacher in London gave me hope that much of this normalised discrimination was being challenged; certainly my colleagues routinely challenged stereotypical discourse and rhetoric. However, my experience as the mother of mixed-heritage children embarking on state funded education, thirty years after my own, alerted me to the continuation of this discrimination by assumption. Their surname marked them out as Asian girls and I believe that their teachers responded according to assumed stereotypes. Attempting to understand this phenomenon has driven much of my work since, including this research.

In a previous professional role I monitored and evaluated all of a Midlands county’s Nursery Education inspection reports for four years (1997-2001). None of these ever made comments on children’s social or cultural development, despite advice written at the time for OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) by the Early Years Trainers Anti-Racist Network (EYTARN, 1999). The lack of comment by OFSTED meant that team leaders or managers gave no priority to taking due care of the attitudes and values with which they were enculturating young children (Mohamed, 2006). This omission is seen in current OFSTED inspection practices of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) programmes according to Bhopal & Rhamie (2013) and Wilkins (2013).

As ‘universal nursery education’ was phased in, all funded pre-school settings were expected to identify and train an equal opportunities co-ordinator to establish and implement their anti-discrimination strategy (DfES: Early Years’ Development and Childcare Partnerships: target 21; 2000-2004). During the national training for the implementation of the Foundation Stage in 2000, practitioners were asked to discuss in groups their understanding of the ten
principles from the curriculum guidance. When given a choice between two of
the principles, despite this expectation, none of the staff from the 650 school
and pre-school settings attending the training were confident enough to discuss
their understanding of ‘equality of opportunity’, opting instead to discuss their
‘settling in process’ (Mohamed, 2006). This choice was questioned at the time
by the trainers and a training need identified.

Working with practitioners across two sectors of early education fuelled my
interest in how biased stereotypes and discrimination were embedded at such
an early age. My professional responsibility at the time meant that I could design
the training to be delivered during 2000-2002. This work was heavily influenced
by the research published by Siraj-Blatchford (1995), Brown (1998) and Wood
(2000). I requested permission to study the training course I had been asked to
create and used the opportunity to research the field in more depth; the work
culminated in my MA dissertation. The impact of this training was positive: 83%
of participants were confident that it had an impact on their attitudes and
practice and 53% indicated that they had already taken action (Mohamed, 2006:
69). However, what materialised led to a concern regarding the lack of
challenge to these pre-conceptions during professional training programmes.

I subsequently took a post at a Midlands university on the ITT programme. This
programme is discussed in great detail through this thesis but at this stage it is
important to point out that the trainees were exposed to many events designed
to challenge their notions of privilege and raise awareness of the damage done
by discrimination. It became apparent to me that the trainees on this programme
were comfortable articulating entrenched commonly held stereotypical attitudes
and beliefs. This was supported by findings from earlier research on this
programme by Wilkins & Lall (2011). I had originally been employed to develop
the Early Years’ strand of the programme for which we recruited a third of the
primary trainees. I successfully incorporated this area of training into all subject
areas and training situations so that the evaluations from all perspectives were highly positive. I now hoped to do the same for the social justice elements of the programme.

Having identified my personal position in this study I now outline the background to the study. To better understand the current situation I explore research from over half a century which has investigated the impact of teacher expectations on pupil outcomes. I take a sociological approach to the study as my understanding of the mechanisms involved is rooted in the way society constructs social forms and practices. I demonstrate that the research and statistical data explored in the thesis confirm that pupil attainment is clearly related to the labels employed by teachers and the resulting interactions within our classrooms.

Through this study I set out to investigate how ITT programmes could be instrumental in eliminating teachers’ discriminatory assumptions of pupil attainment and aim to contribute to current discussions regarding the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

The literature review explores social and political systems and structures involved. It is important to place the review of literature and policies within the historical context as part of my assertion here is that, given all the knowledge within the field of education, we have yet to break the cycle. I begin with an overview of relevant policies which, I go on to demonstrate, remain unheeded almost forty years after publication.
1.2 Background to the study

In 1977 ‘The Rampton Report’ on the West Indian community in England highlighted concerns about the poor performance of West Indian pupils in schools, and recommended an independent inquiry into the causes of this underachievement. As a result, the ‘Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups’ concluded in 1981 that the main problems were ‘low teacher expectations and racial prejudice among white teachers and society as a whole’ (Rampton, 1981: 70). The report was re-examined by the incoming Thatcher government and Michael Swann was put in charge of a committee to review the findings. It is important to point out here that this report also recommended that data on pupil attainment was collected by ethnicity. In 1985 ‘The Swann Report’ confirmed that education was not equally accessible to all children in Britain. The under-representation of ethnic minorities in the teaching profession was cited as one of the main issues. It also confirmed that teachers’ initial training had not ‘succeeded in providing a satisfactory grounding in multi-cultural education for all of its students’ so therefore their approach to teaching did not take ‘full account of the presence of ethnic minorities in our society’ (Swann, 1985: 23). It was recommended that all ITT institutions should review their policies to ensure the changing population was reflected in their practice.

This research builds on the research relating to the under achievement of Black and ethnic minority pupils, but, my study brings together all aspects of inequality perpetuated in the primary classroom. The literature explored in chapter two demonstrates long-standing evidence that equality of opportunity is appreciated as axiomatic but is largely liminal in a teacher’s pedagogy. A wealth of well-established literature documented in journals and books reporting issues from the perspectives of sociology, psychology and critical theories spans half a
century. Although there is a wide range of valuable current research in the fields I explore, it is important to pay regard to earlier seminal work which established much of the current understanding of the issues.

In England institutions of education (schools, colleges, and universities) are provided with professional training, guidance and books to enhance their understanding and practice of equal opportunities. Policies embed anti-discrimination in government organisations and make attempts to eradicate bias from media and society. Nonetheless the issue of discrimination and bias persists in our classrooms: either breaking the cycle is impossible or mechanisms that might finally remove this perpetuation have yet to be determined. This research project is a case study of the experiences of two cohorts of trainees on one university based ITT programme in England as a means of identifying a way forward. The insight from the study leads to some important implications for recruitment and programme design. The research relates to an English university, but the findings are significant to ITT more widely.

Experts debate how inequalities are constructed and perpetuated through educational structures and political hegemony. Many of these structures are highlighted within this thesis as I attempt to construct my own understanding of effective ways to address discrimination through ITT. In grappling with my own understanding of this phenomenon I saw two clear questions emerge from both my personal experiences and my reading. My consideration became focused on the instructional pedagogies employed, what trainees bring to the training in terms of culture and experience of discrimination and how these processes interplay in terms of the possible shaping of socially responsible teachers. The questions I formed to develop my understanding were first:

*Which characteristics, brought to the training process by trainees, assist in the development of socially responsible teachers?*
And second:

*Which instructional pedagogies currently employed in the training process promote socially responsible teaching practice?*

The rest of the thesis explores literature pertinent to each of these questions and to the design of the investigation; the findings are interpreted through this literature. The structure of the thesis is addressed in the next subsection.

Although I recognise that using the terms ‘trainee’ and ‘training’ in respect of preparing candidates for the teaching profession is contentious in education, I began to use them as a way of avoiding confusion with terms used in international literature. However, during the analysis of the programme and literature surrounding teacher preparation in chapter two I conclude that these terms accurately reflect the performative nature of the profession and argue that we are in fact mainly training participants to comply with a heavily regulated set of standards.

As I have outlined my personal interest in the research as a way of declaring my standpoint, I now outline the key elements of my investigation. Each element will be expanded upon in the review of literature; however, a brief overview of the perspective may be helpful in setting the background.

In investigating the first of my questions – characteristics trainees bring to the training process – I considered what I was learning from the literature in the field alongside my personal experiences when interviewing potential candidates.

What I found was that most often when applying for ITT programmes candidates offer altruistic reasons in response to questions probing their desire to teach (Hobson *et al.*, 2009). However, when interviewing candidates I struggled with eliciting positive responses for factors which effect learning. The candidates mostly cited social deprivation and a lack of parental support as affecting children at school, suggesting a very narrow understanding of equal
access to education. Very few candidates referred to their own cultural opportunities as affecting their learning. This deficit approach to the ‘Other’, I suggest, demonstrates a lack of consciousness of personal privilege. According to Irvine (2008) the disposition of the candidate towards social justice should be an essential criterion in the recruitment process. Although selectors for ITT programmes make judgements about candidates’ potential capacity to teach, their capacity for critical reflection is not easily assessed during the recruitment process. This is an important aspect of current ITT programmes and is a significant finding of this study which contributes to the body of knowledge.

I acknowledge that trainees and teachers, however unwittingly, carry with them assumptions and beliefs about diverse ethnic and social groups from their own school days, from the media discourse with which they still engage and from the policies and curriculum content of the education system they are training within. This interplay of educational underachievement and social and cultural disadvantage has been researched by many. The review of literature in chapter two will investigate recommendations from other research of how this can be tackled during ITT. Assuming Foucault’s 1972 theory regarding the relationships between power and knowledge and power and truth I suggest that as recognised forms of ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ (ibid, 1980), the English schools’ inspection framework, national assessment procedures and other policy structures are a form of power and control perpetuating biased teacher beliefs of children’s cognitive development. This study situates the policies of the English National Curriculum firmly within Bernstein’s (1977) visible pedagogy as a reproductive education system.

The thesis focuses on fundamental inconsistencies surrounding the notion of inclusion and equality in the English education system. Previous and current government policies, including the National Curriculum, have directed teachers to actively alleviate discrimination; however, research suggests that the contrary
is in evidence in English schools. Gillborn (2008b) insists that research shows that black pupils are systematically disadvantaged when their teachers are asked to create teaching groups based on their perception of ability or motivation. In schools where pupils come from a range of different ethnic groups ‘black kids are consistently over-represented in the bottom sets’ (ibid: sp. conf). Vardill & Calvert (2000) draw attention to the gender imbalance in SEN referrals, stating that in primary ages almost three times more boys were identified than girls. Lynch & O’Neill (1994: 319) claim that ‘the absence of a working class voice from education has been a significant factor in the theorising of inequality in education as a cultural problem’, highlighting the tensions between working class families and teachers as relating to the difference in habitus. And Bhopal (2011) explores how racism is experienced differently by the white working-class Gypsy and Traveller groups in school and society.

Difference in social skills, values and codes of language can create tensions within the classroom situation. Aronowitz & Giroux (1991) assert that the objective of schooling is to eradicate ‘self-presenting popular culture’ in favour of ‘white middle class’ culture. The main thrust of their theory is that teachers are seen as key to social change in education through the use of critical skills. They suggest that developing teachers’ critical theory skills to frame their teaching could eradicate inequality. However, this may overlook the extent to which the teacher is situated within the social and political context of the classroom with an explicit directive to manage and control learning and behaviour. The review of literature in chapter two will expose how pupils generally align with the teacher’s practice, engaging in education by conforming to social control expectations. Where pupils create management dilemmas for the teacher, stereotypes are attributed to explain the teacher’s lack of understanding, and labelling and self-fulfilling prophecies are developed which support the teacher’s ‘knowledge’. The social structure of a classroom is
therefore in part constructed by the teacher and it partly creates the teacher. I argue that teachers’ consciousness of this context is essential for change and so critical reflection is a necessary asset for a trainee to bring to their teaching.

Although my personal experience of this phenomenon has been as a working class female I do not take a critical feminist approach, or focus my lens through critical theories of social class or poverty. My experience of ‘race’ discrimination is indirect and has been shaped by my own children’s accounts of their school experiences. I have chosen not to explore the issue through any one characteristic since research into each area of stereotyping and discrimination follows a different perspective. I chose to stand back from a critical theory perspective, although it is not possible to study in this field without drawing on the research in this area. It is not the intention to criticise teachers for acts of oppression; my assumption is that, as hegemony is socially constructed, they are unconscious of their position. I therefore consider all forms of discrimination as damaging and seek to understand the social processes at play. I believe that, to become socially responsible teachers, trainees must be conversant with all forms of discrimination and learn to see themselves as responsible for pupil learning. The investigation explores the instructional pedagogies recommended in research (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a/b; Kea et al., 2006) to raise trainee consciousness of the damaging impact of normalised forms of stereotyping on pupils’ attainment.

Throughout the thesis I explore the relevance of social and cultural dimensions in ITT to investigate how essential social justice awareness is in shaping socially responsible teachers. For an overview of the history of the use of the term ‘social justice’ I recommend Grant & Agosto (2008), but for the purpose of this study I only investigate the possibility of ensuring equity in educational outcomes for pupils through the training of teachers. However, I do borrow from them in aligning my interpretation of social justice with that of Young (1990):
'social justice aims for the elimination of institutionalized domination and oppression'. For me social justice is a key aspect of a teacher’s responsibility: as a teacher one has a responsibility to the pupils to ensure that they have equal access to learning and achievement. Teaching is only occurring successfully if all pupils are learning. I recognise that education is laden with this type of expression but, as I stated earlier, through deconstructing the theories at work within this study I learnt why and how this thinking was rooted in my own philosophy of education. It will also become clear through the vignettes that this sense of responsibility and advocacy became key features of the investigation. I explore what it is to be a socially responsible teacher in the second sub-section of chapter two but it is relevant here to clarify that my use of the term relates specifically to a capacity to counter stereotyping and discrimination in the classroom.

The use of terms relating to identity by parental or grandparental cultural heritage is complicated. My own understanding and experience of culture is that it relates to religion and social class as much as to socially constructed traditions and values which are geographically defined. The terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ have been explored and debated across a range of human disciplines – anthropology, sociology and politics for example – but are complex and contentious. In relation to categorising people, the term ‘Black’ is often constructed as a political term and takes no account of geographical heritage or culture, whilst ethnicity is subjective and multidimensional (Malešević, 2004). Arguments regarding perceptions of ethnicity and the separation of those defined as Black from other non-White groups are too numerous to be given fair consideration here. They include the tension between government priorities as well as personal preference. However, Leonardo & Grubb (2014: 3) contend that the ‘hierarchical social system of race, [...] is the valuation of social groups grounded on skin-colour differences’. My beliefs regarding this valuation of skin tone comes from personal experience. Malešević (2004: 5) identifies that, ‘in the
British context, a label such as Asian often refers to an ethnic collectivity whose
descent can be traced to some geographical location in the Indian sub-
continent’. However, he also contends that in Britain it is a ‘racial’ description,
referring to visible identifiers such as skin tone, hair and eye colour. Whichever
is the case, this discussion is too complex and intricate to be covered here. The
identification of people by the colour of their skin regardless of heritage, culture
and identity does not sit comfortably with me or within this research, but
government statistical data draws on these terms, thus they are used in our
school system.

Stereotypes and their perpetuation are complicated and have been established
through sociology and critical theories. The intersection of ‘race’, faith, gender,
social class and special needs as aspects of disadvantage is so enculturated
within our society that it is difficult to challenge this normalised acceptance of
disadvantage. There are compelling arguments for maintaining the separation
of each of these forms of oppression in order to preserve their visibility in social
discourse; however for the purpose of this study I blend all disadvantaged
groups as ‘the other’ in the sociological sense. Sprague (2010: 85) draws on
the work by Dorothy Smith (1979-1990) who draws a sharp male/female divide,
claiming that in fact ‘race’ and class interact with gender in sorting people on
both sides of this divide. She asserts that ‘racially’ and economically privileged
men are the most likely to be in positions of power. I fully acknowledge the
hierarchy of disadvantage and that greater damage is done to particular groups
especially non-White people. Through this investigation I assert that the
separation of disadvantage creates dissonance in the trainees’ acceptance of
social responsibility. It was my intention to investigate the trainees’ sense of
social responsibility and advocacy as teachers rather than to identify which
disadvantage is more visible to them. Learning more about how and why we
see things as we do, shaped the way I understand the meanings others make of
their lives, which has proved to be significantly more helpful to my study than simplifying identity categories.

Although I am researching the intersection of disadvantage through schooling, the thesis occasionally pays particular regard to the research surrounding ‘racialised’ discourse in education. It helps to add depth to the argument being put forward and to develop my understanding of how elements of oppression work on all disadvantaged groups. I made this decision because of the findings of a previous study (Mohamed, 2006: 57) which highlighted more open mindedness amongst practitioners, on an anti-bias training course, to the continued existence of ‘racism’ than to class or gendered discrimination. Categorisation by visible identity salience is also used as a political tool in public debates about pupil attainment. This presupposes that the visible identity salience of skin colour will be more readily referred to by my participants. Although being female is obviously a visible identity, critical feminists argue that women are air brushed from history and politics: I allow myself to consider gender as invisible to the trainees in this study as it was to the practitioners in my previous study. Invisibility could also be attributed to the normalisation of privilege by social class and gender, all of which is discussed further in chapter two.

David Gillborn refers to teachers as ‘the most immediate face of institutional racism in education’ (2008b), supported by Sheets (2003: 111) who claims that ‘we tolerate excuses of poverty and racism rather than focusing on the academic failure our children face daily’. ‘For pupils to experience academic success teacher perceptions and instructional patterns that appear to be detrimental must be transformed’ according to Ambe (2005: 695). Improving educational outcomes for all learners should therefore be considered in designing teacher training: trainees should be encouraged through instructional
pedagogies to develop competencies that demonstrate an appreciation for diversity and a sense of responsibility for the learner.

It is not enough to discover that any cohort of trainees may have narrow assumptions and beliefs about cultures other than their own, nor to draw on past and current research informing us that the attitudes of teachers towards different groups of children affects their life chances educationally. To realise these social justice aspirations ITT institutions should take on the challenge of transforming the stereotypical beliefs of the trainees through the design of the training programmes. A range of approaches from other studies are explored in the next chapter, and I identify how the programme being investigated is aligned with some of these research findings in chapter three, which puts the programme in context.

Much of my study is predicated on the work of Sarah Silverman who suggests that ‘beliefs about responsibility may be as predictive of behaviour as beliefs about outcomes and efficacy’ (2010: 299). Her work chimed a chord with my uninformed feelings about the training of effective teachers. In my own development as a trainer of teachers I was aware of a divide between those trainees who demonstrated a sole focus on themselves during the training process and those who, over time, shifted their gaze from themselves as a teacher to the pupils they were teaching. Silverman further suggests that a sense of advocacy towards various identity groups may reflect beliefs about responsibility and efficacy. The use of her terms and approach are introduced in the literature chapter and later discussed in the context of the study in chapters four and five.

A further consideration for me was that, as with many ITT programmes, the trainees I was investigating were expected to engage with the practice of reflection on their professional development. Elaine Surbeck, along with her colleagues Eunhye Park Han and Joan Moyer, had studied the reflective
journals of their trainees in 1991 and described three categories of responses. These categories were evident in the reflective journals of the trainees I had been working with and offered an alternative way of gaining insight into the trainees' capacity to synthesise how their own learning might impact on the pupils they would teach. The identified levels; *reaction, elaboration* and *contemplation* are explained in detail when I discuss the coding and analysis of data in chapter four. These provide the most significant data in the analysis of social responsibility.

Coming to an understanding of social justice in education positioned my choice of methods and shaped the way I analysed the data to find answers to the questions I posed. Considering the joint emergence of social and cognitive identity in a classroom situation highlighted by Wortham (2006), this study contributes to research into the possibility of removing the perpetuation of injustice within school culture and practice in primary classrooms.

Chapter two reviews the literature surrounding the complexities which emerged as I sought answers to my research questions. I separate the themes researched to respond to the two questions separately before considering how they are inter-related. The first section considers the function of schooling, through sociological theories, to identify how trainees have learnt about the value attributed to different categories of people and how these become normalised through schooling.

This review draws on the taxonomies and practices for classifying pupils within educational institutions traced by Wortham (2006), especially his suggestion that the systems employed in classification facilitate knowledge of what kinds of pupils a school has and how these pupils are likely to behave. Wortham (2006) extends this to explore how this knowledge is drawn from stereotyped categories known and used by the school community. However, Clough (2002: 5) argues that one must also take into account that 'teaching methods are
uniquely created in the presence and service of quite particular contexts of moral and political need', echoing Bernstein’s (1975) theory that ‘the relationship basic to cultural reproduction or transformation is essentially the pedagogic relation’ (ibid, 2007: 98). Bernstein describes how political policy drives have an overt influence on relationships and interactions within the classroom. This can quite clearly be identified in current English policy drives to improve ‘behaviour’ (DfE, 2010a: 31) and the rhetoric surrounding the lack of responsibility demonstrated by ‘poor parenting’. Current English media and political discourse refers regularly to ‘hard working parents’ and ‘parents who “do the right thing”’, suggesting that parents who don’t work or who have culturally different child-rearing practices are not doing the right thing.

McLaren’s (2013) explanation of the critical theory of education offers insight into the partisan approach. ‘It must fundamentally be tied to a struggle for a qualitatively better life for all through the construction of a society based on non-exploitative relations and social justice’ (ibid: 4). There are many questions to be asked regarding the social construction of knowledge and forms of knowledge and how these interplay with class and culture. According to Sprague (2010: 85) Nancy Hartsock argues that ‘all knowledge is constructed in a specific matrix of physical location, history, culture and interests’.

This leads me to draw on the process of hegemony where the status quo for dominant groups is maintained through ‘consensual social practices, social forms, and social structures produced in specific sites’ (McLaren, 2013: 11). These sites include schools, the political system, the media, places of worship, and the family. McLaren proposes that ‘social forms refer to the principles that provide and give legitimacy to specific social practices’ – what people say and do (2013: 11) – and confirms that ‘state legislature is one social form that gives legitimacy to the social practice of teaching’ (ibid).
National statistical data provided by the English government for local authority comparison against national attainment averages until 2011 indicated that minority ethnic groups that traditionally underachieve in the English educational system were beginning to be more successful at end-of-schooling GCSE outcomes. However, it is asserted by Bhopal & Sleeter (2013) that this success is not evident in places gained at university or in employment. It is important to note that one of the coefficients in the formula for collecting school level data of has for years been the ethnicity of pupils. Although this was a response to the recommendations of The Rampton Report in the 1970s, one consequence was that as ethnic groups had different values attributed; the value the school was perceived to be adding to the pupils’ education was affected. This resulted in the school being categorised as successful or not, which could trigger a school inspection. These coefficients created an assumption that children of Indian origin were more educationally aspirational and would therefore outperform white working class and Pakistani heritage children. Effectively different levels of progress and attainment were expected nationally from pupils ‘on the basis of their ethnic or family background’ (DfE, 2010a: 68).

However well-intentioned and supportive this system was claimed to be under the 1997-2009 Labour government, the reality led to claims of it being morally wrong by the subsequent government (DfE, 2010a: 68). This demonstrates that government policy and legislation can support the renegotiation of barriers for some cultural groups whilst maintaining axiomatic acceptance of others. The context of the society within which stereotypes are played out influences the perpetuation or eradication of attitudes. However schools are categorised by the State; teachers, parents and the wider community are known to respond to the discourse surrounding these labels. In my previous professional role it was readily acknowledged that as a consequence of inspection parents removed their children from schools put into a negative inspection category. Although government education policy rhetoric asserts a drive towards equality of
opportunity and inclusive education, the assessment policies at both pupil and school level are driven by attainment outcomes only, creating a dichotomy of educational purpose within schools. ‘The phenomenon of performativity in schooling, characterised by a data-driven ‘audit culture’, a rigorous inspection framework and the use of market levers to provide incentives and sanctions, has been extensively studied’ suggested Wilkins et al. (2011: 4).

The second section of the literature review considers what current ITT researchers are suggesting are the causes of and solutions to this perpetuation of stereotyped assumptions. As we must train the candidates recruited onto our programmes I argue that IT trainers need to be aware of the political and social culture of the education system in which they work and share a commitment to social justice. The lack of teacher autonomy in the English education system together with the Eurocentric nature of its National Curriculum, prescriptive pedagogies and assessment systems undermine the need for teacher awareness of other cultures. It is argued by Bhopal & Rhamie (2013) and Wilkins (2013) that this phenomenon will continue as a consequence of the new standards for and inspection of ITT programmes. In the interests of social justice, this study aligns itself with research confirming that schooling continues to damage the attainment and therefore life chances of some pupils, and suggests that teachers should be encouraged through training to be critical of discriminatory policy and practice. Investigating how biased assumptions and beliefs can be effectively challenged and adapted is imperative as a way forward for ITT programmes if we are to create socially responsible teachers who can potentially break the cycle of inequality and discrimination.

The perspective I take here is that if trainees begin their training believing that biased inequalities are natural or unproblematic they are more likely to have those assumptions confirmed than challenged within the current teaching community. Grossman et al. (2000) have investigated the powerful influence
that trainee teachers' attitudes about teaching have on their professional development. They suggest that most individuals who choose education as a career have had a positive identification with teaching which, according to Lortie (2000) and Lave (1993), can lead to the continuity of conventional practice and reaffirmation rather than challenge and transformation. As ITT tutors are predominantly drawn from the same teaching community, the capacity of tutors to address the issues in the training is also considered throughout the study. There are always new government policies which complicate the dissemination of research. Under current political policies the primary training site for ITT is to be relocated to schools which will bring new and different challenges. Lander (2013: 1) argues that 'new entrants will be trained to become teachers in one year, in one school, in one locality with minimum input from a higher education institution'. She goes on to assert that the latest ‘Teachers’ Standards’ (DfE, 2011) directives ‘limit the content of the teacher education curriculum to a list of classroom related competencies which include little or no reference to diversity, ‘race’, ethnicity or culture’ (Lander 2013: 1). Finding new ways for research to inform practice will be important if we are to make a difference.

Research into preparing teachers for diverse populations concentrates on either the white teacher in a culturally diverse school or on Black and minority ethnic teachers and their role in education. Irvine (2003: 17), however, strongly recommends that ITT programmes ‘create opportunities for beginning teachers to grapple with, reflect upon, and assimilate complicated issues associated with their own personal, social, cultural, and ethnic identities’. Therefore I set out to uncover how my programme shaped the development of socially responsible teachers through their training experiences, during lectures or during school participation.

Kea et al. (2006) use the findings from their research to make suggestions about how to develop ITT course content to provide a culturally responsive
curriculum. They draw on the importance of experience within culturally diverse settings during the practicum referring to the need for: collective discussion; immersion into a new cultural experience; exploring of personal history and the importance of reflective writing. They suggest that programme guidance should concentrate on supporting trainees to uncover their beliefs about diversity, in an attempt to challenge their understanding. These suggestions are considered during the investigation of this programme to determine the impact on beliefs and behaviour of trainees. This is explained further in chapter three, where I set out the context of the programme and the pedagogies employed.

According to DeVault (2010: 147) ‘many naturally occurring groups are relatively homogenous in terms of ‘race’, class, gender or sexuality’ and Tuhiwai Smith (2010) asserts that we all assess people, insiders and strangers, from the first encounter or interaction. She informs us that ‘different cultures, societies and groups have ways of masking, revealing and managing how much of the assessment is actually conveyed to the other person when it is communicated in what form and for what purpose’ ([ibid]: 101). This construction of ‘self’ and ‘Other’ is fundamental to this research, and is embedded in the symbolic interactionism pioneered by Mead (1934) and later developed by Blumer (1969) (see Bogden & Biklen, 2010). My interpretation of the trainees’ professional journey through the programme is shaped by my understanding of ‘self’ and ‘Other’ within this paradigm. This interpretation is discussed at length in chapter four.

My choice to use qualitative, interpretive methods in the investigation is down to personal preference and understanding; my intention was to interpret the trainees’ reflections on their professional progress. Greene (2010: 71) asserts that ‘interpretivist knowledge reflects the values of the enquirer even as it seeks to reconstruct others’ sense of meaning and supporting beliefs. Through a review of approaches to research in chapter four I take the constructivist stance
that ‘knowledge is socially constructed, value bound and indeterminate’ (Greene, 2010: 63). Chapter four situates my study within Stake’s (1995) line of reasoning that interpretive investigation ‘derives from tacit knowledge of how things are’ the findings here take the form of expectation rather than prediction. Interpretivist inquiry ‘is not directly concerned with judging, evaluating, or condemning existing forms of social and political reality’, but ‘with describing and understanding its constitutive meaning’ (Bernstein, 1977: 169).

Given my status as a lecturer on the programme being studied and the time restrictions of the programme, voluntary participation was requested from trainees. Although this led to a convenience sample and didn’t attract participants I might have targeted, this took the study in a different direction and provided new insights. The intention had been to seek participation from both White and minority ethnic trainees and from male and female participants. In chapter five I explain how it was of interest originally to consider how minority ethnic trainees perceived prejudice and discrimination and to ascertain whether the shared cultural identity as self-classified ‘minority ethnics’ is specifically a shared non-White identity or if they consciously draw on respective cultural experiences to gain a sense of belonging and relevancy. I also wanted to consider how the middle class White male perceived aspects of privilege in education. Unfortunately these trainees didn’t volunteer themselves as study participants – the study might have been the richer for their participation. However the study direction led to insights that had nothing to do with identity salience of the participant, other characteristics appear to have a much greater influence on social responsibility.

Although these factors undoubtedly shape the findings from the study, they in no way shift the focus from finding effective mechanisms to shape socially responsible teachers. My original expectations and hypotheses changed as I ruminated on what the data were telling me. Numerous conversations and
lengthy spells of time spent contemplating the trainees’ responses led me away from my initial understanding to a much clearer focus and a new way of viewing the essential characteristics of both potential candidates and the training programme. This is discussed in detail in the conclusion to the thesis.

1.3 Structure of thesis

This case study into the complex issues surrounding the shaping of socially responsible teachers was carried out within the context of a PGCE training programme which sought to actively challenge the cycle of perpetuating stereotypes.

In the introduction I have outlined my investigation into the tensions and contradictions of equal opportunities in primary education in England. I shared some of my personal history and that of my children. This helped to define and shape the research questions. The research has helped me to understand my own history and teaching experience more fully and thus will enable me to pass this new knowledge on to cohorts of trainees I will train in the future.

The review in chapter two of relevant and seminal research literature and government policy seeks to examine evidence which indicates that there is within the English education system a fundamental inconsistency between the rhetoric and reality of equality of opportunity and inclusive education. The study seeks to pursue the notions that this is in no small part due to teacher assumptions of attainment based on pupils’ social and cultural categories and that the training of the next generation of teachers will be a vital component in the eradication of perpetuating stereotypes of cognitive and social capability. This is presented in two subsections: the first a review of literature surrounding the social construction of these assumptions, the second a review of literature regarding the process of training socially responsible teachers.
The training programme, and specifically the instructional pedagogies employed in different sessions, is outlined in chapter three to enable the reader to gain a clear picture of how the findings relate to the programme delivery.

The investigation used a mixed methods approach to the data collection. Chapter four examines the methods employed for both the data collection and the process for analysis of the data. The validity and reliability of the chosen methods are described and explored as well as the ethical issues and procedures followed.

In chapter five, vignettes of the findings are offered as a way of demonstrating how I came to the conclusions regarding my interpretation of the trainees’ reflections. The overlaying of two separate coding themes provided insight into the characteristics of socially responsible trainees. Through the participants reflections it was possible to identify three categories of trainees on the programme. Vignettes for each category of trainee are followed by a critical discussion of the findings emerging from the analysis in response to each question. This is followed in chapter six by an interpretation of the data within the context of other research in the field.

The concluding chapter, chapter seven, offers a brief summary of the evidence revealed through this study and contributes new knowledge to inform a way forward for ITT; it also suggests further appropriate research.
2 REVIEWING THE LITERATURE

2.1 Rationale for the literature

My purpose in undertaking this research study has been to investigate ways of shaping socially responsible teachers through a PGCE training programme. Through this thesis I therefore explore some of the mechanisms by which inequalities are perpetuated in our classrooms using a sociological perspective. This is not a new field of study, indeed it has been explored for decades across the UK, USA, Canada, Australia and Europe encompassing interconnected aspects of these mechanisms. I have aspired to contribute to the knowledge of effective mechanisms by which inequalities are combatted through the training of teachers. Understanding social justice in education involves examining both interconnecting systems of oppression related to ‘race’, class, gender, ability, and sexuality, and how power relations shape children’s experiences in society and schools. This literature review will, therefore, also explore some aspects of these forms of political disadvantage in the English state school system.

The complex role of education systems and schooling in the perpetuation of hierarchies within society necessitates the bringing together of a wide range of research literature. In this chapter I map out which areas of research are pertinent to my study and how these relate to each other. This is separated into two subsections: the first is a review of literature surrounding the politics and sociology of schooling as a means of identifying the development of relevant characteristics trainees bring to the training process. The second is a review of how socially responsible teachers might be shaped through the training process with the aim of identifying the key mechanisms in initial teacher training (ITT)
programmes which effect greatest change in trainee awareness of the damage caused by stereotyped assumptions.

For the purpose of this thesis the term ‘trainee’ rather than the term ‘student’ is used to denote pre-service teachers, student teachers or PGCE students to avoid confusion with the use of ‘student’ to mean a school aged pupil. The term ‘teacher’ is used for in-service practising teachers and the term ‘pupil’ is used to describe children within the primary school context of the study.

Many researchers (Ball, 2003; Sachs, 2005; Hobson et al., 2009) concur that the majority of teachers enter the profession for altruistic reasons, expressed as ‘belief and commitment, service and even love’ (Ball, 2003: 216). It might be reasonable to assume then that they have a sense of responsibility for all pupils’ achievement equally, but research provides contrary evidence (Gillborn, 2008a; Mirza, 2009). Other researchers claim that the beliefs built up through socialisation during formative years in school are a predictor of the beliefs trainees bring to and hold firmly to through the training process, and that are played out in classroom interactions. I will explore through the work of Pajares (1992-2007), Sleeter (1999-2008), Irvine (1999-2008) and others how these beliefs are manifested by trainees. Through the work of theorists such as Freire (1970-1996), Biesta (2005-2009) and Bourdieu (1979-82) I consider how the socialisation of hierarchical categories and stereotyped beliefs about diverse groups are perpetuated through the schooling system. I then go on to review how ITT programmes can deconstruct beliefs regarding privilege and discrimination through the choice of instructional pedagogies employed and the shaping of professional identity in both school and university settings. In outlining the work drawn on for the research study I expose mechanisms which require further research if teacher training programmes are to contribute to combating the inequality of school systems. To put the study in context, I first
outline the political commitment of successive UK governments to justice and equality in education.

Political interest in raising the attainment of Black and ethnic minority children in England can be traced back to the 1970s. Since Britain’s ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 developments in the English education system have ostensibly enshrined equality and inclusion in policy. The National Curriculum (2000) and the Early Years Foundation Stage (2007) direct teachers to consider entitlement, inclusion and equality. The national government agenda has given legislative duty to all schools to pay regard to equal opportunities legislation including the Sex Discrimination Act (1975), the (1976) and later (2000) Race Relations (Amendment) Act, and Disability Discrimination Act (2005), since 2002 embedding anti-discriminatory principles in educational practice has been obligatory. Documents and legislation such as the Children Act (1989), the Macpherson reports (1999, 2009), the Human Rights Act (2000), and the Childcare Act (2006) required that policy and practice reflected a commitment to equality and justice. More recently the introduction of the Equality Act (2010) has brought all forms of equality under one legislative Act. However, research across a range of contexts has exposed barriers to the implementation of legislation primarily related to teacher understanding and expectations. Research also criticises the explicitly outcome-driven agenda of successive governments, performativity has become more of a concern to the profession, Apple (2007) and Beck (2008) would argue, than what pupils are learning about. This performative culture of the British education system is an essential aspect of this investigation and is discussed later in this chapter.

This is confirmed by Lewis (2013) whose PhD work demonstrates that this is also true for children of mixed race: according to Commission for Racial Equality (2007), members of the third largest and most rapidly increasing minority ethnic group in Britain today identify themselves as ‘mixed’, and the majority of this group are currently of traditional study age (under 21). Alongside the inequality of outcomes for pupils according to race and socio-economic disadvantage there has long since been a conflict in British educational policy to balance gender performance. Changes to the way successive governments collect data and reassign pupil characteristics make it difficult to compare statistics over a number of years.

Research by Husbands et al. (2003) and Ladson-Billings (2004) has shown that the way teachers conceptualise the curriculum, and how they understand the constraints pupils face, is often limited. These assertions are supported by Bhatti (2004), Maylor et al. (2009) and Bhopal et al. (2009) who highlight the unintentional racism that some teachers exhibit. Although it is not suggested here that blatant and intentional discrimination is carried out by teachers, Siraj-Blatchford (1995) and Brown (1998) believe that these attitudes are developed by young children as a consequence of messages given through body language combined with an ignorance of issues leading to a lack of challenge from the adults around them. Left unchallenged, these attitudes and beliefs will begin to define the way children are socialised into categories of hierarchical ‘in or out groups’ (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Teacher assumptions of potential pupil attainment have been studied for decades in educational systems (Merton, 1949; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rist, 1970; Irvine 1999). The fact that research in this field continues (Sleeter, 2008; Irvine, 2008; Gillborn, 2008a; Maylor et al., 2009; Mirza, 2009; Smith & Lander, 2012 and Smith, 2013) and that the question is evident in political discourse and rhetoric (Macpherson, 2009; DfE, 2010b) suggests that it remains of concern. Findings from influential research studies reaching as far back as the 1960s (Rosenthal & Jacobson,
1968; Bowles & Gintis, 1972; Bourdieu, 1982) have been available for the period of statutory education of the majority of the current teachers and trainees and during this time English society has renegotiated many of the stereotypical assumptions and taboos of past decades. This shift in knowledge and attitudes and the rhetoric of government policies over these decades might be expected to have led to a reduction in inequality for pupil attainment.

This investigation is set within the context of a number of studies into the discriminatory experiences of trainees on ITT programmes across the UK (Siraj-Blatchford, 1991; Wilkins & Lall, 2011; Smith & Lander, 2012; Smith, 2013), America (Nieto, 2004; Sleeter, 2008; Irvine, 2008; Whipp, 2013), Canada (Soloman et al., 2005), Australia (Allard & Santoro, 2006) and Sweden (Edström, 2009). As a high proportion of trainees on this programme were receiving statutory school education during the 1980’s and 1990’s, it would have been reassuring to find that a growing awareness amongst teachers of the effect of stereotyping and prejudice had positively affected their formative experiences and led to more socially just beliefs. Unfortunately as I stated earlier the trainees were comfortable articulating commonly held stereotyped beliefs. They were equally unlikely to be deliberately or blatantly biased, but as they have been immersed in the ‘silent washing’ of stereotypes identified by Osler (1997) throughout their education, they could not always see why it matters. It is essential that teachers develop an awareness of how potentially damaging stereotypes of groups are. If teachers are to challenge discrimination and promote equality they must first develop a clear understanding of the issues and influences on the learning and development of young children. ITT programmes clearly have a critical role in this transformation.

The basis of my argument regarding the systemic perpetuation of inequality is that, as Bourdieu (1974-1986), Foucault (1972-1980) and others before and after them have consistently argued, schools function to maintain the status quo
through power and knowledge, excluding segments of the population and constructing identities and labels for each stratum of society in order that these labels are normalised. I draw on early work by Tajfel (1969), Bernstein (1977), and Pajares (1992) alongside later work by Richardson (1996), Bhatti (2004), Wortham (2006) and Smith (2013) to demonstrate how teachers and teacher trainers unwittingly reproduce this cultural discrimination in their classrooms.

In order to explore the complex dynamics engaged in perpetuating inequalities through the ‘pedagogic relation’ (Bernstein, 1977) I begin by outlining how government policies in England uphold the privileges of the elite. My thinking is grounded in socio-cultural theories but necessarily draws on critical theory in examining Whiteness as a structure of power in England. One of the most challenging but essential influences explored is the set of personal beliefs brought to the professional training process. These beliefs develop as a result of the complex interplay of race, gender, class, sexual identity, and national origin that shape how we identify ourselves and how we value people we encounter. Sleeter (2008), Picower (2009), Smith (2013) Glenny et al. (2013) and others argue that the lack of awareness of non-dominant groups in society that trainees bring with them to the training process hampers their development as socially responsible teachers. Exploring how these beliefs are shaped during the trainees’ own formative school socialisation, and how they might be deconstructed through the ITT programme, has been a focus for my research and so the literature surrounding the construction of beliefs and the development of a socially responsible professional identity are considered within this chapter.

I first outline here the politics and sociology of schooling as a means of identifying the development of relevant characteristics trainees bring to the training process through my interpretation of Biesta’s theory (2009). He contends that there are three quite distinct functions or purposes of state
education: qualifications, socialisation, and subjectification or individualisation. Given the perspective of my thesis, the review of surrounding literature regarding the national policy context is explored through these three functions. Biesta’s functions are not separate but intersect in intricate and complex ways; I explore these in order to expose relevant characteristics brought by trainees to the training process which support or hinder the development of socially responsible teachers.

2.1.1 Qualification Function

According to Biesta (2005) the transmission of knowledge and skills is based on an economical conception of education which portrays teachers as providers of learning and pupils as consumers of knowledge. In much the same vein as Bernstein’s ‘visible pedagogy’ (1977) and Freire’s (1969) ‘banking’ notion of education, the outcomes of education in the UK, as elsewhere, are driven by the international comparison of economic competitiveness. Policy and practice vary according to whether governments believe that the most important role of the teacher is to transmit knowledge, encourage understanding or foster the holistic growth of the pupils.

What follows is a necessarily brief examination of how policy development has shaped education in England to perpetuate disadvantage through performative structures. This policy backdrop is included to provide the current framework within which teachers and teacher trainers find themselves working in England. Governments make decisions for the public about the purpose or function of the national education system. Teachers in the UK, as well as countries such as America and Canada, are obliged to adhere to statutory and sometimes non-statutory policies through ‘panoptical surveillance’ (Foucault, 1995). Pupil
Educational outcomes are measured to meet ever-changing national priorities through governmental scrutiny and regulation, which is devolved to Head teachers and senior leaders in school to ensure it is ever-present. Today governments in most countries assert a link between the knowledge and skills with which young people enter the workforce and long-term economic competitiveness (Biesta, 2009; Dorling, 2012; Lingard et al., 2013). This has given rise to a rigorous and relentless measurement of educational ‘outcomes’ within countries and through international comparative studies such as the ‘Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study’ (TIMSS), the ‘Progress in International Reading Literacy Study’ (PIRLS) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) ‘Programme for International Student Assessment’ (PISA). The resulting league tables are assumed to indicate how national education systems perform compared to those of other countries (Biesta, 2009; Dorling, 2012; Lingard et al., 2013). The OECD has connected the PISA and TIMSS outcomes to the wider goals of society, especially promoting a correlation between the quality of school systems and economic growth (Biesta, 2009; Kielstra, 2012). Education policies are filled with the statistics that governments utilise to make claims that the national system is failing.

Successive governments in the UK and the USA have repeatedly created education policies designed to protect their wider ideological structures. Using international comparative data to set an agenda of ‘raising standards’ these governments create performative systems which dictate what the teachers should teach, when and how, through explicit hierarchy, sequence and structure, leading to highly visible outcomes (Bernstein, 1977).

According to Stephen Ball, who writes extensively on UK education policy, performativity and social class advantage, (2003: 216) performativity is a: ‘mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change based on rewards and
sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of ‘quality’, or ‘moments’ of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgement. The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial.

This quote encapsulates for me how, year on year, the performative nature of the system works to control learning and reduce the development of children by denying them a holistic education. OFSTED is not an independent inspectorate; it is regulated by current politics. Teachers consider themselves to be powerless in this situation, claiming that the pedagogic values of teaching are marginalised by a discourse of performativity and omnipresent scrutiny within institutions which causes stress and tension. ‘The teachers place themselves within the structure of oppression, submerged in the day to day reality of the job; they cannot perceive clearly how they serve the interests of the oppressors’ (Freire, 1996: 44).

Even though successive governments’ commission and fund research into education and learning, some dismiss academic research which conflicts with their own ideology as ‘misguided’ (Gove, 2013). Current political rhetoric cites the ‘Survey of Adult Skills’ (OECD, 2013), damning literacy and numeracy rates in England, as another way of forcing damaging change in our education system whilst ignoring the real cause of the problem. In this report England was one of the identified countries where social background was seen to have a major impact on literacy skills (ibid: 113). The OECD blamed the lack of complexity in teaching in state schools as the cause of this gap in attainment in England, citing over-publishing of results as detrimental to pupil learning. The findings were presented by the media as ‘England’s young adults trail the world in literacy and maths’ (BBC, 2013) sharing nothing of the OECD narrative.
In England the National Curriculum and testing regime are redesigned regularly to target aspects of knowledge and control; most recently the national priorities are set for ‘EAL, SEND, early maths, phonics and behaviour management’ (OFSTED, 2012). The only reason provided by government has been around the need to be competitive in international studies. A recent government consultation (DfE, 2013b) proposed that by 2016, 85% of pupils in any primary school will have to reach a ‘good level of attainment’ in tests for 11-year-olds in line with the new national curriculum. This report also introduces new ‘scaled scores’ for the testing regime, which are based on the ones used in international tests, including PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS to ‘show pupils are secondary ready’ (DfE, 2013b). This marker of a ‘good level of attainment’ has shifted for pupils as regularly as it has for the schools inspection regime in England, about every four years. This performativity in current education systems has been discussed by Jeffrey et al. (2008), Leaton-Gray & Whitty (2010), Wilkins (2011) and Lingard et al. (2013) who outline how international politics regulates the learning in our classrooms through both internal and external scrutiny.

From the perspective of De Lissovoy (2012), the obsessive regulation of pupil self-efficacy by contemporary academic and performative language is a more complex process than the simple circulation of norms. In his work he foregrounds the ‘continuous process of assault that characterises the hidden curriculum of schooling, particularly with regard to the contemporary discourses that work to name, know, and organise identities’ (ibid: 463).

Ironically, current government rhetoric suggests that academic attainment will support social mobility and end child poverty in the respective countries. In England initiatives have been introduced emulating those in the United States, for instance ‘closing the gap’, a phrase introduced by the previous Labour government in 2004 and turned into an initiative ostensibly to reduce disadvantage by the current Conservative-led coalition, and ‘Every Child
Matters’ (DfES, 2004) based on the American (2001) ‘No Child Left Behind’ policy. As a consequence of the OECD recommending that ‘contextual value added’ be removed from English school inspection regimes (2011), the current coalition government has introduced a new system of analysing the data of attainment for the most deprived section of British society which excludes any suggestion of race, ethnicity or religion: Pupil Premium. This fund is provided to schools to identify disadvantaged pupils by their eligibility for ‘free school meals’ (an indicator of low family income) and incorporates the requirement to collect data on the impact of any extra support purchased with the money. These policies carry the message that government is attempting to reduce inequalities, whilst in reality for schools they will undoubtedly bring further scrutiny. This scrutiny, suggest Leonardo & Grubb (2014: 139), means they will ‘become places where [pupils] are endlessly drilled on basic English, maths and test preparation, to the detriment of other subjects’.

This disadvantage created through the institutionalisation of power and knowledge in schooling has been documented by Freire, Bernstein, Bourdieu and Foucault in the 1970s and more recently by Dorling (2012). Freire (1996: 53) established the banking concept of education, that ‘knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those they consider to know nothing’. His theory explains that in order to be successful, pupils must work hard at storing deposits of knowledge and memorise content but not develop critical consciousness of that knowledge. This concept resonates clearly with the pedagogical approach to learning employed in state schools in England today. ‘The more completely [pupils] accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them’ (ibid: 53). The system of banking education serves the interests of the ruling class ‘who care neither to have the world revealed nor to see it transformed’ (ibid: 60). It also goes some way to demonstrate how potential candidates for teacher training programmes
have assimilated their beliefs about education. As will be discussed later, they have worked hard to store the deposits offered to them in the firm belief that all their classmates had the same opportunity to store them if only they had worked as hard.

The employment of stereotypes within the classroom context creates social and cognitive advantage and disadvantage. Pupils’ social identity within the classroom is drawn upon during both peer and teacher interactions leading to cognitive labels being attributed to pupils, as demonstrated through the work of Wortham (2006). This establishment of social and cognitive advantage and disadvantage through labelling is more subtle and less explicit than overt discrimination, however, a teacher’s unconsciousness of the difficulties some pupils encounter in their daily life can mean that their actions and behaviours are misinterpreted. This creation of advantage and disadvantage within the learning context is further elaborated through the socialisation function and the subjectification function in the following subsections. Through the explicit requirement for targeted attainment data, schools focus learning within the normalised performative framework. Parents’ pursuit of the highest attainment grades for their own children within this competitive market ensures that every advantage available to them is engaged thus creating further disadvantage for those lacking in an awareness of these processes.

This use of state education as a form of social control through the pedagogic relation extends to the way children are managed in classroom situations: hands up to speak or to answer a question, lining up in an orderly queue. These actions are the first social practices of school behaviour that English children learn. In the 2010 Schools White Paper the current coalition government legislated for punitive behaviour management as a practice of social control with which teachers and trainees are expected to comply. Subtle forms of social control continue when parents employ political rhetoric shared by the media and
schools to compare targets attained by their children. Children and parents compare and compete in a fearful expression of guilt or misplaced belief of ‘doing the right thing’. ‘Hard working parents’ anxiously heap more and more pressure onto their children so that by ‘playing the game’ their children might achieve a place at an elite university. However, as Dorling (2012: 66) demonstrates, ‘the 7% of privately educated children took one quarter of all A-levels and gained over half the places at the most selective universities. Almost all the rest of these places go to children from the better funded varieties of state schools, or those who have some other advantage at home’. The English university system colludes in this separation of young people by social class using the systems and procedures available to it.

Katja Hall (Policy Director of the Confederation of British Industries) disputes this performative economic model of the purpose of education and questions the effectiveness of its testing regime, stating that in order to improve the economic outlook ‘we need to tackle the perception that the A-levels and three year-degree model is the only route to a good career’ (2013). However, the pressure for state schools to meet increasingly challenging performance targets means that many disadvantaged young people are misled into believing that they are failures before they begin looking for work.

Institutions recruiting trainee teachers have restrictions placed upon them by governments which perpetuate this homogeneity of privilege. High degree classifications are seen are desirable and qualify candidates for government bursary grants for the training period (DfE, 2010c), and providers of ITT are encouraged to accept the newly described ‘good’ grades at GCSE and A-level in order to ensure only the ‘best candidates’ are accepted. Consequently only trainees who are seen to have ‘worked hard’ and been ‘successful’ in education are accepted into the profession. According to Sleeter (2001b), Irvine (2003)
and Ladson-Billings (2004) the majority will have no experience of discrimination or alternative cultures. Thus the cycle is perpetuated.

Teachers as a community have some aspects of privilege, for instance they have had access to Higher Education, the majority are white and they have consciously accrued ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1979). Drawing on Bourdieu and De Certeau (1984) whose work informs discussion around the difference between the strategies employed by the powerful in society to produce desired outcomes for their own kind, this politics of educational choice and social class has been extensively researched by Butler & Robson (2003), Ball (2004) and Reay (2007) and informs my perception of many of the trainees entering the teaching profession. However, in other respects teachers are onlookers of privilege: they do not have access to power within society; they can be seen to do the ‘bidding’ of the powerful elite through engaging in the government directed and monitored visible, explicit pedagogy. Bourdieu refers to this sector of an oppressive culture as the ‘dominated fraction of the dominant class’ (1979: 81). According to McLaren (2013: 11) ‘the dominant class secures hegemony – the consent of the dominated – by supplying the symbols, representations, and practices of social life …’ in such a way that the basis of privilege and power remains hidden. In this case the performatve social structure of schools and the accepted forms of social practices performed in schools ensure that subordinate groups see their individual failure as personal inadequacy. Teachers do not hold positions of power in society except in their classroom, but if teachers who appreciate the strategic policies which legitimise oppression and comprehend how to interact with non-dominant or ‘Other’ cultures enter school communities as conscious instruments of change, they can make a difference (Sleeter, 2008; Irvine, 2008).

In this section I have outlined my interpretation of how politics shapes the formation of cognitive identity in the classroom leading to the fatalistic
acceptance of success or failure. Later I go on to explore how this is normalised by labelling processes and structures as an essential element of socialised discrimination. First I consider how socialisation in classrooms plays a part in identity formation.

Self-conceptions of identity enter personal and social worlds through social discourses, so according to Bucholtz & Hall (2005: 3) ‘accounts that locate identity inside the mind may discount the social ground on which identity is built, maintained, and altered’. Consequently it is essential to understand the social contexts, including national policy, on which identity is built. The foundation for classroom interaction is laid outside the classroom, and outside the school. Many of the structural arrangements that inform this interaction, such as the hierarchical relationship between teacher and pupils, the timetable and the subject matter that should be taught are laid down by powerful social and policy discourses outside the classroom. The highly visible, explicit nature of this ‘reproductive pedagogy’ (Bernstein, 1977) means that within the target-driven climate of performativity pupils are made aware of expectations of themselves as learners and of those imposed on teachers as professionals. This awareness, or knowledge, of performance expectations creates categories of learners with corresponding labels; sometimes innocuous such as ‘the blue table’ but nevertheless these labels regulate the interactions within the classroom. The knowledge of ‘self’ built through these interactions serves as a socialising function of the school system. It is important at this stage to discuss how this is developed in classrooms.

2.1.2 Socialisation Function

This discussion of the socialisation of children in primary classrooms follows commentators such as Foucault (1980) and Freire (1996) and more recently Dorling (2012) alongside more moderate appraisers whose works provide widely articulated sociological terms such as Bernstein’s language codes
(1964), Bandura’s social learning theory (1977) and Bourdieu’s (1982) cultural capital. Additionally, research carried out in classrooms in the UK and in America has incorporated these theories and has contributed to knowledge of how the ‘Pygmalion’ effect is perpetuated through pedagogies employed in classrooms; (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Sharp & Green, 1975; Bruner, 1996; Wortham, 2006).

In his 1977 work ‘Social class and pedagogic practice’ Bernstein concluded that ‘the relationship basic to cultural reproduction or transformation is essentially the pedagogic relation’ (ibid: 197). In essence, how we educate pupils in schools dictates how we are able, as a society, to reproduce the status quo or to transform our social structures and practices. In the highly visible, explicit pedagogical approach with systematic measuring of targets evident in England, the emphasis is on the external product of the pupil. The principal rationale acts to produce differences between children, while according to Bernstein, the invisible, implicit pedagogical approach focuses upon cognitive, affective and motivational experiences. As Vanderstraeten & Biesta (2006: 169–170) put it: ‘the social structuring of classroom interaction situations is likely to enhance particular types of experiences at the expense of others’. Prejudices and expectations of what a teacher or a pupil ‘is’ and ‘should be’ form the basis of and shape the conditions for pedagogical encounters (Frelin & Grannas, 2010). Setting the development of cognitive and social identity within the context of a highly visible pedagogical approach to schooling ensures not only that the status quo is reproduced but that each member of society has been socialised into the normalisation of disadvantage, believing that this is how it should be, as Freire’s (1970) fatalistic consciousness reveals.

The sociology discussed here is seen by some as denigrating individualism and personal agency, reducing humans to passive actors of given social structures. Sharp & Green (1975) contend that liberal sociologists see ‘social structural
formations as the dynamic creations of constitutive human subjects who, through a continuous process of interpretation and negotiation, make and remake their social worlds’ (ibid: viii). This implies they have agency, which might be seen to conflict with the powerful argument of hegemony. However, I would argue that these two theoretical perspectives are interlinked as they are both grounded in the perspective of social structures; one can have agency within a personal context if not in a political one. To borrow from Sharp & Green again, ‘any notion of human freedom and self-expression must be situated in such a way to highlight one of the key features of modern society, what appears as the freedom and self-determination of a few occurs within the context of its denial to the many’ (ibid: ix). Trainees’ awareness of the social structure of classroom interactions, including reacting against the performative context of labels and fatalism, is essential to the development of social justice in a classroom. A socially responsible teacher will find ways to counteract stereotyped labelling and offer a curriculum accessible to all pupils. Positive identification with learning is crucial to cognitive development as I explain further in the next subsection.

Given the narrow focus of this study I offer only a brief outline of how the social structures of society are perpetuated by the ‘dominant fraction’ of society. This review of literature demonstrates how trainees have been socialised into believing stereotyped rhetoric as fact through their own education and media exposure. The literature also exposes how they go on to reproduce this socialisation as the status quo through the imposed pedagogies and performative structures within their own classrooms. This would be learnt by trainees during their apprenticeship in classroom practice. This aspect of social learning is further amplified when I turn to the literature surrounding the shaping of teachers.
Bandura’s social learning theory was developed in 1977 from experimental psychological studies that demonstrate how children learn and imitate modelled behaviours. In this theory Bandura stresses the influence of symbolic modelling derived from television, films, and other visual media. Humans learn cultural behaviours through observation and imitation (1986a). This view resonates through the literature regarding how we are socialised into the reproduction of cultures (Goffman, 1971; Stanczak, 2007). According to the radical perspective, the political structures of the society are designed to reproduce domination by the ruling class, the elite. This is done not only through the qualifications structure but also through the implicit and explicit use of stereotypes in the wider society which provide a reason for each ‘fraction’ of the dominated structure to accept their life chances. Using contemporary and sometimes localised stereotypes pupils are labelled and expectations for behaviour and attainment imposed on them as shown by Wortham (2006). Even the distribution of media in the UK is directed towards different fractions of society (the newspaper we read, the television programmes we view) and its content is influenced by the education received by those writing the newspaper articles or making the television programmes. In this way the media influences access to knowledge, aspirations and presentation of self as each fraction imitates their identified group. The integration and assimilation of stereotypes becomes normalised as they are ‘silently washed’ over developing identities.

Developing an understanding of self in terms of social, gender or ethnic identity within society is now well researched (Siraj-Blatchford, 1995; Brown, 1998; Wood, 2000; MacNaughton, 2000). This research explores how infants imitate modelled behaviours and engage in self-limiting, specifically gendered roles and activities, from around the age of two. By the age of two Brown (1998) claims that children reproduce the attitudes and values of their parents and begin to absorb prevailing attitudes about gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and disabilities. They are curious about differences and begin using current
stereotypes about people, including themselves, to express their thought and guide their actions. Milner (1993) and Troyna & Hatcher (1992) explored how children become socialised in terms of racial identity and warn against regarding them as empty vessels, confirming that between three and five years old, English children learn to attach value to skin colour.

Several contributions to identity theory explore the relationships between the individual and the social world (Haslam et al., 2000; Hogg & Vaughan 2002), regarding the relationships between individuals and social institutions as inseparable. In the process of building identities, the individual and the social world do not just interact, but are interdependent and mutually constructing (MacNaughton, 2000). To emphasise how this use of socio-historical categories in social interaction is contested and constituted in practice, Holland & Lave (2001) describe the use in terms of ‘enduring struggles’ between and among people.

These identities, socially constructed within the classroom situation, become part of our personal perception of ourselves and of others. In his study of ‘Downtown’, Hammersley (1990) argues that assumptions about humanity, knowledge, society, learning and children have all been built into particular forms of teaching. Teachers’ practice and process, and the perspectives pupils develop to make sense of and adapt to school, are part of the socialisation of children. Wortham (2006) further investigates this concept when considering the way wider socio-historical identities are used alongside local models of identity categorisation and curriculum content to develop the social and cognitive identity of pupils within a classroom situation. These interactions have been criticised as culturally biased for many years (Sleeter, 2001b; Ambe, 2006; Bhopal et al., 2009).

In his classroom based research Wortham (2006) demonstrates how ‘teachers and [pupils] develop local models of identity and habitually apply these to
[pupils] within the classroom using socio-historical models as a resource’ (2006: 9). He suggests that pupils’ construction of their own social and cognitive identity in relation to others’ develops in line with locally held prejudice. This adds to the body of research confirming the notion of the ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ conceptualised by Merton (1949), which was explored further through Bandura’s socio-cognitive theories. ‘Within particular events, teachers and [pupils] construct senses of who individuals are by presupposing and inflicting widely circulating categories’ (Wortham, 2006: 18). This affects the manner in which pupils are viewed socially and academically and how they behave towards the learning context and the teacher, as shown by theories of self-efficacy which I discuss later.

Tajfel & Turner (1986) use social learner theory to propose that inter-group behaviour is always preceded by some social categorisation activity. This is not only for the well-established reasons of ‘cognitive simplification’ but also because such categorisation involves the allocation of the self to one of the available groups, with corresponding implications for the search for some social coherence and self enhancement. Haslam et al. (2000) develop this theory further to postulate that the attitudes and behaviours of members of one group towards another are governed by the strength and relevance of the members’ social identity. This is not only pertinent to the development of identity as a school-aged learner but also to the process engaged in whilst training to teach.

A key element in the process of co-construction of identity is the negotiation between participants of meanings and practices and the emergence of identities through this process. This involves participants in constant role taking, role exchange and negotiation of shared symbols and shared meanings. Since the interaction between pupils and teachers concerns individuals performing institutional roles, as Goffman (1991) suggested, negotiation goes on between
individuals and their institutional role as well as between individuals and between institutional roles.

Pupils as well as teachers develop group communities in schools. Paechter (2007) has shown how pupils in schools construct practices of being boys and girls, while pupils in different year groups or in different subject areas have clear ideas of what it means to construct practice in those social groups. For pupils in classrooms, the process of developing an identity is related to learning. ‘As learning is mediated through their social identity, this identity is in turn integrated into their cognitive models’ (Wortham, 2006: 21). Eckert (2000) refers to such models as markets of available identities. The identities constructed in specific school cultures are influenced by collective presumptions shaped by pupils’ and teachers’ beliefs about gender, faith, ethnicity, social class, ability and norms about work-related identity and power.

Like many people, Wood (2000) believes that learning is influenced by social, historical and cultural factors. Human activities, including academic and cognitive ones, both presuppose and create social identities as identified by Wood (2000) in her early childhood research. The identities socially constructed in schools become part of our sense of ourselves and our perception of others. Stanczak (2007) and Spencer (2011) confirm that we learn prejudiced views through media images and the opinions and perceptions of our families and friends. This is not to say that the pupil always lacks any sense of agency in the situation. Bruner (1996) and Sharp & Green (1975) demonstrated in their studies that the ‘pupil plays a highly significant part in his own identity construction’ (Sharp & Green 1975: 127). This suggests that some pupils can select not to conform to a stereotyped norm or classroom devised label. According to Bruner (1960) this identification of ‘self’ relies on self-evaluation in terms of the class labels and norms and a self-judgement of efficacy resulting in what he terms ‘self-esteem’ (ibid: 37). It also assumes that pupils have a degree
of awareness that they have agency in the classroom or as learners. They may develop a resilience to negative labels in response to more positive affirmation of ‘self’ from other situations. Freire would contend, though, that any superficial analysis of a pupil’s conforming to teacher expectations ‘interprets fatalism as a trait of character rather than the fruit of an historical and sociological situation’ (1996: 43).

In 1981 Bandura & Schunk provided a perspective of human behaviour in which the views people have about themselves are critical elements in the exercise of control and personal agency. Pajares et al. (2007) furthered this by claiming that self-efficacy beliefs provide the foundation for human motivation, well-being and personal accomplishment. Work by Bandura (1997) situates self-efficacy within a theory of personal and collective agency that operates in concert with other socio-cognitive factors in regulating human well-being and attainment. Much current classroom research pays regard to these socio-cognitive theories, confirming that the social interactions within the classroom impact on pupil motivation ‘on the assumption that the beliefs that [pupils] create, develop, and hold to be true about themselves are vital forces in their success or failure in school’ (Pajares, 2003: 29). Given that teacher assumptions about ability will provide the greatest information regarding self-efficacy, pupils’ academic attainment will be disproportionately affected by teacher expectations.

However, according to Madge & O’Connor (2005: 85) ‘identity formation is not fixed but continuous and often contradictory. It involves negotiating changes and affirming continuities. It is a process that draws on everyday place-based identities as much as on ‘fictitious’ representations’. A major element of this is the construction of cultures in schools by groups of people who identify what counts as core and peripheral practice for their groups (communities of practice) (Wenger, 1999). Peripheral practices are constructed in space and time and indicate how participants in different groups in a school may move through school, or remain within it. Wortham (2006: 18) shows that early in the year
pupils and teachers are unsure how to identify individuals or what to expect about their academic knowledge and behaviour. Because they lack specific information they must draw on widely circulating models (stereotypes) to interpret each other’s behaviour; these stereotypes are most often based on race, gender, and physical appearance or language codes. As the academic year proceeds, more robust local models of identity emerge. Gee (2000) refers to these models as ‘discourses’ – presupposed ways of speaking and acting that are associated with certain types of people. Bernstein’s (1977) language codes theory shows how the language people use in everyday conversation both reflects and shapes the assumptions of a certain social group.

Furthermore, relationships established within the social group affect the way that group uses language, and the type of speech that is used. It is now well established that spoken language codes are negotiated in social contexts to present to others a preferred identity (Goffman, 1971): accents are masked, and elaborate sentence construction (Bernstein, 1977) used or removed for different situational discourse (Bakhtin, 1981). It has become widely accepted that success and access to social privilege is largely dependent on the degree of organisation of linguistic messages. This can be seen even in early years’ settings and classrooms according to Lareau (2000).

Bruner (1996: 38) argues that ‘any system of education [...] that diminishes the school’s role in nurturing pupil’s self-esteem fails at one of its primary functions’. Teachers unwittingly maintain cultural reproduction in classrooms where the ‘school judges the child’s performance and the child responds by evaluating himself or herself in turn’ (ibid: 37). Adopting less visible, implicit pedagogies would allow for ‘the spontaneous development of the child from within himself’ (Sharp & Green, 1975: viii). The ethnographic work by Wortham (2006) uncovers how curriculum content interplays with stereotyped categorisation to create social and cognitive identity within a primary classroom, and highlights
the importance of teacher awareness of discriminatory discourse and the need for challenge and amendment to achieve the goal of inclusive education.

These sociological studies are significant to the positioning of my study as I suggest that the way trainees have assimilated culture within society will affect the reproduction this normalisation of stereotyped assumptions with their future pupils. Highlighting the awareness of privilege and the mechanisms by which societal structures are reproduced through their classroom practice is an essential part of teacher training if the cycle of discrimination is to be broken. This key concept of ensuring trainees understand their position of privilege and the position they hold in ensuring disadvantaged groups have equal access to educational success drives my research. The review of this literature is the first step in answering the research question investigating what characteristics the trainees bring to the training process.

2.1.3 Subjectification Function

In exploring the third of Biesta’s (2009) functions of schooling I now turn attention to how performative structures interplay with social constructions of knowledge of ‘self’ to create labels for ‘self’ and ‘Other’ within the larger education system and classrooms.

Sprague (2010: 91) cites Hartsock to demonstrate that ‘the structuring of work under capitalism leads those in privileged class locations to be more individualised and to have a more abstract orientation to the world’. In setting trajectories and developing structures within schools and society which separate and individualise children, the elite are able to maintain their prevailing belief that everyone has an equal chance if they choose to take it. Becker (2010: 57) asserts that ‘over decades institutions of education have found themselves in situations in which they had to prove that they were being fair in the face of substantial and obvious evidence that they were not’. Capozza &
Brown (2000) use social identity theory to provide an analysis of inter-group behaviour which is simultaneously individualistic and social. They explain how uniform behaviour can result from the internalisation of expected behaviours by members of a group and result in widespread collective phenomena such as prejudice. The separation of groups of pupils by perceived cognitive ability based on stereotyped assumptions creates expectations of performance which are adhered to by all those involved. ‘Effects of self-presentation are concerned with the asymmetry between in-group favouritism based on positive outcomes or socially valued dimensions and the distribution of negative outcomes and undesirable attributes’ (Capozza & Brown, 2000: xii).

This review of how performativity leads to social and cognitive labelling is grounded in Tajfel & Turner’s (1986) perspective of social identity theory. They proposed that social categorisation always precedes inter-group behaviour because social coherence and self-enhancement require the allocation of one’s self to one of the available groups. Indeed, it was this process of self-categorisation that provided the initial definition of social identity, and it was from such a conception that various hypotheses were derived concerning the consequences of identity abandonment, maintenance or improvement. These identity processes provide a motivational component of the theory and have been used to explain a wide variety of inter-group phenomena such as biases in social judgements, reward allocation, attributions and linguistic behaviour (Turner, 1991; Brown, 1996).

Generic identification of groups – all women, all Blacks, ‘these people’ – homogenises power and disadvantage. Leonardo (2004: 176) asserts ‘the diversity of White ethnic groups is homogenised under the term Whiteness as a means of asserting power and maintaining White racial dominance’. According to Deschamp (2010: 90) ‘the dominated are defined as undifferentiated elements in a collection of impersonal particles and are thought of as ‘objects’
not ‘subjects’. Wortham’s (2006) work can explain how deficit discourses circulate through schools paying attention to local models and individual trajectories and makes visible how homogeneous resources contribute to both social identities and academic learning. Even in very young children it can be shown how figured image representation overwhelms actuality: hair colour, skin colour, clothes, celebrations and language are used as identifiers to assign yourself to a group (Turner et al., 1994; Siraj-Blatchford, 1995; MacNaughton, 2000).

Becker (2010: 57) stresses that structure of state education suggests that ‘every child is capable of profiting from education. However, although every child can learn what education is supposed to give not all children learn it taught in the same way’ (ibid: 58). Guaranteeing universal results leads to individualism through categorisation, so, in the school setting, rather than teachers asking why their methods haven’t worked, fatalistic categorisation leads them to blame the learners’ capacity to learn. Here it is assumed that it is the cultural differences pupils bring to school that produce the existing pattern of attainment rather than the institutional operations themselves (Ferguson, 2010).

Performative measures also create competition between teachers who are expected to gain specified outcomes per pupil during each lesson and across an academic year. Teachers as individuals are likely to ‘maintain a positive view of self by taking credit for positive outcomes and deflecting the unwanted implications of negative outcomes by attributing them to the situation or circumstance’ (Ditto, 2009: 27). Awareness of the negative impact of performative structures on categorisation of learners is a key aspect of the study in terms of how I orientate the identification of socially responsible teachers.

It is well established now that cultures define their own problems and socially construct deficit categories of pupils (Florian & Black Hawkins, 2011). This
deprivation approach places great trust in received and institutionally established categories. McDermott & Varenne (2010) argue that we believe that we know how to identify tasks that can measure the performances of individuals. They go on to suggest that over the past few decades, school performance has become integral to established political arrangements. By pitting all against all in the race for measured academic achievement on arbitrary tasks, school has become the primary site for reproduction of inequality in access to various resources. Banks (2006: 50) describes an ethnographic study by Klineberg in 1973 where it was found that American Indian students took longer to complete an intelligence test but made fewer errors than their White counterparts. He concluded that that the conception of time in Indian and White cultures, rather than the differences in intelligence, explained variations on test performance. This cultural bias is widely recognised now (Delpit, 1995; Maylor et al., 2009; Bhopal, 2011) but continues to be exploited by successive governments in the cultural bias of standardised assessments and the collection of data by ethnicity. It is this underlying normalisation of bias in trainees that is at the heart of the question of characteristics brought to the training process.

In constructing or defining self, people attempt to see themselves as others see them by interpreting gestures and actions directed towards them and by placing themselves in the role of the other person (Goffman, 1971; Bogden & Knopp Biklen, 2010). McDermott & Varenne (2010) retell the story of Martha’s Vineyard where, during the 18th and 19th centuries, one in every 155 persons was born with genetic deafness. This was never perceived as a problem for the community as everyone signed, and this acceptance raised questions about the nature of disability. If being deaf can go unnoticed in one community and yet be a category of disadvantage of deficiency in another, so it is for every difference: being a girl in a sexist society is conceptualised through a deficit discourse.
This way of conceptualising ‘self’ led to the labelling approach to deviant behaviour as described by Erikson (1962) amongst others. Goffman (1971) described ‘othered’ people’s efforts to manage stigmatisation suggesting that they may feel unsure of how the ‘normals’ will identify and receive them (ibid: 13) and may have to be ‘self-conscious and calculating about the impressions’ that they make (ibid: p14). It is important to recognise how cultural differences play out in classrooms where culturally dominant teachers interface with culturally subordinate pupils.

In their study within one infant school Sharp & Green (1975: 127) tried to demonstrate that viewing the ‘child as an object of the teacher’s attention is influenced by the on-going social structure in which she works.’ However, this work disregards how wider socio-historical identities impact on the social and cognitive identity of pupils within a classroom situation and lead to the embedding of stereotypes in developing identities. Evidence of this can be seen in the persistent under-achievement of groups of pupils as identified by Reay (2001), Maylor et al. (2009), Bhopal (2011) and Strand (2012). These findings are relevant to the way other groups are disadvantaged too: Vardill and Calvert (2000) expose the gender imbalance in SEN referrals. The intersection of disadvantaged groups is a relatively recent move in educational research and one that I would argue is essential if we are to counteract the perpetuation of injustice.

The definition of a group only makes sense in relation to other groups. Groups exist within a system of mutual dependence; identification with the in-group in a classroom avoids identification with the out-group in the context of values which are common to the society as a whole. Confronting the dominant community’s discourses of otherness and of difference, Villenas (2010: 347) cites Weis (1995) who comments that ‘this process of ‘Othering’ is vital to understanding relations of domination and subordination, historically and currently’.
Where these collective identities are about separate and different groups of people they can become institutionalised and coercive. When facing disadvantage and discrimination it is comforting to find rhetoric that offers you someone to blame, though this is often someone at greater disadvantage than yourself. Ladson-Billings (2004) highlights the links between teachers’ conceptualisation of the curriculum and their frequently inadequate understanding of the constraints pupils face. Socially responsible teachers, whilst constrained by a prescribed curriculum will find room for individualised learning, counteracting stereotyped labels used within the performative structures. In England the term ‘inclusion’ ‘manifestly implies assimilation into the school culture where the array of cultural knowledge, skills, abilities and contacts possessed by socially marginalised groups often goes unrecognized and unacknowledged’ (Yosso, 2005: 69). This is also explored by Bhopal (2011) in her investigation of teachers’ understanding of the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller pupils as presence rather than engagement. A setting that systematically devalues pupils’ cultural knowledge so that they cannot display their abilities creates resentment; in response pupils act accordingly, providing the system with the evidence to prove these perpetuating beliefs. Breaking this normalised acceptance of cultural stereotypes through the instructional pedagogies employed on the training programme is a key investigation in this study.

To highlight how these complex social structures interplay I take one field of literature here. I argue that all forms of oppression and disadvantage are working to secure hegemony by the dominant class over the subordinate class. However, in order to develop one notion in more depth I refer here to the literature surrounding racist practices in education.

Many studies highlight the racism that some teachers exhibit (Bhatti, 2004; Maylor et al., 2009; Bhopal et al., 2009; Bhopal 2011) as well as the cultural
differences that play out in classrooms where White middle class teachers interact with subordinate groups of pupils. Bourdieu (1979) regards this as a ‘symbolic market’ which attributes different values to different identities. Sheets (2003), however, echoes other social justice research when she claims that ‘we tolerate excuses of poverty and racism rather than focusing on the academic failure our children face daily’ (ibid: 111). Teachers’ negative expectations are well documented as likely to be conveyed to pupils and adversely affect their performance (Pajares, 2003; Maylor et al., 2009; Bhopal 2011). Exponents of Critical Race Theory such as David Gillborn (2008a) and Heidi Safia Mirza (2009) in Britain and Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) and Jacqueline J. Irvine (2003) in the US insist that change has been too slow and that government policies are designed to perpetuate the White middle class social context through racist practice.

Some contemporary studies of race and education move away from the focus on the ‘racial other’ and examine instead the institutionalisation of Whiteness (Smith & Lander, 2012; Smith, 2013). ‘Whiteness is often constructed in academic life, the media, politics and everyday life of multiracial institutions as neutral and invisible’ according to Solomon et al. (2005). This silent washing allows white English speakers to be blind to the privilege of their skin colour. However Leonardo (2004) challenges discussions of privilege that frame it as if Whites are passively handed advantages in an ‘invisible knapsack’ as first identified by Peggy McIntosh (1988). According to Picower (2009: 198) these ‘privileges, ideologies and stereotypes reinforce institutional hierarchies and the larger system of White supremacy’.

Eckert (2000) identified that the stratification of cultural categories which pays regard to Bourdieu’s (1979) ‘symbolic market’ and sets the value attributed to certain identities, privileges some and disadvantages others within one classroom under the supervision of one teacher who is unaware of how these
categories interplay with learning and behaviour. In a more radical context, bell hooks (1989) contends that ‘they cannot recognise the ways their actions support and affirm the very structure of [...] domination and oppression that they profess to wish to see eradicated’ (ibid: 113). This lack of understanding of difference and the perpetuation of stereotypical attitudes and discrimination creates a social barrier to the concept of equality. Pupils become individuals struggling with local and wider models of deficiency as they each attempt to gain outcomes commensurate with the expectations of parents, teachers, peers and the school through a process of persistent and pervasive self-evaluation. I argue that a teacher with a strong sense of advocacy and an awareness of their social responsibility is capable of resisting these barriers to pupil learning.

Ferguson’s (2010: 237) article ‘Don’t believe the hype’ is an account of the power of institutions to create, shape and regulate social identities. It tells the story of how young black boys are made bad, not on street corners or by the criminal justice system, but in and by school, through expectation and punishment. Adult attitudes to and expectations of these boys, highly charged with racial and gender significance, are openly voiced in front of them, with scarring effects on their adult life chances. ‘No-one at the school seemed surprised that the vast majority of children defined as at risk of failing academically, of being future school dropouts, were mostly black and male’ (ibid: 329). Half the school were black and one third white, but while the teaching staff were predominantly White and female, all the staff at the ‘punishing room’ were ‘African American’.

During the implementation of the Black Children’s Achievement (BCA) Programme across England, findings by Maylor et al. (2009: 2) identified similar educational challenges including ‘negative teacher expectations and the stereotypical thinking about the ability of Black children’ which hindered their ability to view ‘raising Black children’s attainment either as essential or a key
aspect of equality’. These findings accord with Villenas’ (2010) exploration of the way the Eurocentric nature of the English National Curriculum alienates the ‘Other’: ‘the disenfranchised groups have been stripped of their cultures, histories and language through public schooling’ (ibid: 349). Delpit (1995: xiii) argues, however, that ‘we cannot blame the schools alone. We live in a society that nurtures and maintains stereotypes.’

This negative perception of the ‘Other’ is shown through the literature reviewed in this thesis to be prevalent for all disadvantaged groups in the UK. However, Edström (2009: 534) found that this cultural annihilation did not exist in Sweden. She found no evidence of gender disadvantage in Sweden in comparison to current practices in Scotland. ‘The Swedish curriculum places more emphasis on similarities between girls and boys, while the Scottish counterpart tends to emphasize difference more, paying attention to boys and the need for male role models. Scottish gender policies are influenced by the travelling discourse of ‘the boys’ underachievement crisis’, whereas Swedish gender policies in preschool demonstrate little of this. This discourse of difference serves to create the deficit which should be deconstructed during the training process.

Brice Heath (1990) suggested that the literacy practices valued by school determine success: codes of language bring with them deficit discourses and narratives of blame. Pupils are imagined in the mirror of their parents’ occupations as clearly demonstrated in Lareau’s (2002) studies on the difference in values attached to child rearing practices by social class. The code of language employed by parents in front of the teacher and the manner of behaviour displayed during parent child interactions feed into the prejudice that comes with holding cultural capital, an assumption that everyone should be striving to behave as the middle class. This clearly concurs with hooks (1990: 125) who states that ‘the other is always made object, appropriated, interpreted, taken over by those in power, by those who dominate’.
Pearce (2012) describes how the use of ‘microagressions’ in the classroom affects the knowledge of ‘self’ within the hierarchy of social and cognitive identity: the teacher’s subtle facial expressions, ignoring, always supporting someone else first. Just as Wortham found in his work, Pearce claims that teachers are drawing upon existing social discourses but inflicting them on a personal level to alienate individuals, leading to the homogeneity of inclusion and subjectification of exclusion.

Labelling is a form of ‘Othering’, a way of identifying in-groups and out-groups, either by race, ethnicity, class or gender; it also provides a deficit model of classroom apartheid, segregating children into groups of perceived ability or cognitive capacity. Pupils in the stratified groups are labelled by teachers and children alike, and these categories are utilised in the development of identity within the school context and beyond. Gillborn (2008b) insists that ethnic minority pupils ‘end up in low streams and are perceived to be badly behaved’. These labels are also a way of justifying the performance of some pupils, allowing the teacher to blame the pupil for a lack of progress rather than developing expertise in pedagogies which might remove barriers for individual pupils to learn which is central to this study.

Florian & Black Hawkins (2011) and Mirza (2009) argue that the structural system of labelling has been heavily influenced by the ‘bell curve’ thinking about ability. Hart et al. (2007) suggest that lower ability pupils are especially vulnerable to the negative effects of this thinking, compounded by teachers who believe that these pupils need specialist teaching. This is exposed by Dorling’s (2012: 76) claim that ‘testing became all-pervasive partly as a defence of privilege in response to greater equality being won by the poor in affluent nations … following the Second World War’.

By encouraging performance-led outcomes in classrooms and perpetually changing the curriculum and assessment arrangements for schooling,
successive governments blind teachers to how they are being manipulated. They provide teachers with reasons and labels with which to segregate pupils in order to lay the ‘blame’ for the fatalistic outcomes of disadvantaged groups with the pupils themselves. Teachers become more concerned with the identity of the school and the teachers within the institution in order to promote themselves as ‘good’ to the on-looking community.

In chapter four, I will expand further on how I have borrowed from Silverman’s (2010) work and how I use her location of identity salience. It is essential here though to at least apprise the reader of the model used as a form of labelling in the analysis of data presented. Silverman proposes that trainees can articulate attitudes towards three levels of identity salience: these encapsulate the visible nature of identity such as gender, ‘race’, class, disability; invisible identities such as sexual orientation, faith, SEN; and attitudes which relate to uncategorised salience such as family values. These have enabled me to consider the level of acknowledgment given to disadvantaged identities by the participant trainees. In this context I have used the term ‘SEN’ to refer only to specific learning difficulties and ‘disability’ to refer to physical disability so as to separate what is visible from what is not.

By exploring seminal and current literature regarding education policy contexts through Biesta’s (2009) purposes of state education – qualifications, socialisations, and subjectification – I have outlined the theoretical perspective of the way trainees assimilate their beliefs regarding disadvantaged groups as a first step towards answering my question regarding pertinent characteristics brought to the training process.

To focus on the second of my questions regarding the effectiveness of instructional pedagogies employed I turn attention to the training process. In the following subsection I review the key mechanisms which feature in the seminal literature regarding the shaping of socially responsible teachers in order to
identify which effect greatest change in trainee awareness of social justice in education, and how the findings might contribute to the current debate around the way socially responsible teachers might be shaped through the training process. I consider the literature regarding how trainees adjust through the transition from successful learner or career changer to socially responsible teacher; I go on to explore where the training might best be situated, and why, before contemplating which instructional pedagogies a socially just training programme might employ.

2.2 Shaping trainee teachers

The process of transition through a teacher training programme has been researched and documented by many (Shkedi & Laron, 2004; Pierce, 2007; Wilkins et al., 2011) and shares characteristics with other professional programmes (Adams et al., 2006; Braidman & Boggis, 2007). Shkedi & Laron (2004) illustrate early work by Fuller (1969) where the professional transition process is described in three stages: a survival stage when trainees are pre-occupied with their own adequacy; a mastery stage when they concentrate on performance; and an impact stage when they become concerned about their effects on pupils. These stages, subsequently developed by Fuller & Bown (1975), Feiman-Nemser & Floden (1986), and Furlong & Maynard (1995), continue to be identifiable in trainee progress. Furlong & Maynard identified a crucial initial stage as 'early idealism'. The journey that trainees make through these transitions is clearly taken account of in the development of training programmes and is often documented by the trainees themselves through a professional development journal. The analysis of trainees' journals has provided rich data for many academics exploring the development of the trainees during their training programmes and was used during this research project. I explain this further in chapter five when I discuss the methods used for data capture. It is important to note, however, that my early understanding
The process of transition for trainees was based on this process and framed my initial hypothesis that the process might have a significant impact on their potential to be shaped into socially responsible teachers. I have therefore given over a substantial part of the thesis to the capacity of trainees to reflect through this transition.

In many current ITT programmes, narrative, identity exploration and critical reflection are utilised as methods of supporting trainees in constructing and reconstructing themselves as teachers (Carter & Doyle, 1996; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, b; Harrison & Yaffe, 2007). Much is made of the type of teacher that trainees aspire to be and the culture of schools they will encounter. The beliefs that trainees bring to the training have long since been held up as determining their capacity to teach diverse groups of pupils effectively (Kyles & Olafson, 2008; Irvine, 2008; Silverman, 2010; Whipp, 2013). The school based training they encounter has been established by Lave & Wenger (2009) as crucial in negotiating teacher identity.

Beauchamp & Thomas (2009: 175) establish that, in an attempt to understand professional identity development, trainees should appreciate ‘the connection between identity and the self, the role of emotion, the power of stories and discourse, the role of reflection, the link between identity and agency and the contextual factors that promote or hinder the construction of identity’. Literature in the field identifies that identity is dynamic, and that a teacher’s identity shifts over time, negotiated through experience and the way the experience is interpreted and assimilated (Sachs, 2005; Rodgers & Scott, 2008; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). I would suggest that teacher identity at least comprises the notion of agency. My thinking has developed from recognising that, through the dynamic negotiation within institutions, trainees are managing a ‘crisis of identity’, the successful outcome of which will require a clear focus on how to shift the focus of ‘self’ from the personal to the professional (Batchelor &
Mohamed, 2008). This will necessarily include an agentic response to the situation in which they find themselves.

There is here a need to clarify the lens through which I perceive that trainees are ‘constructing’ (Lave & Wenger, 2009) or ‘forming’ their identity (Rodgers & Scott, 2008) as teachers. Beauchamp & Thomas (2009) use the term ‘shaping’ identity which they suggest acknowledges the role of the ‘self and external forces in the dynamism of identity’: this encompasses the concepts addressed in this research more accurately. I therefore follow their lead in using this term to explore the professional transition of the trainees.

A further factor to draw on during this complex shaping of teachers is the way the trainees receive the information and what they do with it. Kagan (1992) demonstrates how a trainee’s projected self-image as a teacher may be strongly related to their self-image as learner: they ‘may extrapolate from their own experiences as learner, in essence, assuming that their pupils will possess learning styles, aptitudes, interests, and problems similar to their own’ (ibid: 145). Thus, it is not surprising that some will believe that there is not much they can learn from the training except during their practicum experiences. According to Richardson (1996) they hold strong beliefs that learning to teach can only be accomplished through experience. However Shkeddi & Laron (2004) suggest that they will approach teacher training with different beliefs and expectations about their own professional development. Some of this will be related to their own experience of formal schooling. They assert that some expect to be told how to teach either by their university lecturers or by teachers in school; some expect to learn from their experience of their own trial and error; others expect to model their practice on a teacher familiar to them (ibid: 4).

Research by Carter & Doyle (1996) made a significant impact on how narrative and life history are taken into consideration when analysing a trainee’s
developing identity. Concurring with Nias (1990) this work is based on the premise that ‘the process of learning to teach, the act of teaching and teachers’ experiences and choices are deeply personal matters and are inexorably linked to their identity and life story’ (Carter & Doyle, 1996: 120). So who we are and how we have experienced school will impact on our transition to teaching. Richardson (1996) brings to this discussion her endorsement that beliefs stemming from personal experiences, including school experience, are a strong determinant of action. ‘Teachers bring themselves into the classroom and the formation of identity involves interplay between internal and external forces’ according to Rodgers & Scott (2008: 732). Alongside this understanding of how trainees shape their identity as teachers sits research by Zeichner & Gore (1989) which identified both individuals and institutions as shaping identity with factors such as teachers’ backgrounds, local contexts, and state policy environments having an important and lasting influence.

Within the social and cultural landscape of university and school identities will shift as circumstances change. I focus attention in this study on the shaping of the trainees’ teacher identity. I begin by exploring the beliefs about ‘Others’ that trainees bring to the training process and consider this alongside their own experiences as learners in schools. I go on to explore how research suggests that beliefs about teaching and learning will impact on the shaping of the trainee’s practice. Situating the training process within the context of school practice requires alertness to the effects this context might have on identity transition: the school environment, the nature of the learner population, the impact of colleagues during the school based participation are all considered as influential in shaping a new teacher. Later in the chapter I turn my attention to the shaping of professional knowledge brought about through the university-based elements of the programme. Considering the beliefs trainees bring to the training process is important as it encapsulates how the social structures and processes already discussed are brought to bear on the trainees. It is also a key
theme in much of the literature surrounding the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

2.2.1 Beliefs about teaching and learning

Street (2003) suggests that the attitudes of teachers about schools and schooling are developed long before they apply for training. It is therefore important to consider the experiences and beliefs about ‘Others’ and about teaching that trainees bring to the training process if we are to challenge them. Brown & Cooney (1982) advocate that belief structures have their roots in Herskovit’s (1943) patterns and processes of cultural transmission, distinguishing between acculturation – contact between cultures, enculturation – the largely unconscious assimilation of cultural norms and knowledge during childhood, and socialisation – formal processes of social integration, such as education. Attitudes and behaviour towards people from different social and cultural groups will have been created and confirmed through experiences in school, through the media and at home during formative years. Having already explored these ideas I will now integrate them into my discussion of how these beliefs can be addressed through the training process.

Research informs us that the power of beliefs can outweigh the most convincing contrary evidence (Pajares, 1992): once beliefs are formed, individuals build explanations around them. As opinions of ‘significant others’ are incorporated, beliefs are created and fostered and generally remain unaltered unless they are deliberately challenged. Work by Milner (1993) and Aboud (1998) leads us to understand that the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter: with time and use beliefs become robust, and individuals hold on to them even after alternative proven explanations are presented to them. This knowledge will inform the decisions to be made about how to deconstruct these beliefs on an ITT programme.
Pajares (1992) builds on Clark’s work (1988) to establish that teachers’ beliefs can be positioned as preconceived theories derived from personal experience, including social and cultural biases and prejudices. This thinking concurs with the socialisation perspective of schools and society discussed earlier in this chapter. As Pajares (1992) informs us, beliefs are unlikely to be changed unless they are challenged. He explains that for trainees to ‘find anomalies in their belief system uncomfortable enough to accommodate the conflicting information, they must agree that the new information should be considered as more accurate and they must want to reduce the inconsistencies of their beliefs’ (ibid: 314). This has clear implications for the deconstruction of discriminatory beliefs surrounding the cognitive ability and behaviour of groups of pupils. It is for these reasons that programme designers cannot afford to ignore the beliefs of trainees in regard of stereotyped assumptions.

In 1975 Lortie (2000) proposed that before attending training programmes trainees have already spent thousands of hours in an ‘apprenticeship of observation’. He is referring to the hours that they have spent in classrooms as pupils assimilating a body of values, orientations and practices. During this enculturation they create beliefs from experience or from ‘cultural sources of knowledge transmission’ which according to Nespor (1987: 310) reside in ‘episodic memory’. Prospective teachers rely on their memories of themselves as pupils to help shape their own expectations of their pupils (Shkedi & Laron 2004). Many trainees think of teaching as a simple and straightforward activity that results in learning: teachers teach and pupils learn (Feiman- Nemser, 2003). Shkedi & Laron (2004) suggest that trainees hold beliefs concerning values in terms of what is desirable: ‘the manner in which pupils learn, the components of study material, how it is appropriate for pupils to learn, […] how learning content should be presented’ (ibid: 694).
Further research has emphasised that trainees' preconceptions have a stronger influence on their shaping as teachers than formal training (Shkedi & Laron, 2004; Virta, 2002). Entrants to ITT programmes have generally been successful in the performative-driven culture of our education systems (Wilkins, 2011). This socialisation would have led them to consider that this is the most effective method of teaching and this idea may already be formed as a firmly held belief. Furthermore, as Virta's research (2002: 688) confirms, trainees 'often have highly idealistic conceptions of children’s motivation and capacity for learning, and of their own ability to manage the classroom settings'. This creates tension between their expectations of self-efficacy and their actual experience, which has an impact on what Bruner termed ‘self-esteem' (1996).

For the purpose of this thesis, however, the impact of teacher assumption on pupils’ attainment is the main interest. The beliefs regarding others that the trainees bring to the training is explored initially in terms of their social justice knowledge and expectations. It is not assumed that any cohort of trainees will share a common belief system even if they share similar social and ethnically cultural features. However, Sleeter (2001b) suggests that White trainee teachers continue to arrive at training institutions with little knowledge, understanding or experience of non-White cultures. Sleeter (2001b) further argues that those who enter the teaching profession are not aware of how cultural influences shape cognitive and social identification. In fact Ladson-Billings (2004) would insist that they know nothing of White culture, suggesting that notions of Whiteness are taken for granted as neutral, transparent and invisible. Along with Nieto (2004) she considers that trainees are not aware of how cultural influences shape our behaviour and thinking. Additionally, Irvine (2003) suggests that trainees often possess stereotypical beliefs about pupils from different cultures and that they have little knowledge of racism and discrimination. In her work, Richardson (1996) found that trainees believed that different pupil characteristics – ethnicity, gender and class – do not make a
difference in teaching but they did believe that pupils’ personalities affect teaching.

Given that I situate my thinking in the social theory perspective that early socialisation through schooling will generate beliefs about underachieving pupil groups, I take time here to outline the current situation regarding the differences between the teaching population and the pupil population in England. This establishes that the homogeneous workforce gives subtle messages regarding who can be a teacher. The trainees participating in this study are generally representative of the population of most ITT courses in the UK, and of the teaching population as a whole: overwhelmingly white, female, middle class, highly educated and monolingual (DfE, 2012). This appears to reflect the situation in both Australia (Allard & Santoro, 2006) and America (Kyles & Olafson, 2008). Although I suggest a similar profile to the sector nationally this programme did successfully attract a higher percentage of non-white trainees in the first year of the study but did not retain this success. Specifically, of the 117 trainees that completed the first year of this study (2011) 21% identified themselves as not White British, 89% were female. In the second year of the study (2012) of the 128 trainees that completed the year 78% were female and only 8% identified themselves as not White British. Only one trainee identified themselves as Black in both cohorts.

The previous Labour Government re-established a policy for race equality in ITT (TTA: 2003): one of the main priorities was to create a teaching workforce more representative of society. This ultimately translated into a mandate to increase the number of minority ethnic candidates in ITT and resulted in an increase in the number of candidates of Asian heritage (from 7% to 12% in the 2012 ITT census). The data refers only to White and minority ethnic or BME trainees and so I cannot state categorically how these statistics represent different groups. However, the figure for Asian trainees matches a similar proportional rise at the
research site and I contend that it is likely that nationally there was no success in attracting greater numbers of Black candidates into the profession. This supports my earlier contention that the recommendations by Swann in 1985 have yet to be fully realised.

Menter et al. (2002) offer conflicting evidence from research for Black pupils not selecting teaching as a career: on the one hand the negative relationship between Black pupils and their teachers (Coulton, 1995), and resentment at being advocates for the profession or viewed as cultural experts (Gillborn, 2001) discouraging minority ethnic people from entering the teaching profession; on the other hand Dhingra & Dunkwu (1995) and Showunmi & Constantine-Simms (1995) suggested that some BME pupils were attracted to teaching so as to become role models. Carrington & Skelton (2003) and Maylor (2009) dispute the notion that Black pupils will see Black teachers as role models and contended that having BME teachers would be a panacea for tackling underachievement. Where pupils see themselves fitting into the school culture they are more likely to select teaching as a career, especially when they hold ‘cultural capital’. Where only individuals who identify with the teaching workforce select the profession as a career, homogeneity and cultural bias is inevitable. This is a further cause in the perpetuation of the social identification cycle which affects the academic learning of non-privileged pupils.

I accept that my review of the homogenous situation within schools in England today is necessarily brief but it is essential to recognise its importance within my study.

Maylor et al. (2009) identified findings in English schools where ‘negative teacher expectations and the stereotypical thinking about the ability of Black children’ hindered their ability to view ‘raising Black children’s attainment either as essential or a key aspect of equality’ (ibid: 2). As has been shown earlier in this chapter, if Black and working class children continue to
underachieve then the possibility of attending teacher training courses will ultimately be closed to them. Black and minority ethnic (BME) teacher recruitment remains an issue in the British education system. This statistical profile gives cause for concern in terms of teacher perceptions of pupils from different ethnic groups to their own. A recent study into the experiences of trainees by Wilkins & Lall (2011: 14) found that ‘several [trainees] reported the stereotypical views of non-White cultures held by White peers’ (my italics). They went on to suggest that this was detrimental to their own feelings of empowerment and engagement in the programme. Anecdotally I have witnessed White trainees anticipation of discomfort in the non-White classroom being mirrored by the minority ethnic trainees' perceptions and fears of the all-White classroom. Both White and minority ethnic trainees on this programme have reported to me as a tutor that this is the first time in their academic career that they have been educated in an ethnically diverse group.

When these findings are aligned with Bourdieu’s (1979) theories of ‘fractions of oppression’ I suggest that more research is necessary to unpick how these hierarchies are played out by educationally successful working class and minority ethnic trainees. Considering the impact of a homogeneous adult group on a diverse pupil body, power relations juxtaposed with self-perception and achievement are important factors. Attention must be given to social identity, power and confidence in this situation as well as to the impact on academic learning.

Alongside beliefs about the pupils they will teach, trainees enter programmes with beliefs about the kind of teacher they will be. The beliefs trainees hold about where and who is best placed to train them in their chosen profession is discussed in this section; these beliefs as well as the beliefs about the ‘Other’ are a significant factor in the characteristics trainees bring to the training
process. These characteristics will shape the transition of the trainee in terms of their resilience and motivation.

Kagan (1992) found that trainees enter ITT programmes with personal beliefs about teaching: they hold pre-conceived images of good teachers, and images of themselves as teachers, alongside memories of themselves as pupils. If these personal beliefs and images remain unchanged by the programme they will be taken by new teachers into classroom practice. For professional growth to occur, prior beliefs and images must be modified and reconstructed (Kagan 1992: 142). Pajares (1992) argues that teachers’ beliefs influence their perceptions and judgements, which in turn affect their behaviour in the classroom. He goes on to assert that ‘understanding the belief structures of trainees is essential to improving their professional preparation’ (ibid: 307). These themes persist through current research literature - Silverman (2010), Whipp (2013), Leonardo & Grubb (2014) – clearly identifying a need for ITT programmes to engage with trainees in deconstructing stereotyped beliefs of cultural groups.

Key concepts pertinent to this study regarding the types of teachers’ that trainees expect to become relate to: the ‘caring’ profession; a bias towards social responsibility; or technical self-efficacy. Vogt (2002) describes the gendered perspective of the ‘caring’ profession, relating to previous studies regarding the concept of being in loco-parentis and the social constructs of mothers being primary carers for children. She explains how ‘the class teacher system in primary schools enforces the maternal subtext, as the teachers spend long hours with their schoolchildren and build up close relationships with them; their care often extends beyond the call of duty’ (ibid: p253). She draws closely on Nias’ (1990) distinction of the six aspects of the culture of care in primary teaching which are heavily laden with the responsibility of the teacher. This sense of responsibility is a key element of whichever teacher type the trainees might align themselves with.
Silverman (2010) builds on the work of Bandura and Pajares in her investigation into the beliefs of trainee teachers. She reasserts that beliefs are cultural constructions and ‘reflect a manner of knowing which is culturally defined’ (ibid: 299), but goes on to say that ‘the motivational component that guides decisions about whether to engage in actions’ is a sense of responsibility. She suggests that without this sense of responsibility trainees and teachers will only engage in actions effecting change in culturally relevant practice if these are ‘externally mandated’. She separates the constructs of responsibility and efficacy whilst arguing they are related. Her work is based on the premise that ‘simply believing that behaviour will produce a certain result is a necessary but not sufficient indicator of the behaviour. Teachers must also believe they are capable of successfully engaging in that behaviour’ (ibid: 301). Changing the way trainees reflect on the learning of the ‘Other’ in their classroom is necessary but not the solution to transforming socially just training.

I have already argued that many of the trainees are likely to have been educated during the highly structured, explicit pedagogies employed since the beginning of the 1990s in England. The impact of this has been discussed through the literature in the first sub-section of this chapter. However, it is essential to reiterate this as an aspect of the beliefs about teaching and teachers brought to the training process. This performativity in current education systems has been discussed by Day et al. (2007), Jeffrey et al. (2008), Leaton Gray & Whitty (2010), and Wilkins (2011). External influences such as pupil progress targets and the scrutiny of teacher pedagogy- along with a sense of agency will impact on a trainee’s motivation and commitment. Rodgers and Scott (2008) argue that ITT programmes should take account of these during the training process and actively prepare trainees to negotiate the system whilst holding onto their preferred identity. Keltchermans & Ballet (2002: 105) refer to ‘praxis shock’ when trainees finally confront ‘the realities and responsibilities of being a classroom teacher that puts their beliefs and ideas about teaching to
the test, challenges some of them, and confirms others’. Each of these suggestions is essential to the discussion regarding this research project and will be explored further when I present findings from the trainees’ reflections in chapter six.

In summary anti-discriminatory practice and the embracing of diversity depend on the knowledge, if not understanding, of other cultural identities and customs. In terms of the important role of power relations in developing human cognition, teacher awareness of stereotypical attitudes and discrimination is paramount to pupils’ achievements. It is crucial that influential adults such as teachers are able to embrace cultural diversity inclusively through the choice of pedagogical approaches within their classrooms. Segregation of social and ethnic cultural groups essentially hinders the capacity of learners to know or understand the impact of stereotyping experiences on the wider society. The beliefs the trainees take into school about ‘Other’ groups will impact on their interactions and relationships. The assumption of behaviour and attainment held by trainees will undoubtedly affect the social and cognitive identification of the pupils.

This study considers the premise that it is important for the trainees to understand the impact of their beliefs on the potential group of pupils they will teach. Current research (Whipp, 2013; Leonardo & Grubb, 2014) essentially suggests that trainers should pay regard to how course content and instructional pedagogies inform and challenge trainee assumptions and should explicitly highlight the impact of trainee beliefs in teaching practice. This is considered in the light of Sleeter (2008) recommending cohesive and coherent programmes in which partners in schools and universities develop a shared philosophy.
2.2.1 Situating the training process

Alongside the physical spaces occupied by the training programme, the impact of the pedagogies and trainers’ philosophies, I begin by considering how the trainee makes the transition through the programme in each of these situations and the impact they have on professional identity. This is important to the research as it helps to explain how some trainees manage their development as socially responsible teachers and others struggle with professional transformation.

Clearly trainees must undergo a shift in professional identity as they move through programmes of teacher education and assume positions as teachers. Davis (1993: 17) argued that shaping an ‘identity involves learning to … read and interpret the landscape of the social world’. The trainees are familiar with the social nature of schools and classrooms and think they understand the landscape, but shifting from learner to teacher in this familiar social context has its difficulties. As research into the developing identities of teachers (Shkedi & Laron, 2004; Pierce, 2007) and other professionals (Adams et al., 2006; Braidman & Boggis, 2007) has demonstrated, the transition into a professional community of practice has implications for the process of shaping professional identity.

Trainees who arrive in a school and participate in its institutional life already have some understanding of the roles which they will take. This comes from previous direct experience, the portrayal of similar roles in the media, relatives’ or friends’ accounts of their experiences in such roles and from years of ‘observation’ as described by Lortie (2000). As Kelchtermans & Ballet (2002) contend, they must interpret and interact with the context in which they find themselves and in the process undertake complex behavioural and conceptual professional learning.
These perspectives contribute to understandings of the notions of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 2009): they explain how people create purposeful work-related communities and identities within the institutions to which they are attached. These communities develop norms of practice to guide their members which help to clarify who are the core members of a group and who the peripheral members. In many UK training programmes there will be an expectation that school experience precedes the university programme; this may be the trainees’ first experience in the role of teacher and will shape their expectations.

School-based communities of practice can exist in several forms for teachers in subject areas or as Year groups or across an entire school (Pierce, 2007). They offer viable ways for existing staff and newcomers to integrate into a school’s professional culture. Teacher communities ‘operate at multiple levels within a school, complementing and reinforcing teachers’ work’ and contributing ‘uniquely to teachers’ knowledge base, professionalism, and ability to act on what they learn’ (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006: 5). ‘These communities help build and manage knowledge, create shared language and standards for practice and pupil outcomes, and sustain aspects of a school’s culture that are vital to continued, consistent norms and instructional practices’ (ibid). Practice here includes use of language, values demonstrated and norms upheld by a group, and arise from the views held by core members of a group within particular contexts. Nias (1990) asserted that teachers’ professional communities of practice were grounded in ‘wholeness’ between perception of self and occupation: they held a shared sense of belonging because their professional identity was bound up with personal identity.

According to social theorists Haslam (2001) and Hogg & Vaughan (2002), socially constructed identities recognise the powerful influence of others on our sense of identity. Seashore Louis (2009: 1) cites Schein (1992) to confirm that
most research in organizations agrees with a view of culture as an enduring, independent phenomenon that consists of some combination of values, beliefs and assumptions that members share about appropriate behaviour. Therefore the community of practice within specific schools is also influenced by collective predispositions shaped by the teachers’ gender, faith, ethnicity and social class, the impact of which has already been identified in this review. As trainees work alongside practising teachers they develop the values and attitudes that they expect will support their attempt to belong to the profession: the shaping of professional identity in this context is thus inherently fragile. As Giddens (2001: 186) confirmed, ‘self-identity has to be created and continually reordered against the backdrop of shifting experiences of day to day life and the fragmenting tendencies of modern institutions’. The socially constructed professional identity specific to the school community may, according to Wenger (1999: 4) ‘have bearing on the encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and the construction of identities in relation to these communities’.

Professional identity as a teacher is an important part of securing commitment to the work and adherence to professional norms; as Hammerness et al. (2005: 383) inform us, ‘the identities teachers develop shape their dispositions, where they place their effort, and what obligations they see as intrinsic to their role’. The co-construction of cultures and identities by staff and pupils is affected by flows of power in schools (Wilkins et al., 2011). According to Deakin (2004) senior leadership teams in schools restrict participation by pupils and teachers in the shaping of institutional practices. It could be argued, though, that whilst this is undoubtedly true, they are also under pressure to adhere to government policies.

Day et al. (2006) found that the personal involvement required by teaching leads to the ‘unavoidable interrelationships between professional and personal identities’ (ibid: 602). Many trainees are torn between their idealistic beliefs, the
knowledge developed during their training and the pressure to conform to the
culture and practices of their colleagues and school. It is possible that some are
subjected to a range of practices and relationships imbued with techniques of
power that can affect their actions, beliefs and sense of themselves (Wilkins et al., 2011). Pierce (2007) used the term ‘liminality’ to explain how trainees can
be caught between the intensity of performing in the classroom and the ‘muted
compliance tacitly expected of newcomers among other adults in the new
school context’ (ibid: 32).

Although generally encouraging and collegial, this culture can be isolating and
discouraging (Williams et al., 2001; Britzman, 2003; Ingersoll, 2003). Faced with
feelings of inadequacy and struggling to find a level of confidence in their
classrooms, trainees can fear alienation in school; emotional competence and
resilience are essential in this situation. Given that this may be the first situation
that many trainees face where they are inadequate most of the time, and are
constantly attempting to move their progress on, a focus on self-efficacy is likely
to take over from social justice concerns. The ‘caring’ reasons which impel
many trainees to enter the profession may be stifled whilst they struggle to
survive. Trainees learn to be insiders by developing appropriate responses and
expectations. According to Fielding (2006: 302), they begin to experience that
‘schools do not care about them as persons, but only about them as bearers of
results and measurable outcomes’. Or as Ball (2003: 224) puts it: ‘performance
has no room for caring’. Gewirtz (1997) argues that one of the consequences of
modern assessment practices, is the ‘decline in the sociability of school life’,
indicating that the time teachers spend on administrative tasks takes time away
from interactions both within and outside the classroom, and from collaborating
with teaching colleagues.

According to Feiman-Nemser (2003), shaping professional identity occurs on
two levels: trainees need to competently acquire the necessary skills and
knowledge to teach in a primary classroom and adjust their attitudes and values to match those of the professionals they are hoping to identify with.

Where the ITT programme is delivered in a university setting, large groups may be created for discussion and collaboration in an attempt to develop a meta-cognitive approach to blending theory and practice, although it is generally accepted that it is not possible, in university, to apply knowledge to concrete experiences. Thus teaching practice is usually seen as the opportunity to apply theories learned during lectures (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). However, Wideen et al. (1998) concluded in their research that the transfer from theory presented during teacher training to practice in schools is often meagre and can be counterproductive to teacher learning. This has been more recently contradicted by Sleeter (2008: 562) who believes that it is the lack of a coherent approach which leads to the disjointed preparation of teachers; she insists that there is evidence that well planned coherent programmes can make an impact that persists into classroom practice.

Zeichner & Conklin (2008) note how closely the practicum and the course components are related in the case studies they reviewed. They state that at one extreme, practicum supervision is carried out by teachers ignorant of the course components and at the other end of the spectrum, practicum and course components are linked within the context of the school. Rodgers & Scott (2008) share their concerns that trainees who enter the school hoping to define their own role may be at risk of a mismatch between themselves and the context in which they find themselves. They recommend that ITT programmes prepare trainees to negotiate the system in a way which is conducive to the professional development. In relation to equality, any lack of synthesis from university-taught lectures on diversity and inclusion can lead to the assimilation of unexamined assumptions played out in classrooms. Further discussion on this point is included in the conclusion to this thesis.
The rigorous focus on performance and outcomes in the training of teachers and the persistent drive to 'raise the academic calibre of teachers' (House of Commons report, 2010), is in accord with the education system for schools in England. Grades are assigned to the trainees' classroom performances; the government education inspectorate (OFSTED) regularly monitors the training provision based on the outcomes grades data of an institution. A shifting balance in the UK in terms of where the training is assumed by the government to be best situated combined with a rise in school based routes into teaching, compounds the situation. In the move by the current government to foster competition between schools and universities, priorities for programme designers might lean more towards meeting retention and outcome targets than ideals of social justice.

This necessarily leads to consideration of the professional knowledge held by the trainers in each situation. Korthagen et al. (2006) suggest that in order to change educational practices in schools, it is necessary to break the circle of traditionally trained teachers who teach in a traditional manner. As Kumashiro (2002: 238) asserts, 'teaching is not a neutral act' and in ITT it is framed by personal philosophy and perspective. There can be discrepancies when teachers believe that university trainers are out of touch with reality; 'some barriers come in the form of mixed messages from within teacher education, as when teacher educators do not trouble their own partialities' (ibid). The design of the programme forms one aspect of the complexity of considerations researched here which will be discussed later.

First I draw attention to the importance of who is undertaking the training of the next generation of teachers. In their review of case studies identifying essential characteristics of teacher training programmes, Zeichner & Conklin (2008: 277) allude in part to the underlying philosophies of education held by the programme leaders - 'the view of teaching, learning, schooling and the role of
teachers that underlie the programme’ - as being essential characteristics. This can be seen to shape the programme delivery which according to Goodlad (1990) ‘responds to either a performative system, producing teachers who can reproduce technically satisfactory lessons in which some pupils make progress towards specified targets, or to a culturally relevant, socially just education system, providing trainees with the opportunities to ‘become more ‘Other’ orientated and identify with a broader culture of teaching’ (ibid, 2008: 277). The influence of the political, professional or personal experience of the trainers and programme designers will impact on the structure, content and selected pedagogies that trainees encounter.

Kumashiro (2008: 240) advocates an ‘anti-oppressive education’ that is based on four approaches: education for ‘the other’, education about ‘the other’, critical privilege education and education for change. However ethical these sentiments are, they bring with them complications produced by the dominance of traditional White middle class trainers and a resistance to acknowledging the need for change already discussed. They also need to be assimilated as an integral philosophy of the programme rather than seen as appendages, taught by particular trainers with a particular philosophy, which may not coincide with the programme as a whole. Any attempt to educate about the ‘Other’ as a separate and distinct aspect of education brings with it accusations of professional, political or personal bias. Smith & Lander (2012) found that in trying to educate trainees about the ‘Other’, the colour of the trainer’s skin fostered an assertion of shared culture and collusion in self-preservation; ‘even for white students willing to engage with the issues, the overwhelming power of whiteness to defend and reify current inequities through a purported common sense, de-politicised discourse against any type of “ism”’ (ibid: 345). As gender and race are visible identities, it was possible to investigate this aspect of trainees’ reflection on lecturers during the programme.
The question of social class is, however, less likely to be foregrounded, as trainers who may originate from working class backgrounds will still hold elements of privilege in their childhood aspirations along with the collection of cultural capital as well as the possible privilege of Whiteness. Lynch & O’Neill (1994: 321) suggest that by ‘being educated in the formal sense is to change one’s social class identity’. Each of these intricacies requires further research to ensure a fully comprehensive body of knowledge from which to develop socially just teacher training programmes. The way teacher trainers’ professional lives have been shaped should be explored alongside the shaping of the trainees’ identities, but I am restricted by the emphasis necessitated by the research questions and the complexity of the socialisation of teachers. Given the sociological perspective offered as the background to my research, I assert that the functions of schooling and the development of beliefs and learner identity will have been the same for the trainers brought up within the UK schooling system as they have been for the candidates new to the training process. I explore next how ITT programmes effectively employ instructional pedagogies through which trainees can begin to understand socially just education.

2.2.2 Instructional pedagogies

Sheets (2003: 111) asserts that ‘we have not demonstrated capacity to educate a professoriate who can prepare teachers to […] apply cultural and language dimensions to curriculum and practice’. There are many recent studies which grapple with finding the most successful way to support trainees in developing an understanding of the impact of low teacher expectations on socially and culturally diverse communities (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Kyles & Olafson, 2008; Silverman, 2010). Whilst Santoro & Allard (2005), Ambe (2006) and Sleeter (2008) focus attention on trainees, questioning their capacity to understand issues associated with race, diversity and inclusion, Kea et al. (2006), Kyles & Olafson (2008) and Silverman (2010) focus their questioning on ITT
programmes, concerned with why social justice and institutionalised disadvantage is not raised as an issue and systematically addressed.

Studies which provide ideas for improving ITT pedagogy (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b; Kea et al., 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2006) suggest the importance of experience within culturally diverse settings during the practicum; the need for collective discussion; immersion into a new cultural experience; exploring personal history; and reflective writing. The suggestions focus on supporting trainees to uncover their beliefs about diversity in an attempt to challenge the participants into adjusting their beliefs and understanding. Kea et al. (2006: 9) however, state that ‘transformation cannot be brought about solely by course development but relies on trainers bringing about a change in trainees’ thinking, behaviour and ultimately teaching’.

Further questions are raised by the work of Sleeter (2001a) and Whitehead (2010). Along with other trainers struggling with the notion of providing transformative teacher training (Smith, 2013; Glenny et al., 2013) they conclude that while the training they offered adhered to their philosophy of social justice education it did not, on further examination, have the transformative impact they desired. There is a series of research projects currently attempting to investigate this issue (Bhopal et al., 2009; Gillborn & Mirza, 2000; Hick et al., 2011; Smith & Lander, 2012; Smith, 2013; Glenny et al., 2013) demonstrating both a need and a desire within the profession to find solutions. Rather than asking what kinds of cognitive processes and conceptual structures are involved, Lave & Wenger (2009) lead us to ask what kinds of social engagements provide the proper context for learning to take place. They are very clear in their assertion that ‘learning is a process that takes place in a participation framework. Learning is distributed among co-participants’ (ibid: 15). Research into how the trainees are situated in the
learning process and the instructional pedagogies chosen for the experience is essential to move the debate forward.

The instructional methods employed in the teaching of social justice issues is one consideration which I shall address in this subsection, but first it is important to consider ways in which trainees might receive the information, however it is offered. I therefore pay regard to Turner's (1991) theory of informational and normative social influence as key to the learning process. Drawing on Deutsch & Gerard’s (1955) theoretical paradigm, Turner (1991) interprets the theory to suggest that through ‘informational influence’ learners (in this case the trainees) are influenced to ‘accept information from a trustworthy other, [to accept] evidence as objective reality’ (ibid: 35). The status of the trainer will give greater credibility to the information being imparted and affect the way new knowledge is received and processed by the trainees. ‘Normative influence’ is defined by Turner (1991) as being ‘influenced to conform to the positive expectations of another’. This leads to ‘positive feelings towards and solidarity with’ the group (ibid: 34), indicating a need to conform to the group consensus about a contentious issue during any group discussions.

According to work in cognitive neuroscience by Spezio & Adolphs (2009: 87), emotion and cognition are required for the formation of states like belief: ‘cognition provides the reasons or justifications for our beliefs, whereas emotion makes us act on our belief’. Smith (2013: 7) reasons that ‘emotion plays an integral role in transformative education’ but where the emotional response is related to feeling about ‘the other’ it will be loaded with cultural reactions. She quotes McLaren (1998) to explain how ‘categories of difference, which include our emotional responses to difference, are constructed in ways that hierarchically locate people as ‘superior’ or ‘inferior’ and then universalise and naturalise such differences’ (ibid: 7). In her work with trainees on a PGCE programme in England, Smith explores how they use their Whiteness as a
shield from acknowledging negative reactions to ‘the other’ or from acknowledging their privilege. She is supported in this thinking by Irvine (2003), Leonardo (2004) and Sleeter (2008) amongst others. Creating a safe environment conducive to critical dialogue which includes the voice and experience of the non-privileged trainees is an essential consideration for the benefit of both groups. The place of emotion as motivation in the training process was not initially a concern in this study however; findings suggest that it is a key mechanism in the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

As already stated, Wilkins & Lall (2011) report how BME trainees experienced stereotypical attitudes towards them from their White peers as well as overt racism in school placements. Whereas Bhopal et al. (2009) found that the majority of trainees in their study developed some understanding of issues associated with ‘race,’ diversity and inclusion in schools and reported wanting specific sessions on ‘how to deal with racist incidents.’ This highlights a real need to examine the content and pedagogies employed within ITT and especially on one year PGCE programmes across the UK in order to ascertain an effective way forward.

On the training course in question here, where, as has already been stated, the vast majority of candidates are from privileged groups in society, finding effective instructional pedagogies which supported the deconstruction and acceptance of privilege was a concern to this study.

2.2.3 Socially just pedagogies in ITT

Irvine (2003: 13) draws on Hollins (1996) in discussing the idea that education designed to include pupils from minority ethnic cultures would incorporate ‘culturally mediated cognition, culturally appropriate social situations for learning, and culturally valued knowledge in curriculum content’. Delpit (1995: 182) argues that ‘if we are to successfully educate all of our children, we must
work to remove the blinders built of stereotypes, mono-cultural instructional methodologies […] so that it is possible to see, to really know the [pupils] we must teach.’ However, education policies are routinely accused by education critics of the segregation of pupils into ethnic groups, where difference is seen as negative and deficient, and in need of support and social acculturation. The same can be said of pupils with specific learning needs. As Bandura (1997: 324) argued, ‘people regulate their level and distribution of effort in accordance with the effects they expect their actions to have’. When considered alongside theories of enculturation and the reproduction of society’s values through classroom pedagogy, this creates a barrier to culturally exclusive policies. Many educationalists argue that both the curriculum and the assessment procedures are designed to favour the culturally dominant White population and that teachers often teach subject specific content according to the values they attribute to the content itself. Reay (2001: 334) argues that ‘we still have an educational system in which working-class education is made to serve middle-class interests’. It is important, then, to consider how we are training the next generation of teachers to counter these stereotyped labels.

Gay (2000) suggests that culturally responsive teachers realise the importance of maintaining cultural identity and heritage. Ladson-Billings (1995) further explains that culturally responsive teachers develop equality of learning by ‘using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes’ (ibid: 382). Brown (1998: 3) accurately articulates that the aim of educational equality will most readily be achieved where informed teachers ‘hold high expectations of all children, not limited by stereotyped views’. In the next chapter I examine the instructional pedagogies for ITT taking into account the range of literature that offers advice on how to develop culturally responsive and socially just ITT programmes.
Although practical competence, subject knowledge and classrooms skills are essential elements of ITT programmes, they are not discussed as part of this study. The influence of instructional pedagogies relevant to shaping teacher capacity for social responsibility in the classroom is the main area considered. Pedagogical approaches which promote the understanding of bias in cultural content and which impact on responsibility for learning and interaction in classrooms are the key drivers for the research project. Informational content is inevitably significant in challenging biased assumptions but pedagogical approaches that encourage trainees to deconstruct their beliefs are central to this study.

In their review of ITT programmes Zeichner & Colkin (2008) found a wide variation in instructional pedagogies employed during the training, although micro-teaching, critical reflection, portfolios and autobiography were most commonly found. They quote Schulman (2005) who criticises the variety of instructional pedagogies that exist across different training programmes and calls ‘for a consensus on a small set of signature pedagogies that would characterise’ socially just ITT (ibid: 280). They challenge programme leaders to review the extent to which the culturally relevant teaching pedagogies needed for diverse primary classrooms are modelled in the ITT programme.

Much of the research surrounding pedagogical approaches to the training of socially responsible teachers focuses on culturally relevant education which I put into context next.

Culturally relevant teaching is central to a social justice oriented teacher training programme and most current research in this field draws from the work of Gay (2000), Ladson- Billings (2006) and Banks (2006). Their work pays attention to critical Whiteness in interactions and curriculum pedagogies in the classroom, discussing power relations and teacher knowledge. In the USA Davis et al. (2008), for example, use this seminal work to focus their culturally
relevant teacher training programme on ‘the nature of oppression in our society
and begin to identify how oppression plays out in the classroom’ with the
purpose of signalling that ‘teachers can disrupt the cycles of oppression’ (ibid:
ibid: 224). I have already discussed the work by Smith & Lander (2012) and
Smith (2013) who have published their research regarding the impact of their
social justice work with trainees in the UK. Whipp (2013) found that coherent
training programmes that emphasised the need for advocacy and a sense of
responsibility towards pupils during teaching practice generated a lasting sense
of social justice in teaching practice. Jordan et al. (2009) stress that effective
teaching depends in part on the beliefs teachers have of pupils with special
needs and about their roles and responsibilities in supporting them, asserting
that ‘classroom teachers who believe students with special needs are their
responsibility tend to be more effective overall with all of their students’ (ibid: 1).
This sense of advocacy and responsibility is a key theme for this investigation
and will be explored further in the ‘Case Study’ chapters.

There is currently no comprehensive or systematic view of how ITT
programmes are preparing trainees to be socially responsible teachers. Such
an overview would be useful in two ways, according to Gorski (2010): first it
would support programme leaders to identify effective pedagogies and
resources for the ITT context; second, the lack of a comprehensive overview
‘inhibits our abilities to uncover the theoretical and philosophical frames’ being
used (ibid: 2). The recent review by Hick et al. (2011) into how English and
Scottish ITT programmes deal with race and equality issues revealed the lack
of the coherent and sustained approach identified as necessary to shape
socially responsible teachers. However, key findings by Sleeter (2008), Irvine
(2008) Villegas & Davis (2008), Lander (2011) and Smith (20013) all concur
that trainees should critically review the privilege and inequalities of their own
and their pupils’ lives. One way to do this would be through the content and
pedagogy of the university-based course and another through the school-based practicum.

Gay (2013: 50) defines culturally responsive teaching as ‘using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them’. Although this statement refers to ethnically diverse pupils it is applicable to all disadvantaged pupils: the term ‘ethnically’ could be substituted with ‘culturally’ and refer to all aspects of social and cultural disadvantage. Pioneering studies into culturally relevant curricula by Gay, Banks and Ladson-Billings in the 1970’s have evolved and been further refined by their own work and that of others. In response, many researchers (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; Kea et al., 2006; Sleeter, 2008) recommend that cross-cultural learning is essential to link the theoretical philosophies of social justice and the practice of working with pupils from ‘Other’ communities. Maylor et al. (2009), Gay (2013) and Leonardo & Grubb (2014) all discuss how pupils experience the imposition of White middle class culture and social frameworks as the standard. Culturally responsive teaching is seen as bridging the gap between home and school and therefore the more awareness of ‘the other’ the trainees possess, the more likely they will be to bridge the social or cultural divide. Bernstein (1977) and Lareau (2002) all demonstrate how language interaction codes used by the teacher and pupils are represented in attainment outcomes. This study will show that some participants in this study were acutely aware of how they used these codes for their own gain and lay claim to the individual effort which had gained them academic success. Some also expressed a lack of motivation for teaching in schools where pupils would be from ethnically or socially different backgrounds from their own. This is also noted in Allard & Santoro’s (2006: 117) research on a three year undergraduate ITT programme in Australia in which they discuss how their trainees ‘view from
the centre of the hegemonic culture often leaves them unable to see how those outside the dominant discourses may be marginalized through curricula, pedagogies and assessment practices that do not take into account different kinds of knowledge, or different approaches to learning or different values and beliefs'. The key drivers for this research are the challenge to this blindness and the enduring need for ITT programmes to begin to deconstruct the pedagogies through which they hope to shape teachers who acknowledge responsibility for the learning of all pupils.

Davis et al. (2008) set out a clear explanation of how they have developed a socially just teacher training programme which examines White middle class privilege on a three year undergraduate programme. Much of this theory and content is highly relevant to a PGCE but the time constraints make the transition more complex for the trainees. Their work integrating ‘teaching that considers the cultural, racial and ethnic, social class, linguistic, and religious backgrounds of [pupils] in planning inclusive, anti-oppression, and relevant curriculum and instruction’ (ibid: 224) is to be admired. However, in constructing a notion of social justice training on this PGCE I was not initially looking to redesign the programme. I would now welcome the opportunity to design a programme based on Ladson-Billings’ (2006) culturally relevant pedagogy – academic achievement, cultural competence, and socio-political consciousness – or Kumashiro’s (2002) anti-oppression education. However, my intention here was to investigate existing opportunities designed for the trainees to become more ‘Other’ orientated and identify with a broader culture of teaching in terms of social responsibility. The use of reflective practice already employed was expected to encourage the shift for trainees from ‘being only consumers of educational knowledge to also becoming inquirers into knowledge and the nature of schooling’ (Goodlad, 1990: 274). When I began this investigation, the limitation of my role in the programme and the nature of
the study necessitated my enquiry into the content, theories and events offered during the programme and the pedagogical approaches taken.

The content of any programme will, as previously suggested, be influenced by the expertise and philosophical bias of the programme leader and training team. Subject-specific knowledge and teacher skills are less of a concern to this research than the impact of socialisation and a sense of responsibility in shaping teacher capacity for social justice in the classroom, so I only discuss the pedagogies and culturally relevant social justice content. The instructional pedagogies employed in the training programme discussed here are explained and mapped out in the next chapter. But first I draw on literature to explore how to move my practice to a more socially just training stance.

2.3 A way forward

Despite the literature on how social structures and processes work to shape our identity and perpetuate hegemony, finding instructional pedagogies guaranteed to challenge trainee awareness and redress the balance in our school systems proves more challenging. There is a wide range of research and guidance, as already shared, regarding what a socially just training programme might include; however, we know very little about what English IT trainers are doing in a systemic sense. This knowledge is crucial, given the speed of change in the English training structure, if progress is to be made within our school system for the benefit of all pupils not just the privileged few.

Zeichner (2003), Cochran-Smith (2003) and Loughran (2008) propose a number of different general frameworks for the conceptual orientation of ITT programmes. What distinguishes one programme from another is the emphasis placed on curriculum knowledge, pedagogy, theories of teaching and learning and the practicum. In their ITT review, Zeichner & Conklin (2008) present Darling-Hammond’s (2006) case study, where she argues that theories of
cognition, motivation and child development are essential preparation. Howey & Zimpher (1989), on the other hand, contend that there should be balance between general knowledge and pedagogical approaches.

The premise of this study rests on the research surrounding the enculturation and socialisation of pupils through the highly visible, target driven, performative culture of our state funded education systems. The history and politics of oppression are brought to bear through the reproduction of society in school pedagogy and follow us into teaching. The perpetuation of an unjust society is unwittingly executed by those who profess to want justice, through the discourse of denial and the silence of privilege. All these notions have been presented over decades to the teaching profession and earlier in this chapter I offered a brief overview of this work in order to situate my own study. Whilst teachers continue to use well-formed stereotyped judgements in their interactions with pupils this not only maintains the ‘circulation of stereotypical identity’ according to Wortham (2006) but damages children’s development and potential attainment. I suggest this undermines the notion of inclusion and equality in English primary schools. One could argue that one of the most challenging tasks for designers of ITT programmes lies in dispelling the myths and stereotypical perceptions and beliefs of trainees in order to create a workforce informed about cultural difference.

There is considerable evidence in research that there is an urgent need for further progress in the development of socially responsible teachers. Bhopal et al. (2009), Rhamie (2010) and Hick et al. (2011) are among a growing group of ITT providers calling for ‘all teacher trainers in England to examine how they are teaching their trainee to be aware of issues of ‘race’, diversity and inclusion with a view to disseminating and sharing ‘good practice” (Bhopal et al., 2009: 4). Some research focuses on the recruitment and retention of non-white trainees - Carrington (2000), Basit et al. (2006) and Wilkins & Lall (2011) in the UK, and
Zeichner (2003) and Sleeter (2008) in the US - confirming that the recruitment of BME teachers is essential to progress. Other stances consider that programme development (Sleeter, 2008; Smith, 2013) and the integration of culturally relevant experiences (Bhopal et al., 2009; Rhamie, 2010) will help to progress socially just ITT programmes. Smith & Lander’s (2012) study into the effect of lecturer ethnicity on trainee reception of knowledge indicates that further understanding of the issue is necessary before conclusions can be drawn. This study focuses on how the instructional pedagogies employed on one PGCE programme supported the development of trainees as socially responsible teachers.

Statistics on the composition of trainee cohorts in England are a cause for concern: whilst 88.4% of the teaching workforce declared themselves as White British, 87% of current trainee teachers are White: 73% of teachers are recorded as female and 80% of trainees are (DfE, 2012; ITT, 2012). This has been shown to be an issue in research in Australia (Allard & Santoro, 2006), the USA (Picower, 2009) and the UK (Bhatti, 2004; Rhamie, 2007). Furthermore these trainees are being instructed by a training profession that is itself overwhelmingly White. This demographic suggests an urgent need to encourage trainees to deconstruct the normalisation of privilege and its relationship to teaching. Picower (2009:197), whilst situating her study in the US, confirms the seriousness of this issue, remarking that ‘the sheer number of White people in the teaching field in a country marked by racial inequality has implications for the role White teachers play in creating patterns of racial achievement and opportunity’ as a result of the structures discussed throughout this thesis.

In 2009 Bhopal et al. identified the need for a comprehensive review of ITT provision across the UK; this still needs to be addressed if trainers of socially responsible teachers are to develop sustained, successful provision. The Hick
review (2011) of how race and equality issues are dealt with in ITT in England and Scotland began to consider this issue. The review provides findings from 31 lecturers alongside published findings from UK research and recommends that all ITT programme leaders should review their own provision. However, without guidance about what counts as a socially just training programme and a clear understanding of the need for change by trainers, this leaves too much to chance. As the review of research surrounding the subtle and insidious way in which hierarchies are perpetuated and normalised in public consciousness demonstrates, the trainers are as susceptible to the silence of their White middle class privilege as the trainees. As Sleeter (2008: 562) points out, ‘case studies have found that predominantly White institutions provide disjointed preparation for diversity and equity, dependent on the interests of individual professors’.

Atwater et al. (2010) quote Hollins & Guzman’s (2005: 512) affirmation that ‘we need research that examines the links among teacher preparation for diversity, what teacher candidates learn from this preparation, how this affects their professional practices in schools, and what the impact is on pupils’ learning’. According to Sleeter (2008) there is some evidence that well planned coherent ITT programmes can make an impact that persists into the workplace. However, she argues that most programmes lack a coherent sustained approach to countering these ongoing forms of socialisation.

In 2008 Sleeter confirmed that although it is essential to address the attitudes and lack of knowledge of trainee teachers ‘it is not the same as figuring out how to populate the teaching profession with excellent multicultural and culturally responsive teachers’ (p94). Citing Haberman (1998) she suggests that one solution ‘is to recruit and select only those who bring experiences, knowledge, and dispositions that will enable them to teach well in culturally diverse urban schools’ (ibid: 96). This has implications for the knowledge and assumptions of
those selecting and interviewing the candidates and requires a deconstruction of what these characteristics might actually be. As John & McCrum (2012) point out in their analysis of the personal statements of ITT applicants for a UK PGCE programme, candidates of minority ethnic heritage were perceived to not have the same levels of fluency as White British candidates. There is a perception by those reviewing the applications that the personal statement is a neutral measure of ability and suitability: this ignores the crucial aspect of socialisation and the need to understand how to present your cultural capital. Decades of literature point out the embedded marketisation of social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1979, 1986; Eckert, 2000) by which stereotyped categories are assigned to groups; these are clearly displayed through the presentation of self in a candidate’s personal statement. Even if the candidate is called to interview, they will be judged by the same markers of suitability. They may misread cues in the conversational conventions of White middle class privilege, or not understand the rules of the game of the interview: the power base, body language cues, expectations of performance and articulation which will all be part of White, middle class candidates’ preparation.

The significance of this interaction has been discussed in the review of socialisation and the policy context of schooling in England but is also supported by findings of institutional racism by Macpherson (2009) and specifically in ITT by Basit et al. (2006). Their work identifies that ‘the individual and institutional discrimination still experienced in the teaching profession […] impacts on the recruitment and retention of BME teachers (Basit et al., 2006: 19). Evidence presented here has demonstrated that despite policies to increase the number of men and minority ethnic trainees to teaching, there has been no significant development in the diversity of the teaching workforce. I suggest that this creates an imperative to recruit and select trainees who are favourably predisposed to social responsibility as much as those who are from diverse backgrounds. Although Villegas & Lucas point out (2002a: xxii) ‘trainee
diversity is central to the process, to avoid the subject being treated as an add-on’. The challenge of removing misrecognition and encouraging the deconstruction of positions of power will benefit from being confronted by those who recognise and understand privilege in society. From a social change perspective, people from privileged groups perpetuate oppression through individual acts as well as through institutional and cultural practices; however, where socially informed people from privileged groups are included, I suggest they can help facilitate transformation - they can influence decisions as conscious instruments of change.

Villegas & Lucas (2002b) and Kea et al. (2006) offer solutions as to what the programmes should include, and Turner (1996) argues that learning taken from studies is heavily dependent on how the information is received and what the trainee does with that information. What and how trainees learn in their training programme is strongly influenced by their existing knowledge and beliefs; challenging these through creating dissonance is, according to Loughran (2008), one way of generating opportunities for new learning. The Hick review (2011) of teacher trainers’ understanding of diversity cites Jones (1999: 153) in asserting that there is still a need for ‘planned, yet frank yet sensitive discussion’ which allows trainees ‘in schools and universities to explore their own attitudes and beliefs’. However, even with a well-planned coherent programme, the mainly White cohort of trainees must have the capacity to learn from someone else’s community.

Trainees on the programme may not share a philosophy of teaching pedagogy so mixed messages regarding effective teaching skills may be received for processing during both lectures and practicum elements of the training programme. Trainees encounter a range of teaching methods which require processing for efficacy; during each practicum the trainee will be learning to perform according to the school based mentor’s belief of what constitutes ‘good
teaching'; university based trainers will offer subject specific teaching strategies and pedagogic understanding which may need to be processed meta-cognitively. There will also be a series of other lectures, the purpose of which will be less about subject-specific teaching or pedagogic strategies and more about values and beliefs surrounding our education system. Trainees must construct understanding in each of these learning situations: they must establish the relationships, making mental connections themselves, and then put this new-found knowledge to use during the practicum. If trainees are to understand the knowledge and information regarding cultural diversity and institutional discrimination they need opportunities to assimilate these complicated issues. Learning situations must offer the same perspective on these complex issues if the trainees are expected to commit to adjustments in beliefs and behaviour.

Street (2003: 76) cites Porter & Brophy (1998) to confirm that 'personal experiences, especially teachers' own experiences as [pupils], are represented as important determinants of how teachers think and what they do'. Many of the participant trainees in this study were in primary schools at the introduction of the National Curriculum for England and have been educated in the highly visible, performative culture of this education system. Targets were visible to pupils and teachers alike and have shaped the lives of the students, enabling them to clearly identify how to attain specified grades at each stage of their schooling. In order to create programmes capable of challenging the belief systems of the trainees, it is necessary to understand how they engage with the learning experiences offered and investigate whether the course content or instructional pedagogies have an impact on their developing understanding during their teaching practices. Reflection might provide a way of considering the shaping of teacher identity since it continues to be acknowledged as a powerful way for students and practising teachers to delve deeply into their teaching identities (Bold, 2012; Mälkki & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2012).
Trainees must reflect on their learning in a conscious manner in order to explicitly understand the skills they are acquiring. They are encouraged to write reflections of their professional learning as a method of encouraging critical evaluation skills which Harrison & Yaffe (2007: 2) suggest is a ‘purposeful, deliberate act of inquiry into one’s thoughts and actions’ which helps us ‘to make sense so we better understand’.

In ITT there is an accepted view that reflection is a sophisticated form of pedagogy, however Mälkki and Lindblom-Ylänne (2012) contend that ‘although the enhancement of one’s practice is undoubtedly a possible result of reflection, it is far from being a self-evident or automatic one’ (ibid, 2012:35). My interest in the trainees’ professional reflections instigated this study, as they exemplified the axiomatic belief that discrimination is only noticed by those it directly affects. There was also clear evidence of what Bourdieu (1982) terms ‘cultural capital’ in the trainees, displayed through their actions and interactions with the course programme, the trainers and fellow trainees. Concurring with much of the reviewed literature, many of the trainees were largely uncritical of the legacy of discrimination and unaware of the need to draw upon respective ethnic and social cultural experiences to afford their pupils equal access to learning.

This literature built over decades of research appears to contain the defeatism of oppression. However, through analysing the narrative reflections of trainees, I discovered the development of a social responsibility in some participants which, according to Giroux (1992: 99), is the ‘disposition through which teachers reflect upon their own actions and those presented by others. Rather than passively accepting information or embracing a false consciousness, teachers take a much more active role in leading, learning and reflecting upon their relationship with their practice and the social context in which the practice is situated’. Bold (2012: 75) suggest that some trainees ‘move into a phase of
reflexivity having a heightened awareness of the self and their relationship with others’.

Recognising which of the participants demonstrate a sense of social justice and a capacity to build on culturally relevant pedagogy in their own classrooms is the most significant aspect of this research. Within the constraints and context of an English PGCE programme trainees need to bring with them the capacity to flourish in classrooms where the pupils are culturally and linguistically different to themselves. The next chapter contextualises the key mechanisms employed in ITT and specifically in the professional studies element of the programme. In order to identify which situation or instructional pedagogy may effect greatest change in trainee awareness of the damage caused by stereotyped assumptions; these have been offered as separate and distinct. However, they are all inextricably linked to the whole process of professional transformation.

This research study brings together what is already known and adds to the discussion the findings regarding the capacity of ITT programmes to shape socially responsible teachers.
3 THE CASE STUDY

In the introduction I established my reasons for embarking upon this study and in the previous chapter, reviewing pertinent literature, I set out my developing understanding of how stereotyped attainment prevails within the English education system. Drawing on research regarding the shaping of socially responsible teachers on ITT programmes was essential to shape my own professional knowledge whilst working on a PGCE programme. In this next chapter I outline the programme investigated here and discuss how it is aligned with the literature previously discussed.

The Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) in the UK is a 36 week professional teacher training programme which mixes theoretical underpinning of teaching and learning with social and cultural aspects of schooling, subject enhancement and block teaching practices. This research study sought participants from two consecutive cohorts of the programme in the academic years 2010-11 and 2011-12.

Across the UK ITT programmes share many similarities, but for clarity here I outline the structure and content of this particular programme. At the time of the research the programme was divided equally between university instructions and teaching practice; some university instruction was presented off-site in more appropriate venues such as places of worship and occasionally in partnership schools. University instruction was divided between subject specific strands: the core National Curriculum subjects of maths, science and English, a cross-curricular approach to other ‘foundation’ subjects and professional studies. The timetable in figure 1 shows how the social justice sessions fit into the overall programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WK</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preliminary Tasks in self-selected primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional Autobiography</td>
<td>Reflective Writing</td>
<td>Professional Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereotyping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RE / Faith Trail</td>
<td>RE / Faith Trail</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Comm/ Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holocaust Memorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Two weeks prior to each practicum are spent on basic classroom skills and knowledge; in subject enhancement and professional pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>Teaching Experience 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Diversity and Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Focus Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional Focus Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Safeguarding children</td>
<td>Inter Professional Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>Two weeks prior to each practicum are spent on basic classroom skills and knowledge; in subject enhancement and professional pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 -</td>
<td>Teaching Experience 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>University based personalised learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ICT &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>gifted and talented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Special educational needs</td>
<td>Diversity lecture/ debates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 &amp; 29</td>
<td>Two weeks prior to each practicum are spent on basic classroom skills and knowledge; in subject enhancement and professional pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 -</td>
<td>Teaching Experience 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools half term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of reflection and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Timetable of Social Justice programme
The programme was designed around a ‘spiral curriculum’ (Bruner, 1960) encouraging the synthesis of theory and practice as a means of deepening understanding. Trainees were taught subject specific knowledge and pedagogy in corresponding strands for core and foundation National Curriculum subjects through which diversity and inclusion issues may have been addressed. Core subject knowledge sessions made explicit reference to learners with specific teaching requirements in regard of language (EAL) or disability (SEN), but there was no evidence that trainees were encouraged to consider a culturally appropriate or socially just curriculum during the subject specific elements of the programme.

To focus attention on social justice aspects of the programme this study concentrates on the professional studies strand; relevant sessions are explained in more detail later in this section. This decision was also significant as I was the co-ordinator of and tutored on this strand and so had greater access to the analysis of the pedagogies employed and was able to locate my personal perspective in the desired transformation of the trainees.

Although it could be argued that this would make me too close to the research and more especially the data, Brannick & Coghlan (2007) support the notion that this theoretical ‘pre-understanding’ of the process in question does not invalidate my research. They suggest that within the hermeneutic approach ‘subjective interpretation is key to the research process’ a notion that actively promotes the researcher being close to the subject (ibid: 64). I was in effect researching the impact of my own work. The validity of my insider status in the study is explained in more detail in the following chapter.

The professional strand was designed to encourage trainees to understand their role and responsibility as a teacher in the English primary classroom and covered the equivalent of 4 weeks. It offered theoretical instruction which was drawn from and fed into the trainees’ teaching practice as a ‘spiral’ curriculum.
The content incorporated explicit teaching about discrimination, child protection and the diversity of learners in classrooms as well as implicit teaching about values, attitudes and school cultures, to which trainees needed to relate through their own learning experiences. This coherence through the university and school based instruction follows Sleeter’s (2008) advice and is in line with current ITT practice in England.

On successful selection for the programme trainees were provided with a pre-course reading list of primary aged children’s books for information and analysis. Initially selected as recently published children’s novels that the trainees would not have read during their own primary years, many of these books contained potential themes of inclusion and discrimination. This was the first contact trainees had with the social justice aspect of the programme.

The training programme began with one week of school experience, selected by the trainees; the first university based block was six weeks of subject and professional knowledge instruction and included eight days of specific interest to this study: professional identity development, challenging stereotyped assumptions, the ‘Faith Trail’, Holocaust memorial visit, and ‘language, communication and identity’. After a four week block of teaching practice the trainees returned to university for a seven week block of instruction including five days professional strand: two days of school participation followed by full days of instruction in diversity and inclusion, inter-professional education and safeguarding vulnerable children. This was followed by a six-week block of teaching practice. The schools half-term break weeks that fell during each of the two six week teaching practice blocks were dedicated to individual and small group university instruction relating to identified need. Trainees returned to university instruction for four weeks before completing a further six-week block teaching practice. Four days of this block of university instruction are captured in this study; these provided insight into a range of specific learning needs including gifted and talented pupils and included debates surrounding current
controversial issues. Trainees returned to university for a final week of reflection and evaluation.

The content and pedagogical approaches for the instruction are all explained in more detail in the following subsection regarding the instructional pedagogies.

**Situating the learning process**

The way that trainees might assimilate the instruction on a short programme with a large cohort of peers may be relevant to the impact of the instruction on the trainees’ progress and so needs consideration.

Much of the learning on the PGCE must be done independently: the course is fast paced and trainees must process a wealth of information both subject-specific and pedagogic. Often the differentiated needs of categories of young learners will be explicit in the instruction but at times trainees will be expected to incorporate the learning needs of the full range of pupils into their personal understanding. Newton (2012: 1) argues that what is important here is ‘how well it is digested and how well it hangs together in ways which we can use to guide what we do in new situations’. He suggests that the main concerns are with the understanding of the information, how well it is processed and stored and how relationships with existing knowledge are established. The trainees documented how they processed the information to incorporate professional skills into their teaching practice through a reflective journal which they added to at least weekly. These narrative reflections provided insight into how effectively trainees assimilated the learning into their professional development. The use of narrative reflection in the process of professional training is discussed in more detail in the following subsection regarding instructional pedagogies. Study participants offered their journals for this research.

‘Social influence’ theories are taken into account here alongside ‘social conformity’ (Turner, 1991) in the learning context. Whilst Goodman (2001: 3)
believed that ‘consciousness raising can increase an awareness of self and others’, Turner’s (1996) theories of ‘informational’ and ‘normative’ influence are drawn upon in considering the impact of the consciousness raised during this programme. Although I had an ambition to increase trainee awareness of self and ‘Others’ through the professional strand, the influence of tutors and peers must also be taken into account, in accordance with Smith & Lander (2012). Turner’s (1996) theories advise that uncertainty in the learning experience creates social dependence: learners are likely to gravitate towards conformity when processing new and especially difficult information. Consciousness raising in large groups may not be helpful, as Goodman (2001: 3) suggests, in encouraging people to ‘challenge stereotypes, overcome prejudices, and develop relationships with different kinds of people’. Furthermore Turner builds on Lewin’s (1947) theory that ‘when a person's attitude is anchored in a group it is necessary to change the group as a whole before an attitude could be changed’ (ibid 1996: 12). The ambitious aim to ‘help individuals enlarge their narrow worldview and recognise that there are other legitimate ways of thinking, being and doing’ (Goodman, 2001: 3) may be obstructed either by fellow trainees or by the instructional pedagogy. The information offered to the trainees will necessarily be understood within the social context of the learning situation, including the past experience of the trainees. Trainees’ collaborative discussion of experiences and beliefs will be influential in reinforcing the information the tutor is sharing, as will the perceived status of the tutor and, according to Smith & Lander (2012), the colour of the tutor’s skin.

There are studies that provide pedagogical suggestions for improving the cultural and social aspects of training (Villegas & Lucas, 2002b; Kea et al., 2006). This range of suggestions includes: reflective writing; exploring personal history; the importance of experience within culturally diverse settings during the practicum; the need for collective discussion; and immersion into a new cultural experience. There is no clear guidance, however, on how to facilitate the
consciousness-raising of professional trainees. Suggestions from previous studies concentrate on facilitating trainees in exposing their beliefs about ‘Other’ groups in an attempt to challenge and deepen their understanding of disadvantage. These studies each have particular perspectives and provide insights into and recommendations for possible ways forward.

Through this study I explore the effectiveness of my own interpretation of these instructional pedagogies in shaping socially responsible teachers. In order to situate and interpret the findings from my research data alongside the research in this field I have categorised the university instruction using these suggested pedagogical approaches. Each session within the chosen pedagogical approach is explained to identify why the approach and the content were relevant to the shaping of socially responsible teachers. To that end I now situate the university instruction session within the pedagogical approach taken.

All trainees on the programme engaged in every aspect described in this study, which meant that no extra burden was placed on research participants. Therefore for clarity the term ‘trainees’ refers to all candidates on the ITT programme and ‘participants’ refers specifically to those trainees who offered data sets for analysis during the study.

**Instructional Pedagogies**

**Reflective Writing**

Instruction for a cohort of 120 trainees is not easily differentiated for personalised learning meaning that all trainees received the same information and had to relate the experiences to their own learning framework. In ITT there is an accepted view that reflection is a useful method of professional enhancement. Brookfield’s study (1995) has been influential in encouraging trainee progress through deliberate reflection about practice, certainly in the UK, America and Australia (Loughran, 2002; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). The
use of a critically reflective journal of professional development experiences was employed during this training programme in line with Surbeck et al. (1991) who suggest that reflection characterises a capacity to make sense of and internalise learning. The purpose for using this form of pedagogical instruction in most current ITT programmes is, as Bold (2012) describes, to challenge underlying beliefs, values and assumptions when looking back at events. She suggests that through being critically reflective, ‘we question actions and challenge accepted truths or claims and we consider various alternative ways of interpreting and analysing situations’ (ibid: 3). This perspective of the value of reflection on learning was considered in this study.

Trainees were encouraged to reflect on their learning in a conscious manner in order to explicitly understand the skills acquired. Along with many others in the field, Campbell et al. (2004: 10) cite Schön (1993) in arguing that ‘part of what it is to be a good practitioner is to be able to bring tacit knowledge to the surface by a process called reflection-in-action’ which he identifies as reflective practice. However, as trainees are still developing the essential skills and knowledge of their new role they are encouraged to engage in what Schön refers to as reflection-on-action. This reflection was formalised in the regular writing of narrative articulation of professional development by every trainee: they were encouraged to reflect on the impact of their professional learning at university and their progress in applying this learning during the practicum. These narrative reflections demonstrated the extent to which the trainees assimilated the information and created relationships between knowledge and practice and identified their beliefs about the training process and the pupils they taught on practicum.

The responses of the participants in this study were captured through their reflective accounts of the range of instructional events over the full length of the programme. This was essential in ascertaining if the instruction had an impact
on their awareness and if this could be acted upon during the practice elements of the programme.

Harrison & Yaffe (2007: 2) offer useful explanations for the use of reflective practice with trainees, suggesting that it encourages ‘the purposeful, deliberate act of inquiry into one’s thoughts and actions through which a perceived problem is examined in order that a thoughtful, reasoned response might be tested out’. Considering how we are changing and developing allows us to depersonalise our feelings and manage and control our responses, which in turn eases the process of transition. Trainees were explicitly taught about the process of professional transition to support the reflective exercise. The narrative reflections were regularly shared with progress tutors over the year and discussions informed judgements about professional development.

Sikes & Gale (2006) suggest that we make sense of the world and the things that happen to us by constructing narratives to explain and interpret events both to ourselves and to other people. The narrative structures and the vocabularies that we use to interpret our perceptions and experiences are also, in themselves, significant, providing information about our social and cultural positioning. I was interested in particular to capture the way participants reflected on the social justice elements and see whether these were referred to during teaching practice. These weekly reflections were therefore used as a key method of extracting data for this research, as will be discussed in the subsection of the following chapter explaining my coding system.

**Exploring Personal History**

The second of the instructional pedagogies to be explained is that of personal history or biography as suggested by Pajares (1992) and Street (2003).

Engeström et al. (1999) indicate that by exploring personal and institutional histories, norms and culturally defined goals, factors which influence identity
transition become clear. In this study the exploration of personal histories was documented in professional and language autobiographies, a commonly used approach in professional training (Zeichner & Gore, 1989; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005) as well as in a pre-course questionnaire which was specifically designed to elicit information for this study.

**Pre-course questionnaire**

During the preliminary week of school experience trainees had directed tasks to complete which included a pre-course questionnaire about awareness of discrimination within English society and media, especially children’s media. Here I acknowledge Pajares (1992) who draws on the work of Eraut (1985) in suggesting that personal experience, taking the form of visual images, resides in long term memory and plays a key role in the process of creating and recreating knowledge. In an attempt to capture these memories the pre-course questionnaire was designed to capture trainees’ experience of stereotyping and discrimination through children’s media; understanding and attitudes about the importance of inclusion and diversity in early experiences; and acknowledgement of the need for challenge. The questionnaire also explored prospective trainees’ understanding of the terminologies ‘equal opportunities’, ‘anti-bias education’, ‘anti-discrimination’ and ‘inclusion’. These terms are in common usage although it is not evident that each person using them shares a common understanding about the meanings they attribute to the terminology. Interpreting this use of language was another attempt to elicit assumptions the trainees held. Further questions encouraged the trainees to consider their own understanding of the importance of a teacher’s attitude and vocabulary to the pupils they teach (See appendix 1).

**Professional autobiography**

Trainees were engaged in the reflective process in the first days of the professional strand. They explored their awareness of any prior professional
experience or identification with teaching through the use of a guided professional autobiography. Pajares (2006) argues that through a growing interest in evolving theoretical constructs such as autobiographical enquiry ‘it has become apparent that sensorial experiences of people are pivotal domains of cultural expression and the medium through which beliefs are enacted’ (ibid: 34). I hoped to capture the participants’ beliefs and assumptions through this use of autobiography. Many ITT researchers also define this use of autobiography as a useful method of supporting trainee deconstruction of assumptions. As Pajares (1992: 328) tells us ‘narrative and biography can be used to understand how early experiences paint the portrait of a teacher that students bring with them to teacher education’. Similarly, the use of autobiography by Street (2003) confirmed that trainees do not arrive at university void of prior experience, and these prior experiences are utilised by researchers in advancing our understanding of mechanisms which impact on shaping teacher development.

In these autobiographies trainees were guided to reflect on why they embarked on their chosen career path and to consider their emerging philosophy of education giving consideration to beliefs and assumptions about children and learners in a classroom. They shared their experience of working with children and young people and identified their reason for wanting to teach. In this programme the process began at the interview stage in a written response to a question regarding the ‘purpose of education’. It was then built on at regular intervals during the training year. Trainees were encouraged to express how they wanted to be perceived as a professional. This process was identified in the review of literature (Zeichner & Conklin, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006) and was considered here in relation to characteristics brought to the training process.

According to Webster & Mertova (2007) autobiographical narratives can help us to learn about how people make sense of aspects of life through exploring
underlying themes from memories about episodes of the narrator’s life, considering features of identity as a reflection of cultural forms and values. So alongside the professional autobiography, trainees were guided to write a language autobiography.

**Language autobiography**

During week 4, trainees were encouraged to consider the links between communication, language and identity and to learn about the language diversity of different communities. Trainees received instruction in small groups in a language that was not their ‘mother tongue’. This is an immersive pedagogical approach as the trainees personally experienced how it felt not to understand the teacher expectations. They began to consider their own language history in terms of culture and privilege as well as how they might investigate the language autobiographies of the pupils they would teach. Reflection on how privilege shaped their own experience is also considered as demonstrating a willingness to acknowledge disadvantage for ‘Others’.

**Collective Discussion**

The next of the instructional pedagogies to be explained is the use of discussion with peers to shape the knowledge and awareness of trainees. In a previous research project I found this approach to be very successful in changing practice (Mohamed, 2011). The context of the study was different, however, in that experienced practitioners were discussing their observations of young children. Here the trainees were sharing personal opinion and sometimes sensitive information; this could have produced a significantly different effect.

In this study expert tutors structured the opportunity for collective discussion in response to information being presented, during several sessions over the programme, some university based others school based. These are explained
here alongside the theory about the potential impact of this pedagogical approach on the learner.

This pedagogical approach has to pay regard to theories of ‘social influence’ and ‘social conformity’ (Turner, 1991) already discussed earlier in this section. Turner’s (1996) ‘informational’ and ‘normative’ influences are key concerns in how the trainees received the information provided and how they responded to challenging or uncomfortable messages. Although Ditto (2009: 33) contends that ‘merely thinking more deeply about a piece of information leads to greater likelihood of considering multiple explanations for it’, my experience of training led me to heed advice from Sleeter (2008: 563) and carefully plan how I guided trainees through reflection on the collective discussion experiences.

Ghaye & Ghaye (1998) introduced principles of reflective practice which require practitioners to engage in reflective conversations that may disturb their professional identity and help them recognise and understand their existing conceptual frameworks. They claim that trainees should be encouraged to interrogate their own and other people’s experiences by asking probing questions, viewing situations problematically and exploring taken-for-granted values, beliefs and assumptions. The social interactions employed during these pedagogical experiences were designed to aid deliberation through which the trainees could create new knowledge and understandings to inform future practice.

What follows is a brief explanation of the sessions included in this pedagogical approach. The stereotyping and discrimination session is explored in most detail as it was specifically designed after analysis of the programme revealed gaps in social and cultural awareness prior to my taking responsibility for the professional studies strand. The debates regarding current controversial educational issues are explained at the end of this pedagogical approach.
**Stereotyping and discrimination**

This instructional session delivered in week 3 was designed to engage the trainees in considering the way beliefs and assumptions are created through media presentation to young children. Trainees were encouraged to explore how these may be formed and how they might challenge enduring stereotypes through teaching practice. During this session the whole cohort was arranged into groups of six and remained in the group for all activities.

As stereotyping and self-image are thought to be largely drawn from what we see and hear in our early years the participants were provided with media images from past and present children’s television and early reading material. Trainees discussed how they analysed the messages about race, gender and socio-cultural values. The tutor provided information about both seminal and current research and local statistical knowledge about non-privileged pupils being taught within partnership schools. The key theme of the session was the barrier to learning created by biased teacher assumptions about the pupils they teach. The session incorporated a range of instructional pedagogies: a lecture alongside collective discussion and reflection on personal responses to visual media both photographic and video.

This choice of pedagogy was based on my reading of the sociologist Stephen Spencer (2011) who suggests that media images are used as agents of social control, highlighting that the use of found images and their subtexts reveals cultural, social, historical and political and visual data. Bayne & Fernandez, (2009: 91) cite Spezio & Adolphs suggestion that visual images provide more ‘emotion-congruent facilitation’ than the written or spoken word: stronger responses can be gleaned from the ‘reactivation of emotional responses’. Building on this premise the trainees watched a presentation of images intended to elicit an emotional response and then recorded this response simply as *positive, negative or neither*. Images were drawn from a range of gender-
specific toys; cultural images related to music styles; media images of schools and head teachers; non-conventional images of disability and sexual orientation book covers; sports with class connotations; gendered career choices and media images of the developing/developed world. The images were on a four-second loop which gave the trainees little time to think about their responses. This immediate response needed to be captured if trainees were to reflect on and challenge their cultural ‘knowledge’. In the ensuing group discussion they were encouraged to explore their reactions.

Next, the cohort watched video footage of a currently popular children’s television programme. Engaging with media images explores how we understand what is happening in the world around us: if messages are consumed uncritically it is fair to assume that we are using a culturally specific frame of reference for interpreting complex situations. This can foster a biased view of the world which may be shared with others around us. This uncritical consumption was highly visible to me as I observed the trainees watching this children’s visual media.

Group discussion explored bias, discriminatory messages and conformity to social norms of reference. These responses were voiced as feedback to the whole cohort and built upon by me as the expert tutor. This approach clearly lent itself to ‘normative influence’ where ‘one conforms outwardly but not necessarily inwardly to the expectations of others’ (Turner, 1996: 37): it was found that trainees were likely to share their thinking privately rather than speak against the majority in a whole cohort session. As values, beliefs and perceptions are socially and culturally learnt group conformity has survival value: in a short training programme with new peers a sense of belonging is vital to survival.

The trainees were then provided with a selection of children’s books and asked to analyse the messages portrayed through visual imagery and early text. The
collective discussion of these learning experiences was used to engage the trainees in challenging their own and each other’s biased assumptions and acceptance of stereotypes. Next they were tasked with sharing any recollections of discriminatory practice and its impact during their own primary school years, either personal or for someone they knew. This was an attempt to determine what the trainees’ own early schooling had provided in terms of knowledge and understanding of disadvantage and discrimination. The concluding activity engaged the trainees in collective discussion of a series of scenarios that they might encounter in a school setting. They were asked to agree ways in which they might respond to the given situation. Feedback from these group discussions was taken at the end and opened up to the rest of the cohort for further debate.

Through sharing their understanding and beliefs about the messages portrayed by the material, trainees inevitably influenced each other’s thinking in some way. This influence was balanced by the status of and the information provided by the tutor. The confidence of individual members of the group to influence others and the social and cultural makeup of the group are also important factors in this study. As social conformity is influenced by the nature of the group and the need to belong, group discussion can bring about adjustments in attitudes only if the group as a whole allows it. In addition, if social influence was held by a group member with firmly embedded alternative beliefs then the influence of the ‘expert’ might not have been the strongest on the developing understanding of the cohort. This is crucial in determining whether the pedagogical approach had more of an impact than the instruction in this case. Reflections on this session provided insight into the participants’ sense of advocacy.

Following this session the trainees were expected to write down one personally relevant action for the first teaching practice. These were followed up during subsequent professional strand sessions post- and pre- each teaching practice.
Debating educational issues

Late in the university instruction (week 27), following a keynote lecture on social justice (see lectures), trainees formed teams to debate current controversial issues in education. The purpose of the debate was for the trainees to discuss personal convictions, outside influences (including media pressures) and societal and religious expectations which may create tensions within communities. The issues to be debated and the arguments for and against were set by the expert tutor.

This type of pedagogical approach engages trainees in conflicting opinion and may force them to argue an opposing view to their own. This challenges their thinking about widely circulating rhetoric.

Lectures

Another instructional pedagogy employed where there are large cohorts of trainees, is the lecture. For the purpose of this study the term signifies the pedagogical approach taken where one expert transmits knowledge and information to the whole cohort (120 trainees) at the same time. In a lecture the expert transmitting information assumes or is attributed high credibility status: this can be considered in the light of Turner’s (1996) theory on social influence which suggests that it could lead to a lasting change in attitude. The following sessions incorporated a lecture as part of the instruction:

Safeguarding vulnerable children

This whole day of lectures prior to the second teaching practice (week 16) was offered by experts in the field. It opened with a keynote lecture from the manager of the Local Authority Safeguarding Department who shared the reality of life for some children in Partnership schools. Next, a Partnership head teacher made explicit the role of the teacher in protecting the most vulnerable
children, and informed the trainees of the policies and procedures that must be followed. Trainees were then taught about e-safety and how to protect themselves. The final lecture, delivered by the School Nurse Service Team leader, instructed them on ‘sex and relationships education’ for primary aged children.

There was little time for discussion during the day although informal discussions were invariably held to ease the assimilation of potentially difficult information. These sessions were an attempt to teach about the ‘Other’ as well as professional responsibility.

**Working with gifted & talented children**

This lecture in week 26 was designed to demonstrate to trainees the most effective methods of identifying Gifted and Talented pupils and to ensure that they were well informed as to how these particular pupils may present challenging behaviour if they feel undervalued or bored. Ways of recognising gifts and talents and ways of target setting with these pupils were explored by the experienced class teacher instructing on this topic. This practicing teacher is known to the trainees and is held in high esteem. Little time for discussion was provided during this lecture: trainees were expected to synthesise the information with their experience in classrooms.

**The legal and moral responsibility of teachers**

This lecture informed the trainees of the need to avoid direct discrimination and to actively promote positive values and attitudes towards diversity in communities; it took place towards the end of the taught programme (week 27), prior to the final teaching practice. It afforded no time for discussion but delivered difficult messages regarding the social responsibility of a teacher. The lecturer had a high status position in the department.
In this lecture the trainees were informed about the social, cultural, historical and political context of the schooling. The tutor encouraged the trainees to appreciate that not only are the values of society reflected in school practices, but that school practices can help shape the values of those that work and study in them. This lecture was followed by the debates, (already explained), as a way of immediately engaging the trainees with some of the controversial issues surrounding social justice in education.

It was acknowledged as a follow up lecture to the stereotyping and discrimination session and was designed to identify whether some trainees might engage readily with this pedagogical approach. This spiral technique ensured that messages regarding social justice were extended and developed through university instruction before each of the three teaching practice experiences to raise the trainees’ consideration of social justice issues; they were asked to write action plans for their practice from this lecture. This ensured that issues of discrimination and disadvantage were kept high on the agenda during the programme and were offered by alternative ‘expert’ tutors as a way of establishing the political and philosophical stance taken by many of the programme’s tutors.

**Culturally Diverse Experiences**

In the final instructional pedagogy a range of opportunities was offered to trainees to widen their understanding of disadvantage and discrimination.

Culturally diverse experiences are a feature of many ITT programmes (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, b; Kea *et al.*, 2006; Sleeter, 2008; Irvine 2008). In this programme diverse experiences were provided from across a range of ‘Other’ groups through teaching practice and seminars. The situation does not lend itself to cultural immersion as some studies advocate (Aguilar & Pohan, 1998; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; Sleeter, 2008; Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008) but the training provider made a great deal of effort to offer a wide range of school and
other settings for trainees to experience cultures other than their own. The programme provided the opportunity for trainees to ‘learn how to recognise and build on assets pupils bring [to?] contextualising problems within a socio-political rather than cultural deficiency analysis’ (Sleeter, 2008: 563). Sleeter goes on, however, to suggest that this must be ‘carefully planned to guide reflection’.

For the purpose of categorising university instructional pedagogies, here it is regarded that being confronted by the effects of barriers on a personal level is a new cultural experience: trainees had to contemplate the issues raised from the perspective of those for whom the most damage is done. Trainees were taught through workshop-based seminars about working with pupils who face barriers in their learning. Watching real people talk about their lived experiences is refreshing for trainees because it captures embodied expression; the result can be powerful. Critical Race Theorists have long recognised the power of individual voices to provide a ‘counter’ story to expose and challenge consensus (Spencer 2011). These culturally diverse experiences were drawn upon as a way of immersing the trainees in a shared experience of the ‘Other’ in society.

There are six training events explained in this section; they are spaced out across the programme to highlight their importance to the trainees.

Trainees also had opportunities to work across a diverse range of schools from a broad cultural perspective including social class, race, ability and religion. They were actively encouraged to spend time in a school with a culturally different community from their previous teaching placements or experiences.

**The Faith Trail and Holocaust Memorial**

Early in the programme (week 4) trainees were taught about the place of religion in statutory schooling in Britain through a ‘Faith Trail’; trainees visited
sites of religious worship where they received talks by the religious leaders about the place of their religion in the lives pupils. Over the course of two days trainees visited a Hindu Mandir, a Sikh Gurdwara, an Islamic mosque, a Christian church and a Jewish synagogue in order to create a foundation for understanding about religious education and religious observance in schools. The visits also helped to inform trainees about the religious and cultural diversity of the children they would be teaching. The Faith Trail was followed by a lecture and carefully guided collective discussion with regard to the teaching of religion in schools.

In the following week trainees spent a whole day visiting ‘Beth Shalom Holocaust Memorial Centre’. Beth Shalom is an educational centre and a place of remembrance, devoted initially to the Nazi Holocaust but increasingly assuming a role as a centre for studying and resisting genocide wherever it happens. The centre has a primary-aged ‘hands-on’ exhibition called ‘the journey’ which commemorates the *kinder* transportees. Most memorable for the trainees is that they were privileged with a talk from a holocaust survivor who demonstrated the damage that can be done by the silent washing of stereotyped assumptions on whole communities.

*Language, communication and identity*

Another day in week 4 included expert instruction in the systemic barriers faced by pupils who speak languages other than English. During the day seminars covered different topics and included workshops on how to use the DfE ‘EAL Toolkit’ and ‘writing for more advanced bilingual learners’.

A brief lecture focused attention on the importance of practice that effectively includes children who are learning English as an additional language (EAL). Many pupils in Partnership schools are recent arrivals from Europe, but some trainees use the term EAL to refer to second and third generation Asian
heritage pupils. They appear to presuppose skin colour relates to English language competence; the instruction aimed to dispel this myth.

To experience the exclusion and inequality of access to the learning situation they were taught in groups in a language of which they had no knowledge.

**School based ‘Focus Days’**

Further culturally diverse experience took place in weeks 12 and 13. Trainees spent time in classrooms in a Partnership school in order to extend their knowledge and understanding of a range of key professional issues and school policy in action. They were expected to select a school which was culturally different to previous experiences. Trainees observed the diversity of practices of experienced teachers within one school and the responses of their pupils at different ages and stages of their primary years. A senior leader from the school led a plenary discussion at the end of the second day to guide reflection on the relationship between learning and behaviour, teaching and equality of provision. Focus Day 1 concentrated on preventing difficulties through differentiation, including gifted & talented support. Focus Day 2 concentrated on equal opportunities, the role of the school SENCo and Child Protection policies and procedures. Trainees could begin to create relationships in their learning between the theoretical stances of university instruction and guided, focused classroom observations of children for whom many barriers exist. They were able to discuss culturally appropriate removal of barriers with school-based experts.

This development of coherence and the guidance of trainees' reflection on learning are recommended by Sleeter (2008) amongst others.
**Inter-Professional Education (IPE)**

In week 16 the PGCE trainees had the opportunity to work with trainee social workers and speech and language therapy trainees to explore ‘Inter-Professional’ practice. Tutors from all three courses worked together alongside parents with experience of the issues raised. During the workshops the trainees were confronted with real stories from pupils and parents of pupils who faced barriers in their learning. Collaborative discussion and active engagement between the professional trainees aimed to open up dialogue about working with disadvantaged ‘Others’. A further expectation was that having parents share their experience with the trainees would lead to greater acceptance and internalisation of the barriers to learning for some children. The keynote lecturer for this session was attributed high credibility status which coupled with the knowledge and experience shared, Turner (1996) suggests, would enable the trainees to remember the salient points when confronted with similar cases during their practice.

**Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN)**

This session, in week 27, was led by pupils from a secondary special school. Workshops and seminars brought the trainees face to face with pupils who have ‘specific learning difficulties’, confronting their understanding of how education systems can affect learning.

Trainees were also introduced to DfE-published materials for primary schools. The session included information provided by a school senior leader regarding a range of learning difficulties and their impact on teaching pedagogies. The trainees then held discussions with the pupils to gain deeper insight into the impact of teacher behaviour and expectations on them.
**Diverse teaching practices**

During the three school practice experiences, all trainees were provided with the opportunity to work across a diverse range of Partnership schools, and were encouraged to have school-based experiences within contexts which were unfamiliar to them. The most unfamiliar to the trainees were schools with high intakes of economically deprived pupils and those with a majority of pupils from culturally or ethnically different communities from their own. The majority of Partnership schools were mono-cultural both socially and culturally, and included recent and well-established migrant communities; schools in both the city and the county were included.

Trainees set personal targets for development of a key area of social justice during each school experience. After the second and third practicum a scaffold to guide the critically reflective narrative was employed to engage trainees in the process of analysing, reconsidering and questioning their experiences. This was used in the investigation to elicit how the information received at university cohered with school based training in developing trainees’ awareness of social responsibility.

Each of these experiences was captured in the trainees’ reflective journals. Trainees were all encouraged to reflect on what impact the experiences had on them as developing primary teachers. The study participants offered their journals for analysis.

This overview of the social justice elements of the professional strand was essential to situate the instructional pedagogies within the context of wider research literature. Having a view of the programme gives some background to the experiences provided for the trainees and situates the reflective accounts of the participants. In the next chapter I set out the framework for the investigation into shaping socially responsible teachers.
4 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

4.1 Using a case study approach

The review of literature surrounding the perpetuation of stereotyped attainment outcomes within education systems identifies a range of contributing factors, including teachers’ biased assumptions. In an attempt to identify how mechanisms employed in initial teacher training (ITT) can affect the challenge to these assumptions, I analysed the reflected journey of participants through the training process.

This chapter sets out the framework for a study into the complexity of mechanisms involved in shaping socially responsible teachers. The study is ‘bounded’ within one PGCE programme but sought to establish generalisations about the population represented, namely trainee teachers. The research arose from a previous small-scale study into changes in attitudes and practice following training in an anti-bias curriculum which I had designed and delivered. Findings from this study gave cause for concern surrounding the perpetuation of biased routines and habits within educational settings (Mohamed, 2006). As discussed in the introduction, this was reinforced as I began lecturing on a PGCE programme at an UK Midlands university where the trainees were voicing, commonly held, stereotypical attitudes. Previous findings by Wilkins & Lall (2011) on the same programme had instigated some of the changes to the instruction studied here. Much of this earlier development was based on research by Siraj-Blatchford (1991), Cole & Stuart (2005) and Basit et al. (2006) identifying the lack of attention paid to issues of social justice on ITT programmes.

Studies across international contexts (Irvine, 2003; Sleeter, 2008b) have revealed the levels of bias trainees bring to the training and have linked the outcome of these biased assumptions to pupil attainment in classrooms (Mirza, 2009; Maylor et al., 2009). In this chapter I outline the process of carrying out research within the context of one ITT programme which sought to identify
relevant characteristics trainees brought to the training process and possible instructional pedagogies which might actively contribute to the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

The study is positioned as one that Hartas (2010: 44) would consider a ‘case study that offers an in-depth exploration of experiences with findings which rely on interpretation of multiple perspectives as they are constructed and voiced in the context of social interactions’. As I sought participants from two subsequent cohorts of one primary PGCE programme, a case study approach was a practical research method through which to analyse the participant responses in depth. Each year one group of self-selected participants reflected on their learning during this training programme; the trainees were recruited to programme through the same selection process in both years. Through the choice of instructional pedagogies employed on the programme, trainees were challenged to reflect upon prior understanding of stereotyped assumptions about the pupils they may teach.

The case study approach was selected in order to recognise the complexity and ‘embeddedness’ of the social truths evidenced in this study. To emphasise this Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier (2013: 10) cite Pollard (1987) who claims that ‘case study has evolved as an approach to research which can capture rich data, giving an in depth picture of a bounded unit or an aspect of the unit’. The research here is essentially focused on the study of the PGCE as the case, and is, as Merriam (1988) and Stake (1995) suggest, a ‘bounded unit’: what I study is encased within the confines of one strand of a PGCE programme coordinated and often delivered by me. As I sought to explore outcomes through interpreting how the participants experienced the programme, the study is situated within a hermeneutic case study; my intention was to increase my own understanding of the case, again following the stance of Merriam (1988) and Stake (1995).

As educational research is considered critical enquiry, aimed at informing knowledge and decisions which improve education for all, Williams (2000) emphasises the need for a reflexive approach, to ensure a consciousness of the social and personal values and aspirations of the research project. These
considerations are further discussed in the section of this chapter which outlines the trustworthiness of the research, but essentially my personal values and aspirations drive this study. These have been explained in depth in the introduction. According to Brannick & Coghlan (2007) insider research is typically seen as problematic due to the researcher's personal stake and substantive emotional investment. However they go on to argue that being native to the research provides the benefit of insight from the lived experience. This lived experience is where my need to unravel the complexity arose and why I embarked on this investigation. They suggest that ‘through a process of reflexive awareness, we are able to articulate tacit knowledge’ (ibid: 60): arguing that insider researchers are immersed in the situation ‘generating contextually embedded knowledge that emerges from experience’.

My desire to engage in the critical enquiry of my own professional work has led me to research studies in the UK and abroad to analyse and reflect on the real impact of my attempts to shape socially responsible teachers. Although the research doesn’t follow the stance of Yin’s (1994) empirical enquiry, I argue that this critical realism is, as Kemp & Holmwood (2003) argue, the way of defending my social enquiry as empirical.
Research Questions

Specifically this research sought to provide a detailed analysis of the following key questions:

In the context of one UK primary PGCE programme:

1. Which characteristics, brought to the training process by trainees, assist in the development of socially responsible teachers?

Here I refer to characteristics brought to the training process based on trainees’ knowledge about schools and teaching, awareness of stereotyped assumptions or discrimination, and experience of ‘the other’ which they have built up through socialisation during their formative years in school (Pajares, 1992; Sleeter, 2008; Irvine 2008).

2. Which instructional pedagogies currently employed in the training process promote socially responsible teaching practice?

Only those training events for which I had direct responsibility and focused on social justice in education are investigated. These pedagogies have been detailed in the previous subsection of this chapter: ‘context of the study’.

The emergence of any relationship between these two aspects of the study is interpreted through the framework of literature reviewed. The research questions in this qualitative case study were developed from literature in the field and refined from issues emerging during the formative stages of the study.

The original hypotheses were founded on the literature pertaining to each of these questions. I expected to find that the beliefs trainees brought to the training process could be challenged by the instruction or pedagogies and that this would be demonstrated through the trainees’ capacity to reflect beyond the personal. I set out to investigate whether the instructional pedagogies successfully influenced trainees or whether the characteristics brought to the training were more significant. This necessitated the analysis of narrative reflections offered for the study by the volunteer participants. The methods and the paradigm are all explained in greater detail in this chapter but it is essential
to establish that I base the investigation in the narrative. The use of narrative reflections as data is a robust conceptual model used by many researchers (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clough, 2002; Bold, 2012) and I am comfortable that it demonstrates a trainee’s capacity to consider their own learning experience and their knowledge of the ‘Other’ during the training process. The reflections are analysed to elicit the participants’ sense of efficacy or advocacy as a method of identifying a sense of responsibility. I base this on the premise that a pre-requisite for becoming a socially responsible teacher is a capacity to focus on the ‘Other’; participants who only focus on the impact of situations from the perspective of their personal efficacy are, I suggest, less likely to be able to counter deficit models of pupils. However, I also employ an identity salience model which is less well established but, as will be explained further in the coding section of this chapter, offers clear indicators of the trainees’ awareness of disadvantaged ‘Others’.

The use of narrative reflections as a data collection tool requires the interpretation of participant responses to new professional knowledge and to the instructional pedagogies employed. This narrative approach is affirmed by Clandinin & Connelly (2000:19) who suggest that as ‘experience happens narratively, educational experience should be studied narratively’. And ‘as we live in an already interpreted world, a doubly hermeneutic exercise is necessary to understand others’ understanding of the world’ according to Giddens (1976: 104). This cycle of interpretation is explored further in the next subsection of this chapter.

As the study is set within an interpretivist perspective the data will, as suggested by Cohen et al. (2000: 106), be ‘socially situated and socially and culturally saturated’; reality is recognised as a construct of the mind within the environment. The aim of the study was to draw the social and cultural aspects from the participants’ reflective journals to identify how their experiences influenced their understanding of social justice in education. Narrative is seen as central to the learning process as it provides the opportunity to share the nature and order of events at particular times. The notion behind this premise is that it assists trainees in defining their developing professional identity.
The study followed the progress of a small group of fifteen self-selected trainees, referred to here as participants, through their weekly reflective accounts over the course of the 36-week PGCE programme. These reflections identified the professional development taking place across a range of training events. The theoretical paradigm allowed for comparison of the impact of instructional pedagogies with how the participants made sense of what they experienced in schools, therefore no particular group of participants were to be studied, being a trainee teacher on my programme was the only criteria necessary. It was also possible through the self-selection to consider the participants’ level of reflection and whether their focus was solely classroom efficacy or contained an element of professional advocacy rather than be led towards specific aspects of disadvantage in the classroom. The reflective journals were coded and analysed in order to reveal the similarities, discrepancies or conflicts held by participants. Details of this are explained later in this chapter when I discuss the coding of data.

It is important to recognise that data does not ‘speak for itself’, nor does it emerge in a vacuum. My personal experiences have influenced the questions and my interpretation of the responses as well as the way the study is presented. This study arose from a personal interest in research evidence that the assumptions of the teachers impact on the attainment of the pupils in their classrooms (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Bourdieu, 1982; Wortham, 2006; Maylor et al., 2009; Bhopal et al., 2009). My own desire to understand the process of enculturation of stereotyped identification and the possibility of challenge through ITT mechanisms led the research. My interpretation of the participants’ responses is influenced by intrinsic expectation and my own response to the shared experiences, especially those events organised specifically by me in an attempt to shape socially responsible teachers. The participants’ reflective articulation could create ethical issues which are raised later in this chapter. However, the hermeneutic tradition argues that as the researcher I am an integral part of the research process, describing and explaining the social phenomena, and this allows for my interpretation within
critical reflexivity. The cycle of reinterpretation of data to the emerging themes retained my reflexive approach to allowing the data to provide the answers.

### 4.1.1 Rationale for research methods

Many social constructionists have been influenced by Foucault’s (1980) theory that ‘power is enacted through the organisation of knowledge’ and that ‘knowledge is constructed as a form of domination’ as defined by Sprague (2010: 82). This construction of knowledge is socially and culturally bound, and those with social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982) perceive this as fact. I have argued in chapter 2 that trainees entering the teaching profession hold both forms of capital and have been enculturated with currently circulating stereotyped discourses. Sprague continues: ‘forms of power operate through discourses that circulate through our daily lives prompting us to construct certain forms of self-awareness’ (ibid: 82). This investigation draws on research regarding the social nature of knowledge construction, and the connection between the organisation of knowledge and social domination. Not only does this research raise important questions about the social and cultural embeddedness of knowledge but it has also allowed me to develop ways of deconstructing narratives that reveal meanings embedded in social and cultural ‘facts’. It is these embedded responses that I retrieved through the coding and analysis of the narrative reflections created by participants as they experienced the training programme. Here the interpretation of participants’ motives, role obligations and cultural perspectives became the constructs that I drew upon to analyse and predict awareness and behaviours.

Webster & Mertova (2007: 1) profess that ‘narrative is well suited to addressing the complexities and subtleties of human experience […]. Narrative allows researchers to present experience holistically in all its complexity and richness’. The reflective journal all trainees were expected to keep was chosen for this study. Using these reflections the expressions pertinent to social justice awareness were captured for each of the instructional pedagogies. The
narrative refection also made clear the context in which the experience took place.

Given the research (Tajfel, 1969; Wood, 2000) into how stereotyped beliefs and assumptions become entrenched if unchallenged, and the resistance learners are known to put up when faced with challenge to previous knowledge (Pajares, 1992), the participants’ documented reflections on the social justice sessions provided data pertinent to changes in the participants’ attitudes and behaviour over the time of the programme.

In selecting a typology for the coding of reflections I reviewed several ITT models; each offered frameworks to record changes in reflective capacity but they attribute the changes to identity transition. My own experience of the training process does not perceive this as true: I argue that some trainees are unable to make the transition in terms of the capacity to reflect even if they progress to become teachers. This hypothesis from my own experience led me to select the typology created by Surbeck et al. (1991) when they were investigating how their trainees were engaging with the reflective process introduced on their ITT programme.

Beauchamp & Thomas (2009) identify a typology of reflection developed by Luttenberg & Bergen (2008) which they say may be helpful to the understanding of reflection as prominent in identity development for teachers. They propose three domains of reflection – pragmatic, ethical and moral – for which there may be differences in the depth and breadth of reflection. In addition, reflection may be more or less open or closed, depending on its separation or connection to the self that is reflecting (ibid:551).

This concurs with Surbeck et al. (1991:26) who identified three levels of narrative reflection: reacting - commenting on feelings towards the learning experience, such as reacting with a personal concern about an event. At this level the trainees are deemed to be focused solely on their own progress and learning. For professional trainees this will occur in Luttenberg & Bergen’s (2008) ‘pragmatic’ domain and at Fuller’s (1969) ‘survival’ stage when they are preoccupied with their own adequacy. For some, this may continue to be the
only level they reflect at. The second of Surbeck’s levels is *elaborating*, that is comparing reactions with other experiences, such as referring to a general principle, a theory, or a moral or philosophical position. For professional trainees this generally occurs in Luttenberg & Bergen’s (2008) ‘ethical’ domain and at Fuller’s ‘mastery’ stage when they are able to concentrate on performance rather than personal concern. The third of these levels is *contemplating*, demonstrated by an ability to focus insightfully on problems or difficulties, including focusing on educational issues, attitudes, ethical matters, or moral concerns. This is shown in Luttenberg & Bergen’s (2008) ‘moral’ domain and at Fuller’s ‘impact’ stage when the trainees become primarily concerned about their effects on pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective characteristics</th>
<th>Surbeck <em>et al.</em></th>
<th>Luttenberg &amp; Bergen</th>
<th>Fuller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focus solely on their own progress and learning</td>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compare reactions with other experiences</td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus insightfully on problems or ethical matters</td>
<td>Contemplating</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Typologies of reflection

There is some suggestion, especially in Fuller’s work, that trainees may progress through each stage of transition which will be evident in their reflections. In this study consideration is given as to whether participants consistently reflect at one level throughout the programme. Surbeck *et al.* (1991) found that where the complete sequence of reaction-elaboration-contemplation was evident in a trainee’s journal they detected greater integration of information. This suggested that a capacity to reflect at a deeper level would support trainees’ internalisation of their learning.

A further method of analysing the reflective responses was based on the work of Silverman which was introduced in the literature chapter of the thesis and will
be explained further later in this chapter in relation to the coding. In terms of social justice, Surbeck et al. (1991), Silverman (2010) and Whipp (2013) all agree that a sense of social responsibility and advocacy in teaching are essential components that should emerge from the analysis of trainee reflections. Silverman (2010: 293) claims that the teachers’ ‘identity-based attitudes predict their orientations toward social responsibility’ which are likely to be influenced by their judgments of efficacy and advocacy. Here I consider that for a trainee to feel responsible for pupils’ learning they require a sense of advocacy; where they only demonstrate a desire for efficacy they are unlikely to consider the learner, only themselves as a teacher. To counter deficit models of pupils participants would need to demonstrate a capacity to ignore stereotypes and respond to individual learning needs.

I also needed to find a way of identifying the beliefs about the ‘Other’ that the trainees brought to the training. Beliefs are complicated to interpret accurately as discussed in the literature review; however Silverman proposes a model of visible and invisible identity saliences to which the trainees will refer in their narrative responses. She classifies ‘visible identities’ such as race, gender, disability and class as associated with a greater sense of social responsibility than ‘invisible identities’ such as religion, sexuality and SEN. The third identity salience she refers to as ‘those identity based attitudes which are not part of identity groups themselves, such as family values, conflict or opt out’ (ibid, 2010: 293). The premise for her argument is that characteristics which are seen are expected to play a more prominent role in an individual’s propensity towards social responsibility than those which are not.

The research considers the capacity for deep level reflection in the participants and any changes to this over the duration of the programme; whether the participants focus on their personal efficacy or advocacy along progression points in the training. Further, the participants’ understanding or endorsement of the ‘Other’ is identified through the specific mention of labels attributed to visible or invisible identity salience.
This study does not consider the impact of the trainees on pupil attainment, but focuses on mechanisms which influence trainees’ developing consciousness of social responsibility. Becoming a socially responsible teacher requires a professional disposition toward the continuous and conscious examination and reconstruction of one’s own existing assumptions about differences, along with skills to work with equitable pedagogy and high expectations for all pupils. It is this disposition which is significant to the research findings.

4.1.2 Paradigm

The research is embedded in the interpretive paradigm. I base this stance on the premise that ‘the central endeavour in the context of the interpretive paradigm is to understand the subjective world of human experience’ (Hartas, 2010: 23). My primary aim was to make sense of how the participants interacted with and interpreted the training experience in terms of their development as socially responsible teachers. This research is situated within Cohen et al.’s (2000) conception of subjective social reality which holds that, as it cannot be firmly established, it relies heavily on the perceptions and honesty of the participants. Thus my theories emerge from my interpretations of the participants’ reflections on the training process. To avoid subjective interpretation on my part the data were analysed through several iterations spaced over three years. Across the year each of the participants’ reflective responses remained typical, there was no change in either the depth of reflection or the sense of efficacy or advocacy. This demonstrates that as the journal was a requirement of the programme the participants completed the reflections for their evidence rather than for the study. I suggest that this led to more authentic reflections but also demonstrates that involvement in the study had no influence on their responses.

Hermeneutics involves recapturing the meanings and reconstructing the intentions of the participants: the meanings and perceptions rather than the actions take on significance in this paradigm. Essentially, I set out to interpret the meanings participants attribute to their experiences and the intentions of their practice within the context of the training experiences. Spencer advocates
(2011: 50) that the ‘purpose of research is to mediate between different constructions of social reality’ as such I relied both on the honesty of the participants and my capacity to be true to their original meaning. Several iterations of analysis of the data supported my understanding of this mediation.

Focusing the study within the hermeneutic interpretivist paradigm allowed me to begin to make sense of mechanisms which might be effective in shaping socially responsible teachers within this case study. Giddens (1976), however, introduced the concept of the double hermeneutic which recognises that as a researcher I am interpreting how people have already interpreted events in their own life: this was clearly evident as I was interpreting the reflections provided by the participants. These interpretations were further coded to emerging themes and the findings from the coding were again interpreted to offer as evidence of the outcomes of the study. These findings are necessarily then interpreted within the framework of already existing research in this field of enquiry. Taking time to deliberate findings as I analysed and interpreted the meanings, my interpretations of the participants’ reflections began to reveal answers to my research questions. This employment of a cycle of analysis brought distance and objectivity to the interpretation.

Given the focus of the study it is important to recognise my decision to situate my perception of teaching within a Foucauldian view of knowledge as being intertwined with socioeconomic and political structures. Foucault (1980) stressed that there is no objective viewpoint but a multi-perspectival way of examining social structures. I have shown that the study is situated in decades of research and considers a range of mechanisms which may contribute to significant findings. Any explanations uncovered are situated in the context within which participants operate and form relationships. According to Foucault (1980), interpretation and not absolute truth is the cornerstone of knowledge. I suggest that the comparison of responses which are interpreted according to the same criteria affords a degree of accuracy to the findings.

Having set out the rationale and paradigm for my study the next section of this chapter explains how I went about collecting the data for the investigation.
4.2 Data Collection and Coding

The study used a qualitative approach to the data collection to determine the answers to the two main research questions posed (see p. 121).

For the first question – which characteristics, brought to the training process by trainees, assist in the development of socially responsible teachers? -data was collected via a pre-course questionnaire, a professional autobiography and a language autobiography.

For the second -which instructional pedagogies currently employed in the training process promote socially responsible teaching practice? -the narrative reflections pertaining to instructional pedagogies and training events collated within the participants’ professional development journal were collected. Two of these were guided reflections after the second and third teaching practice and specifically responded to the research enquiry.

In this section I make regular reference to ‘trainees’ as the investigation takes account of the PGCE programme. I refer to ‘participants’ where there is a need for clarification.

4.2.1 Data Collection

Data sets

A key interest in the research was to determine the impact of informational content and pedagogical approaches on the participants’ ability or willingness to challenge and adjust their awareness of the effects of stereotyped discrimination and disadvantage. To establish any change in attitudes over time, the narrative reflective accounts were gathered from each of the 15 participants through the 18 weeks of university based learning and 18 weeks of teaching practice.

Prior to beginning the programme trainees were expected to complete one week of school experience. They completed a pre-course questionnaire
regarding their awareness of discrimination within English society and media, especially children’s media. This questionnaire was completed by all candidates as a way of identifying the level of understanding of stereotyping and discrimination prior to developing one of the teaching sessions. This data was coded in the same way as the study participants however, no consent was sought for the use of this data set. Agreement was sought from participants for the inclusion of the data from their pe-course questionnaire in the study.

The initial weeks of the programme contained large group sessions designed to provide the trainees with plenty of opportunity to collaboratively discuss with peers and the tutor their developing understanding of culture and identity within the primary classroom contexts they had experienced. The trainees received instruction on the need to become a reflective practitioner and were provided with scaffolds to facilitate the process (see appendix 3). Reflections from these early sessions provided the narrative regarding the awareness of the impact of disadvantage and discrimination that participants had brought to the training. Other early attempts at reflective writing about experiences were also collected from participants for analysis; these were a professional and a language autobiography (see appendix 2).

All participants’ narrative reflections from university instruction were collected for analysis. The impact of the information given in relation to the pedagogical approach taken was of particular interest. Participants also provided weekly reflections on professional development during teaching practice. This provided the opportunity to compare levels of reflection and identity salience in the two distinctly different situations: university instruction and teaching practice. Trainees critically reflected upon aspects of social justice in the second and third teaching practice in an attempt to facilitate their exploration of what they observed happening in schools. This was a direct attempt to engage trainees in reflecting on theory and practice whilst exploring their own philosophy or sense of advocacy for socially responsible teaching.

It was necessary, given that I was a tutor on the programme and the time restrictions of the PGCE year, to request participation from the trainees. This
led to a convenience sampling approach which brought with it the danger of ‘selectivity bias in that the characteristics or attributes of individuals may not be distributed equally’ (Hartas, 2010: 69). It can be assumed that these self-selected participants had a personal interest in engaging with the project; some stated that they found the topic of interest and had already had some thoughts on the subject themselves. This may have been due to a sense of social justice which the participant brought to the training programme, an awareness of the danger of stereotyping and discrimination, a keenness to be aligned with the tutor or an interest in participating in a research project. As Hartas (2010: 69) warns, ‘individuals who function as volunteers are likely to present characteristics such as motivation, interest or extreme views which may set them apart from the target population’. Reasons for participation were not explored during this research, although my position as an insider-researcher is explored in terms of the possible influence on participants in the next subsection of this chapter. Participant prior awareness of social justice issues is however a significant aspect of the investigation and is discussed at length in the findings and concluding chapters.

Twelve trainees agreed to participate in year one (2010-11) and ten in year two (2011-12). Although all trainees engaged in all stages of the data collection process, only seven of the original contributors offered full data sets for analysis in year one. All eight participants that successfully completed the programme offered full data sets in year two, (two participants from year two were unsuccessful in completing the programme). Therefore fifteen participants are presented in this case study. In the first cohort of volunteer participants (2010-11) all were white females and in year two (2011-12) seven were white females and one was white male.

A meeting was held to explain the research to willing participants and request written consent for use of their data (see appendix 7).

In order to match my teaching to the needs of the cohort of trainees I analysed the pre-course questionnaires each year. This acted as a baseline in providing me with knowledge of the level of awareness trainees entered the programme
with and the degree of challenge required during teaching sessions. In considering how the participant sample was reflective of the cohort I identified the percentage of trainees falling into each of the three categories adopted from Surbeck et al. (1991). This emerged as a significant contribution to the findings and is potentially relevant to other ITT programmes.

**Instruments used for data collection**

Examples are provided in the Appendices.

**Questionnaires (Appendix 1)**

Pre-course questionnaires were employed to determine assumptions prior to any influence from the training course; these were the primary data source for analysis of the characteristics trainees brought to the training process. All trainees were expected to complete the questionnaire prior to meeting anyone else on the course or having received any element of training. The aim of this was to begin the process of identifying the participants’ assumptions and beliefs in terms of social justice before they began the training. They also provided data of trainees’ responses regarding awareness of visible and invisible identity salience.

Although highly structured, closed questionnaires may have been useful in generating frequencies of response amenable to statistical analysis, they would not have allowed trainees to give their understanding and thinking about particular issues. However, to catch the specific responses necessary for this situation meant that the questionnaire was necessarily semi-structured. Authentic, personal data needed to be collected, providing a richness and depth to the responses without eliciting closed responses. There needed to be an element of information gathered from the respondent not articulated in the questions; however, it needed to be contained enough for patterns to be observed and to allow comparisons to be made. Therefore open-ended questions were chosen as the most suitable method of gathering data. Open-ended questions can carry problems for data analysis: the information cannot be converted into numbers, and it is not certain that responses will bear
sufficient similarity to each other to enable them to be aggregated tightly. However, previous experience suggested that there would be a degree of similarity in the reflective capacity and awareness of discrimination presented in the responses (Mohamed, 2006). Given the qualification requirements for entry to the programme it was assumed that respondents were all equally capable of articulating their thoughts and committing them to paper.

Questions were designed to draw awareness of prejudice and discrimination from the trainees, and the responses of the cohort were taken into account in the preparation of the social justice sessions. Silverman’s (2010) classification of visible and invisible identity salience was employed to elicit acknowledgement of discrimination in the media and in schools and the degree of importance participants attached to this. Decisions regarding the interpretation of the data are further explained in the subsection describing the coding systems.

The questionnaire accounts allowed me to uncover whether the beliefs about privilege and social justice with which a participant enters the programme influenced what they were willing and able to learn.

**Autobiographical Accounts** (Appendix 2)

Trainees were engaged in the reflective process in the first days of the training programme. They began to explore their awareness of any prior professional experience or identification with teaching through the use of a guided professional autobiography. They were guided to reflect on why they embarked on their chosen career path and to share their emerging philosophy of education, taking into account their beliefs and assumptions about children and learners in a classroom. This process provided rich narrative accounts of the beliefs about teachers and teaching that trainees brought to the training process. Trainees also explored their own language history as a means of identifying social or cultural values and capital brought to the training process. It is these early reflections which support the analysis of the influence of prior experiences on participants’ sense of social responsibility.
Journals of Narrative Reflection

Much of ITT today is built on the notion of reflective practice as discussed in depth in the literature review. Throughout the programme all trainees were expected to write weekly reflections of their professional learning as a method of encouraging critical evaluation skills. The narrative reflections from instructive sessions and teaching practice experiences were considered effective instruments for this research study as they enabled me to elicit the participants’ awareness of the impact of disadvantage and discrimination, how this affected their sense of social justice and which of the instructional pedagogies were effectively incorporated in their teaching practice.

In her work Craig (2009) found that the capacity to reflect was essential to the process of change. The narrative responses to instructional sessions which were designed to enhance social justice awareness provided a timeline of reflections from which to elicit the capacity to challenge or change. The narrative reflections required for evidence of learning throughout the programme demonstrated the extent to which the trainees assimilated the information and created relationships between theory and practice. These provided rich data when analysing how the participants interpreted the instructional pedagogy on their professional development. However, according to Quinn (2010: 239), although ‘cultural meanings are implicit in what people say, they are rarely explicitly stated because they reflect the cultural experience from which they have been learned, rather than an articulated understanding’.

Of course, a personal narrative is not an exact record of the learning experience or the impact of instructional pedagogies. Rather, each participant will share a different experience dependent on what captures their interest and how they make sense of the event in relation to their own experience. According to Quinn’s perspective there was a possibility that participants may not articulate their sense of social justice because they assume it is implicit in their choice of professional identity.

Guided reflections (appendices 4 & 5) after both the second and third teaching practice were intended to engage trainees directly in the process of analysing,
reconsidering and questioning their experiences and in contemplating how the university instruction interrelated with the teaching practice. The reflective responses from participants showed how the training programme supported socially responsible teaching practice. The trainees were asked, over the time of their teaching practice, to deliberate and reflect specifically on an event or occurrence which supported their awareness of discrimination in the classroom.

The challenges for participants were in finding the time and the motivation to keep the reflective journal up to date and therefore responsive to the instructional pedagogies and training events; there were always more pressing demands. Bold (2012) reinforces the idea that the way information is collected depends on the context, the purpose of the research and the proposed mode of analysis. Analysing a document which was an essential requirement of the programme maintained a positive response to my request for reflections.

I chose not to provide a scaffold for reflective responses even though this might have provided easily extractable, quantifiable data for the project. I found, through the analysis of coded reflections, that the early use of scaffolds to introduce trainees to the act of critical reflection on learning actually inhibited and directed the responses of some participants. In hindsight this validates my decision not to provide a reflective scaffold in order to elicit more accurate and richer data from participants. I considered it would be more beneficial to allow the data to emerge as the participants progressed through the training and as they responded personally or professionally to each aspect of the programme. They were not responding to my requests for information for my research but engaging in a general requirement of the programme.

4.2.2 Coding

Rationale for the coding themes

According to Campbell et al. (2004: 131) the process of coding ‘involves breaking data into fragments, analysing their meaning and allocating codes to the concepts that are identified. The intention is not to come to a definitive answer but creatively open up possibilities’. In such a small scale study as this,
the chance to reflect on several iterations of analysis has allowed me to consider possible ways forward as will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

Mishler (2010) tells us that coding units are phrases which are only meaningful to the researcher and the study focus. He states that ‘adequate understanding and use of this code depends on the particular study’s coder’s subculture, the coding procedure could not be transferred directly to another research context’ (ibid: 295). However the coding system which emerged from the data collected in this study took shape during the review of other relevant research which has been discussed in chapter two. To find answers to my questions it was essential that I could determine the awareness of disadvantaged ‘Others’ that trainees brought to the training process as well as identify how the reflective capacity of the trainee demonstrated a focus on professional efficacy or on the advocacy of social responsibility in teaching. Both elements of this coding system were adapted from previous research projects as identified earlier in this chapter. As Campbell et al. (2004) contend, data should be examined analytically attending to not only what is said but how it is said and what effect it has (2004: 132) and so the coding of this data was analysed from each of these viewpoints. This coding system is therefore transferable to other professional contexts.

As outlined in the background to my study, I was conscious of different transitions for trainees during the training process. The research was a genuine attempt to develop a socially just training programme and as such both the depth of reflective capacity and sense of efficacy or advocacy were essential to my understanding.

The way the trainees respond to and reflect on the learning experiences can be viewed and analysed from a variety of perspectives. This has already been discussed in my exploration of reflective practice in the review of literature (Harrison & Yaffe, 2007; Bold, 2012; Mälkki & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2012). For this study, however, I wanted to consider the depth of response to each learning situation. I had hypothesised that a capacity to reflect beyond the personal would be a key factor (Surbeck et al., 1991). Using narrative reflections supported my exploration of the participants’ beliefs and knowledge about
teaching and learning; this, according to Bold (2012), will impact on their professional development. The three levels of reflection identified by Surbeck et al. (1991: 26), reacting, elaborating and contemplating; indicate how the participant is synthesising the information and instruction into the development of their professional identity during the training programme.

Silverman (2010: 293) argues that a teacher's sense of responsibility is likely to be influenced by their judgments of self-efficacy and advocacy in relation to their teaching. She suggests that visible identity in the form of ‘race’, gender, ethnicity and physical disability will be the best indicators of a trainees’ perception of the ‘Other’. The premise of her argument is that characteristics seen play a prominent role in our conceptions of diversity. Participants’ reflections were further analysed and coded according to Silverman’s (2010: 293) theorised models of identity salience which she suggests are associated with ‘sense of responsibility, efficacy and advocacy’. This premise is further explored once the data is analysed and interpreted as I also consider the notion that the acknowledgement of invisible identity salience may suggest a deeper awareness of disadvantage and discrimination since it is not visible and therefore not obvious. In trying to uncover the characteristics that participants brought to the training process these identity-based predictors provide a clear framework for analysis.

To create a framework for reflections on instructional pedagogies, Silverman's suggestion that a teacher’s sense of responsibility is likely to be influenced by their judgments of efficacy and advocacy aligns with Surbeck et al.’s levels of reflection. In my interpretation of efficacy I take it to refer to the participants’ focus on their developing skill set as the only priority. In interpreting the code for advocacy I use it to refer to participants’ reflection demonstrating a sense of responsibility for the pupils.

My thinking here was that if a participant is capable of elaborating on the impact of the instruction on the pupils they will teach this can be a predictor of socially responsible teaching. If the reflection is at the level of a personal reaction to the instruction or focuses only on a sense of self-efficacy then this may predict that
the participant is focused on their skill set and not yet ready to consider the impact of their practice on pupils. The same coding is attributed to the teaching practice reflections to determine how any sense of advocacy is demonstrated in the developing teaching practice.

Consideration is given here as to whether the narrative reflections through Surbeck et al.’s and Silverman’s models reveal the capacity of the participants to develop socially responsible teaching pedagogies within their own classroom. By this I mean an ability to counter deficit models of pupils and their learning. It was anticipated that the narrative reflections from teaching practice would reveal participants’ acknowledgement of barriers to learning for social or cultural ‘Others’ by visible or invisible identity coding. They were also expected to reveal beliefs and assumptions carried by the participants and changes in their attitudes and assumptions in response to events or situations.

Levels of reflection and aspects of identity salience were used to determine relevant characteristics participants brought to the training process and instructional pedagogies which most supported the development of socially responsible teachers.

**The process of coding and analysis**

In the previous section I have explained the coding system employed in this investigation. This section describes the process of attributing codes to the narrative reflections of the participants. The coding themes were applied to chunks of text without consideration of which question I was referring to; I was confident that the chosen coding system would provide answers to the shaping of socially responsible teachers through ITT pedagogy or content, recruitment or instruction.

Narrative text from all fifteen participants was coded for the whole programme; these were anonymised and identifiable only by a sequential number. This number didn’t necessarily relate to a specific week as it couldn’t be guaranteed that every participant would provide a weekly reflection.
The referencing of the source data does identify whether the narrative reflections are from the questionnaires, university instruction or teaching practices. The teaching practice reflections are identified by the academic term.

Each piece of narrative text was coded to themes relating to Surbeck et al.’s (1991) levels of reflection (contemplating, elaborating and reacting) and to Silverman’s (2010) themes of advocacy and efficacy, which I use as relating to a sense of teacher responsibility for pupil learning, and identity salience as discussed in detail in the rationale sections of this chapter. For the purpose of this study, ‘contemplating’ was translated as articulating the need to challenge assumptions and discrimination; ‘elaborating’ was identified as being able to consider the impact of social justice issues on diverse groups of learners and ‘reacting’ was used where the trainee responded on a personal level to the event. To demonstrate how the characteristics trainees brought to the training were established from the coding of the pre-course questionnaire, I present here how I interpreted levels of awareness and orientation to social responsibility based on Surbeck et al.’s (1991) theory of reflective competence. Figure 3 demonstrates the coding of a sample of text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>This piece of text was coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know very little about faiths other than Christianity, as I was not taught this at school. I would like to talk to others who have worked in schools with a high percentage of EAL pupils and ask about their views on the EAL toolkit and the suggestions it makes.</td>
<td>Reacting personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible identity of spoken language</td>
<td>With a focus on self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>This piece of text was coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the day, the greatest impact on my thinking was to listen to a parent of a child talking about the experiences of their family. It adjusted my focus considerably from thinking of SEN as a question of differentiation within my own lessons to a much broader appreciation of the effect that it can have on the child and their family. This is something which I will try not to lose sight of in future.</td>
<td>Elaborating on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an awareness of invisible identity salience (not a physical disability)</td>
<td>And a sense of advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Sample of text coding
Those who demonstrated a propensity to challenge the portrayal of stereotypes in the media through education were coded as showing the *contemplative* reflective capacity. Trainees who demonstrated an ability to consider how themes of social justice play a part in children’s lives were coded as displaying ‘*elaborative*’ reflection. Other trainees were coded as *reacting* if they were reiterating commonly held assumed knowledge regarding the development of stereotyping in child development. There were other trainees who were deemed to be reflecting limited awareness of how to influence children’s thinking and used rhetoric without depth or explanation; I interpreted this as demonstrating a lack of awareness of or even denial of the existence of stereotyping and of its mattering to children’s lives. They were coded as *reacting* but the data was analysed alongside other coding themes which provided a richer analysis for interpretation which is discussed next.

In line with Silverman’s (2010) model, these data were also coded to the theme which classified salient visible or invisible identities mentioned: ‘race’, religion, gender, poverty, class. The aim of this coding was to allow interrogation of the data in terms of the relationship between identities-based attitudes and orientation towards social responsibility demonstrated through the coding to Surbeck *et al.*’s levels of reflections. The term EAL was recoded from invisible to visible as it became clear through the analysis that some participants used it to refer to non-White EAL speakers.

To establish characteristics brought to the training, data sets from the pre-course questionnaire, the professional autobiography and the language autobiography were analysed. Through the coding themes I wanted to determine whether the level of reflective capacity; reference to visible or invisible identity salience; identification with teaching; experience of disadvantage or of the ‘Other’; or an awareness of the danger of stereotyping emerged as significant features through the analysis.

Decisions regarding the levels of reflective capacity have been discussed at length in the rationale to the methods section of this chapter and touched upon briefly above. In regard of identity salience I have discussed Silverman’s (2010)
categories of visible and invisible salient identities previously. So I go on to explain other decisions made when coding the data for these queries.

The participants' identification with teaching came from their professional autobiography; they might cite family, friends or a significant teacher in their formative years as contributing to their choice to teach. However, not all participants indicated any association or identification with the profession; they might refer to their own role as a mother or a previous work experience in contributing to their decision. This is not coded as such but is drawn upon in the interpretation as explained in the following sub-section regarding the limitations of the coding system.

In making decisions about whether the narrative demonstrated evidence of direct experience of discrimination or disadvantage I considered whether the experience was personal. If a participant shared any experience of discrimination which had directly affected them or their children I coded this as ‘direct’. If a participant shared information regarding a position at work or during academic study such as their first degree, I considered this to be ‘indirect’ experience. Where a participant shared no information this then had to be coded as ‘none’, the limits of this third code are discussed further in the next sub-section of the thesis.

The act of reading narrative text provided by the participants in order to assign the data to a code within the selected themes required deliberation, constantly giving consideration to how my choice related to what had gone before and how I was interpreting what the participant actually meant. This process of interpretation brought with it a deeper understanding of the typology emerging even if the data did not fit neatly into codes. Trying to attribute codes limited the narrative but meant that I could draw up large chunks of coded text to see how they related to each other.

To establish which of the instructional pedagogies had the greatest impact on the synthesis of information into the participants teaching practice over the duration of the programme, reflections for each of the university sessions, described in chapter three, were identified in the source data. Teaching practice
reflections were identified by the academic term in the source data. These data were coded for level of reflective capacity, teacher responsibility coded as advocacy or efficacy, and identity salience.

Coding data in this way across the programme and in response to various aspects of instructional pedagogy was designed to predict the participants’ orientation to social justice in their teaching practice. Further analysis of the participants’ data was carried out to determine whether their sense of efficacy or advocacy changed from the first teaching practice to the last. This was important in determining answers to the question regarding the impact of instructional pedagogies on the shaping of socially responsible trainees.

The meanings attached to the various data were subject to my interpretation from my particular position in relation to the research questions (Bold, 2012). The data from year one of the study was interpreted during coding in order to confirm any emergent themes. The emerging themes were set against my questions which acted as signposts from which to make hypotheses. Once the emerging themes were in place this data set was then recoded at the same time as the data from year two; this second iteration ensured consistency of interpretation over the two data sets. Through the process of organising and collating the information I was constantly deciding on the significance of specific pieces of data, creating questions, finding answers and beginning to shape the analysis.

The coding and analysis of the data sets was supported through the use of NVivo9. The strategic coding of data to themes using this software allowed for retrieval of chunks of narrative which enabled contemplation on how the codes emerged and how they related to each other. This consolidated the initial interpretation of findings emerging from the evidence base to ensure depth of exploration of all data sets. Rather than relying on the initial interpretation of the data it was possible to recode as my understanding of the themes and my analysis became clearer. Through negotiating my understanding of the raw data and existing theories, more secure coding was established. Kvale (2009) refers to this as the cyclical hermeneutic approach to coding. The themes were
studied for potential patterns and relationships and the evidence eventually matured into more secure interpretations.

The emerging relationships made it possible to conceptualise how I might interrogate the data and identify similarities and differences between participants coding. Once responses were firmly coded, the data sets were imported into ‘Excel’ software allowing more rigorous questioning of participant coding according to the various mechanisms or themes which were coded for. As already identified the codes did not hold complete information but reported responses such as visible, elaboration or direct, for example, in response to themed headings relating to each question (see figure 4 p146). Although I had originally analysed the data in response to two separate and distinct questions, hypothesising that one or other of the questions might hold the answer I was seeking, what transpired after I collated both data sets into one grid was that the story the data told changed. Clearer relationships began to emerge through this method of questioning the data. The relationship between the two questions became the more prominent feature of the data. These relationships are discussed in chapter six as the findings are related to the original questions.

Data were further analysed for similarities or identifying factors in an attempt to answer the research questions. In the ‘Excel’ programme it is possible to reorganise data by theme (e.g. level of reflection), placing the codes (e.g. reaction) within a hierarchy using the ‘sort and filter’ function. Several iterations of this type of interrogation led to the identification of distinct types of participants following similar patterns of progression from entry to exit of the programme. The data for the themes relating to the characteristics brought to the programme were less effective as codes in making clear decisions about the findings; these needed further information to draw findings. The themes relating to levels of reflection and advocacy or efficacy highlighted clear differences which could be probed for further insight. The participants emerged as three distinct types: these were exemplified by the narrative responses to the less clear codes.
The full spreadsheets of the themes and codes merged and analysed through ‘Excel’ is presented in the findings appropriate to each question.
4.3 Enhancing trustworthiness of the research

Validity and reliability of research methods

As already discussed, the study is set within an interpretivist perspective: the data will therefore be socially situated and as Giddens (1976) argues a double hermeneutic exercise is necessary to understand the way others’ understand the situation: interpretive validity or fidelity to the meanings is complex by nature. Using emerging coding of responses supported the validity of the interpretation as it allowed similar responses to be elicited without my attributing personal meaning or assumptions. Although during the research project I only analysed the narratives provided by participants I drew on my own experiences to interpret the meanings and purpose attributed to their actions as described through their reflections. As the social justice sessions were often taught by me there were regular remiders for all trainees that the purpose of the reflection was to synthesise theory and practice. Clough (2002: 6) reminds us that when using personal narratives there must be ‘perpetual concern with ethics and moral positioning in relation to derivation of data, ownership of data, issues of honesty and integrity’. To ensure that this level of integrity was adhered to during the research, the participants’ data is presented in the form of vignettes in the next chapter. This is designed to demonstrate the decisions I made when coding the responses.

The challenge of using narrative reflection is in encouraging trainees to distinguish between descriptive writing and reflective writing. Bold (2012) draws on the work of Hughes (2009) in writing about trainees’ development from what she terms ‘self-indulgent’ writing to ‘self-critical’ writing. She considers that they ‘move into a phase of reflexivity having a heightened awareness of the self and their relationship with others: the process of ‘becoming self-reflective takes practice, encouragement and time and belongs to a domain where people and social contexts are the focus, not just the professional development activity’ (ibid: 75). This study is situated within the process of professional development
activity and therefore may not allow the participants enough time to engage in
the process of reflexivity. I do not consider that this invalidates the study as it
provides interesting and valid findings within this context and goes some way to
providing an explanation where participants’ reflections remained self-efficacy
focused.

The aim of the autobiographies was to encourage the trainees to articulate their
cultural norms and goals prior to beginning the programme and to consider
what may have contributed to their general expectations. Emerging patterns in
the coded data could be interrogated for similarities in characteristics or
experiences. Whilst the limitations of using self-reported histories to convey
episodic memories are recognised in terms of reliability, similar experiences
may be uncovered which could support an understanding of how change can be
brought about through pedagogic approaches. I consider that this validates my
chosen method.

The programme being studied is one in which trainees are encouraged to
discuss their professional development with each other, and the narrative
reflections are discussed with subject and progress tutors There is, therefore, a
real possibility that over the time involved the critical reflections provoked
changes in attitudes and awareness. However, participants may have felt
vulnerable sharing narrative reflections of their inner thoughts about social
justice issues and events which they may not dare to vocalise elsewhere or that
pertain to their professional development and integrity. To avoid personally
sensitive issues being raised it was important to assure all participants that the
content and information being shared in this research project came only from
that narrative which had been written as a public document.

As a researcher of personal narratives it is important to acknowledge my
position within the process as the interpretations and conclusions reached are
influenced by the clear political bias and values explored through the
introductory and literature chapters. It is also crucial to consider my own
reflexive engagement as I pay regard to the details in the narratives collected
and begin to understand the role they play in shaping individual identities. An
essential component of my role as a tutor on the programme was to encourage trainees to consider their developing professional identity: the theories I recommended and the very design and structure of the programme all pointed to my philosophical standpoint in this situation. Trainees were made aware of my personal philosophy of education through my teaching sessions. Hammersley’s (2005: 148) claim that ‘researchers are embodied agents whose identity shapes their work’ advocates that our research ideas emerge from our biographies and relate to our emotions and identities. It is clearly essential to recognise my evident resolve for socially just education: any attempt to conceal it would be contentious and invalidate the study.

My professional position on the PGCE programme changed over the time of this investigation. At the exploratory stages I was new to the programme and to ITT, after teaching on the professional strand for a year I became responsible for its co-ordination. For the participants engaged in the research I was a strand leader and a course tutor. This sets me in a position of power in relation to the participants, but I argue that the requirement to make regular requests for the data meant that any participant could withdraw at any time shifting the power balance in the study. My relationship with the participants was, I believe, dependent on my role in the judgement of their progress. Where I was only a tutor, many participants sought help and advice at all stages of the programme; where I might have been a teaching practice tutor, they did appear threatened by the possibility of my power to deny them qualification. I therefore did not visit any of the participants on their teaching practice. My power and control in the research came in the analysis and interpretation of the data provided; this is discussed later in the chapter.

As previously acknowledged, the instigation for the research arose from a small scale study into changes in attitudes and practice, findings from which gave cause for concern surrounding the perpetuation of biased routines and habits within educational settings (Mohamed, 2006). This concern continued to be reinforced as I began working in ITT. Wilkins & Lall’s (2011) study of non-white trainees’ experiences on this programme found that ‘stereotyping based on ignorance or prejudice’ (p31) was a feature of the social interactions during
university instruction and school teaching practices. In a desire to expose why this perpetuation of uncritical examination of stereotyped assumptions prevails in education I set out to investigate the ITT programme I had involvement with.

My research relies heavily on interpretation and I do not deny, as Clandinin & Connelly (2000: 121) purport, ‘the meanings attached to the various data are subject to interpretation by a researcher who has a particular position in relation to the research’. However in the process of organising and collating information it was crucial to continually query the purpose of the questions being asked; whether the responses were being interpreted differently to the intended meaning; and to decide on the significance of specific pieces of data. In reviewing the anonymised texts, the themes and the coding over both years I was making a determined effort to remove any subjectivity. Through this rigorous iterative focus on the findings from the data it was possible to begin to shape the analysis without personal bias. The data from year one was recoded at the same time as the data from year two to ensure coherence of meaning attributed to the narrative responses, and was consciously re-examined during analysis one year later. In ensuring that my interpretations have been rigorously analysed through various iterations over two years of interrogation and questioning I have avoided asserting any initial assumptions.

In the field of social justice I concur with Hartas who indicates that the researcher’s position is ‘value relevant as the strife for neutrality is neither feasible nor desirable’ (2010: 21). The very nature of the research and the questions being investigated point to my stance in this study. I make no pretence at being impartial – instead I have framed the investigation to determine how reflective capacity demonstrates a focus on teacher efficacy or advocacy and how this has a likely impact on socially responsible teaching practice. I make no value judgements on the individual participants but attempt to allow types to emerge from similarities in characteristics.

Drever (1995: 4) reminds us that in narrative analysis ‘you constantly have to exercise judgement about how to summarise without distorting what people have said or omitting anything important’. The difficulties surrounding this type
of research are in ensuring reliability – in knowing that being involved in the research hasn’t influenced the participant responses in any way. The challenge here has been to assess each component so as to have confidence that my interpretations of participants’ responses are accurate. This is further explored in the ethics section of this chapter.

The idea that knowledge is objective and value-free has been defeated on both theoretical and empirical grounds according to Paul et al. (2007): each paradigm determines the meaning of all terms that occur in it and there is no such thing as neutral language to assess different theories. For pragmatists, knowledge is theory- and value-laden and capable of shaping human values (Hartas, 2010: 41). As I am fully engaged in the training process, my critical and analytical observations of the trainees and the programme are integral to the research. I do not declare that my research is value free though I have made every effort through rigorous analysis to be objective. Through this interpretive hermeneutic approach the meanings attributed to participant narrative responses are designed to offer an account of the context at a given time. The ultimate aim of the investigation, though, is to determine, through analysis of reflective capacity, the possibility of shaping socially responsible teachers during the training process.

Acknowledging limitations of the study

DeVault (2010: 150) reminds us that no study can include everything. She advises that we should ‘write with acute consciousness of what is being left out and the implications of omission for the reader’. In the case of this study, that is the impact of trainees’ teaching strategies on the pupils they will be teaching. The study is based on decades of research (Rosenthal & Jacobson 1968; Bourdieu, 1982; Irvine, 2003; Wortham, 2006) that holds that the beliefs and assumptions of teachers will impact on the pupils in their classrooms. This research is accepted, and leads the inquiry towards how this is perpetuated within the profession.

Although this research does not seek to observe participant practice within the school context, the reflective accounts of social justice during the teaching
practices are drawn upon. This use of critical reflection anticipates that the participants will draw on the developing understanding of social justice generated through instructional pedagogies whilst on teaching practice. This will be demonstrated through the level of reflection and the demonstration of professional advocacy. However, criticality in reflective practice is not assumed here in line with Hughes’ (2009) discussion around the journey from ‘self-indulgent’ to ‘self-critical’ writing. Determining how crucial criticality in reflection is to shaping a socially responsible teacher is one line of enquiry in the study.

The design of the research was based on the hypothesis that trainees who incorporate new learning about social justice in education are able to reflect on this during classroom practice. A participant’s continued focus on self-efficacy is interpreted as an indicator that they are not conscious of their responsibility for individual pupils’ learning needs. It is not suggested here that a lack of critical reflection equates to a lack of social justice awareness but an inability to challenge assumptions. It is proposed that without a capacity for high level reflection, personal efficacy is likely to remain the focus of the teacher.

It was anticipated that by exploring the capacity of participants to reflect critically on issues of social justice, some solutions for ITT would emerge. However, the use of more than one coding system in relation to several mechanisms allowed for the emergence of alternative findings. What wasn’t taken into account in the design of the study was the part that emotion plays in the motivational domain of teaching. I was aware of the need for emotional resilience and for a capacity to take risks during IT training and acknowledge the work of Smith (2013) in this field but this mechanism didn’t emerge as significant for me until the vignettes had been assembled. These findings offer original insights into the shaping a socially responsible teachers.

DeVault (2010: 152) confirms that through setting the boundaries of the investigation and the control of participation, researchers exercise particular kinds of interpretive and representational power. She asserts that this is further consolidated as they ‘interpret data and craft the text that will be taken as authorised “knowledge”’. Once my data had been shaped and crafted I continue
to interrogate what I was finding, this led to the emergence of findings I had not anticipated. Luttrell (2010: 3) advises that ‘understanding one’s “self” and stake in the project is crucial for knowing both the limitations and the strengths of the “instrument”’. I consider that being immersed in the programme design and delivery supports my understanding of the meanings contained within participant reflections. It also consistently confirms the need for me to be alert to my power relations with the participants. Luttrell cites Schwandt (2001) who also confirms that it is not negative for ‘the enquirer to be part of the setting, context, social phenomenon he or she seeks to understand’ (2010: 3). The paradigm and perspectives chosen set my beliefs in context and acknowledge my subjective acceptance of the social and cultural constructions that maintain power. Selecting an interpretive approach allows me access to the participants’ emerging capacity to counter deficit models of pupils.

**Limitations of the methods**

Although the pre-course questionnaire was employed to determine baseline data prior to any influence from the training course, this proved too complicated to administrate. All trainees were to complete the questionnaire prior to meeting anyone else on the course or receiving instruction. The aim of this was to begin the process of identifying assumptions and experiences of participants before they were influenced by tutors or other trainees. However, as trainees begin to consider sites for potential PGCE programmes they are introduced to mission statements and lecturers’ fields of research interests via the University web pages, giving some indication of bias already held within the programme team. Also, once all trainees have been offered and accepted a place on the PGCE course they are provided with pre-course reading material which on further inspection provides a clear bias towards material which challenges stereotypes and discrimination. Therefore the research cannot claim to have data which has absolutely not been influenced by the programme prior to initial attendance.

In using visual media as one of the instructional pedagogies my aim was not to create the images used to interpret the participants’ socio-historical assumptions and beliefs. An analysis of stereotypical media images currently in
circulation and similar video and text from the majority of the cohort’s early schooling was carried out; dates of birth from registration data were used to select the images to be used in the research. Prosser & Loxley (2008: 19) confirm that the ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ will employ different but overlapping visual cultures in understanding the photographs used which could lead to the possibility of the respondent reflecting and articulating what they perceive to be my preferred meaning. Spencer (2011: 19) tells us that ‘experiences impose a set of available frames of reference; the observer decodes the image through associations to existing cultural knowledge. So an observer’s perception of an image is constrained by rhetorical forms which exist and circulate in a culture’. Each viewer will bring with them their own culturally mediated interpretation which not only affects the way in which the content is selected but also the meaning ascribed to it. It has to be acknowledged that the meaning of the image is a construction of culture both in production and interpretation, both by me in creating the image demonstration and by the trainees in reflecting a response to the image. As I determined the choice of images, sequence and length of time of exposure, my own expectation of a shared cultural meaning in how the images would be received must be called to account.

In attempting to investigate key mechanisms at play both prior to and during the ITT programme there was a danger that everything would be superficial and I would have no depth to any one of the factors I was investigating. Reviewing the pertinent literature in the field of shaping socially responsible teachers I could have probably selected just one factor as sufficient for a PhD study. However, I would not have been satisfied that I had selected the key to change; I have therefore tried to scratch the surface of each of the suggested mechanisms. In doing so, I used coding themes which made sense to me throughout the years of the investigation and which emerged during the coding process. I collected the data in as open a form as possible with minimal guidance allowing for the voice of the participants to emerge. In trying to attribute key mechanisms to particular theories raised in research, I found that
having not asked directly for specific information I ran the risk of not finding the responses necessary to draw conclusions.

The single factor coding themes employed for the pre-course data emerged as limiting. For example coding identity salience to visible or invisible was designed to identify whether the trainees were aware of barriers to learning for groups of ‘the other’; gender, ‘race’, social class. Since the social justice elements of the training programme highlight issues for pupils with invisible identity salience such as EAL and SEN most of the participants mentioned these in their reflections. It has been essential to clarify this through my interpretation of the data rather than leave the coding to imply something which might not be accurate.

The same is true of the coding for direct and indirect experience of the ‘Other’ in the pre-course data collection. There was no single code to which I could assign the range of experiences prior to attending the training course. I therefore had to interpret the responses as either personal experience for themselves or their children and indirect awareness because of a previous academic course or employment situation. This feels unsatisfactory but as I had made a commitment to ask for no data other than what was required for the programme already I was not in a position to delve deeper into this issue. In interpreting the data regarding identification with teaching, this was clear in some of the narratives but in others I began to notice a connection with mothering more than with teaching. Given the literature regarding the way trainees perceive their professional identity before they begin the training programme, this data has been utilised in the analysis even where it wasn’t coded. Some trainees did not provide information which I could attribute to my chosen codes, so I coded this as a negative response but the narrative told a story which needed to be unpicked and interpreted further. Had I been able to use discourse analysis in my study I may have found much deeper responses to my questions.

Having pointed out these limitations and frustrations I am still confident that the information provided by the participants gives a clear picture of how my study relates to other research and makes a real contribution to the way forward for
ITT programmes in England. The findings which surfaced out of the narrative reflections offered insights which have put the literature into a real context for IT training.

Further limitations arose in considering methods of gaining affirmation of the accuracy of my interpretations. Not being able to confirm meaning attributed through a structured interview and not having participants reviewing my coding could leave the research open to misinterpretation of the data in some cases. However participants were reluctant to give any further time because of the intensive demands of the programme. There is also a real possibility that once the process of training was complete the participant could have reflected further in a more considered manner. The reflective journal may well have focused on personal efficacy as the trainees’ main objective was to successfully attain a teaching award. The consideration of a capacity to reflect with a sense of social justice was analysed for changes across the programme in an attempt to alleviate this concern.

**Considering ethical issues**

As Bold (2012) points out, researcher values underpin the choice of research topic and drive the choice of methodological and ethical strategies used in conducting the project. In this research project I needed to remain cognisant of my own assumptions and beliefs being engaged throughout the research – in interactions with the participants; the research design; curriculum content; and instructional pedagogies. As Glaser & Strauss (1967 cf Cohen et al., 2000: 151) state, ‘interpretive researchers set out to understand their interpretations of the world around them’. My own desire to understand the process of enculturation of stereotyped identification and its use in primary classroom leads the research. My interpretation of the participants’ responses is heavily biased by intrinsic expectation, as is my personal response to shared experiences, stimuli and the participants’ reflective articulation.

Hartas (2010) confirms that our research emerges from our own biographies and experiences, as I explored in the introduction to the thesis. Sandra Harding and Julia Wood (1992) also claim that the social groups to which we belong
shape what we know and how we communicate. As a white female with a surname originating from the Muslim culture, researching the shaping of socially responsible teachers situates me in a socio-culturally biased position. My ‘Whiteness’ is bounded with privilege which is highly visible but my aim is to encourage trainees to think about the effects of bias from the standpoint of the excluded. In this situation, the majority of trainees were white which afforded me ‘insider’ status. Through the thesis I have drawn on the work of Gillborn (2005) and Leonardo (2004) to explore questions of privilege and power in terms of ‘Whiteness’ and locate myself within the framework of their critical perspective. I do not declare privilege other than my ‘Whiteness’ although it was either accepted or contested by the trainees depending on their own life experiences. Their responses to me and the queries they raised whilst engaging in discussions regarding stereotyping and discrimination demonstrated a sense of comfort in challenging me within the situation.

As a tutor on the programme I am positioned as an ‘insider researcher’, I am researching the impact of my own programme; however I am an outsider to the body of trainees who were on the receiving end of the training process. According to Harding though, (1992) all standpoints are partial, meaning that a person can have many standpoints at a time. Through the ‘outsider-within’ phenomenon of this research, I place myself in a position to notice and identify patterns of behaviour that those socialised into the dominant group culture are unable to recognise. According to Harding, the perspective from the lives of the less powerful can provide a more objective view than the perspective from the lives of the more powerful. However, my study is firmly set within the context of understanding how those with social and cultural capital and by implication power view the lives of those with less power or social and cultural capital. My standpoint therefore is to view from within my own programme, the levels of reflection my trainees’; a group to which I am an outsider.

I had access to the target community on a regular basis and as such I had a captive audience which I had to be careful not to exploit. To ensure this I kept a professional distance and made clear throughout that the research and my tutor role were separated in my work. Considerations of possible power relations
were addressed to assure the participants throughout their continued participation that if stereotyping and assumptions of disadvantage and discrimination emerged, this would not influence their chances of successful completion of the programme.

Hartas (2010: 21) refers to Abraham’s (1996) argument that personal investment in the research should not be seen as negative, stating that research should be ‘value-conscious’ rather than value-free – he suggests that representing my voice and politics in the research indicates purpose and relevance to my work. Hyden (2008) contends that the main sensitivity is the relationship between the researcher and the researched including consideration of cultural, contextual and personal views. This has clear implications for the research carried out for this study in which tacit knowledge of cultural dominance was necessarily highlighted in a public environment. Therefore the initial meeting with interested participants was used to construct an understanding about what might be confidential even if shared through a reflective journal. It was essential that the participants knew the purpose of the research and what the intended audience would be. As Bold (2012: 64) confirms, this ‘enhances its validity and reliability because it helps to ensure that the research story you tell is one that they would want people to know’.

Trainees sometimes make personal connections with tutors and in this study some participants used the opportunity to ask for professional feedback on the quality of their reflective writing as a tool for developing efficacy. This was given careful consideration and in order that I did not influence the quality of reflection or the content of the narrative to be provided as data it was agreed with participants that the reflections wouldn’t be coded or analysed until they had completed the programme. This also avoided my receiving any knowledge which could influence my judgements about their developing teaching skills. I remained conscious of my position to participants, regularly confirming their comfort in continuing with the research relationship.

Coding and analysing the reflections after the cohort had completed the programme also made it possible to be objective during coding and analysis.
Once data had been inputted to the software package, the names were changed for anonymity. For much of the duration of coding and analysis I could not easily identify the participants.

The participants were passive objects of the research and therefore it was important to ensure that their voices were heard, and that they were regularly informed of the nature, the purpose and the outcome of the study so that they could continue to make an informed choice in regard to participation. They needed to be aware exactly how and where the data was to be stored and be assured that I would follow data protection guidance, so that there would be no access by unauthorised persons to their data, especially during the active research process. This was confirmed and upheld regularly throughout both years of data collection and beyond.

Clough (2002: 6) reminds us that in narrative analysis ‘you constantly have to exercise judgement about how to summarise without distorting what people have said or omitting anything important’. This has previously been discussed in the reliability and validity section of this chapter.

Acknowledging the potential impact of my own values and challenging my own viewpoint is an essential reflexive response to the research process. Bold (2012: 63) suggests that in researching my own work I might affect my ability to ‘examine data from a distanced perspective, to be reflexive and see alternative points of view and to balance the participants’ responses against those of others in similar situations’. However, the findings from this study are interpreted within the scope of research in this field to align my findings with other studies.

During the research process I came to develop an understanding of how respect for beliefs is demonstrated within large groups of trainees, and how a lack of knowledge or awareness and the difference in cultural expectations could be managed during university instruction. There was a further dilemma in regard to how I would potentially respond to any discriminatory discourse in evidence. Les Black (1996: 24) asserts that ‘a question that is often raised is what one does in situations where racist ideas are communicated to the
researcher’. As I did not read the reflections provided for the study until each cohort of trainees had completed the programme this issue did not arise, but such ideas were always appropriately challenged during the training process. This will have further exposed my own political and social bias to the cohort of trainees. However, it enhanced the understanding of ethical considerations during the research process; trainees were encouraged to be aware of the need to be emotionally cognisant and to see the journey to developing an understanding of socially just education as a continuum along which some had travelled further than others. There was an agreed ‘no-blame’ approach to the discussion of content in order to support each other’s developing awareness, and tutors shared anecdotes of their own journeys. However, the size of the group was recorded as making some feel vulnerable: they were in the early stages of developing friendship groups, and felt exposed. One participant recorded moving her seat during activities as the group was not taking the task seriously and she wanted to deepen her understanding.

According to Halse & Honey (2010: 131) ‘the ethics framework that regulates Western research and guides the decision making of ethics committees is based on the concept of a universalised rational subject and an ethic of justice’. They go on to assert that the ‘presumption of the universalised subject takes for granted that the experiences of the dominant social group can be generalised and is taken as true for all others’ (ibid: 131). Generalisations are not taken for granted here but significant findings are considered relevant to other ITT programmes. Drawing closely on the Research Ethics Framework to include informed consent, the confidentiality of information provided by participants, the anonymity of study participants and the avoidance of harm (ESRC, 2010), the data for the research study was drawn as a convenience sample from participants attending the university primary PGCE programme. Participants were made fully aware of the purpose of the research and their involvement in it. It was acknowledged that participants may not fully understand the full implications of informed consent, and therefore consent was an on-going process throughout the research through regular requests via email. This meant that by sending the data they were consenting again. All participants were made
aware that anyone may withdraw at any time and in fact more than one participant did withdraw as a result of this information during both years of data collection.

I limited potential dilemmas in dealing with the information shared with me by ensuring that participants were aware that it would be stored for analysis until after their completion of the course. This avoided bringing my own perspectives into play until the writing and analysis stages. Squire (2008) suggests that researchers must accept interpretive responsibility and consider whether to discuss analyses with participants. This was not possible within this context although all participants could be provided with a copy of the findings at an appropriate time. This will guarantee that I 'accept responsibility for producing an account that does not lend itself to misinterpretation that others can mould into something they want to say' (ibid: 69).

There was no disruption to people's time or activities. The use of printed responses was considered to be the easiest way to preserve the anonymity of participants; however, emailed responses were easier for the participants which meant that the participants were identifiable by me before they were coded. It proved essential to have named responses in order to collate the individual texts for the analysis and accurate merging of coded findings. The participants were made aware of this and voiced no objection at any stage during the data collection stage. The participants were re-coded for research purposes and will remain anonymous in the analysis and reporting of data as evidence.

In the next chapter I explore how the findings emerged through these iterations of coding and analysis. A selection of vignettes has been included to clarify the decisions made when codes were attributed to the text and to explain how I arrived at my interpretation of the meanings in my analysis.
5 FINDINGS EMERGING FROM ANALYSIS

In this next chapter I demonstrate how the iterations of analysis and interrogation finally gave up answers to my questions.

In responding to my review of social justice in education literature, I wanted to understand my own position as an IT trainer. I sought answers to questions regarding how the prior experiences of trainees and the training process affected the shaping of socially responsible teachers. I was keen to ascertain which specific instructional pedagogies were more effective in bringing about an awareness of the impact of discrimination and disadvantage in trainees. In the light of the research into the assimilation of normalised disadvantage and discrimination already discussed, I investigated the use of well-used pedagogies designed to encourage trainees to challenge their beliefs and assumptions about ‘the other’ in the classroom.

In the previous chapter I established how the coding system was applied and how the codes were selected from relevant literature in the field. Here I describe the analysis of the data for each research question in turn, demonstrating how answers began to emerge. In the next chapter I interpret my findings within the scope of the literature in the field of enquiry. The data is presented in the form of a selection of vignettes allowing the reader insight into the decisions made when coding a participant’s response.

The fifteen participants have been coded by the year of participation in the study, Y1 or Y2, and then P for participant followed by an alphabetic order for my own analysis. Data for only one male participant was used in the analysis of data and therefore all responses are referred to in the feminine. As I can draw no conclusion from any comparison based on gender this was an appropriate way to retain his anonymity.

The investigation sought to uncover participant trainees’ sense of social responsibility through the coding and analysis of narrative reflections. As
already discussed, this investigation is predicated on Silverman’s (2010: 293) claim that a teacher’s ‘identity-based attitudes predict their orientations toward social responsibility’. These attitudes are evidenced both through the trainees’ reference to visible or invisible identities and their acknowledgement of the impact of disadvantage and discrimination on pupils learning. The capacity to act upon this orientation to social justice is likely to be influenced by their judgements of the balance between efficacy and advocacy in teaching. This study shows that a degree of both is required to demonstrate social responsibility in teaching practice. Coupled with a capacity to reflect beyond a personal reaction, I argue, that this provides characteristics which typify someone able to counter the stereotyped deficit models of pupils and their learning and responding to their individual learning needs (Sleeter, 2008).

My interpretation is elicited from interrogating the data which was coded to identify features brought to the training process as well as to expose the impact of specific instructional pedagogies on a participant’s sense of social responsibility.

In terms of prior experience brought to the training process, the vignettes offer an overview of whether the participants demonstrate an awareness of the importance of identity salience, discrimination and the impact of stereotyping; have personal experiences of ‘Other’ groups; and express identification with teachers or teaching. To compare which pedagogical instruction had the greatest impact on participants’ social justice awareness I analysed participants’ highest level of reflection and the sense of advocacy or efficacy revealed. The premise behind this decision was that I considered that the capacity to reflect at all three levels increased the chance of social justice content being internalised, as proposed by Surbeck et al. (2006). I suggest that a participant’s ability to contemplate the impact of the event on their teaching practice and on the pupils they may teach demonstrates that the pedagogical approach was successfully employed. If the participants react personally to the event then they are considered unlikely to be able to elaborate on how they might relate this pedagogy or the subject to the pupils they will teach.
To expose the capacity to respond to specific pedagogic instruction and information regarding discrimination and disadvantage, the vignettes provide selected quotes to show how I have interpreted the level of reflection and the sense of advocacy and efficacy as developing professionals. I present these vignettes (V1-6) as a method of exemplifying assertions which are drawn from my interpretation of the awareness of social responsibility. In the vignettes the teaching practice reflections are coded by the term in which they occur; TE1 refers to the first practice, TE3 to the final.

When the data sets in response to question 1 were imported into ‘Excel’ (fig. 5, p167) to allow manipulation there were similarities for groups of participants but nothing which could be presented as conclusive evidence. For example many participants’ coding for ‘awareness of impact of stereotyping’ shared the same coding for ‘level of reflection’ but not all shared the same response for ‘experience of ‘the other’ or disadvantage’. A similar pattern emerged when the data was imported for question 2 (fig. 6, p168): responses to instructional pedagogies didn’t necessarily correspond for particular participants. The data was therefore merged onto one spreadsheet and through the use of the ‘sort and filter’ function different hierarchies were employed. What stood out was that similar characteristics began to emerge for particular groups of participants (fig. 13, p. 207). Those who shared the same coding for their sense of social responsibility i.e. professional advocacy were quite clearly matched for the highest level of reflection coded across the programme. The most significant finding to emerge for my study came from those participants who were capable of drawing on the university instruction with a degree of advocacy in their final teaching practice. This led to the identification of three types of participants.

I present next the evidence of how my analysis of data sets identified three distinct groups of participants. One group were ‘unconscious’ of the effect of disadvantage on pupils; another group demonstrated a sense of advocacy, acting as ‘instruments’ of social justice issues in their practice; a third group were ‘evangelistic’ in their mission to become socially responsible teachers but their goal was out of line with their skill set.
I now explain the characteristics the participants revealed as each of these terms emerged before presenting the responses to each of the research questions.

**Characteristics of three types of trainees**

**Unconscious:** Participants who emerged in this category were all identified as reacting to social justice sessions at a personal level with little or no elaboration on the impact of the pedagogic instruction or information, either on their practice as a developing teacher or on the importance of this learning to pupils. Typically these participants would reflect on whether they had enjoyed or learnt anything new during the training and focused on their technical ability as a manager of behaviour and lessons whilst on teaching practice. Their focus was on self-efficacy throughout the reflective journal and didn’t change from a personal reaction to events. These participants did not generally refer to identity salience unless in direct response to a question. In the pre-course questionnaire they evidenced perpetuating assumed knowledge, without elaborating on the possible impact or a need to challenge their assumptions. They shared little or no direct experience of ‘the other’; issues of social justice were invisible to them and in some cases the importance of such issues was denied.

One participant (Y1PE) was attributed to this group even though her highest level of reflection was coded as *elaborating*: during university instruction, she did not reflect beyond self-efficacy. She was also the only person in this group who acknowledged the damage of stereotyping and discrimination.

**Instrumentals:** I consider these participants instrumental in seeking ‘active mastery’ of socially responsible teaching practice (Giddens, 2001). These participants were able to contemplate the impact of instruction on the development of the pupils they would teach, synthesising university instruction with teaching experience. They focused on both efficacy and advocacy throughout the reflective journal. Their reflections demonstrated all three levels of reflection which according to Surbeck *et al.* (1991) indicates a greater integration of information. Giddens’ (2001) reference to identity transition suggests that these trainees are aware of the gulf between where they are in
terms of skills and competence and where they recognise they need to be. All of these participants revealed some social justice awareness prior to beginning the programme.

**Evangelists:** Participants who emerged in this category were identified as using all three levels of reflection in response to instructional pedagogies or subject matter, and were highly focused on their development as socially responsible teachers. They reflected with a clear sense of advocacy regarding their goal of teaching, but struggled to retain this sense whilst on teaching practice. They did not focus on developing competence whilst at university; it appeared that these participants saw the elements of the programme as distinct and different. They demonstrated a focus on learning theory at university and practice skills at school which led to a lack of synthesis both in their professional learning and in their identity transition. Their reflections demonstrated a focus on advocacy during university based instruction and efficacy during teaching experience.

Their teaching experience reflections evidenced a sense of powerlessness. Giddens (2001: 193) says that ‘when an individual feels overwhelmed by a sense of powerlessness we speak of engulfment; the individual feels dominated by encroaching forces from the outside, which he is unable to resist or transcend’. This is particularly true of trainees for whom the ‘ideal self’ and ‘ought to self’ do not coincide (Lamb, 2004); they are unable to project their perception of their ideal teacher identity into the reality of their teaching practice. Only two of the fifteen participants emerged with these traits, one in each cohort. Interestingly with regard to this study, neither stated any direct prior experience of ‘the other’ but both demonstrated a strong sense of social justice for the widest range of identity salience including ‘family values’ throughout the training process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Level of reflection</th>
<th>Reference to identity salience</th>
<th>Acknowledge impact of stereotyping</th>
<th>Identify with teaching</th>
<th>Experience of ‘Other’ or disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconscious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PC</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PE</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PG</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PH</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PK (V1)</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PO (V2)</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PA (V3)</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PB</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PD</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PI</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PJ</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PL</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PN (V4)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evangelists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PF (V5)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PM (V6)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Data for Q1
## Question 2 data: reflections on the ITT programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particip code</th>
<th>University Instruction</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher response</td>
<td>Collective discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconscious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PC</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PE</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PG</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PH</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PK (V1)</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PO (V2)</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PA (V3)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PB</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PD</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PI</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PJ</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PL</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PN (V4)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evangelists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PF (V5)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PM (V6)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 Data for Q2
The analysis of what the findings mean within the scope of relevant literature will be explored in the next chapter. Here I report the findings for each type in relation to each question separately. I have selected two vignettes to exemplify the characteristics of the ‘unconscious’ and the ‘instrumental’ types. These are followed by a grid of the participants’ characteristic codes and emerging findings in response to each question. The selected vignettes show the richest responses across all aspects of data collection and therefore give a good overview of the characteristics of the type. For the ‘evangelists’ I have chosen to use selected quotes from both participants: using one example to demonstrate how she typifies the other participants would not offer realistic evidence. Once the data for both questions has been presented by participant characteristics the findings from the programme as a whole are discussed.
5.1 Characteristics for Unconscious category

Unconscious vignettes

Y2PK (V1)

Y2PK is a young graduate who indicates that her first experience of a non-white population began at university:

_I have lived and worked in a diverse multicultural city for five years and this has equipped me to work with a wide range of different people and children._

This quote I suggest provides evidence that she thinks that seeing ‘Others’ around you is enough to understand them.

In her Pre Course Questionnaire she did not elaborate on the impact of assumptions or the need to challenge them. This example demonstrates her assumptions of disadvantage:

_For example Jacqueline Wilson’s book ‘Suitcase Kid’ would encourage a child whose friend’s parents were having a divorce to be more careful and caring with their friend while still treating them as a normal person._

She reflects with an acceptance of discrimination making reference to the salient visible and invisible identities of characters in the media; _race, disability or ADHD_, however, she goes on to demonstrate a lack of social justice awareness.

_Often this may end up going the other way as children who may have been discriminated against end up with more opportunities, as people are worried they will be seen as discriminating._

In her professional autobiography Y2PK demonstrates a lack of understanding of social or cultural difference or the need for professional advocacy in teachers. Reflecting on working in a mixed ethnicity school she suggests that the children
learn from each other, with no hint that the teacher may have some responsibility. Here she absolves teachers from that responsibility:

*Often primary school teachers spend more time with their pupils than their parents do. Therefore they ought to be able to influence how children interact with others. Of course some parents have such strong views that this isn't always possible.*

She makes no reference to what informed her decision to become a teacher or to any prior experience of working with children. Although she offers some insight into her experience of teachers and teaching, some of what is written gives insight into what is left out, for example, the next quote has a flavour of personal injustice:

*Class teachers often spend more time with lower attaining children students than with higher attaining ones meaning they are not achieving their potential.*

**Instructional pedagogy reflections**

During university based sessions Y2PK’s reflections were almost always *reacting* at a personal level with no consideration of how the pedagogies employed might impact on her development as a teacher:

*My group worked particularly well together. We therefore expanded on the importance of listening to others ideas. More importantly I saw how beneficial it was to share ideas with others as some ideas I came up with were discussed by the group and expanded upon and changed. Following Monday’s session on exploring beliefs and attitudes I have been reflecting upon my own assumptions.*

When reflecting on sessions which included ‘collective discussion’ she responded to the impact of the pedagogy on herself as a learner rather than as a developing teacher:
The best learning experience I have seen was when a group of students were discussing possible answers to a question and a tutor was listening nearby. The tutor did not immediately help solve the problem but waited for us to discuss possible solutions first. When we were unable to answer the problem she stepped in with a solution. This meant that we discussed around the subject rather than immediately being given an answer so we learnt more about the subject from each other and developed relationships with other students.

When reflecting on the ‘culturally diverse experiences’ she reacted either to the impact on her personal learning or to the interest of session content:

I was astonished at how much the group understood the lesson in German. This taught me how easy it was to make lessons understandable to children who have English as an additional language (EAL) and children with language issues.

In response to listening to a holocaust survivor:

The visit to Beth Shalom increased my subject knowledge. It also gave me more enthusiasm for history as this is a subject area I did not enjoy myself much at school. I was inspired most by the personal stories that we heard and the details we were given. I believe this is very important to inspire children to want to learn history and to help them empathise with people from different eras.

Her reflection on learning during the School Based Focus days demonstrates a focus on herself rather than any professional learning:

Due to taking this course in a very multicultural city, I have been worrying about how it might be more difficult to teach children who speak more than one language especially if English is not their first language. I was surprised that there are no issues with children/teachers not understanding each other. This has challenged me to consider my ideas and to find evidence before making assumptions.
Responses to the ‘lectures' were again personal reactions about what she was learning rather than reflecting upon the impact of these issues on the pupils.

During the day on safeguarding I realised how important it is for teachers to work with other professionals and to report any information that seems slightly unusual. I learnt a lot during the day and feel I would now be better equipped to deal with any issues that may arise in regards to child safety.
The diversity lecture gave me the opportunity to develop my views and ideas. It made me better equipped to deal with the children’s views and beliefs and to challenge these when/if necessary.

**Teaching practice reflections**

All reflections demonstrated a clear focus on self-efficacy and a desire to meet the standards to become a teacher.

**TE1:** *During the counting activity I was surprised that one child could easily count the money and one could not even though they are in the same numeracy group and their ability is not widely different. This taught me that all children are different in all activities and on different days.*

This next reflection demonstrates contradictions in her understanding of instruction for differentiation and emphasises a lack of awareness of her role as a teacher.

**TE2:** *I have been surprised at how easy it is to differentiate for such a wide range of ages. Many tasks have been self-differentiating and the children have been able to choose activities that suit them. Even though I did an example on the board with them the children really struggled to understand what to do.*

In this next quote she draws on a deficit model of parental support for pupil learning rather than asserting the responsibility of the teacher:
TE3: The children are listened to reading in both of these sessions and this has given me a greater understanding of the importance of giving the children the opportunity to read in order to help raise their attainment, even if their parents are unable to listen to them.

The following three quotes come from the penultimate week of the final teaching practice where her focus is on providing evidence that she has completed tasks relating to the required standards.

This week I have communicated with parents by writing and sending a letter to parents.

I have written three formal reports and obtained feedback from these from my mentor.

I have taught a series of science lessons following on from my assessment lesson

Y2PK is considered to be reflecting at a level of ‘reacting’ and with ‘professional efficacy’ throughout the whole programme. She does not reflect on the social justice issues from university instruction nor does she demonstrate a capacity to consider the impact of her teaching practice on pupils.

Y2PO (V2)

Y2PO is a career changer previously working in publishing; she doesn’t explain why she decided to change careers but explains how she gained necessary experience:

During my Master’s degree I spent some time volunteering in my local primary school later I was working full time as a Teaching Assistant.

In her Pre Course Questionnaire she was able to articulate the importance of cultural awareness and of exposure to a range of identity salient books and films:

Children should be aware at a young age that not everyone is the same as them and their family. This will enable them to relate to those around them and be open minded. Minority communities and faiths may have exciting
stories, artworks or music that other children may find exciting and inspirational.

She also makes reference to visible and invisible identity salience although the phrasing could be seen as widely circulating rhetoric:

A fair education system should ensure that no child is disadvantaged because of gender, race, background or ethnicity.

Her autobiography shared that she has lived in Japan teaching English as a foreign language and so has had some exposure to living and working with people of a different culture to herself. Here she reveals her perception of cultural bias in the UK curriculum but does not consider the impact on pupils:

I visited Hiroshima. I remember feeling that this was an incredibly important lesson to teach to children of all ages but I am still struggling to decide how I would deal with it in a primary school. The museum at Hiroshima very successfully portrayed the events of 1945 in a completely unbiased way. In the UK this kind of history is very unusual for us; our curriculum only really deals with England as the victors. How could I teach about Hiroshima and avoid the class trying to categorise the various sides into ‘good guys’ and ‘bad guys’? In Japan children of all ages are taught about Hiroshima and Nagasaki but this is done without any sense of bias or portrayal as victims.

Y2PO demonstrates that she is aware of and interested in ‘the other’, however the main concern throughout her reflections is on self-efficacy. Although she can articulate a need to teach pupils with a degree of social responsibility, this comes from indirect experience. She is aware of other groups but not of how being ‘Other’ can be a disadvantage. I argue that the reflections typify ‘unconscious’ characteristics. She has gained experience living abroad but this does not disturb her perception of ‘the other’. This experience is observed and reflections are related to her personal enjoyment. She does not discuss any learning from her time as an English language teacher in Japan; integration difficulties and outsider status are not mentioned.
Instructional pedagogy reflections

Y2PO’s reflections demonstrate that she doesn’t generally respond beyond self-efficacy to any learning during the university based programme, her main concern is about how she can use the information as a teacher:

*I am looking forward to choosing and creating resources for maths lessons and I’m pleased to see how effective really simple resources such as empty number sticks, beads on string and a washing line, can be.*

*The importance of talk has been emphasised a lot so far, and I really agree with this, but I am still struggling to decide how I would transfer this to the classroom.*

Reflections on ‘collective discussion’ focused on what she enjoyed and how she might use the information. She reacted to the impact of the session on herself with no indication that she might understand the content in relation to the pupils she would teach:

*I think that asking different groups to prepare preparations on different educational theorists is a really good idea, and an excellent time-saving device.*

*I felt it gave us a good opportunity to work in teams and to organise ourselves and our time.*

*It was interesting to work on a group project with this much freedom and to have the control to organise our own time in order to meet the objectives*

Reflections on the ‘culturally diverse experiences’ were also reacting on a personal level. Her concerns are about self-efficacy in the face of pupils not like her:

*The highlight of this week has been the faith trail. Finding out about [the city’s] rich and diverse cultural mix has been really beneficial as the likelihood is that I could find myself in a classroom containing elements of all of these faiths.*
In this next reflection she shows a degree of being able to elaborate on the impact of situation but the content was viewed through her beliefs about children as represented by current media:

The visit to Beth Shalom was incredibly thought provoking children today are often fairly exposed to violence through TV, more savvy reading materials and, particularly, video games. This could give the impression that they mature faster and are able to cope with these issues. The holocaust is a vitally important lesson for everyone to learn but I would be wary about introducing it to children too young in case they became desensitised to the issues.

Reflections on the ‘lectures’ are again all reacting with a focus on self-efficacy demonstrating little in the way of an awareness of the social justice issues being discussed:

Monday’s Safeguarding day was very beneficial. I had been quite wary of a whole day of information on this topic but everything was of value and the importance of the content could not be downplayed.

The afternoon session on teaching sex and relationship education was both informative and educational. I thought the idea of an anonymous questions box was particularly worthwhile.

Teaching practice reflections

All these reflections were reactions to a desire for professional efficacy:

TE1: This week I have done a lot of work with the group of EAL children. As I previously worked as an EFL teacher for teenagers this has been a very interesting challenge. All five of the group have very little English but their abilities still vary hugely. It has been interesting planning for these mixed abilities.

TE2: On the whole I feel that the literacy series has gone a lot better than the maths; I am unsure whether or not this relates to my greater
I have been impressed by how willing the children are to listen to the story, even though I was worried that they would view it as slightly dated.

She had a clear sense of wanting to be a good teacher; however this final reflection indicates her acceptance of a deficit model of family involvement:

TE3: Again this has emphasised to me … what an absolute disadvantage children are at if they don't have this parental support. This disadvantage also applies to the school; it must be incredibly difficult trying to teach children and progress them on if their learning is not being consolidated at home.

Y2PO does not offer reflections which demonstrate a capacity to move from a concern about her own performance or learning to a concern about the impact of her teaching on pupils' learning. She absolves teachers of the responsibility of countering disadvantage, projecting a defeatist attitude to social justice (Freire, 1996).
Unconscious as a definable type

In this section I demonstrate how Y2PK and Y2PO typified the ‘unconscious’ characteristics for this group of participants. Y1PE is discussed separately as her findings demonstrate a different pattern she is added to the bottom of the grids to demonstrate this.

Q1: Characteristics brought to the training process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Level of reflection</th>
<th>Reference to identity salience</th>
<th>Acknowledge impact of stereotyping</th>
<th>Identify with teaching</th>
<th>Experience of ‘Other’ or disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1PC</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PG</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PH</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PK (V1)</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PO (V2)</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PE</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of reflection demonstrated in the pre-course questionnaire gave an early indication of the capacity for reflection for each participant. Five of the ‘unconscious’ participants responded at the level of reaction. Whilst Y1PE demonstrated a capacity to elaborate with her reflections this was only ever in regard to her own efficacy; this participant has been identified as ‘unconscious’ in terms of acknowledging any aspect of social justice in teaching. Participant Y1PE does not conform completely to this evidence so she is discussed in more detail later, as I consider that she provides greater insight to my findings.

Y1PK and Y2PO were the only participants who made specific reference to a range of salient identities but they demonstrated no evidence of being able to elaborate on this experience or contemplate with any sense of advocacy.
towards social responsibility. Three participants made no reference to any identity salience and provided no evidence of any awareness of the impact of stereotyping or of any direct experience with ‘the other’. One of these participants was Y1PG: whilst she did have limited experience of disadvantage, in that her parents had fostered when she young, she related all experiences to one foster child’s learning difficulties; she made no reference to identity salience. This experience did not appear to provide the participant with the capacity to elaborate or contemplate the impact of disadvantage or discrimination. Her reflection didn’t suggest she had even indirectly assimilated his disadvantage as a ‘looked after pupil’, only as someone with ‘information processing difficulties’:

My parents fostered children all my life and I think that my recollection of a child who lived with us for 12 months helped me to understand how to relate to J. The problem for J was that because he was slow in processing the information during whole class teaching he would lose interest and get distracted.

As this wasn’t further related to teaching or teachers I have interpreted this as having no impact on her experience of disadvantage or discrimination. She doesn’t refer to how he was supported as a learner; his problem was the fault of his learning difficulty. This fatalistic attitude absolves her of having any responsibility or a need for advocacy in the situation.

This lack of advocacy is also shown by Y2PO; she had experience of living amongst people from a different culture to her own, teaching English in Japan, yet she shared no reflection on how this time had developed her cultural awareness.

Four participants from the ‘unconscious’ category made reference to more indirect experience, for example two of the participants had completed a disability studies degree and had spent some time in special schools, and two of the participants had worked abroad teaching English:
My interest in education began during my degree when I became fascinated by child development, barriers to learning and how to overcome these barriers (Y1PE).

I considered this as 'indirect' experience based on the premise that the experiences were specifically gained to benefit the participant's life experience rather than to support any understanding of how disadvantaged pupils might experience school. The experience is relayed as interesting rather than as disturbing any prior assumptions.

**Q2: Reflections on the ITT programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Teacher response</th>
<th>Collective discussion</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Cultural experiences</th>
<th>Reflection on teaching</th>
<th>Teacher response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1PC</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PG</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PH</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PK (V1)</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PO (V2)</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PE</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 Data for Q2; Unconscious

In reflecting on university instruction on social justice issues five ‘unconscious’ participants reacted personally to the pedagogical approach or the content. They also reflected a sole concern for self- efficacy:

*The sessions in particular that have really helped me are those which involve EAL, as I had no prior experience of this in the past. The session where we were given a lesson in German was exceptional and really got me to think of what helped me to understand what was going on (Y2PH).*

The responses to listening to a holocaust survivor describing his experience of the concentration camps are of particular significance. The responses for Y2PK and Y2PO have already been shared and are quite typical in providing evidence
that the event had made an impression on them personally, talking about the experiences as ‘emotional’:

*The visit to Beth Shalom Holocaust Centre proved to be an interesting and emotional day. It left me a bit more confident about approaching the subject with Y5 or Y6, but I don’t think I would want to do this with children any younger (Y1PC).*

This overriding focus on ‘self’ appears to prevent the participants from learning about the impact of the lived experience on the ‘Other’. These participants were identified through the analysis as the least likely to develop a sense of social justice from the training programme and typified as ‘unconscious’ of the impact of their teaching on pupils’ learning. This is considered to be a result of a lack of awareness brought to the training process and the limited reflection produced when considering the instruction as an issue for their teaching practice.

*I was particularly impressed with the open-mindedness of the all those involved and the ability of the Sikhs and Muslims to acknowledge and discuss more controversial topics, as well as tailoring their talks to suit our needs as teachers (Y2PH).*

This ‘self-indulgent’ reflection (Hughes, 2009) and a preoccupation with their own adequacy (Shkedi & Laron, 2004) is directly related to an ‘unconscious’ response to any need for advocacy in teaching practice. This is in accordance with Surbeck *et al.* (1991) who considered that being able to demonstrate all three levels of reflection indicated a capacity to integrate learning from university instruction.

Only one of the participants who displayed an *elaborative* level of reflection across the programme also focused solely on professional efficacy through all three teaching practices. This participant, Y1PE, demonstrated that even with a capacity to reflect at a higher level, without a sense of social responsibility she continued to reflect on herself as the teacher. She did not demonstrate the capacity to project the information from instructional pedagogies onto the impact she would have on pupils’ learning. She only demonstrated that she could
elaborate on how learning from university instruction would support her in developing a set of skills.

Y1PE shows all the characteristics of the 'Instrumental' category in responses to question 1; she acknowledged the impact of stereotyping on children and had indirect experience of disadvantage. However, when these responses were merged with findings in regard of question 2 she demonstrated a focus on self-efficacy. It is this characteristic focus on 'self' which I consider typifies the unconscious group.

The most valuable learning experience for me this week has been the Focus day at (a partnership school). I was very nervous about going into an inner city school as this was my first experience in a large school. I thoroughly enjoyed the day; it really helped to dispel some of my preconceptions (Y1PE).

Although she reflects on instructional pedagogies at two of Surbeck et al.'s levels of reflections she does not achieve the third. In itself this does not typify the unconscious but when aligned with no reflection on the impact of her teaching on pupils either during university instruction or on teaching practice I argue that this demonstrates no sense of advocacy for socially responsible teaching.

One significant finding for the ‘type’ was that the self-indulgent reflections identified a lack of capacity to consider the lived experience of disadvantage for the ‘Other’. Coupled with a low level of reflection which according to Surbeck et al. (1992) is a barrier to the integration of information I suggest this indicates that they will not be able to counter stereotyped experiences of pupils in their teaching.
5.2 Characteristics for Instrumental category

Instrumental vignettes

Y1PA (V3)

Y1PA is a mature trainee with experience in schools as an environmental charity worker; she cites this as the significant event which prompted her to become a teacher. Reflection on this experience demonstrates a prior acknowledgement of the need for social justice issues to be included in education:

I have had some experience of working with year 5 and year 6 groups in drama and debate activities where we explored the view points and empathised with those involved in or affected by bauxite mining in the Amazonian rain forests.

Her pre-course questionnaire responses demonstrate a level of contemplation, advocating the need to challenge assumptions and discrimination:

Adults working with children have a responsibility to lead by the example of their behaviour towards the children in their care. They also have influence through their choice of activities. By exposure to resources which reflect families and communities which may not be like their own, children can explore difference and similarity in a safe classroom environment to promote understanding of others.

Y1PA makes reference to a broad spectrum of visible and invisible identity salience including age, gender, sexuality, race, additional language speakers and special educational needs in her pre-course questionnaire. She elaborates on how issues affect children:

When children are struggling with their attitudes towards each other they may tend to stick with friends who appear to be most similar to
themselves. Sometimes this may mean that some children are left out and isolated due to difference.

Growing up, Y1PA was very conscious of how others perceived her due to her accent, regularly changing the way she spoke to ‘fit in’ with the community she was amongst. She reflects on how her:

*Fear of speaking other languages and making mistakes decreased when I lived in Japan and had to try to speak the language in order to survive.*

She *elaborates* that this first-hand experience of speaking a foreign language supported her understanding of the importance of retaining mother tongue languages:

*I am aware that I am forgetting Japanese vocabulary in a way that makes me understand why my grandmother, born in Wales, forgot so much Welsh after living in Birmingham for over 50 years. This certainly makes me realise the importance for children who have English as a second language to continue to use their mother tongue.*

**Instructional pedagogy reflections**

Y1PA was able to retain a high degree of advocacy and social justice awareness in reflections on university instruction. Generally reflections elaborated on a tension between a desire for professional advocacy and the need for professional efficacy:

*I will consider the comments of the staff from the Holocaust Centre that pupils would not really be able to empathise with the experience of children on the “kinder transport” through role play and that it is best avoided. Although I am not sure if I entirely agree with this it has given me food for thought.*

Occasionally reflections on ‘collective discussion’ were *reacting* to the impact on herself or to the session content rather than the instructional pedagogy:
I really benefitted from the opportunity to work with and observe others identifying the possible learning opportunities across the curriculum from this fantastic resource.

In her responses to the ‘lectures’ Y1PA elaborated on the impact of the instructional pedagogy on professional her learning outcomes. She advocated a sense of responsibility in responding to issues raised.

The Inter-professional Education (IPE) day was extremely useful in giving me an understanding of the need […] to support children with SEN. During the day, the greatest impact on my thinking was to listen to a parent of child talking about the experiences of their family. It adjusted my focus considerably from thinking of SEN as a question of differentiation within my own lessons to a much broader appreciation of the affect that it can have on the child and their family. This is something which I will try not to lose sight of in future.

This is replicated in her responses to ‘culturally diverse experiences’:

Taking part in the ‘Faith Trail’ this week made me really consider the value of the experience of meeting someone from another faith as part of the learning process. Anything that I had previously read, or learned about the faiths which we were studying was put into context […] when I found myself sitting in a hall of worship listening to a practitioner of the faith that we were studying.

During our sessions on Language Communication and Identity I enjoyed the experience of learning in another language which will help me empathise better with students who have English as an additional language. I was particularly interested to explore techniques of using actual objects to help with sensory stimulus, facial expression, exaggeration, gestures, intonation and repetition to make a simple story accessible to speakers of other languages.
Teaching practice reflections

During the teaching experiences Y1PA demonstrated a desire for professional advocacy; she clearly wanted to be a good teacher for the benefit of all pupils rather than focusing solely on self-efficacy:

TE1: *I felt that the way the lesson was structured allowed for differentiation as children were free to use key phrases from the text or ad lib according to their level of confidence. I was particularly pleased that the visual nature of the puppet story had engaged the children who had English as an additional language and that they all tried to take part and say at least one line.*

As she became more confident and competent towards the final practicum the reflections demonstrated a greater degree of professional advocacy and contemplation:

TE2: *I have tried to modify lessons and planning this week in an increased effort to respond to my PD focus of evaluating the impact of my teaching on the progress of all learners (Professional Development).*

TE3: *two children whose family was of German origin shared some stories, told to them by their families of bombings in Germany. There were some negative comments made by other children which I dealt with instantly before allowing the children to continue with their presentation. At the end of the presentation we briefly discussed, as a class, the impact of war on the innocent citizens of other countries but I feel that some time should have been set-aside for a more in-depth look at this aspect of the topic. Even without such an obvious example of prejudice there is a danger that the World War 2 topic could be a catalyst for such thinking.*

This concern about prejudice in the classroom and of her effect on pupils is articulated through reflections which employ all three levels of reflection.
Y2PN (V4)

In her Pre Course Questionnaire Y2PN was *elaborating* on issues of social justice with a sense of professional responsibility. She is socially and culturally aware and makes reference to visible and invisible identity salience; race, gender and SEN with a desire for professional advocacy.

Here she contemplates the influence of her upbringing in an area of England known for a high Pakistani Muslim population. She also refers to the fact that her father died suddenly at an early age and she was subsequently brought up by her stepfather relating this to empathy for children of single parent and step-families:

*My own upbringing and background have enabled me to empathise with and support those children with one parent or a step-parent.*

*I was brought up in a multicultural environment and have used this personal experience to relate to children of British Asian backgrounds and recent immigrants. However, I had not appreciated that as a teenager my school friends tried very hard to conform and in fact I was not truly party to their beliefs and cultural approach to life. Looking back, I now realise that although my schooling had the outward signs of diversity, in fact, there was very little divergence in culture between myself and my Muslim and Sikh friends.*

She also lived with an orthodox Jew at university; she *contemplates* how these experiences have shaped her life and attitude to others:

*Although only short, these first hand experiences were more informative and influential than the years I had spent with my Muslim and Sikh school friends.*

As a career changer she reflects on her choice for entering the teaching profession as:
Fitting with my children's lives and would offer me the intellectual challenges I was looking for. I hope that this is the beginning of a process of self-awareness that will lead me to be able to affect children's sense of self-worth and awareness of their own potential in order that they can flourish.

**Instructional pedagogy reflections**

In response to university based sessions Y2PN was able to reflect meta-cognitively on the instructional pedagogies employed, displaying a capacity to contemplate advocacy in teaching practice:

*Sitting in lessons in another language has made me think how confusing it must be to be a child in a school where English is not your first language. Teacher talk is horribly boring when you don’t understand any of it. I’ve gained an appreciation for how this must feel for EAL children and for any child in a class whose time to actively participate in a lesson is cut by too great a proportion of teacher talk.*

In reflecting on the ‘collective discussion’ she contemplated the impact of the content on herself in terms of professional advocacy and on the pedagogical approach:

*I was not particularly surprised by the reactions I had to the visual images used, or to any of the discussions we had. It did make me think about the children’s literature we had read over the summer which included a wide range of issues related to diversity and identity regarding race, culture and ethnicity but none related to sexuality. I would like to have spent some time exploring how to deal with aspects of gender and sexuality in a sensitive and supportive way with young children.*

*I enjoyed the debate, and trying to look at arguments for or against a motion that I didn’t agree with was a valuable experience. Learning from and discussing these attitudes with my peers has been a valuable*
experience and one that I could apply to the children I work with, encouraging them to learn directly from one another.

In reflecting on sessions which included ‘culturally diverse experiences’ she contemplated the impact of the pedagogy on her developing socially just teaching practice:

I found the experience of visiting the Mosque and Gurdwara particularly interesting as it highlighted a number of pre-conceptions about both places and the cultures of the devotees that I was unaware of before the visits. The importance of hearing about a religion in the context of its place of worship and the experience of being in these places is something that I will strive to incorporate into my own practice when teaching.

I will not assume that just because children of different faiths and cultures outwardly appear to mix freely at school that they will automatically be aware of each other’s practices and beliefs, but that these need to be discussed and acknowledged.

In reflecting on the impact of the ‘lectures’ she contemplated the impact of the pedagogy on her professional development:

I feel that another implication from the diversity session for my teaching was the thought of limiting children’s attainment through my own pre-conceptions about those children. The research discussed showed that children will perform to the level we expect of them.

The overwhelming impression I had from the session was that every child deserves the right to have a safe and secure childhood. Since children spend such a large proportion of their time in our care, as teachers we have a huge responsibility to look for signs that they may need support or protection.

Y2PN was academically able to articulate theories of social justice extremely well especially when asked to respond specifically to areas of social justice.
Teaching practice reflections

During teaching practice experiences she demonstrated a desire for professional advocacy. She referred to the provided scaffolds of reflection through the early teaching experiences but began to contemplate using her own professional philosophy during the later stages of teaching practice.

An early reflection:

TE1: *The scaffolding of the spirals has enabled me to see how I am progressing and show me the next steps I can take to move forward. I need to think carefully about the resources I want to use in my lessons.*

TE2: *one of the activities was finished much quicker and was less open-ended than the others, meaning that some children were left waiting whilst others were still engaged. I considered the differentiation by making sure that the harder tasks were left ‘til last for the lower attainers, but realised quite quickly that some of the higher attainers needed more challenge on certain tasks.*

A final reflection:

TE3: *I would like to encourage a feeling in my classroom that it is a safe place to make mistakes, that in fact, mistakes and risk taking is encouraged. A place where as a teacher I can see the mistakes that children make and praise them for learning from them.*

Y2PN challenges her own assumption in an unconcealed way through the programme:

Whilst the views held by many BNP members are factually incorrect, racist and deeply offensive to much of society (and to me), they are views that some people believe in strongly and I was shocked to find that I would automatically discriminate against someone that was a member of a legitimate political party, purely on the basis of their membership of that party.
I was surprised to find that I was nervous that both the Sikh and Muslim speakers would be evangelical and want to promote their faiths and denigrate the faiths of others. This could not be further from the truth, both were warm, welcoming and friendly; great ambassadors for their faiths. This unconscious fear was exorcised entirely by our visit: an important point when considering teaching children about other religions, that by meeting people our misconceptions can be changed.

These vignettes characterise trainees with the capacity to become socially responsible teachers. These participants reflected through all three levels, integrating university instruction and retaining a sense of advocacy in their teaching practice. Through self-critical reflections they were instrumental in consciously acting upon university instruction in their practice.
Instrumentals as a definable type

In this section I demonstrate how Y1PA and Y2PN typified the ‘Instrumental’ characteristics for this group of participants.

Q1: Characteristics brought to the training process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Level of reflection</th>
<th>Reference to identity salience</th>
<th>Acknowledge impact of stereotyping</th>
<th>Identify with teaching</th>
<th>Experience of ‘Other’ or disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1PA (V3)</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PB</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PD</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PI</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PJ</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PL</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PN (V4)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 Data for Q1; Instrumentals

These participants all made reference to both visible and invisible identity salience in the pre-course questionnaire. The levels of reflection presented in the pre-course questionnaire demonstrate an early indication of the capacity for reflection for each participant.

Three of these participants, Y1PB, Y2PI and Y2PJ, were interesting in that they provided no prior experiences of disadvantage for the study and therefore are coded as having ‘none’. However, Y2PI makes reference to the ‘the portrayal of black people’ and the disappearance of ‘the nuclear family’ as evidence of both
visible and invisible identity with some sense of a desire for advocacy, and she did elaborate on the need for:

*Adults to ensure they are aware of the influence they have.*

Y2PJ is very articulate and demonstrates a capacity to contemplate issues of social justice but provides no evidence of personal experience:

*If you can tap into what a child is good at, find ways to help them advance, then this can have knock on effects in other areas of success for the child, not only say academically but socially and emotionally too.*

Y1PB was overtly conscious of her own privilege and of her ‘cultural capital’ including her extensive vocabulary, foregrounding her post graduate studies in feminism through her narratives:

*Although I have lived most of my life in the midlands, I have a southern accent. My parents were constantly extending our vocabulary; they said they never used short words where long words would do.*

These three participants are judged to have a theoretical understanding of social justice and a sense of advocacy without acknowledging any personal experience of disadvantage.

Two of the participants made reference to having personal or direct experiences of ‘the ‘Other’ or of disadvantage:

Y2PL’s experiences relate to her own children:

*When I leave the house I can tell my eldest daughter to put her shoes on we are going to the park. I am not able to do this with my youngest child who has autism.*

Having prior personal experiences of the ‘Other’ or of disadvantage did not appear to be a key mechanism for typifying socially responsible teachers through the first stages of data analysis. Early indications were that a
disposition for social responsibility in teaching might be more important than direct experience or cultural immersion.

In the professional autobiographies, those participants who shared how they came to identify personally with teachers or teaching were able to reflect at a high level. Of the ‘instrumentals’ who did not provide specific identification with teachers or teaching, Y2PJ and Y2PL both referred to their own role as a mother in their decision to become a teacher. In the language autobiographies some of the participants reflected on how they had been encouraged to consciously use elaborate codes of language and vocabulary in their spoken language.

Q2: Reflections on the ITT programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particip code</th>
<th>Teacher response</th>
<th>Collective discussion</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Cultural experience</th>
<th>Reflection on teaching</th>
<th>Teacher response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1PA (V3)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PB</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PD</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PI</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PJ</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PL</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PN (V4)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Contemplate</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 Data for Q2; Instrumentals

All participants in this category were able to demonstrate a level of *elaboration* and except for Y1PD also employed *contemplation* in their reflections. Like Y1PE the participant Y1PD reflected mostly at the level of elaboration and they had similar coding for question 1; however Y1PD used more *elaboration* in response to the university instruction. This is taken into account alongside the most significant coding to emerge in this characteristic- a sense of advocacy. She is therefore considered to be more typical of this group:
I felt very fortunate to be able to experience different acts of worship.

The session made me realise the difficulty for children with English as an additional language to access the learning in the classroom.

I felt that the importance of remembering the holocaust and stopping persecution in the current world was expressed through the talk and I was able to gain an insight into the impact that the holocaust had on the survivor (Y1PD).

The most common response to the ‘lecture’ was at a lower level of reflection than other approaches or events. This result required further interrogation into the narrative responses which revealed reference to the lecturer and recognition that this pedagogical approach may encourage engagement with the content:

It mostly appealed to my style of learning (Y1PB).

Many trainees reflected that the influence and expertise of the lecturer was important in delivering messages as suggested by Turner et al. (1994):

For me this was a wonderful example of how to engage an audience and deliver important knowledge’ (Y2PJ).

The capacity to make sense of the information provided by the pedagogical approach was also referred to:

Being a listener though gave me the opportunity to hear and take in opposing views (Y2PJ).

In reflecting on the culturally diverse experiences these participants demonstrated a capacity to elaborate on or contemplate the impact of the social justice issues on the pupils they might teach. The following responses gave a clear message of the power of listening to someone with direct experience of discrimination:

IPE day: During the day, the greatest impact on my thinking was to listen to a parent of child talking about the experiences of their family (Y1PA).
EAL: *The strongest learning experience for me this week was the session led in Italian. The session made me realise the difficulty for children with English as an additional language to access the learning in the classroom (Y1PD).*

Faith Trail: *The experience of listening to the religious leaders/ experts not only revealed more about their beliefs and traditions but the respect that they have for other people’s faiths too. I found this quite a revelation and was surprised by the similarities and links that different faiths have (Y2PJ).*

Holocaust Memorial: ‘*For me the most moving part of the experience was hearing from a holocaust survivor and it was heart breaking. Although the holocaust is an extreme example, the same attitude and stigma begins simply in the playground with children taunting, teasing or bullying another child for being different (Y2PL).*

From this initial analysis I suggest that this series of experiences had the greatest impact on these participants’ potential for developing social responsibility as teachers. These participants demonstrated an ability to incorporate learning from lived experience of someone else. The responses show empathy and a sense of agency in the acknowledgement that they should counter discrimination in their classrooms. They considered the impact of their actions on others through self-critical reflection. It is these characteristics that I argue demonstrate the propensity to counter deficit models of stereotypes in their teaching practice.
5.3 Characteristics for Evangelist category

Evangelist vignettes

Here I offer excerpts from both participants to exemplify the ‘type’ as there are only two; one from each year of the study.

Y1PF (V5) and Y2PM (V6)

In the Pre Course Questionnaire Y1PF and Y2PM reflect with a high degree of contemplation, articulating the need to challenge assumptions and discrimination of people with a wide range of visible and invisible identity salience.

Y1PF: I think that this covert stereotyping does matter, greatly.....stories and illustrations should include more diverse cultures and ethnicities it is important to include children with hearing aids, mobility aids and other aids to living. This would more accurately reflect the society and schools that most of our children experience. Adults who have reflected on their own experiences and beliefs can provide opportunities and activities across genders and range of abilities which minimise stereotyping and prejudice.

Y2PM also provides examples of a wide range of identity salience and explores what this means to children:

Providing positive examples of diversity; questioning attitudes; and encouraging children to think beyond stereotypical ideas of what they can achieve because of their gender, race, income, status or class.

In considering her path into teaching Y1PF refers to her first career as a nurse and her involvement in her own children’s early stages of learning:

I have always been really involved with their development and learning. Before they started school I wanted them to experience rich and varied
opportunities to play, socialise and explore the world. When we went along to play groups and Parent and Toddler schemes I got involved with helping, and when my children started school I enjoyed occasionally being a parent helper.

Y2PM informs us that she was:

Supporting adults and young people with learning disabilities; working as a teacher in the FE sector, teaching on a range of courses.

In her autobiographies Y1PF gives nothing away about her personal experiences although she does reflect on the influence of early experiences:

I've given a lot of effort to reflecting on and evaluating the attitudes and beliefs of my family of origin and whilst I think I now live according to my own beliefs, I worry that there are influences from my own childhood that are still subconsciously affecting my attitudes to others.

Y2PM tells us:

I was encouraged to challenge, to think for myself and to question what I was told

And:

I managed and led summer and Easter holiday camps for children experiencing disadvantage and deprivation.

These participants demonstrated a strong sense of social justice in their prior experience data although their experience of disadvantage or ‘the ‘Other’ is not personal. They also provided the widest range of identity saliences referring to poverty and sexuality as well as to family circumstances.

**Instructional pedagogy reflections**

In her reflections of university instruction Y1PF was one of very few respondents who recognised the disadvantage that poverty can bring to a child’s education:
I feel frustrated that the real economic difficulties of many families are not seriously acknowledged - IT is expensive and encouraging children to use and even bring into school expensive i-pads etc has socio-economic and associated emotional consequences that I think are being belittled.

Reflections on the ‘collective discussion’ were coded as contemplating the impact of the chosen pedagogy on development as a socially responsible teacher. They make reference to both visible and invisible identity salience.

Y1PF: In addition to considering prejudice and stereotyping due to gender, sexual orientation, race and culture, I was struck by the possibility that children we teach may trigger associations within us that mean we react to the child because of someone or something that they remind us of. This also needs to be brought into our consciousness to ensure we are not favouring nor prejudiced against any child.

Y2PM: Although I was [working] with a group of people I trust and feel confident with, I was still surprised by the things that they had never considered as being equality issues. This includes the use of gendered language, the difference between transsexuals and transvestites, and calling non-disabled children ‘normal’.

In reflecting on the pedagogy Y1PF reflected that:

Working collaboratively with a group of different professionals was a powerful model of multidisciplinary working around a child with specific needs. Sharing information which was unique to each of our professionals created a much clearer and fuller picture of the case study than any of us had individually.

Y2PM was the only participant to be critical of some of the messages given by tutors in the PGCE programme especially around gender:

I have a concern about some of the messages we have been given in University sessions about the ways boys and girls learn.
She followed this up in school:

    I noticed that one staff member was leading a girl to choose a princess pencil sharpener instead of a robot one.

The reflections demonstrated a real sense of advocacy when referring to specific disadvantage related issues, although it reveals sympathy and guilt rather than an agentic awareness of responsibility;

    Y1PF: The input from a parent of a child with a speech, language and communication need has really made me think about the contribution that the child and the family make to a situation. I have perhaps been guilty of underestimating the value of such contribution and so have unknowingly perpetuated the feeling of disempowerment that families can feel.

Y1PF revealed she is capable of considering the impact of her teaching on pupils in her reflection contemplating barriers to learning although it is an emotional response rather than focusing on efficacy:

    I felt that the tool which should be a help, a vehicle to carry all the other learning, had become a door that had shut on me and prevented me from accessing everything else. It greatly affected how I have been thinking about the barrier that some children face in not being able to read/write or speak/understand English.

When reflecting on the impact of the pedagogy Y1PF refers to content and approach:

    The speakers were clear, concise and obviously passionate about their roles and our responsibilities. Some of the contents were harrowing. It felt difficult to end the day without acknowledgment of the emotionally challenging nature of this subject. In addition, legislation requires us not to be neutral but to be positive and proactive in challenging discriminatory values and practice.

Y2PM focuses on the impact of the experience on herself:
When I first sat down, I sat on a table with people I didn’t know. This was difficult for me as I did not feel comfortable sharing information about my own experiences of discrimination. This was partly due to them not taking the session seriously. I therefore decided to move to another table, to ensure that I could get the most out of the course.

**Teaching practice reflections**

Reflections during the practicum experience for both Y1PF and Y2PM focus specifically on their self-efficacy. The strong sense of social justice does not translate to the reality of the classroom where they are trying to build professional competence and confidence.

Y1PF appears to lose sympathy in her desire to gain efficacy:

> X is very ‘clingy’, physically and wants lots of approval for anything she does. I will have to be careful to avoid her becoming dependent on me.

Y1PF often referred to pedagogies aimed at supporting the learning for pupils with EAL or SEN as a reflection on how to improve her teaching skills for specific children. She shares a sense of wanting to develop advocacy within the classroom but reflects a sense of powerlessness due to her lack of professional skills and competence.

TE2: I find that this is too difficult to achieve for all the children every lesson because there is such a diverse range of need and ability and often I am the only adult in the classroom.

TE3: I have had some useful discussions about some of the children, their attitudes and behaviours including relationships at home. It has been uncomfortable, but useful to acknowledge that I find some children difficult to like and that I find I feel irritated and impatient with their behaviour.

Y2PM considers the positive impact of work happening in one school:
Demonstrating how a positive school environment and high expectations of children can lead to strong academic results, despite EAL needs and the school being positioned within an ‘area of deprivation’.

This sense of responsibility for high expectations was not retained when reflecting upon her own practice:

Many of the children in F1 come in with little or no English; using key words in the children’s home language [...] helped me to teach new concepts to the children and to assess their understanding, as they could answer in either English or Gujarati.

My assertion is subjective but in my role as a professional tutor I would want her to consider that more than a few key words are necessary to teach new concepts or assess understanding. This quote reduces the level of her understanding of the barriers faced by pupils to a simplistic level.

Y1PF shares her frustration at what she regards as constraints of the course requirements and the culture of the classroom, reflecting that the course demands were an added pressure to her progress:

It feels contrived; to meet the demands of the PGCE rather than the learning needs of the children. (However, I will try to keep things simple and ‘make the best of the situation’). (Participant brackets retained).

Planning was such a burden and a drain it took a disproportionate amount of time and energy. Often I didn’t have the mental energy to make a good job of teaching what I had spent so long preparing. (Participant underlining retained).

These quotes demonstrate the lack of integration of instruction into practice which is considered essential for the development of socially responsible teaching (Surbeck et al., 1991).
Evangelists as a definable type

There are no further participants to draw upon in this category so I summarise the findings for these two participants here.

Q1: Characteristics brought to the training process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Level of reflection</th>
<th>Reference to identity salience</th>
<th>Acknowledge impact of stereotyping</th>
<th>Identify with teaching</th>
<th>Experience of ‘Other’ or disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1PF (V5)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PM (V6)</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Visible and invisible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two participants are both acutely aware of disadvantage and ‘the other’, but do not provide any evidence of direct experience of disadvantage or ‘the other’ during their formative years although Y2PM has direct experience of both during her adult life. These participants bring a strong sense of social justice awareness to the training process. They demonstrate a disposition to think deeply about complex issues and can articulate the damage of discrimination. However, during the process of training teach this was evidenced as hypothetical; they were not able to retain this into their developing competence as a teacher.
Both Y2PM and Y1PF generally *elaborate* on issues of social justice with a sense of professional advocacy through the university instruction. However, self-efficacy is the overriding focus of all reflections during practicum experiences, demonstrating a focus on their own adequacy. This lack of advocacy or reflection on barriers the pupils encounter through the teaching practice suggests that even with a strong social justice awareness, there is a need for professional transition through the stages to Fuller’s (1969) ‘impact stage’ to retain and act upon any sense of advocacy. They felt strongly about social justice but the act of learning to teach was too difficult for them to perform with social responsibility. They resorted to finding another outlet to blame for their inadequacy; even though they both reflected at all three levels the early idealism didn’t get beyond a focus on personal performance in teaching.

Their motivation for social justice appeared to be sympathetic rather than empathetic which lacked a sense of responsibility for action. Without the capacity to incorporate social justice instruction into their learning the sole focus during teaching practice was on mastery of skills.
5.4 Discussion of findings

To analyse characteristics brought to the training, the participants’ pre-course questionnaires and language and professional autobiographies were interrogated. Corresponding with research in the field, themes which emerged from the responses offer an overview of whether the participant trainees demonstrate knowledge of the impact of stereotyping or disadvantage (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Richardson, 1996), have personal experiences of the ‘Other’ or disadvantaged groups (Irvine, 2008; Sleeter, 2008; Silverman, 2010), make reference to identity salience (Silverman, 2010) and acknowledge positive identification with teachers and teaching (Shkedi & Laron, 2004; Virta, 2002; Grossman, 1990).

To analyse which instructional pedagogies promote social responsibility as a teacher the participants’ reflections on their professional learning were explored. The level of reflection is suggested by Surbeck et al. (1991) to demonstrate a capacity to integrate learning into practice. Reference to self-efficacy and advocacy were also determined (Silverman, 2010), these were drawn from instructional pedagogy reflections and the reflections from teaching practice. A capacity to consider the impact of professional learning on pupils is seen as key here.

In order to interrogate the data further, both data sets were merged and several hypotheses were probed through the ‘sort and filter’ hierarchy function in ‘Excel’. Most revealing for this investigation was the relationship between the themes ‘level of reflection’ and ‘sense of teacher responsibility’. When the prior experience data was merged with the data for reflection on instructional pedagogies what stood out was that similar characteristics were shared by groups of trainees. Those with the same coding for their sense of social responsibility i.e. professional advocacy or efficacy were quite clearly matched for the level of reflection across the instructional pedagogies. Apart from two of the participants these similarities were also tracked to their capacity to focus on advocacy during the teaching practice. This led to the identification of the three types of participants.
Not all data collected yielded significant findings so I will deal with these anomalies first in order to develop the findings which did provide significant findings. The coding of participants’ prior experiences of ‘Other’ or disadvantage was the least helpful without narrative evidence. Each of the three identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Pre- Course</th>
<th>Pre- and during ITT</th>
<th>University instruction</th>
<th>Final teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge impact of stereotyping</td>
<td>Highest level of reflection</td>
<td>Teacher responsibility</td>
<td>Teacher responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PG</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PK (V1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PO (V2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PA (V3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PN (V4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1PF (V5)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2PM (V6)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Merging of significant data
groups had a mix of direct or indirect, and ‘none’. Even with narrative reflections it cannot be confirmed that having actual experience of ‘the other’ is essential. What this study revealed was that a prior theoretical awareness of disadvantage and discrimination coupled with a capacity to contemplate issues was much more important. What emerges from this data is that, for ‘unconscious’ participants, experience of other cultures or of disadvantage did not disturb their focus on ‘self’.

The participants’ identification with teachers or teaching drew no conclusive evidence for any group of participants. Many participants drew on their role as a mother for their experiences and those with teaching or school experience had often obtained this as a pre-requisite for ITT.

All trainees completed reflections in regard diversity and inclusion at the end of the second teaching practice and at the end of the course. The aim of this was to encourage them to reflect on how their thinking, knowledge and understanding may have adjusted as a result of the ITT programme. Only half of the study participants provided the end of practice reflection for the study, and interestingly only three of the university sessions were included in any of the responses - ‘communication, language and identity’, the ‘faith trail’ and the ‘legal responsibilities’ lecture. This is attributed to the influence of the situation in terms of the expertise provided by the tutor and a direct request to critically reflect upon the potential impact of the session upon developing practice. The coding of these was in line with the reflective responses for each participant and is therefore included in the data for the university instruction referred to.

Two of the three sessions referenced in the end of course reflection come under the heading of ‘culturally diverse experiences’ which does appear to have had the most significant impact on the participants. I consider this series of experiences to have been the most successful in supporting integration of social justice issues. In the merging of data this factor became clear but when reanalysing why it hadn’t been possible to identify the ‘evangelists’ absence of a capacity to become socially responsible teachers I returned to the narrative accounts. After organising the vignettes for these experiences the participants’
responses to this series of events provided the most significant finding. I discovered that a sense of responsibility in response to the lived experience of discrimination was most evident in participants who could reflect at all three levels. I explain further when discussing the instructional pedagogies.

Of the fifteen participants only three did not follow a predictable pattern from entry to exit. The majority of participants entered the programme with the same sense of advocacy as they completed with. The difference was in how the programme supported them in achieving social responsibility in their teaching practice. Two of those with unpredictable patterns across the programme were ‘evangelists’, they are described as mature females with teenage children; they refer to their role and experience as mothers in their professional autobiographies as well as to previous careers in traditionally ‘caring’ professions. Although they were not the only mature mothers in this study I considered this worthy of further investigation. This reflexivity through the rigorous analysis of data led me to return to the original data sets to review them. I began to consider whether the participants’ sense of ‘authentic’ and ‘aesthetic’ care (Whipp, 2013) may shed some light on a way forward with this understanding. If there was evidence that the two evangelists were more concerned with nurturing pupils than developing teaching skills this might provide some insights. However, the responses did not yield any further insight as the pre-course narratives only gave a sense of the ‘ought to’ self, demonstrating the participants’ beliefs. This needed to be aligned with the capacity to internalise information from the programme and an ability to act upon it in the classroom. What became more apparent was the need for a sense of responsibility demonstrated through empathy and agency in the reflections as Silverman’s (2010) study found.

I now focus on the data sets which yielded answers to my questions. In analysing the relationship between levels of reflection across each of the instructional pedagogies used and the teaching practice I discovered that those participants identified as contemplating or elaborating on issues of social justice were more able to retain this level over the course of the programme and to transfer this learning to teaching practice than those coded solely as reacting.
This corresponds with Hughes (2009) findings regarding the ‘self-indulgent’ and ‘self-critical’ writing of trainees.

Of the ‘unconscious’ characters, Y1PE was the only one who demonstrated a capacity to *elaborate* in reflections across all of the instructional pedagogies, however, her sole coding for all three teaching practices was for self-efficacy. Whilst Y1PD was also coded at *elaboration* throughout her reflections she demonstrated a sense of advocacy. It was this capacity to reflect beyond the ‘self’ with a sense of social justice that I argue differentiates the two participants and encourages Y1PD to develop social responsibility in her teaching practice. The capacity to consider the effect of discrimination for ‘the other’ indicates a predisposition to counter deficit models of pupils.

The seven ‘instrumental’ participants, all demonstrated *advocacy* through their later teaching practices and also reflected with a degree of *elaboration* or *contemplation* on the instructional pedagogies, with the exception of the lecture. Their reflective accounts demonstrated that the diverse cultural experiences encountered had a significant impact, which corresponded to the higher levels of reflection. Any normalised assumptions of the ‘Other’ were evidenced disrupted in the critically reflective participants. This evidence is important in exposing the assimilation of information and an ability to act on the learning. It also further indicates that empathy for the lived experience of discrimination can be integrated in the motivation for efficacy in the classroom.

The collective discussion pedagogy sessions elicited a greater proportion of *contemplative* responses in the ‘instrumental’ and the ‘evangelist’ groups, whilst the diverse cultural experiences elicited a greater proportion of responses indicating a capacity to *elaborate* on the instruction. For these groups the series of diverse cultural experiences was the one pedagogical approach which elicited only high level reflections i.e. no *reaction* level responses. The formal lecture was the least effective at eliciting high levels of reflection.

A significant pattern emerged from the pre-course data after both sets of coded findings were merged. The early identification of high levels of reflection and awareness of the damage of stereotyping and discrimination corresponds with
those candidates who completed the programme as socially responsible teachers. Those participants who displayed understanding or explained the importance of challenge to stereotyped assumptions were categorised through the analysis of coding as ‘instrumentals’ (47% of this group) or ‘evangelists’. Those participants who were initially deemed to be repeating assumed knowledge were all further identified through coding and analysis across the programme as ‘unconscious’ of the need for a socially responsible approach to teaching (40% of this group). The ‘evangelist’ category didn’t emerge until the final phase of analysis and therefore was not identified through the pre-course questionnaire. Considering that when responses for the whole cohort were analysed through a less rigorous process prior to teaching, 37% of trainees were coded as reacting with an awareness of assumed knowledge and 37% were able to elaborate on or contemplate the importance of challenge to stereotyped assumptions.

This finding is a significant contribution to the discussion around the shaping of socially responsible teachers. This study identifies that it is possible to identify candidates with a propensity for social justice prior to commencing the programme. For those candidates who are recruited without this propensity, clear guidance and support can be offered from the beginning of the training process.

It became clear that most of the participants who had a stronger capacity to reflect with elaboration or contemplation through their pre-course narratives could retain this level of reflection through the social justice elements of the programme and were more able to reconcile the need for professional efficacy with their desire for advocacy during the teaching experiences. These participants were termed ‘instrumental’ and shared similarities in their pre-course data; namely levels of reflection, reference to identity salience and awareness of the impact of stereotyping. Although all these participants’ early reflections in teaching experience began with a clear focus on self-efficacy, the later reflections demonstrated a greater degree of professional advocacy and contemplation as they became more confident and moved towards the end of the final teaching practice.
The reflections of the participants with a level of personal *reaction* in their pre-course narratives focused solely on *self-efficacy* during all three of the teaching practices. The participants’ sole concern was their development of classroom skills, not pupils’ learning or barriers to learning. This was the group termed ‘unconscious’. Classroom skills and teaching activities modelled on the programme; songs, hot seating, behaviour management strategies, paired talk, puppets, etc., were referred to not ethical principles or alternative pedagogical approaches.

The more reflective of these participants, however, occasionally referred to instructional pedagogies from sessions regarding the teaching of children with English as an Additional Language or Special Educational Needs when reflecting on how to improve their teaching skills for specific children. The most highly reflective participants made references to family culture difference, to gender and to philosophy for children.

Y1PF and Y2PM, the participants I termed ‘evangelists’ demonstrated a capacity to *contemplate* issues of social justice and to *elaborate* on their understanding of discrimination and stereotyping in the pre-course narrative. They demonstrated a strong sense of *advocacy* throughout the programme; however they were unable to resolve the tension between their motivation for social justice and the need to develop skills which would promote classroom efficacy. Y1PF articulates a lack of coherence between what she is learning in terms of teacher skills and knowledge and a sense of responsibility: *it feels contrived to meet the demands of the PGCE rather than the learning needs of the children*.

In summary, the pre-course data regarding characteristics brought to the training process was important in indicating that a capacity to reflect beyond the personal, coupled with awareness of the damage of disadvantage and discrimination, generally identifies those trainees who are capable of becoming socially responsible teachers. Identifying that it is possible to recognise trainees who can develop as socially responsible teachers is a significant contribution to the field of study. Participants from both year groups portrayed characteristics of
each type of trainee. This demonstrates that the findings are attributable to participants from this programme across two cohorts and thus contributes significant findings to current discussions regarding the shaping of socially responsible teachers.

Whilst the instructional pedagogies each had a different impact on different participants, which will be discussed alongside learning theories in the interpretation section of this chapter, they were only effective in shaping socially responsible teachers where the participants had the capacity to reflect on the experience of discrimination for ‘the other’. This demonstrates motivation to find ways to counteract stereotyped labels and offer a curriculum accessible to all (Sleeter, 2008).

The most significant finding to emerge from this analysis was that the capacity to reflect at a high level meant that participants could assimilate the information from the instruction into their sense of social responsibility and had the potential to retain this during teaching practice. A capacity to be self-critical through the training experience enabled participants to ‘learn how to recognise and build on assets pupils bring […] contextualising problems within a socio-political rather than cultural deficiency analysis’ (Sleeter, 2008: 563). Those with low levels of reflection retained a focus on self-efficacy throughout the programme.

In the next chapter I discuss how these findings are situated within the scope of the literature in the field. I discuss how my findings are significant in contributing to ITT programmes attempts to minimise teachers’ discriminatory assumptions of pupil attainment.
6 SITUATING MY FINDINGS WITHIN THE WIDER FIELD

In many current ITT programmes, the use of narrative, identity exploration and critical reflection are considered effective methods of supporting trainees in shaping their professional development. Much is made of the type of teacher trainees aspire to be and the culture of schools they will encounter. However, there is no consensus amongst education researchers about the most effective way to produce teachers who can offer a culturally relevant, socially just learning environment.

As the focus of this study has been to understand the effective shaping of socially responsible teachers, the performative approach to education is not analysed nor discussed here. I turn to the mechanisms identified by other research to explore how effective the strand of professional training for which I had responsibility has been in shaping socially responsible teachers. As the strand being investigated contains content intended to raise awareness and disrupt normalised assumptions regarding issues of social justice in education, the study focused on the effectiveness of the instruction employed. This will be discussed in response to the second of my research questions. But first I describe conclusions from this study which correspond with research regarding the importance of the prior experiences of trainee teachers.

In response to the first of my research questions - which characteristics, brought to the training process by trainees, assist in the development of socially responsible teachers? - I have examined the characteristics brought to the training programme and now situate my findings within the relevant literature. I take each characteristic identified for investigation in turn before synthesising what the whole means to my research and to the field of study.

The review of literature in chapter two set out the stance I have taken in terms of the socialisation which occurs in schools. The assimilation of social and cultural capital and currently prevailing stereotypes, both as widely circulating ‘knowledge’ and local interpretations, as Wortham (2006) has suggested, happens in classrooms across the world (Sleeter, 2008; Whipp, 2013; Soloman
et al., 2005; Allard & Santoro, 2006; Edström, 2009). Trainees often possess stereotypical beliefs about pupils from ‘Other’ groups and demonstrate little knowledge of discrimination (Sleeter, 2001b; Irvine, 2008; Gillborn, 2008a). In this study these assimilated beliefs are captured in the pre-course questionnaire. They are coded to two themes; having direct or indirect ‘experience of other or disadvantage’; and as ‘acknowledging the damage that stereotyping’ can do. The beliefs that trainees bring to the training has long since been held up as determining their capacity to teach diverse groups of pupils effectively (Kyles & Olafson, 2008; Sleeter, 2008; Irvine, 2008; Silverman, 2010).

The study revealed that all those participants who acknowledged the impact of stereotyped assumptions in the pre-course data were able to articulate their beliefs using high levels of reflection- elaboration or contemplation. This finding is an important first step in discovering answers to my questions. These levels of reflection have been shown through previous research to demonstrate a capacity to focus insightfully on problems or difficulties and ethical attitudes (Fuller, 1969; Surbeck et al., 1991; Luttenberg & Bergen, 2008). It emerged from this study that a capacity to reflect at this level prior to attending the programme was evidenced by those participants who went on to consider the learning experiences for pupils.

The question of direct experiences of discrimination or disadvantage was more difficult to interpret as none of the participants involved in the study offered any narrative accounts of personal experiences of discrimination. I consider this to be an important aspect of social justice but it transpired through the participants’ reflections that an awareness of injustice and the motivation to combat it is more important than having direct personal experience. It became evident that to become a socially responsible teacher it is necessary to develop a capacity to reflect beyond ‘self’ and be able to reflect on the lived experiences of ‘the other’. The ‘unconscious’ participants could not remove their gaze from their own experience to consider the lived experience from another’s view point. This is most potently demonstrated in their reflections on listening to a holocaust survivor:
The visit to Beth Shalom increased my subject knowledge. It also gave me more enthusiasm for history as this is a subject area I did not enjoy myself much at school (Y2PK).

Engeström et al. (1999) indicate that personal histories and culturally defined norms and goals influence identity transition. The personal history captured in the professional autobiographies demonstrated the participants’ knowledge of school success; they articulated accepted norms and culturally defined goals. In this way it was possible to identify assimilated beliefs and attitudes evident in the participants’ narrative accounts:

In my opinion there is very little harm in the (children’s TV) programme and the children love it. However it is clearly a misrepresentation of today’s society (Y1PG).

It was clearly identified where participants’ were conscious of achieving highly prized goals:

Having studied Disability Studies at degree level I feel I am well equipped for understanding the diverse needs of individuals (Y2PH).

In the language autobiographies the trainees reflected on how they had developed their own language and vocabulary and their awareness of spoken language as a valued element of socialisation:

Although I have lived most of my life in the midlands, I have a southern accent. My parents were constantly extending our vocabulary; they said they never used short words where long words would do (Y1PB).

It was also evident that for ‘unconscious’ participants this acknowledgement of ‘cultural capital’ was not projected onto the ‘Other’ or to disadvantaged groups; there was an assumption that there is an equal chance to gain these rewards if you work hard. The lack of advantage for the ‘Other’ was not a consideration for some participants:
Class teachers often spend more time with lower attaining children students than with higher attaining ones meaning they are not achieving their potential (Y2PK).

Only the two participants termed ‘evangelists’ in this study showed evidence of tackling ignorance or privilege during the programme. These participants demonstrated surprise at the lack of support by their colleagues for disadvantaged ‘Others’:

I was still surprised by the things that they had never considered as being equality issues. This includes the use of gendered language, the difference between transsexuals and transvestites, and calling non-disabled children ‘normal’ (Y2PM).

Silverman (2010) suggests that references to salient invisible and visible identities indicate a sense of responsibility, but this could not be confirmed through the coding in this study. Many participants referred to salient identities in response to specific instruction or to pupils’ labels rather than through a sense of responsibility. Through the narratives it was possible to identify that the participants were likely to respond to identities which were highlighted as different and in need of extra support during the programme. EAL was the only identifier for ethnicity or ‘race’ used by the participants; gender, for example was not mentioned except by those with prior knowledge and awareness of normalised privilege:

I noticed that one staff member was leading a girl to choose a princess pencil sharpener instead of a robot one (Y2PM).

Participants’ identification with teaching - the type of teacher they aspire to be or their reference to the culture of schools - was not a key finding from my study as it has been in previous studies (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 1996). The performative culture of the schools they may have been educated in did not play a significant part in preventing any of the participants in becoming socially responsible teachers. One participant states:
I find that I am thinking the way I was educated worked well for me.

And although she doesn’t manage her sense of responsibility effectively on teaching practice she is able to reflect that:

I have to consider several aspects; just because I did ok at school does not mean it was the best system (Y1PF).

The significant findings to emerge in answer to my first question– the characteristics brought to the training process, which assist in the development of socially responsible teachers – are:

- A positive acknowledgment of the need to counter stereotyping and discrimination on pupils specifically and society as a whole
- A capacity to articulate beliefs using high levels of reflection; elaboration or contemplation.

Significantly the capacity to reflect at all three levels was evidence by the participants who were self-critical and could consider their effects on pupils. Those participants who were unable to reflect beyond a personal reaction demonstrated a sole focus on ‘self’. In accordance with Irvine (2008) this study found an effective way to examine the predispositions of trainees admitted to the programme. The coding of participants’ pre-course questionnaires in this study identified candidates who were socially aware and critically reflective. These participants continued to reflect at all three levels and most demonstrated advocacy in their teaching practice. Just as Goodman (2001) concluded, those people who are aware of injustice in society are more likely to be committed to social justice. If we are to shape teachers with socially just practices, identifying candidates’ awareness through the recruitment process will be essential in shaping their professional capacity.

Although further study into the difference between the motivations of empathy and sympathy would confirm my findings, the initial analysis of this data suggests that to counter stereotyped assumptions and act responsibly towards the lived experience of disadvantage and discrimination requires empathy.
In response to the second of my questions— which instructional pedagogies currently employed in the training process promote socially responsible teaching practice? – I explored which of the instructional pedagogies employed made any difference to the way the participants reflected on the information. All university based instruction analysed for this study related to aspects of social justice in education. It must be acknowledged at this point that the instructional pedagogies and the programme content do not employ confrontation. All pedagogies are recommended by researchers in the field, as I go on to explain, but my choice was to avoid creating resistance through discomfort and encourage engagement and contemplation. Resistance and denial were evidenced during the programme, which was dealt with by the tutor at the time. Reflection on this was occasionally referenced by participants.

Siraj-Blatchford (1991), Bhopal et al. (2009), Rhamie (2010) and Hick et al. (2011) have raised concerns about why social justice and institutionalised disadvantage are not raised as issues and systematically addressed through ITT programmes. I based my research on studies which provide suggestions for improving social justice pedagogies - (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, b; Kea et al., 2006). These suggestions include experience within culturally diverse settings during the practicum; collective discussion; immersion into a new cultural experience; exploring personal history; and reflective writing. The study acknowledged that these are important in supporting trainees to uncover their beliefs about diversity as a way of challenging them into adjusting their beliefs and understanding. Kea et al. (2006: 9) state that ‘transformation […] relies on trainers bringing about a change in trainees’ thinking, behaviour and ultimately teaching’. Considering the content and the pedagogy is important, as is the philosophical or political standpoint of the trainers. Sleeter (2008) also contends that coherence across the programme including the school-based training is essential. These aspects will be discussed in turn in this subsection.

A further aspect to draw on during this complex unravelling of characteristics is the way the trainees receive the information and what they do with it. Some will believe that there is not much they can learn from the training except during their practicum experiences and, according to Richardson (1996), they
hold strong beliefs that learning to teach can only be accomplished through experience. However Shkedi & Laron (2004) suggest that trainees will approach teacher training with different beliefs and expectations about their own professional development. They inform us that some expect to be told how to teach either by their university lecturers or by teachers in school; some expect to learn from their experience of own trial and error; whilst others expect to model their practice on a teacher familiar to them. Some of the study participants provided evidence that the process of learning development was bound up with self-perception or learner identity which demonstrated that their prior life and learning experiences impacted on how they encountered the transition to teacher:

*I saw some excellent teaching which inspired me to be open to all the opportunities that I will experience enduring this coming year – and beyond. I’ve thought back to teachers who inspired me. They had great subject knowledge, shared it with an enthusiasm and in such a way that I understood or wanted to understand. They understood something of me too* (Y1PF).

Bandura (1986) and later Pajares (1992) established that beliefs predict behaviour and are developed through cultural transmission. This has been identified by Silverman (2010: 299) as ‘reflecting a manner of knowing that is culturally defined’: she suggests that what is missing from these studies of self-efficacy is the motivational guide, which according to her work is a sense of responsibility. Her evidence that ‘beliefs about responsibility may be as predictive about behaviour as beliefs about outcomes and efficacy’ (ibid: 299) has been utilised in the analysis of participants’ narrative reflections in this study. The sense of efficacy or advocacy demonstrated is used as an indicator of the participants’ sense of social responsibility. The evidence from this study was generally in line with these findings. Those participants who demonstrated a sense of responsibility in the pre-course data and through the instructional pedagogies acted on this during their teaching practice. The two ‘evangelists’ had a strong sense of advocacy but struggled with developing the skill set to create accord between their ‘ideal’ self and their ‘ought to’ self (Lamb, 2004).
This sense of advocacy for the ‘evangelists’ was related to sympathy, whereas for the ‘instrumentals’ the emphasis was on responsibility driven by empathy.

Who provides information has an impact on the way a trainee receives or accepts it. As Smith & Lander (2012) discovered, even the colour of the trainer’s skin will have an impact. Turner (1991) defines this as ‘informational influence’; the ‘influence to accept information from a trustworthy other as objective reality’ (ibid: 35). Y1PC is clear that:

*It was extremely beneficial to have someone as experienced and involved with safeguarding as [Head of Children’s Safeguarding] do this part of the course.*

Informational influence was a consideration for all of the instructional pedagogies employed on the programme and clearly had an effect during the lecture and the diverse cultural experiences. I regard Turner’s (1991) theory of informational and normative social influence as key to the learning process. However, before discussing these findings I turn my attention to collective discussion pedagogy.

Turner suggests that ‘normative influence is defined as an influence to conform to the positive expectations of another’. This leads to ‘positive feelings towards and solidarity with’ the group (1991: 34), which in turn leads to a need to conform to the group consensus about a contentious issue during discussion. Lave & Wenger (2009:15) agree that ‘learning is a process that takes place in a participation framework where learning is distributed among co-participants’. Collective discussion was an essential component of my training event. It was essential to create a safe environment conducive to critical dialogue which included the voice and experience of less advantaged trainees. I found that the trainees were prepared to listen to their peers’ experiences and so this worked to benefit those capable of considering the experience for ‘the ‘Other’. The use of voice within collective discussion has been an attempt to engage all trainees in open dialogue about the impact of stereotypes and discrimination. It has been shown in other ITT programmes that attempting to educate about the
‘Other’ as a separate and distinct aspect of education brings with it accusations of professional, political or personal bias. I give the impression of privilege by my academic status and ‘Whiteness’ whilst using a surname of Muslim heritage. This appeared to make the trainees comfortable to question my perspective, especially where I was discussing rights and responsibilities. Although this cannot be substantiated with evidence from the study, I was reported as having an impact on the thinking of some participants in this study (Wednesday morning below). Other tutors were also afforded high credibility due to their expert knowledge:

For me this was a wonderful example of how to engage an audience and deliver important knowledge. This I think demonstrates what was said on Wednesday morning about challenging your own thinking about assumptions and prejudices, explore them do not just accept them (Y2PJ).

Brookfield (1995) also considered how identity transition may be influential in the way teachers are shaped during the training process. Brookfield’s term ‘cultural suicide’ was evident in some responses to sessions which employed collective discussion. Participants demonstrated a fear of being excluded from the group for questioning common understandings.Y2PM is clearly concerned about the attitudes of her peers as she explains:

When I first sat down, I sat on a table with people I didn’t know. This was difficult for me as I did not feel comfortable sharing information about my own experiences of discrimination.

The following findings relate to the series of university based instruction which were grouped under the heading of culturally diverse experiences. Kea et al. (2006), Sleeter (2008) and Villegas & Lucas (2002a, b) all contend that diverse cultural experience is essential to link the theoretical philosophies of social justice and the practice of working with pupils from ‘Other’ communities. These sessions afforded the trainees direct access to ‘Other’ people’s lived experience of discrimination.
During this training programme trainees had experience of ‘Other’ communities across a range of settings – ‘Holocaust Memorial, school focus days, interprofessional working, and a ‘faith trail’ and ‘communication, language and identity’. These experiences are hosted by experts in the areas on which they speak and are usually held off-site. The intention of the programme was that the diverse cultural experiences should provide the opportunity for trainees to ‘learn how to […] contextualise problems within a socio-political rather than cultural deficiency analysis’ (Sleeter, 2008: 563).

The development of trainee understanding of cultural diversity is said to be enhanced by ‘a field experience setting that is different from their own’ (Kea et al., 2006: 10), however, this ‘community based learning’ according to Sleeter (2008: 563) must be ‘carefully planned to guide reflection’. The participants all responded to the request to reflect on the impact of the experiences on their development as a teacher. Through the analysis of the reflections it became evident that the participants who were categorised as ‘unconscious’ reflected on the experience as a personal reaction to the impact it had on them emotionally; only one ‘unconscious’ participant elaborated on the impact it had on her developing efficacy in the classroom. For those participants who could elaborate or contemplate the experience with a sense of advocacy, this series of experiences had a clear impact on their assimilation of the link between theoretical philosophies of social justice and the practice of working with pupils from ‘Other’ communities. These lived experiences of discrimination highlight to trainees the need to counteract deficit models of pupils and their learning.

Sander et al. (2000) found in their study of university undergraduates that, although they expected to be taught by both formal and interactive lectures, they preferred to be taught by interactive lectures and group-based activities. Their least-favoured learning method was the formal lecture. It was clear that the majority of participants in this study responded personally to this pedagogical approach rather than reflecting on the content’s impact on their professional development. Participants consciously articulated their preference or not of this style of teaching:
It mostly appealed to my own style of learning (lecture format where there was a lot of content and where I can take notes and critically listen). The lecturer was also an engaging speaker who did not simply read her power point presentation (Y1PB).

In a lecture, the expert transmitting information assumes or is attributed high credibility status, which Turner (1996) suggests could lead to a lasting change in attitude. This was not evidenced during the lectures studied here, but where experts external to the university were employed to ‘talk’ to the trainees and where the ‘talk’ included active participation in any form – debates, alternative languages, school participation, attending places of worship – many conscious participants were more able to elaborate with a sense of advocacy. As Sleeter (2008) recommends, these sessions were also accompanied by carefully guided reflection. This combination of pedagogies emerged as the most effective in the shaping of the ‘instrumental’ participants. Participants with a capacity to make sense of and reflect upon the information provided, assimilated and used the learning in their teaching practice, as indicated by Newton (2012).

In ITT there is an accepted view that reflection is a useful method of professional enhancement (Brookfield, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Mälkki & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2012). It is clear in this study, however, that, as Dewey (1989: 197) asserts, for some participants ‘the mind tends to dislike what is unpleasant’: for participants without the capacity to reflect beyond the impact on their own feelings, there are no grounds to assume that uncomfortable issues of discrimination and disadvantage for ‘Others’ will be considered. It became evident that for the participants to integrate the learning, a capacity to reflect beyond the ‘self’ was essential. Mälkki & Lindblom-Ylänne (2012: 35) also contend that ‘although the enhancement of one’s practice is undoubtedly a possible result of reflection, it is far from being a self-evident or automatic one’. It is fundamental here to recognise that reflection requires a ‘disposition to theorise’ (Eraut, 2007), rather than to assume that all trainees will be able to utilise this process as an effective tool for progress. This use of reflection over the training period afforded important insights into the relationships between
reflective capacity, prior experience of social justice and instructional pedagogies in the shaping of socially responsible teachers. It was a valuable tool in exposing which participants were able to employ reflection to enhance their professional development and which documented their personal feelings in response to the training through the journal.

*I am pleased to say that I now feel far more at ease with the issues of diversity and inclusion, mainly because I feel I now have a much greater understanding of both terms and the issues they encompass. In particular I feel much better prepared to tailor my lessons as appropriate to make them inclusive to all children under my care (Y2PI)*.

In considering the shaping of teacher responsibility I interpreted the participants’ narrative reflections through the transition across the programme. Hughes (2009) identifies a transition from responding self-indulgently to responding self-critically. This study found, however, that as the programme did not provide a focus on developing reflective practice the ‘unconscious’ participants didn’t make this transition, even when given guidance and support. Those participants who were reacting to events personally at the beginning of the journal were still reflecting at this level at the end of the training programme.

School based training encountered by trainees has been established by Lave & Wenger (2009) as crucial in negotiating teacher identity. The review of literature draws from the theoretical discussions about the socialisation of teachers and how subjectification works to expose categorising and labelling theory. High-attaining trainees will have benefited from the current education system and formed beliefs accepting its validity. They will have been party to the reinforcement of categorisation of pupils and will have contributed to the perpetuation of local and societal stereotypes (Wortham, 2006). They will also have formed a perception of what a teacher is and does (Richardson, 1996). Much of this ‘knowledge’ or belief base will be shaken during the university instruction but the most challenging aspect of developing teacher identity happens during teaching practice.
This was something I found hard to understand because I was always taught that literacy was reading and writing which I think of as solitary practices (Y1PC).

Day et al. (2006: 602) found that the personal involvement required by teaching leads to the ‘unavoidable interrelationships between professional and personal identities’. Many trainees are torn between their idealistic beliefs, the knowledge developed during their training and the pressure to conform to the culture and practices of their colleagues in school. It is possible that some are subjected to a range of practices and relationships imbued with techniques of power that can affect their actions, beliefs and sense of themselves. Whilst on teaching practice some participants, especially those who are termed ‘evangelists’ in this study, demonstrated a fear of being revealed as not fully competent – Brookfield (1995) refers to this as ‘impostorship’. Virta’s research (2002: 688) confirms that trainees ‘often have highly idealistic conceptions of children’s motivation and capacity for learning, and of their own ability to manage the classroom settings’. Faced with feelings of inadequacy and struggling to find a level of confidence in their classrooms, trainees can fear alienation in school: emotional competence and resilience are essential in the situation. Since this may be the first situation that many trainees face where they are inadequate most of the time; constantly attempting to move their progress on at a phenomenal rate, a focus on self-efficacy overrides any notions of social justice. The caring impulse that leads many trainees to enter the profession can be stifled whilst they struggle to survive.

Feiman-Nemser (2003) and Zeichner & Conklin (2008) draw attention to how closely the practicum and the course components are related in the training process. It is clear here that that a lack of coherence not only creates difficulties for the ‘evangelistic’ trainees but also that, in relation to equality, this lack of synthesis with university instruction can lead to the assimilation of unexamined assumptions played out in classrooms. Kea et al. (2006) assert that change requires the overt highlighting of assumptions and attitudes by all involved in the training process and a focus on trainees monitoring their own progress in this area.
All researchers in the field (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Sleeter, 2008; Irvine, 2008) endorse the importance of experience within culturally diverse settings during the practicum and so, this aspect of the programme is fundamental to the study. Trainees are required to track the diversity of their school experiences, and trainers take these into account when placing them in school for teaching practice. This is designed to augment a synthesis of the theoretical understanding of diversity through teaching practice. The reflections, from teaching experiences, demonstrate that the majority of references to salient identities in respect of barriers to learning were SEN and EAL. The subject specific sessions identified pedagogical approaches useful for teaching pupils of differing abilities including SEN or EAL. Although pupils from ‘Other’ groups in terms of, for example, religion, ‘race’, sexuality and poverty were referred to as disadvantaged groups in some university sessions, these sessions did not include specific teaching strategies. Participant evidence identifies that these groups were referred to hypothetically rather than in response to an event or a pupils’ learning. I suggest that this demonstrates the perpetuation of labelling pupils through the ITT subject specific strands. It is noteworthy though, that an element of coherence through the programme appears to work successfully for some disadvantaged groups.

It is important to note that these responses do not align with Silverman’s (2010) view of the hierarchy of visible and invisible identities being associated with a stronger sense of responsibility. ‘Race’ as a visible identity is not mentioned in teaching experience reflections: I interpret this as participants not acknowledging ‘race’ as a disadvantage, even though it was clearly part of the information articulated during university based pedagogies. The question of faith and ‘race’ appears in this study to have been translated by the participants as EAL for children from Asian heritage backgrounds.

Kanter (1983: 64) asserts that ‘change is disturbing when it is done to us, exhilarating when it is done by us [and] considered positive when we are active contributors […] bringing about something that we desire’. During the training process those participants who reacted personally to events clearly felt that the training process was being ‘done to them’ rather than proactively engaging in
the transformation process. These participants typically thought of teaching as a simple and straightforward activity that resulted in learning: teachers teach and pupils learn, as identified by Feiman-Nemser (1990). Shkedi & Laron (2004) described the professional transition process in three stages: a survival stage when trainees are pre-occupied with their own adequacy; a mastery stage when they concentrate on performance; and an impact stage when they become concerned about their effects on pupils. In this study it transpired that some participants don’t make this transition: some of the participants could not shift their gaze from themselves, while others could progress to the impact stage and consider their effects on pupils. For social justice to occur in classrooms it is essential that teachers are able to consider the impact of their teaching on their pupils. Identifying these self-efficacy-focused trainees early in the process affords trainers the opportunity to create more effective programmes or to provide the kind of support for critical reflection advised by Hughes (2009).

For other participants the awareness of difference between their previous career competence and this new situational learning created potential problems. Managing emotional disturbance was not addressed for those participants during the programme. These participants demonstrated sympathy in respect of disadvantage or discrimination which was sometimes displayed in an emotional manner. Their motivation was more closely aligned with sympathy than responsibility but without the competence to support their purpose they rendered themselves helpless. Rodgers & Scott (2008) recommend that ITT programmes pay regard to preparing trainees to negotiate the cultures of schools. This personalised professional development is not deemed appropriate at this level of training; rather, trainees are expected to be capable of accessing the learning individually.

Giddens (2001: 186) suggests that a ‘self-identity has to be created and continually reordered against the backdrop of shifting experiences of day to day life and the fragmenting tendencies of modern institutions’. For the participants in this study this transition was evident in the reflections on the impact of experiences. Those participants who emerged as ‘unconscious’ of social justice issues made little transition in awareness: they denied the seriousness of issues
raised during instructional pedagogies and focused solely on development of basic classroom skills during teaching practices. These participants clearly demonstrated holding onto ways of thinking rather than challenging their former assumptions. They demonstrated that their single concern was personal efficacy in the classroom situation. They also reacted at a personal level to university sessions designed to expose social justice issues, without regard for the pedagogical approach having bearing on the pupils they might teach.

For the participants who emerged as ‘evangelists’, taking control of the situation involved an element of risk because it meant ‘confronting a diversity of open possibilities, creating the lack of an essential sense of security […], producing anxiety which psychologists believe can lead to crisis in transition’ (Kanter, 1983: 64). Lamb (2004) believes that essential motivation comes from the awareness of where we are and what we’d like to become – what he refers to as ‘the harmony between the ‘ideal’ and the ‘ought to’ self’. These participants had already projected themselves into the role of teacher and expected to achieve that goal; however, they could not reconcile the strong sense of social justice with their slowly emerging skills.

For the ‘instrumentals’, social responsibility awareness brought about by guided reflection generated the understanding necessary to construct a considered approach to progress and development in accordance with social justice practice. These participants were all able to elaborate or contemplate the relationship between what they had learnt and how they understood the information would impact on their practice. Significantly, a broad reference to visible and invisible identities was evident in the reflections of these participants as was the acknowledgment of Silverman’s (2010) third identity salience – attitudes, beliefs and lifestyle choices. These participants were the most likely to be shaped by the programme into socially responsible teachers.

The significant findings to emerge in answer to my second question - which instructional pedagogies currently employed in the training process, promote socially responsible teaching practice? – is that:
• For those participants with a sense of social responsibility and a capacity to reflect self-critically the chosen range of instructional pedagogies was effective. Those events described as ‘diverse cultural experiences’ were the most effective in challenging beliefs and attitudes. Being confronted with the lived experience of discrimination highlights the need to counteract prejudice and discrimination in the classroom.

• Information provided by tutors with high credibility or expertise was considered to be most readily accepted by participants. Collective discussion needs careful planning and guidance by expert tutors.

• The study evidences the regular use of the terms EAL and SEN by all participants. This shows that as a set of terms used by all trainers across the programme, the coherence of these salient identities appears to have had an impact. However, this separating of pupils into labelled groups of learners for the purpose of differentiation serves to perpetuate disadvantage and hindered participants’ consideration of individual pupils.

• There is a need to focus trainee development on critical reflection of the impact of a range of pedagogical approaches on individual pupils. ITT programmes will require expert tutors to carefully guide trainees’ reflection through this process.

When the responses for teaching practice were merged with pre-course data, it transpired that those participants who did not mention identity salience or the social responsibility of the teacher, or responded with widely circulating rhetoric, did not retain or act on the information regarding discrimination or barriers to learning. Those who reacted most strongly with personal efficacy did not demonstrate a sense of social responsibility. Their reflections focused specifically on themselves throughout the whole training process and demonstrated little capacity to consider pupils’ disadvantage or identity salience as a barrier to attainment.

The participants most likely to acknowledge and act on the information provided through the social justice instruction brought an understanding of identity
salience and social justice awareness to the training process. This was evidenced by the participants’ capacity to reflect beyond their personal feelings and contemplate insightfully on educational issues, attitudes, ethical matters, or moral concerns. As Surbeck et al. (1991) suggested this level of reflection characterises the participants’ capacity to integrate and synthesise the information from instruction to action. These findings confirm Street’s (2003) suggestion that trainees’ prior experience forms part of the transitional identity of socially responsible teachers. This also coincides with Sleeter’s (2008: 96) insistence that ITT programmes should ‘recruit and select only those who bring experiences, knowledge and dispositions that will enable them to teach well in culturally diverse […] schools’.
7 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

This research was undertaken in an attempt to better understand how ITT programmes could end the cycle of perpetuating disadvantage in education through either the selection of candidates or the instructional pedagogies employed. The investigation arose from professional and personal experiences which led my genuine desire to find mechanisms to support this aim. I drew on research in the field to establish a way forward for the programme I was coordinating; these studies evidenced the different researchers' foci but provided me with no conclusive path to follow. In carrying out this investigation I contribute to the current discussion about the shaping of socially responsible teachers and offer conclusions which lead to important implications for future programme design. The research relates to one English university, but the findings are significant to ITT more widely.

In this chapter I undertake a critical review of my work within the context of the field before summarising the contribution my investigation makes to this field of inquiry.

Through this thesis I have outlined research surrounding some of the mechanisms by which inequalities are perpetuated in our classrooms and explored how researchers of ITT programmes suggest we can combat this issue. Equality in education is not a new field of study; I was able to draw on considerable research, spanning decades and countries, into teacher assumptions of potential pupil attainment (Merton, 1949; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Milner, 1993; Aboud, 1998; Bandura, 1997). I have put this into the context of current research in this field (Maylor et al., 2009; Bhopal et al., 2009; Edström, 2009; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Glenny et al., 2013), and British education policies (Macpherson, 2009; DfE, 2010a). Although I framed my study on the work of Biesta’s (2009) theory regarding the purpose of State education; qualifications, socialisation and subjectification, this contextualises my understanding of what the trainees bring to the training
This theory is not pertinent to the discussion of findings which emerged, the findings relate more specifically to the impact of the training programme and the capacity to reflect at a deep level.

Over many years researchers (Nespor, 1987-1997; Irvine, 1990-2008; Pajares, 1992-2007; Sleeter, 1999-2008) have argued that the beliefs built up through socialisation during our own formative years in school are brought to, and firmly held, through the training process. The literature also exposes how trainees go on to reproduce this knowledge through the imposed pedagogies and performative structures within their own classrooms (Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 2006; Frelin & Grannas, 2010). The training programme must therefore alert trainees to alternative ways to conceptualise the curriculum they offer, and to understand the constraints some pupils face. It is important that they assimilate information about how contemporary stereotypes are used to attribute labels to pupils which carry expectations for behaviour and attainment. Training should expose how this perpetuation of stereotypes can be a consequence of messages given through body language which, when combined with teachers’ ignorance of issues, can lead to pupil failure. When pupils respond accordingly they are thought to provide evidence to prove the stereotype: countering this fatalistic attitude is crucial in the shaping of socially responsible teachers. Labelling to identify groups provides a deficit model of classroom segregation through which pupils’ perceived ability is confirmed. Given that a teacher’s assumptions about a pupils’ academic ability will affect their attainment, the deconstruction of this normalised acceptance of disadvantage through the instructional pedagogies employed on the training programme was key to this investigation.

Prejudices and expectations of what a teacher or a pupil ‘is’ and ‘should be’ form the basis of and shape the conditions for pedagogical encounters (Frelin & Grannas, 2010). Setting the development of cognitive and social identity within the context of a highly ‘visible pedagogical approach’ to schooling (Bernstein, 1977) ensures that not only is the status quo reproduced but each member of society has been socialised into the normalisation of stereotypes, believing that
this is how it should be. This pedagogic mechanism ensures disadvantage is perpetuated in our classrooms.

This literature then, demonstrates how trainees have been socialised into believing stereotype rhetoric as fact through their own education and media exposure (Goffman, 1971; Bandura, 1986; Bourdieu, 1982). As Street (2003) asserts, it is through this socialisation that beliefs about schools and schooling are developed long before trainees apply for ITT. These are predictive of beliefs trainees carry through the training process, acting them out in their classroom practice. It is not my intention here to pass judgement on the trainees but to identify how I situate my understanding of the perpetuation of inequality. In outlining these decades of research I have drawn attention to mechanisms which it is suggested require active engagement by teacher trainers in order to contribute to combating inequality in our classrooms.

Given that this wealth of research already exists it is essential to explain why I considered it important to undertake this investigation.

Much of the research in this field examines one aspect of the training - either the characteristics trainees bring to the training process or the ITT instruction - and rest their findings on a single dimension of teacher preparation. I have outlined these dimensions throughout the thesis and explained how I felt that no one solution satisfied my desire to develop a highly effective social justice programme strand. These have been presented separately but they are both part of the process of professional transformation. I gave consideration to each of the dimensions in the review of academic literature surrounding the instructional pedagogies employed to determine the most effective way of shaping socially responsible trainees. I discovered through the pre-course questionnaires that some of trainees had narrow assumptions and beliefs about cultures other than their own, which confirmed the concept of hegemony referenced in this thesis. Reviewing literature into socially just ITT programmes led me to believe that many of the essential elements recommended were already employed on my programme. I still had no confidence that the trainees were acting upon the issues raised through the programme; however good the
programme content might be, the impact on the all trainees was not as effective as I had hoped. Listening to colleagues presenting their work at conferences alerted me to the fact that many programme tutors were grappling with the same issues. Clearly there is no definitive answer to be found within the wide range of research available. My contribution seeks to engage with other ITT providers across the UK to transform the focus and delivery of training programmes.

The research report published by Hick et al. (2011) reviewed how ‘race’ and equality issues were addressed in ITT across England and Scotland. Hick et al. recommended that all programme leaders should review their own provision. Current studies investigating how ITT should take account of disadvantage and privilege have been replicated; Glenny et al. (2013) focus on poverty, Bhopal reports findings for (2011) White traveller groups and Smith (2013) discusses the impact of denying White privilege. As the review of research surrounding the way in which stereotypes are perpetuated and normalised in public consciousness demonstrates, the trainers are as susceptible to the silence of their privilege as the trainees. Bhopal & Rhamie confirm that ITT tutors need to ‘critically engage with their own identities drawing on this to support interactions with students’ (2013: 19). However, without clear guidance and an agreed understanding of the need for change this leaves too much to chance.

The trainers delivering this ITT programme were not part of this investigation, although they can’t be ignored. This was a judicious decision based on both a lack of agreement to be involved and some acknowledgement of a lack of confidence in raising the issues. Most colleagues did not respond at all to my request for information regarding elements of diversity and inclusion contained within their programme strands. I did consider the trainer as part of my review of the literature and as they are an essential component of the programme they are considered as part of the conclusion to the findings. Just as Bhopal et al. (2009), Rhamie (2010), Hick et al. (2011) and Smith & Lander (2012) have all argued, ITT providers must examine how they are teaching their trainees to be aware of issues of equality and diversity. It seems that in concurrence with Sleeter’s (2008) finding that ITT programmes provide ‘disjointed preparation for
diversity and equity, dependent on the interests of individual professors’ (ibid: 562), this subject was only addressed on the study programme by interested tutors.

Being unable to investigate this dimension of the problem I turned my attention to the trainees and to the programme they encountered. I based my investigation on the premise that to become a socially responsible teacher one requires a disposition towards the examination and reconstruction of assumptions about difference, along with developing skills to employ equal expectations for all pupils. In response to this the investigation led me to analyse the disposition and beliefs brought to the training programme and the instruction provided through the programme strand. It transpired that even with a socially just programme the trainees must already have the disposition to accept and act upon the information and instruction. Findings from the pre-course questionnaire could be tracked to the end of the programme through teaching practice reflections. It became obvious that most of the participants who had a sense of social justice prior to beginning the programme were able to learn from the programme pedagogies and content to inform their teaching practice in school. These participants had understood their responsibility for the learning of all pupils regardless of learning needs. Of equal importance was their capacity to reflect beyond the ‘self’ in considering the impact of their learning.

One contribution of this study to the current discussion in UK PGCE training is that it is possible to identify social justice potential prior to starting the programme. This finding affords programme designers a chance to consider the impact of the programme on trainees’ identity transition.

In order to determine the prior experiences and awareness which made up my analysis of the characteristics, I employed well established tools such as autobiography and questionnaires. The rationale for using these methods has already been discussed at length, as has the research that informs this way of discovering trainees’ beliefs. I designed the questionnaire to find out how the trainees responded to issues of media discrimination or awareness of
stereotyping. This provided very useful information about the beliefs the participants brought to the training and the disposition to challenge discrimination. I argue that this questionnaire has the potential to identify trainees who require more intensive support in the identification of discrimination perpetuated in classrooms and the deconstruction of their normalised privilege. A trainee’s lack of awareness of privilege in society hampers the impact of the instructional pedagogies on their development as a socially responsible teacher. The ability to predict which trainees bring with them a sense of responsibility for the removal of disadvantage and who demonstrate a capacity to contemplate and therefore integrate the instruction regarding the learning of ‘Others’ is a significant contribution of this research.

Many professional training programmes use reflection as a method of self-discovery for trainees. Using the narrative reflection approach to study the impact of the instructional content or pedagogies lay in the belief that this would enable the retrieval of rich data which may otherwise be guarded. Where the participants were specifically directed to respond to a taught session or there was a scaffold guiding the responses the participants offered more thoughtful accounts of their learning and the importance of the knowledge to their future practice. These narratives demonstrated that there was no change to the participants’ sense of advocacy over time. I suggest that not only does this indicate a lack of my influence on the research findings but gives credence to the calls for recruitment of socially just candidates by other researchers.

It was important to me to analyse the instructional pedagogies which were already employed on the training programme I was coordinating. I had spent much time reviewing the research surrounding essential elements to be included in ITT programmes where issues of diversity and inclusion were a priority. I considered the elements offered on this programme to be potentially transformative and to be delivered by experts. The elements had all been created by different tutors at different times over the recent years of the programme and did indeed demonstrate individual philosophies. I saw my role as the new coordinator to bring all these elements together as a coherent unit with a clear message which was reiterated through the whole of the
The professional strand of the programme. This included the preparation for teaching experiences.

The success of the investigation is that I embarked on it with a genuine desire to discover how ITT programmes might contribute to the shaping of socially responsible teachers. As I had no pre-conceived hypothesis of what might transpire I covered a lot of ground trying to find answers. Attributing my data to some of the coding themes provided very little in terms of conclusive evidence when looking at the codes. Once the text had been coded to a theme though, it could be retrieved for further analysis; interpreting the text within the themes meant that it was possible to identify where visible and invisible salience related to instruction and where it related to personal values. Interpretation was an essential element of my analysis; being able to interpret how participants viewed their role as a socially responsible teacher was essential to the investigation.

Using the reflective journals of the participants' progress provided rich data but the emergence of two coding themes as highly significant gave more clarity to the findings. When the data sets had been coded and contemplated during numerous iterations of questioning, the alignment of the codes for advocacy or efficacy with the codes for levels of reflection demonstrated a clear link with nearly all participants. It was this rigorous attention to realigning the data sets in a variety of ways that led to the discovery that the capacity to think about social or ethical issues in the classroom was directly related to a sense of 'self' and 'Other'. To consider the pupil before the 'self' as the teacher was not a skill we appeared to successfully teach but was an essential disposition demonstrated through reflections. Those participants who only reflected on what the event, situation or instruction meant to them personally could not reflect on the impact of their developing teaching skills on the pupils they taught. Through the interpretation of the reflections of the participants I discovered that this lack of awareness of the 'Other' prevented the assimilation of information and knowledge of social justice, regardless of pedagogical approach employed.
I discovered in my early days of training in this subject that confrontation can create resistance to change; making people uncomfortable with who they are and their own privilege is not essential to breaking down these barriers. However, it is essential to want to reduce the inconsistencies of beliefs (Pajares, 1992) if we are to accommodate conflicting information. It is therefore necessary to encourage trainees to consider the pupils they will teach, not just to respond to visible or invisible identity salience within the classroom but to challenge how they approach all pupils and how they become responsible for all learning taking place.

Almost half the participants in my study had been recruited to the programme with no awareness of the impact of disadvantage or discrimination and no disposition to challenge their normalised beliefs that education is equally distributed for those who want to achieve. They found no reason through the programme to remove their focus from their own professional efficacy and to consider the learning for individual pupils in their classrooms. If this is replicated across the whole cohort and more worryingly across the country, despite all the research and all the work being implemented by other ITT providers, then I suggest it is time for ITT programmes to consider ways of recognising social responsibility through recruitment processes in order to offer alternative learning experiences.

Allard & Santoro’s (2006: 117) view is that cultural privilege often leaves trainees unable to see how labelled ‘Others’ may be marginalised through ‘curricula, pedagogies and assessment practices that do not take into account different kinds of knowledge, or different approaches to learning’. To add to this, the emphasis on many ITT programmes on focusing on subject specific knowledge leads the trainees to consider that the performative culture within which we currently operate is the only pedagogical approach. A socially responsible ITT programme would focus more specifically on alternative pedagogical approaches and less on what knowledge must be taught in which sequence.
Institutionalised disadvantage needs to be raised as an issue and systematically addressed by all ITT programmes. In 1996 Siraj-Blatchford identified a checklist of what constituted good Early Years practice for ‘challenging inequality and promoting respect’ (ibid: 23). It is timely for similar guidance offering evidence of how to shape socially responsible teachers through ITT programmes. However, I believe that using terms such as; ‘children’s rights’, ‘social justice’ and ‘diversity’ acts to pigeonhole the wealth of knowledge and appeals to already informed parties. To move this discussion forward it is necessary to engage in a discourse which embeds social justice into the responsibility of the teacher. By integrating social responsibility into ITT discourse all trainers will be able to consider how their own subject specific strand contributes to social justice practice. In contributing to other research in the field of inquiry I suggest that a new way of communicating the negative outcomes for disadvantaged pupils is developed. As Jordan et al. (2009: 1) confirm, ‘effective teaching depends in part on the beliefs teachers have […] of their responsibility in supporting pupils’ learning.

Much of the research into preparing teachers for diverse populations (Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 2004; Sleeter 2008) suggests that programmes must ‘create opportunities for beginning teachers to assimilate complicated issues associated with social, cultural, and ethnic identities’. In this investigation the training programme was only 36 weeks and included instruction in subject specific learning as well as classroom skills. This meant that for social and cultural identity issues to be covered in any depth it required all those involved in the process to be mindful of not setting the subject aside as the domain of one expert. Often in ITT there will be one tutor responsible for coordinating this aspect of the programme. In recent years ‘diversity and Inclusion’ have been elements of both standards for teachers and inspection of ITT provision, the coordinator would have been responsible for developing coherence across the programme. This is currently not an aspect of national priorities and will not be a focus for the inspection of programmes. As Bhopal & Rhamie (2013) point out this will negate the importance and value attributed to diversity and social justice as colleagues focus on government priorities of phonics and behaviour
management. Wilkins (2013: 2) argues that ‘the focus on ‘standards’ and ‘accountability’ [...] can be seen to marginalise issues of equality and social justice’ as Silverman suggested (2010) trainers will only engage in action if externally mandated. The changes in both the ITT inspection framework and Teachers’ Standards in 2012 removed accountability for ITT engagement with issues of social justice. This may remove the obligation from training programmes to educate their trainees in this field and I argue that this gives urgency to the need for guidance to enable all ITT providers to engage with the shaping of teachers who understand social responsibility.

All recommendations and government policy drives to increase the diversity of our teaching workforce have failed to have any significant impact on equality through education, and so raising the awareness of trainees recruited to our programmes is imperative if we are to counter school based disadvantage. There is currently no comprehensive picture of how English ITT programmes are preparing trainees to be social responsible teachers. This will be important to support programme leaders in identifying effective pedagogies and resources (Gorski, 2010). In outlining some of the current research in this area I have drawn together conclusions which are also demonstrated through this investigation. In summary to the concluding discussion I outline how my research contributes implications and recommendations for ITT programmes.

Recruitment

Key researchers recommend that we only recruit trainees who bring ‘experiences, knowledge and dispositions that will enable them to teach well in culturally diverse schools’ (Irvine, 2008). However, given the government requirement for candidates with high level degree qualifications and the statistical evidence that these students will be predominantly White and middle class we don't have the luxury of selecting only candidates with direct experience of disadvantage. My investigation does however demonstrate that we can identify candidates with the prior awareness and the disposition to be able to act upon instruction regarding disadvantage and discrimination. Being
able to predict candidates who can be shaped as socially responsible teachers is a significant contribution of this study.

Two important findings in the pre-course data were the capacity to reflect beyond the ‘self’ and an awareness of the damage done by stereotyping. All the participants who later demonstrated the potential to develop socially responsible practices in their teaching were coded as *elaborating or contemplating* through the pre-course questionnaire and all provided responses which evidenced an acknowledgement of the damage caused by stereotyped assumptions. Three other participants who demonstrated these characteristics in the pre-course data did not complete with a sense of advocacy in the teaching reflections. These participants had projected themselves into a particular role but could not reconcile this ‘ideal self’ and the ‘ought to’ self (Lamb, 2004) required by professional progress. This requires further inquiry within the scope of a new investigation; of the fifteen participants in this study these three demonstrated the disposition and knowledge but were unable to act upon it. For two of them their social justice motivation was based on sympathy rather than empathy with, or a sense of responsibility for, the lived experience of discrimination.

ITT providers are required to meet government recruitment targets which results in the recruitment of trainees who do not demonstrate a disposition for social responsibility. This cannot be avoided so I suggest that identifying trainees with no awareness of social justice issues before the programme begins and then providing them with more rigorous guidance and support is essential. I am not recommending streaming or teaching separately as I am aware of the implications of this as a pedagogical approach. I recommend that personal or professional tutors guiding the trainee’s progress pay particular regard to social justice through action plans, learning tasks and reflections and use these to direct the professional tutorials. This will work particularly well for the group identified as ‘evangelists’ who could not align their strong sense of social justice with the need to develop skills as a teacher. Rodgers & Scott (2008) recommend that ITT programmes pay regard to trainees who enter teaching practice displaying a mismatch between their values and the context in which they find themselves. Careful monitoring of these trainees may support a more
successful conclusion to their training. This will also create coherence for these trainees.

There will be pressing priorities for programme leaders driven by government agendas as well as individual trainers’ philosophies to take into account when preparing programmes. Programme leaders are encouraged to recruit trainees with high degree classifications to their programmes due to the persistent drive to ‘raise the academic calibre of teachers’ in England (House of Commons report, 2010). In contrast to this focus on qualifications Irvine (2008) argues that ‘we have to find ways of attracting or identifying trainees who are [...] reflective and complex thinkers’ (ibid: 676) as further identified through this study.

Screening application forms and interview techniques for these qualities was not addressed in this study although I recognise that some of the qualities recommended by Irvine are reflected in the interview schedule for the programme. As a result of this investigation the screening and selection process was redesigned to identify social responsibility potential. However, the pre-course questionnaire was effective in identifying candidates with a sense of social responsibility and as such I consider this to be a key aspect of future recruitment procedures.

The recruitment team’s perception of the application and interview responses are known to be heavily biased by assumptions of the type of knowledge and experience a candidate should bring (John & McCrum, 2012). The power base, body language cues, expectations of performance and articulation will all be part of the middle class candidates’ preparation while ‘Other’ candidates may misread cues in the conversational conventions or not understand the most appropriate way to present ‘cultural capital’. BME candidates, according to John & McCrum (2012), are often perceived to have less articulate levels of fluency than their White British counterparts. This has implications for how their knowledge and dispositions might be demonstrated at interview.

I suggest that screening criteria for application forms pay particular regard to the capacity for critical reflection rather than the presentation of cultural capital. At interview there should be a schedule of the kinds of responses which identify
those candidates who are unconscious of or deny their own privilege and use negative language when referring to disadvantage. Implementing this at the interview stage will also alert all those involved in the recruitment process to the importance of social responsibility to the programme as a whole. I have found no recommendations for this in literature but have provided a sample of the one created after this project in the appendices (see appendix 6).

I would further recommend that the pre-course questionnaire employed for this investigation be used as a pre-interview task to be discussed at interview. This is not in an attempt to prevent unconscious trainees from taking up a place on the programme but, as I have already suggested, to provide a way of identifying groups of trainees who need support and guidance in focusing their role and responsibility as a developing teacher. (See appx 1).

**Instruction**

Findings regarding the impact of instructional pedagogies clearly demonstrate that for those participants with a capacity to reflect at all three levels, the approaches were effective in developing socially responsible practice. The ‘instrumental’ and ‘evangelist’ participants responded at a high level to both the collective discussion events and to the series of culturally diverse experiences. They were able to draw on their sense of advocacy through their reflections to demonstrate that the information and instruction was having an impact on their developing awareness of discrimination and disadvantage. The participants acknowledged that the expertise of the informant was essential to the way they received the information and how they made decisions about what to do in response. Who provided information had an impact on the way the information was accepted. Turner’s (1991) ‘informational influence’ gives credence to this finding that the use of an expert affects the way the information is received and processed.

In terms of the topics addressed, pedagogical approaches used and expertise employed, I consider that the programme strand provided an effective basis for developing trainee understanding; the chosen pedagogies are supported in this finding by other research. I do not suggest that my strand offers a set of
signature events which can be transferred to other ITT programmes although I found, in concurrence with other research, that the pedagogies employed were highly effective for reflective participants. Social justice needs to be integral to the philosophy of the programme rather than separated into distinct issues taught by particular trainers. I conclude that for assimilation and integration of knowledge and information to take place from each event, the content offered and the instructional pedagogy are reliant on the knowledge and confidence of the trainer. This has implications for the whole training team.

Key findings by Sleeter (2008), Irvine (2008) Villegas & Davis (2008), Smith & Lander (2012) and Smith (2013) all agree that teachers should critically review the privilege and inequalities of their own and their pupils' lives. This strand of the programme studied made several attempts to engage the trainees in this discourse over the 36-week programme through a range of events and pedagogies. In an attempt to challenge through creating dissonance, the trainees were taught by those who recognise and understand discrimination in society through a series of ‘diverse cultural experiences’. These lived experiences supported trainees in ‘contextualising problems within a socio-political rather than cultural deficiency analysis' (Sleeter, 2008: 563). The reflections on these experiences provided the most relevant data in terms of instructional pedagogies. The participants attributed to each type responded in the same way, the ‘unconscious’ type with a focus on ‘self’, the ‘instrumentals’ with empathy and a sense of responsibility and the ‘evangelists’ with sympathy and a sense of advocacy but not agency. This, then, needs carefully planned guidance and well-structured discussions to support those trainees who have difficulty reflecting beyond how the events made them feel. Support for the ‘unconscious’ trainees in developing criticality in their reflections with an emphasis on focusing on the learning of all pupils is essential.

Further reading pertinent to the session and specific tasks for school practice would help but I further recommend that written guidance is provided to establish the importance of social responsibility in the classroom. Offering lectures and seminars without explicit aims and content messages encourages the trainee to assimilate within their current understanding rather than challenge
their thinking. Unfortunately this is not currently an aspect of this programme; I would strongly recommend that once 'unconscious' trainees have been identified they have much clearer guidance and constructive support to assimilate the information and reflect on the pupils they will teach. As recommended earlier the personal or professional tutor would be in the best position to provide this individualised support. For social justice to occur in classrooms it is essential that trainees consider the impact of their teaching on their pupils. Identifying self-efficacy-focused trainees early in the process affords the opportunity to create effective personalised support for critical reflection advised by Hughes (2009: 75). She goes on to say that the process of ‘becoming self-reflective takes practice, encouragement and time’.

As well as identifying the groups for further guidance and support, I suggest that there is a need to mix up groups of trainees so that they don’t sit in homogenous groups during instruction, reinforcing their own narrow beliefs and assumptions. Both the collective discussion and the culturally diverse experiences demonstrated a reproductive rather than transformative impact on the ‘unconscious’ participants’ beliefs and attitudes due to a lack of coherent, sustained intervention. Lave (1993: 15) asserts that ‘learning is distributed among co-participants’ which leads to ‘positive feelings towards and solidarity with’ the group (Turner, 1991: 34), indicating a need to conform to the group consensus about a sensitive issue during discussion. Creating a safe environment conducive to critical dialogue which includes the voice and experience of non-privileged or ‘instrumental’ trainees is an essential consideration for the benefit of all.

Trainers should help trainees to make the shift from being consumers of educational knowledge to becoming inquirers into culturally bound knowledge and the nature of schooling. As Aronowitz & Giroux (1991) contend, developing critical theory skills through which trainees can frame teaching could enable them to see how inequalities are manipulated. Critical study of past and current education policies and the impact on practice and children’s lives alongside the study of theoretical interpretation of systems and processes will, I suggest, encourage trainees to think more deeply about widely circulating assumptions.
about the ‘Other’ in our societies. Setting the whole programme within a socio-political stance including culturally relevant pedagogies in subject specific sessions will, I suggest, support trainees in countering deficit models of pupils.

As the outcomes of education in the UK are driven by international comparison I suggest trainees need to know about TIMMs and PISA since the findings from these reports are now routinely shared on national news bulletins. The understanding of how these findings impact on curricula and pedagogic approaches to teaching are essential aspects to understanding educational ideology and structures. Trainees should be aware of how performative approaches adopted within schools fit into the wider performative structure. They are taught about how pupils are expected to make specified progress during each lesson and across an academic year but not how this performativity leads to social and cognitive labelling. For social justice to take place in their classrooms they need to see how labels are used to justify the performance of some pupils. Trainees must never be allowed to blame the pupil for a lack of progress rather than developing expertise in pedagogies which might remove barriers to learning. Understanding the wider context of this competition may encourage some trainees to focus on their own role and responsibility more effectively.

A coherent approach to countering deficit models of pupils and their learning is essential preparation for teaching practice in all subject areas. Zeichner & Conklin (2008) argue that the underlying philosophies of education held by the programme leaders is a pertinent characteristic of how teacher knowledge and skills are shaped. The challenge for programme leaders is to review the extent to which socially responsible teaching pedagogies needed for diverse primary classrooms are modelled in the teacher training programme. These pedagogies need to be assimilated as an integral philosophy of the programme; we must do all we can to ensure the removal of mixed messages regarding effective teaching skills. I suggest that a focus on developing trainees’ competence in how to teach rather than what to teach would be an effective way for all trainees to become socially responsible. Training them to use a wide range of pedagogies with a focus on observing how individual pupils receive the learning
will support the trainees in countering the fatalistic attitude brought by deficit labels.

Trainees need to be open to change and aware of conflicting professional dispositions within the community of practice. The transfer from theory presented during university instruction to practice in schools needs to be guided and followed up by well-informed tutors. Zeichner & Conklin (2008) draw attention to university instruction linked within the context of the school. Where the trainees’ action plans are followed up by progress tutors during the teaching practice and at the reflective discussion at the end of the experience, this will support trainees’ capacity to integrate the university instruction. As a recommendation I argue that this also needs to be discussed with the school based mentor during the practice. The school based training needs to correspond with this coherence of social justice awareness. Shared values must be held by the training partners in schools and in universities in an endeavour to support the shaping of socially responsible teachers. Programme leaders should therefore create essential learning tasks which combine university based learning and teaching practice. Personal action plans, audits and observations, from reviewing bias in the book corner to analysing gender biased questioning would enhance the trainees’ awareness of how different pupils respond to the classroom context. Trainees’ technical classroom performance is judged by trainers from both university and school; this is driven by the Standards in place at any given time. However, I argue judgement criteria should give greater priority to the responsibility the trainee accepts for progress made by all pupils. This can be provided by all training institutions in the terms of the ‘Partnership agreement’.

The lack of coherence across this programme meant that some messages were more clearly identified by participants. Subject specific instruction was identified as making reference to specific categories of pupils who might require alternative strategies or differentiated tasks. In their reflections the participants demonstrated an awareness that, for some categories of children, strategies must be employed to ensure the removal of barriers to learning. However, the ‘unconscious’ participants demonstrated no awareness that the teacher can
create a barrier to learning for some groups of children in their class. They showed no awareness that they might positively or negatively impact on the attainment of pupils through the perpetuation of assumptions and did not reflect on their attitude towards the behaviour of some categories of pupils. In relation to equality, this lack of coherence from university instruction on social justice in subject specific areas leads to, at worst unexamined assumptions being played out in classrooms, and at best, the use of labelled identities EAL and SEN as being the most used reference to disadvantage in teaching experience reflections.

To create a socially responsible teaching workforce we need to engage the trainees and trainers in challenging assumptions about social and cultural difference. I suggest that programme leaders develop a culture of addressing issues of social justice across the whole programme. In this way I suggest we can begin to break down the stereotyped disadvantage perpetuating in classrooms. Separating pupils into forms of disadvantage and discrimination hinders the progress of socially just teaching practice; my participants mostly identified only those pupils for whom specific reference was made. I do not advocate a blindness approach; rather I suggest that all disadvantaged groups are referenced as a matter of general discourse. I argue that treating all pupils equally regardless of visible or invisible identity salience should not be consigned to political rhetoric. Trainees need to understand the structural inequalities which are perpetuated and assume responsibility for removing barriers to learning whilst holding high expectations of all pupils. I consider that being an effective teacher equates with being a socially responsible one; a teacher who regards themselves as responsible for all the learners in their classroom rather than focussing solely on their own experience. Developing the technical skills only provides the basis upon which a trainee behaves as a teacher. Shaping teachers who can provide equitable learning environments must be a priority for all our training programmes across all subject areas.

Through analysing the findings from my investigation I discovered that the issues arising cannot be attributed to one or other of my research questions alone- they are inextricably linked. Both the dispositions brought to the training
programme and the instructions employed are important elements of the shaping of socially responsible teachers. Specifically the study responds to recent calls for ITE programmes to examine how trainees are being taught awareness of social justice. The focus on pedagogical approaches provides insight for other providers seeking to understand their programmes and the focus on trainee reflections supports an understanding of how theory is integrated into practice. The study draws together a wide range of work in both the field of social justice and the field of research into the training of teachers; the findings contribute to both disciplines.

In extending this agenda one finding urges ITT providers to identify candidates with social justice awareness during the recruitment process. My work argues that rather than considering the qualification of a trainee or the cultural and social capital that they have been taught to display recruitment should elicit a capacity to reflect beyond the personal and an ability to show a sense of advocacy in the responses. Candidates should demonstrate contemplation or elaboration alongside a sense of responsibility for ‘the other’. At interview there could be a schedule of the kinds of responses which identify those candidates who are unconscious of or deny their own privilege and use negative language when referring to disadvantage. The pre-course questionnaire used here could be adapted for a pre-interview task to predict candidates motivated by social responsibility.

Through the analysis of the instructional pedagogies employed on this programme I present clear findings about the high level of integration from the culturally diverse experiences demonstrated by those trainees who were able to integrate theory into practice. Programmes employ a series of events through which the trainees are confronted with the lived experience of discrimination for ‘the other’ as an essential component of a socially just training programme. The findings highlight the necessity to develop coherent programmes that emphasise the development of a sense of responsibility towards pupils during teaching practice. A clear focus on pupils’ learning needs rather than differentiation for labelled groups is essential to counter deficit models of pupils.
My primary aim was to investigate my own ITT programme in order to better understand how it was affecting the social justice awareness of the trainees. Along the way, some important patterns and findings have been discovered. Ensuring the next generation of teachers is properly equipped to break down institutionalised disadvantage and ensure equality through education continues to perplex educators. I suggest that the results of this study have many lessons for those involved in the design of UK PGCE programmes.

To end the perpetuation of stereotypes used in our classrooms research shows the importance of disrupting trainees’ deficit assumptions of stereotypes. This study takes this further and draws upon other studies which advocate that we need to help trainees to reflect on their responsibility for the learner as well as the leaning. I found that those trainees who can act with a sense of advocacy in the teaching practice arrived at the training process with an awareness of the damage done by stereotyping and discrimination and were able to reflect at deep levels; beyond themselves.

Sleeter, Irvine, Nieto, Ladson-Billings all foreground how white trainees teachers arrive unaware of issues of racism and privilege, Street and Silverman contend that beliefs and attitudes about schools and teaching determine their capacity to take responsibility for learning and Feiman-Nemser, Shkedi & Laron and others suggest that there is a process of transition to a primary focus on the learner; my works demonstrates evidence of these findings for some trainees but also shows this is not true for all trainees in this context. The role of reflection advocated on most ITT programmes in the UK provided the study with evidence of the trainees’ sense of advocacy both for their learning and for their teaching practice. These narratives identified that the trainees focus on advocacy in teaching practice and a capacity to reflect beyond themselves characterises a capacity to become socially responsible.

In the words of Eglantyne Jebb ‘For Better or worse the whole world can be revolutionised in one generation according to how we treat the children’ (1923).
8 APPENDICES

To provide greater clarity and rigor to the thesis I have included examples of any forms given to the trainees during the course of this investigation.
8.1 Pre Course Questionnaire

Name……………………………………..

In an attempt to match our teaching to the needs of the cohort of students for next year’s PGCE course we ask you to complete this questionnaire and return by 4th September. Please answer all parts of each question.

Please give any examples of children’s media (books, t.v., films) portraying discrimination of any kind saying in what way it was discriminatory and whether you think it matters.

In what ways do you think children benefit when they are provided with resources that reflect a wide range of families and communities?

In what ways do you think adults who work with children are in a position to influence their attitudes to others?

What do you think is the difference between an equal opportunities approach to education and an anti-discriminatory one?

How do you think primary aged children display awareness of difference?

Can you explain which you think it is more important to treat all children the same or treat children equally?
8.2 Professional Autobiography

Pajares (1992:328) tells us that “narrative and biography can be used to understand how early experiences paint the portrait of a teacher that students bring with them to teacher education”. Similarly, the use of biography by Street (2003) confirmed that trainee teachers do not arrive at university void of prior experience which will form part of the developing understanding of factors which impact on learning. The aim of this autobiography is to find out why you embarked on this journey. Updating this throughout the year will allow you to consider your emerging philosophy of education giving consideration to your beliefs and assumptions about children and learners in classrooms.

Your professional autobiography should be no more than one side of A4 describing your experience working with children and young people. You should also think about giving the reader a flavour of yourself as a professional and a person so let your personality shine through.
8.3 Reflective scaffold for professional development

Scaffold writing of a weekly reflection by using critical incident from pre-placement;

Complete first **professional reflection**;

- I saw really good teaching when…
- I thought it was good because……
- The best learning experience I have seen was….  
- I am most worried about…………
- I would really like to learn how to…………
- I would really like to try to…………….  

Examples:

The teacher asked the children to line up using a different idea each day, she might use initials or laces and buckles, colours of jumpers, name rhymes with….I think she did this to help the children remember their learning in a real context.

The teacher always told the children what the lesson would help them to learn and then said what she expected the children to do. This help them all to know what they were supposed to be doing and why.

I am most worried about behaviour in class because the children might not want to do as I ask. I saw some good ideas when I was observing but everyone does it so differently.

I would really like to learn how to stop my voice from being high pitched when I raise my voice.

I would really like to try the investigations I saw my teacher doing, the children loved them and worked hard at getting them finished.

I saw some year fours doing maths outside with a parachute, it was hysterical. One child who didn’t remember his times tables inside was so desperate to have a go he realised he could remember a few. It was amazing.

**Think about how you might appraise the pupils’ learning in relation to the teaching.**
8.4 Guided reflection for second teaching practice

**Achievement, Diversity, Health and Well Being**

Read through your reflections from this teaching experience and consider any events or incidents which have directly influenced your developing understanding about barriers to children's learning and attainment. Please reflect on how your own life experiences have equipped you to teach the diversity of learners in your class.

Please use the 'scope of evidence' in Area 2(d) from your portfolio if you need further prompts.
8.5 Guided reflection for final teaching practice

Achievement and Diversity

What aspects of your life experience equipped you to teach the different children in your class?

Which of the taught university sessions had an impact on your developing attitudes and beliefs about teaching children from diverse backgrounds and how?

How have your beliefs about culture and diversity shaped the development of your teaching strategies for inclusion? Can you include any specific examples from your practice please?
## 8.6 Interview criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Outstanding A</th>
<th>Good B</th>
<th>Satisfactory C</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to make explanations clear and engaging to the listener</td>
<td>Confidence conveyed through voice and body language, interactions with group; imaginative and engaging approach</td>
<td>Responses inspire and communicate their enthusiasm. They have an intrinsic passion for learning, being charismatic, drawing the audience into the topic being discussed, showing innovative and creative thinking – lateral thinker</td>
<td>Expressive and clear use of voice and good use of eye contact and body language. Voice clear and well projected. Friendly Demonstrates a sense of audience Listens well and processes discussion accurately</td>
<td>Responses involve description of experiences but limited analysis. Communication skills; use of voice, body language, etc. are sometimes weak Makes a good attempt to ask questions albeit uninteresting ones</td>
<td>Does not engage with others, despite encouragement. Poor communication skills; use of voice, body language, etc No capacity to build on others’ ideas demonstrated. Struggles to ask any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research; understanding of topic</td>
<td>Analysis and reflective responses and ability to extrapolate from personal experiences to answer question and to present ideas clearly with no need for prompting</td>
<td>During group discussion responds with clarity, competence and confidence. Clearly researched topic to provide a personal insight to their understanding in a primary classroom</td>
<td>Leads discussion with adequate confidence if unoriginal Topic drawn from first degree with an attempt to demonstrate how that has been observed in practice.</td>
<td>During group discussion unresponsive and lacks clarity and confidence. Topic demonstrates assimilation of assumed knowledge not research Limited understanding demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of spoken and written standard English; structuring of ideas</td>
<td>Demonstrates creativity of thought by making connections between topics. Thoughts structured imaginatively. Ideas clearly articulated using standard English. Fluent argument</td>
<td>Consistent use of standard English in sentence construction, articulation and clarity of expression. Able to structure ideas fluently so that listeners can engage.</td>
<td>Inconsistent use of spoken Standard English, some confusing expression, ideas not well articulated. Hesitant in responses but ideas structured quite well</td>
<td>Poor communication and/or poor spoken Standard English Structure of ideas disjointed and distracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to make sense of and internalise their learning</td>
<td>Awareness of the social and cultural importance of education and current educational issues</td>
<td>Contemplative - focusing on constructive personal insights or on problems or difficulties, such as focusing on education issues, training methods, future goals, attitudes, ethical matters, or moral concerns.</td>
<td>Considered – comparisons of experiences, such as referring to a general principle, a theory, or a moral or philosophical position Can draw on a range of both positive aspects and barriers which may affect children’s learning, engaging with current educational debates Superficially drawing on a limited range of barriers which may affect children’s learning, restricted to language, SEN or ethnicity Able to talk about current educational debates circulating either within schools or the media.</td>
<td>Generally responds within a blame reference that parents are the children’s main barrier. Limited knowledge of current educational debates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on personal experience</td>
<td>Has the ability to reflect critically and rigorously—they are able to learn from their mistakes, take full responsibility for their own learning Full of initiative of enthusiasm</td>
<td>Know how to learn from both success and ‘failure’, clearly understand their own role as a learner and can ensure they achieve their own learning goals, systematically evaluate their own practice. Hard working Reacting - commenting on feelings towards the learning experience, such as reacting with a personal concern about an event; unimaginative</td>
<td>Reckless response to questions about personal experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to teach in a primary classroom</td>
<td>Knowledge of, and potential to relate to primary age children</td>
<td>Demonstrates a clear orientation towards teaching carrying a sense of responsibility Positive and creative ideas about strategies for effective teaching and learning. Considered knowledge of factors affecting or inhibiting learning.</td>
<td>Acknowledges the children are the most important people in the classroom. Capacity to reflect on own experiences in a primary classroom, skills to structure thoughts and answer related questions. Able to present themselves and their ideas appropriately with little need for prompting</td>
<td>Clear focus on personal efficacy wants to learn how to do everything right. Able to make links between personal experience and the role of a primary teacher with support. Able to develop ideas with prompts</td>
<td>Little consideration of relationship between own experiences and primary teaching. Unable to develop ideas even with prompting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of what the PGCE course and primary teaching involves</td>
<td>Indicates considerable enthusiasm and energy demonstrating a realistic understanding of the workload and responsibilities of PGCE course and of teaching</td>
<td>Indication of a clear commitment to teaching with plenty of experience to inform their awareness of the demands of primary teaching and the pressures of the course</td>
<td>Some experience to draw upon with an indication that they have an awareness of the demands although this may not be accurately articulated</td>
<td>Limited experience and unrealistic demands of the pressures and expectations of the role of a teacher or the PGCE course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.7 Consent Form

I am looking for Primary school trainee teachers who would be willing to take part in a piece of small-scale research, as outlined below. The results of this study will be published as a PhD thesis. All responses will be anonymous and confidential; they will in no way affect your training and development during the PGCE course.

Research Aims:

Research questions the capacity of trainee teachers to understand issues associated with race, diversity and inclusion (Ambe 2006, Santoro and Allard 2005). It is widely understood (Milner 1983, Aboud 1998) that the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure the more difficult it is to alter. If we are to take this issue seriously then investigating how and when culturally biased assumptions and beliefs are developed and entrenched is imperative as a way forward for Initial Teacher Training programmes to develop effective methods of awareness-raising for trainee teachers.

As a result this project sets out to consider the relevance of previous studies to the current trainee population. The research project aims:

a) to determine trainee primary teachers’ perceptions and assumptions of cultural groups other than their own to analyse the extent to which school culture, the curriculum or media discourse has had an impact on the stereotypical attitudes and beliefs about diverse cultural groups;

b) to discover trainee teachers’ awareness of the stereotypical attitudes and beliefs they hold and;

c) to consider whether they perpetuate these in their conscious or unconscious dealings with others.

Study Design:

This is a small-scale qualitative case study, involving participants from University of L. School of Education.

A narrative journal of the trainees’ reflection on training experiences will be employed to enable the investigation to uncover significant influences of the programme over time. Alongside this approach the researcher will incorporate responses to visual experience, as visual images reside in long term memory and play a key role in the process of creating and recreating knowledge. So drawing on important episodes and images both in the narrative biography and the visual analysis could help to explain how we develop belief structures as children. It is proposed that a small sample of participants will be selected to further explore beliefs and assumptions through semi-structured interviews.

Ethical Considerations:

The study was approved by the School of Education Ethics Officer in July 2010. Although the topic is potentially sensitive, you will be able to reveal as little or as much of your own experience as you wish. You will have the right to withdraw at any stage and your data will be securely destroyed.

I am expecting to publish a PhD thesis as a result of this research. I will not name any of the people who take part in the study, nor the institutions to which they belong.

If you are interested in taking part, please let me know. And if you need more information before making your decision, please do not hesitate to email me.

Consent for ‘identifying influences on the formation of cultural assumptions and beliefs of trainee teachers’

I agree to the information I provide during this research project to be analysed and recorded anonymously for the purpose of

I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and all data collected from me will be destroyed.

Signed…………………………………………………             Date……………………….
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