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Abstract

This study examines the racialised narratives of White tutors in initial teacher education (ITE) with specific reference to how well initial teacher education (ITE) prepares student teachers to teach in an ethnically diverse society. It draws on critical race theory as a framework to identify how the discourse of whiteness is embedded in the experience, knowledge and hegemonic understandings of these tutors and how it affects their approach to the topic of race equality and teaching in a multicultural society. The research was conducted in a predominantly White institution where the majority of student teachers and tutors reflect the national teacher demographics within the context of an increasingly diverse pupil population and the continued underachievement of pupils from certain minority ethnic groups.

The study involved interviews with White ITE tutors within one institution. The resulting narratives were juxtaposed with the narrative of a minority ethnic tutor to examine the embedded and embodied effects of the dominant discourse of whiteness. The tutors’ narratives reveal how whiteness is embodied and performed within the context of ITE to maintain whiteness whilst simultaneously engaging with the rhetoric of race equality and compliance with statutory duties and requirements. The study shows how the tools of whiteness (Picower 2009) are used to maintain and promote the misrecognised discourse of whiteness resulting in the symbolic violence evident in the persistence of endemic racism within the academy.

The disruption of such a discourse has implications for ITE policy, practice and recruitment. There are particular implications for the school-based aspects of initial teacher education programmes and the continued professional development of ITE tutors and mentors.
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Professional Statement

The EdD Programme at the Institute of Education has enabled me to find my professional voice within the area of race equality and initial teacher education. This area receives cursory attention in the preparation of teachers and it is one which requires further research and analysis. As the only minority ethnic member of staff in ITE within a predominantly White university it has been difficult to promote and progress the need to prepare student teachers to teach in a multicultural society. My voice has often been muted or ignored in the drive to deliver the curriculum. The EdD programme has provided me with the structured opportunities to develop my professional and theoretical knowledge and understanding about race equality, the politics of race, and to examine what I have long perceived as the rhetoric-reality gap between the legal obligations to promote race equality and the shortfalls evident in ITE practice, both within the higher education institution and within the school-based training elements. Throughout the EdD I have focussed on this one area in order to firstly problematise the area of race equality and ITE; then to begin to search for a theoretical stance in order to understand the multidimensional and political nature of race equality within the preparation of pre-service teachers.

In my work as Deputy Director of a TDA funded Professional Resource Network on achievement and diversity, called Multiverse, I have been involved in the preparation of materials to assist teacher educators and student teachers to advance their understanding of race equality and to develop their practice within the ITE classroom or the school room respectively. As I have travelled the country disseminating the work of Multiverse the persistence of good intentions coupled with colour blindness and in some cases a reluctance to move forward, or just a polite reception, has fuelled my thinking about how well England prepares its teachers to teach in a multiethnic society. The complacency of apparent acceptance of race equality and the prevalent attitudes of ‘why are you telling us this?’, or ‘we know’, so indicating the apparent futility of the need to be told about race left me wondering how the persistent inequality of outcomes for some minority ethnic pupils could be reconciled with perhaps intentions which appear to be good at best, or complacent at worse.
The Foundations of Professionalism module helped me to examine the professional context of race equality in ITE. My module tutor noted that this was a little researched area and that it was good to problematise a professional situation such as this. I examined race equality as a professional duty and as part of the Professional Code of Conduct for Teachers. The reading and research for the module illustrated how the professionalism of teachers in the English context had been eroded over the years. It was Professor Gillborn’s lecture on this module that served to propel me to read more about the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000; the need to promote the Duty under the Act and to begin to examine Critical Race Theory (CRT). Indeed it is this module which gave me the professional raison d'être to examine race equality and ITE. The assignment provided a launch pad for the further examination of race equality within ITE because as professionals student teachers not only had a duty to promote race equality but in terms of their professional values they needed to understand this area in order to do more than pay lip service to it.

Throughout the EdD I have examined the topic of race equality in ITE through all subsequent modules. The work on the Foundations of Professionalism led to linking critical race theory to a research proposal for Methods of Inquiry 1, to examine the perceptions of ITE tutors with regards to an ITE module on Diversity and Inclusion taught on the undergraduate programme within the university. The proposal was then implemented as part of the work on Methods of Inquiry 2. The first methods module really developed my understanding of my own epistemological stance with respect to research related to race equality. The work of Crotty (2005) showed how my study about race was not only premised on a constructionist epistemology but how it was linked to the work of the critical theorists associated with the Frankfurt School, who examined the notions of dominance and hierarchy. I devoured Crotty’s text because it represented a breakthrough in my own understanding of how research can be used for the purpose of emancipation. For here lay the roots of not just critical theory but how it extended to critical race theory. My excitement about research paradigms was palpable as I recommended Crotty’s text to my EdD colleagues who were still in search of their theoretical framework.

The synergy between my epistemological and theoretical stance was beginning to develop my understanding of the professional problem I had highlighted in the first module. The Specialist Course module on Contemporary Education Policy helped
me to develop a depth of understanding about race relations history in England and race equality policy. In this module I examined the Race Relations Amendment Act through Bowe et al's (1992) and Ball's (1994) 'Policy Cycle'. This particular analytical framework helped to identify the context of influence and the history of race relations in Britain; the context of text production and practice helped me to reveal why the Act has never been a law with teeth so to speak. The context of influence related to the murder of Stephen Lawrence and the struggle to get justice was expunged by the need to revert to a manageable rhetoric of equality which signalled good intentions which underpinned the context of text production and the context of practice. This module was instrumental in supporting my understanding of how such a law failed to affect the everyday practices of institutions beyond the need to for compliance. It could be said that the 'scales were lifted from my eyes'.

The Methods of Inquiry 2 (MOE 2) module where I undertook five interviews with my ITE colleagues regarding the diversity module that they taught paved the way for the work undertaken on the Institution focussed study (IFS) and this thesis. The process of interviewing my colleagues was initially quite stressful because as a novice researcher I had not developed my own interview techniques or research persona. This first incursion into the real research domain was as illuminating as it was uncomfortable. It is in this small scale research I discovered how awkward and uncomfortable some colleagues were with respect to talking about race even though they taught on a module which examined notions of inclusion, diversity and equality. It is in this research that tutors alluded to the nature of the student intake and how it was difficult to effect change when the students themselves have limited experience and understanding about different ethnic groups. Here in the context of ITE practice emerged the equality rhetoric and the institutional excuses. I was left wondering 'Is it the students or is it the tutors?' It is the MOE 2 study that led to the IFS and this in turn to the thesis.

The IFS was very enjoyable both personally and professionally. The study examined the perceptions of student teachers in relation to how well their initial teacher education prepared them to teach in an ethnically diverse society. I interviewed ten secondary postgraduate student teachers within my own institution. The interviews revealed their dissatisfaction regarding their understanding of race equality and preparation to teach in diverse school settings as well as largely White schools. The
students' perceptions ranged from wanting an inventory of different cultural beliefs and attitudes; to race as a scary subject in schools which the ITE programme did not prepare them for very well; to students whose previous personal and professional experience helped them to recognise and analyse school situations which perpetuated racist stereotypes and self-fulfilling prophecies with respect to Black\(^1\) youngsters in predominantly White schools; to those who had a very strong understanding of race equality and were dismissive of the University’s token sessions on the subject and they were appalled by the racism of their colleagues. The results of this study were disseminated to the secondary team of tutors and school based mentors. I used pen portraits of the student typologies to present the different standpoints of the student teachers for the mentors to analyse and discuss with a view to identifying how they may support the composite students with further professional development with respect to race equality. These constructions were a useful way to examine the differing perspectives teachers themselves may hold without generating the attendant hostility that often accompanies the examination of individual attitudes about race and ethnicity. The session was very well received by all who appreciated the nature of the study based as it was on empirical evidence from within the institution. The IFS was for me an exhilarating piece of work. I felt as if I was becoming clearer about the dynamics of student-tutor-university and school relationship within ITE with respect to race equality. I felt more confident in my professional role and as a researcher. The study revealed how racism was endemic in schools regardless of their locality and perhaps more evident in areas of low ethnic diversity. As one of my PGCE respondents termed it, there seemed to be a ‘nostalgic racism’ in schools and staff rooms. He meant that in the locality most White people including teachers and non-teaching staff were not well versed about what is acceptable and what is not in terms of language and attitudes. The lack of professional support within schools highlighted the shortfall within the context of practice not just in schools but within the University. This research was disseminated at the Institute’s Doctoral Conference in June 2008 and at the British Educational Research Association (BERA) Conference in September 2008. I have also had a paper based on this research accepted for publication in the journal *Race Ethnicity and Education*.

\(^1\) This term is a political construction used to describe people from African, Caribbean, Asian and South Asian, as well as mixed heritage backgrounds. It is used to describe non-White people who are subject to racism (Back and Solomos 2009).
It would seem that the transition from the IFS to the thesis would be a natural progression. But the initial plan to examine the positions of ITE policy makers and tutors was focused on the examination of the narratives of ITE tutors. It was in my reading for the thesis proposal that I began to look more widely at Bourdieu’s work and the notion of symbolic violence leapt from the page. The term encapsulated my race encounters as a BME tutor within ITE. In my research diary I traced my professional journey through the EdD. I realised that in order to examine the topic of race equality and ITE further I had to look for the bridges and barriers within White ITE tutors’ narratives in order to identify why the Duty associated with the Race Relations Amendment Act had such a minimal impact on the training of teachers to work in an ethnically diverse society. What factors maintained the status quo? I knew that CRT and the presence of racism as a part of society was a key element. I was also aware of the criticisms of CRT and tried to read more widely to search for the reasons why such racism persists and how it may be enacted and embodied. As I read so my diagrammatic notes show how I started to chart CRT, habitus and symbolic violence and how they started to intersect each other. Throughout these notes the need to identify a BME voice, not just the White voice of the ITE tutors, emerged as a strong element, underpinned by CRT that needed to be heard. On one page of my notes are the words ‘voice’, ‘voice’, ‘voice’. The EdD has not only developed my theoretical knowledge and understanding of CRT, race relations, research methods, race policy and practice it has helped me to develop a strong professional voice with which I hope to effect change with respect to race equality within ITE in my own institution and beyond.
Chapter 1  Introduction and rationale

This thesis aims to examine how the operation of whiteness as a dominant discourse is embedded within the work of ITE through the narratives of White tutors and how some narratives result in the embodiment of symbolic violence\(^2\) within the minoritised experience of ITE. In addition there is very little published work in this area in England. It is not just this belief that has propelled this thesis, nor indeed the need to establish an empirical basis for further discussions about ITE tutors’ positions with respect to race equality in ITE. It is the need to chart the minority experience within the majority story which serves to drive this work.

This thesis represents the personal and professional journey of discovery of a minority ethnic woman tutor within a predominantly White ITE institution. It is the very nature of my identity and experience as a British-Indian woman working within ITE that fuels the passion which has given rise to this work. This passion and this work is the result of a professional journey scarred by race encounters within ITE. These encounters which span the eighteen years in ITE have shaped and constrained my career. They have promoted success and innovation within course design and some encounters have been injurious. It is the latter that have provided opportunities to reflect on comments such as, ‘multicultural education is political indoctrination’, ‘you can overdo some things’, to the age old accusation that, ‘I have a chip on my shoulder’. My reflections on public rhetoric versus institutional and personal professional action have led to me asking many questions and finding some answers. This work encompasses some of the race encounters I have had and they form the counter story to the narratives of the White tutors. Maylor (2009:53) notes how experiences of Black and female researchers ‘often remain silent’ and she examines how these everyday experiences have affected her very being and how she negotiates her way through them. The opportunity to study at doctoral level has helped me to find a theoretical and methodological framework with which to legitimate my story and give voice to my experiences within the dominant discourse of whiteness.

It is also my lifelong passion for social justice and to educate future teachers in this area that spurs me on. They hold the lives and futures of the children they teach in

---

\(^2\) Webb et al (2002:25) note that symbolic violence is constituted through inferior treatment, denial of resources, limited social mobility and aspirations. But such violence is perceived as part and parcel of the natural order of society.
their hands; they need to be educated to work for fair and equitable outcomes for children who belong to minority groups, or those who live in marginalised communities whose worth is undervalued and underdeveloped due to hidden and not so hidden teacher assumptions and beliefs. It is these beliefs that remain unchallenged, unshaken and intact to replicate the patterns of inequality which still pervade the education system today. I cannot be a silent colluder in the perpetuation of such injustice, ‘It is the refusal to remain silent, in and of itself, that gives strength and empowerment in a society determined to cling to established habits of repression’ (Taylor 2009:12). On a pragmatic and professional level this work is about identifying ways to bridge the gaps and surmount the barriers that contribute to the replication of inequality within ITE in order to make some improvements to the preparation of future teachers and thereby make a very small contribution to the lives of the children they will teach.

In addition, I feel honour bound to reveal the inadequate nature of the ITE curriculum in relation to preparing teachers to work in a multicultural society; through this research I seek to find ways to challenge the ITE community. I am fully aware of the negative reactions it may engender but as a lifelong worker in the field of race equality and the pursuit of it throughout my professional career I know that this is not just an academic or professional endeavour but one which will consume my body, heart and soul. The pursuit of justice is never an easy journey and liberatory endeavours undertaken by those who are from minority groups are fraught with the potholes of majority denial and protestations in an attempt to recalibrate reality – the majority’s reality, not mine. This research may fall on the deaf ears of the mostly liberal White ITE tutors who will have cast themselves as ‘nice people’ who may well close ranks and deny the outcomes of this research, or criticise the methods. Such denial and criticism is predictable and to be expected. The denial and possible marginalisation is a bridge I will have to cross at some point, if I choose to do so.

This thesis also represents a journey that maps my professional progression from the institution focused study (IFS) which looked at postgraduate secondary student teachers’ perceptions of race equality in their initial teacher education to the examination of the embedded and persistent nature of whiteness in the academy as represented in university based initial teacher education. The IFS showed that in
terms of their knowledge, understanding and preparation to teach in a multicultural society, student teachers on a one year initial teacher education programme received minimum preparation in aspects of race equality, namely one lecture and one seminar. They voiced that this was not only inadequate preparation, but that it also failed to equip them to deal effectively with racist incidents in school, or to talk openly about issues of ethnic and linguistic diversity in the school environment. An environment which did not always welcome, nor provide opportunities to engage in professional dialogue with a knowledgeable other about issues of race, ethnicity and education, or to debate them openly within the staff team. So neither their university preparation nor their experience in school facilitated the development of their understanding with respect to race issues, pupils’ ethnicity, or dealing with racist incidents. The student teachers’ starting points related to their knowledge and understanding of race equality remained static and unchanged leaving some of them with their naïve constructions of ethnic difference premised largely on a deficit model; others feeling scared about race issues; some feeling guilty, and others frustrated that their initial teacher education failed to help them and their peers to make positive progress in this area.

The journey through the combined terrains of race equality and initial teacher education has been, at times, without a route map or guide. The intersection of these two fields, with respect to tutors’ perspectives is largely uncharted ground in terms of research within England. This has been part of the impetus which started the journey. As a British-Indian teacher educator working in a predominantly White university this has been a personal, academic and professional journey which has been one of discovery, excitement, disappointment and hope. One could consider that the IFS formed the first part of this journey and that the thesis forms the second part. The thesis examines the perceptions of ITE tutors in relation to race equality and preparing student teachers to teach in an ethnically diverse society. Along with teachers in schools, acting in their capacity as mentors for student teachers, the university-based tutors are key players in, and form the other part of the learning triad within ITE. This study focuses only on the ITE tutors, both primary and secondary within one higher education institution in England.

The study of this terrain (Cochran-Smith 2004, Marx 2006) has revealed how the discourse of whiteness is evident in the constraints proffered as limiting factors to
the extension of race equality teaching in ITE beyond the minimum that it is currently offered; how this discourse continues to maintain the status quo and fails to prepare intending teachers for teaching in a multicultural, multiracial and multi-religious society as represented in twenty-first century Britain. The discourse of whiteness reveals stories of resistance (Solomon et al 2005) which seem superficially plausible, but when tested against the adage ‘where there is a will there is a way’ and indeed the theoretical framework utilised in this study fall short in terms of addressing the needs of White student teachers to fully understand their role in not only teaching pupils from Black and minority ethnic backgrounds, or those who have English as an additional language, but to prepare all children, regardless of their ethnicity to live in a multicultural society.

The narratives of resistance show how tutors feel that the regulation of initial teacher education has limited the time to engage student teachers with the theoretical concepts and philosophies which underpin professional practice in the classroom resulting in pragmatic actions and solutions to deal with the needs of pupils. They note how students are taught to value the whole child, to treat them as an individual; how the issue is about humanity and being decent; how the locality of this particular university constrains the recruitment of Black and minority ethnic student teachers and in turn how the predominantly White schools that it works with limits students’ ability to put their understanding of race equality and linguistic diversity into action in a meaningful way to advance their professional knowledge and skills. The irony is that these stories of deprivation in terms of the lack of ethnic diversity within the University, the student and the school population, and how it constrains the student teachers’ ability to put theory into practice merely serve to expose how the situation has never been addressed in a meaningful way and in turn how this negligence reveals the operation, maintenance and perpetuation of whiteness in ITE.

This is an important study because there is very little work related to ITE tutors and race equality and preparation of student teachers in this country. This work is premised on the simple assumption that there must be a relationship between the tutors’ experience and orientation with respect to race and ethnicity which may implicitly, or explicitly, be evident in the curriculum they construct and present, and the way they work with student teachers. A curriculum embedded in a White perspective and one which does not provide the tools to analyse this perspective, or
to address the shortfalls that may lie within it, is not going to serve the purposes of preparing new teachers to teach in a multi-ethnic society. The thesis is shaped by three research questions:

1. How is institutional racism revealed in the narratives of the White tutors and BME tutor?
2. How is whiteness illustrated in the stories of ITE tutors?
3. What are the links between institutional racism and white privilege in ITE policy and practice?

**Key historical dimensions of race equality or multicultural education within Initial Teacher Education**

In a study looking at the narratives of ITE tutors with respect to race equality it is important to briefly examine the history of the topic across the last three decades. In doing so the intention is to illustrate the progress which has been made, or not. If the progress is limited then the results of this empirical study may help to illuminate possible reasons and serve to examine why this inertia persists.

Long before the inception of the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) teacher training in England and Wales was governed by the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) which was set up in 1984. (For details of current ITE provision see Appendix 1). Gaine (1995:116) acknowledges how the establishment of CATE signalled a ‘real change, with central control’ in ITE. The CATE criteria seemed to place greater emphasis on the development of teachers’ subject knowledge rather than their preparation to teach in a pluralist society. In this way the discipline of education studies, where students would have had time to study, ‘the social factors which influence children’s learning’ (Siraj-Blatchford 1993:27) and where they examined the history, philosophy and sociology of education diminished to make time for subject knowledge (Siraj-Blatchford 1993, Gaine 1995). Menter (1989) notes that the CATE criteria which set out the centralisation of teacher education course design promoted a technicist model of teaching and simultaneously removed the ‘education disciplines’ of sociology, philosophy and psychology (Menter 1989:460). He and others argue (Reid 1993, Gaine 1995) that these disciplines provided the foundations for understanding the
nature of learning, the learner and the function of schools in society thereby removing the theoretical framework which would enable, in this instance, the analysis of educational inequalities. Menter (1989:471) highlights the disadvantages of the technicist approach noting through research that issues of racism and sexism do not form part of the student-classteacher, or mentor professional dialogue and through the absence of discussions related to these two issues the student teachers fail to, ‘engage in practices which question or challenge educational inequalities’. It is through these changes in the course structure and the greater involvement of schools in the preparation and assessment of teachers that centralised control of ITE reduced the time to prepare student teachers to appreciate and understand the complexities of teaching in a multicultural society and meeting the needs of Black and minority ethnic pupils.

The courses which retained aspects of multiculturalism demonstrated limitations. Siraj-Blatchford (1993) notes that ‘multicultural courses’ were understood by students and tutors to involve the examination of the problems posed by different cultures rather than the exploration of racism in schools and the role of White majority professionals in it. In my experience this is still the case in ITE today. In institutions where discrete courses on multicultural education were not evident but permeated within other elements of the course Gaine (1995:126) rightly expressed the feeling of teacher educators of the time that, ‘things can become so well permeated that they disappear altogether’. The Anti-Racist Teacher Education Network or ARTEN (1987:5) noted that, ‘permeation and incorporation can be seen as institutional forms of resistance’. The Swann Report advised that all providers of ITE should aim to provide opportunities for students to gain teaching experience in a ‘multi-racial school’ (Swann Report 1985:565). Siraj-Blatchford (1993:31) notes a HMI inspection report 1986-87, focussed on ITE institutions’ response to Swann, which highlighted aspects of good practice including the writing and monitoring of multicultural policies and, ‘tutors with first-hand experience of teaching in multi-ethnic schools’. She asserts that, ‘the black perspective needs to be part and parcel of course structures’ (Siraj-Blatchford 1993:33). Six years later Blatchford and Blatchford (1999:141) stress that, ‘It is white identity and white ethnographic realities that we need to be studying and not those of Black and ethnic minority pupils’. They note this because rightly the evidence at the time (and today) showed
continued concerns with minority ethnic pupils' underachievement and exclusions which indicated that the underlying assumptions associated with the latter had not been overcome. They (ibid) asserted the need to change focus from, the deficit-premised assumptions and models related to minority ethnic underachievement, to the hegemony of whiteness indicating that this may be where the answer lay to education related to Black and minority pupils.

The recommendations of the Swann Report also advised that the trainers, namely tutors, in ITE, should, ‘become involved in a process of reappraisal, reorientation and even retraining themselves [there is] still a need for teacher trainers themselves to seek to develop a pluralist perspective in their work’ (Swann Report 1985:598). In response, the CATE criteria required ITE tutors to have recent and relevant experience of teaching in schools and many new staff who had experience of working in multi-ethnic schools were recruited. Siraj-Blatchford (1993) stresses that in response to a DES 1989 report on the recruitment of minority ethnic teachers that the role of the ITE tutor was crucial, noting that they need to be, ‘more conscious and proactive...in order to positively promote racial equality’ (Siraj-Blatchford 1993:26). Unfortunately this does appear to be the case seventeen years after these words were written.

Gaine (1995) notes how the introduction of the National Curriculum for schools in 1988 led to changes in the ITE curriculum with an even greater focus on the development of student teachers’ subject knowledge, especially within primary ITE. This had the effect of further squeezing out topics such as race equality due to the time taken up by subject knowledge development. There seemed to be a ‘token nod’ given to aspects of racial and ethnic diversity. Gaine (1995:125) notes that the implicit references to race, ‘potentially, at least, provide additional legitimation for the continued coverage of the issue’. In tracing the development of teaching and preparation of student teachers to work in a multiracial society in his own institution Gaine (1995) outlines how these courses evolved on a four-year BEd degree and how they instigated student hostility and denial which led to the subsequent ‘toning down’ of the content and the consequential lack of examination of racism as a structural component of society. This change in focus led to ‘patchy provision’ with regards to race equality within ITE (Gaine 1995). The legacy of that patchy
preparation, or even the lack of it, is now evident in this study as some of the student teachers of the 1980s have become the teacher educators of 2010.

Gaine (1995) and Hill (2001) note the links between the political climate and the attrition of race equality within ITE. They document the Right-wing attacks on the nature of teacher training with its over emphasis of issues related to educational inequality. The combined effects of increasing the period of time spent in schools, the focus on subject knowledge and the political attacks from the Right contributed to the inadequate preparation of teachers to understand and respond to aspects of race equality. Gaine (1995:139) notes that the Right set the agenda for ITE,

They have effectively pilloried ‘theory’ in ITE and promoted a climate where school teaching is defined primarily as a skill, as a technical craft best learned by apprenticeship giving a good grounding of subject knowledge and firm discipline. ITE is obliged to base students in school for increasing proportions of their time, acting merely as a conduit for money to schools from the Teacher Training Agency [now the TDA] which is the body which has removed ITE from mainstream higher education funding.

Blatchford and Blatchford (1999:143) highlight that whilst ITE was not responsible for the educational inequalities within schools, it ‘played an important part in reproducing and sustaining educational inequality’. Jones (2000:61) firstly argues in the year following the murder of Stephen Lawrence that beginning teachers needed to understand race equality issues. Secondly, he bemoans the way in which ITE trains teachers in a climate which assumes ‘cultural homogeneity’; how it fails to develop the student teachers’ understanding of social justice thereby leaving them ineffectual in their stated aspiration to create classrooms based on the principle of equality; and points the finger at the Teacher Training Agency (now known as the TDA) when he chronicles the exasperation of the Head of the Commission for Racial Equality who referred to the Agency as, ‘‘impotent’ and ‘negligent’ in their failure to address racism on the teacher training curriculum’ (Jones 2000:63). It is not surprising then that in 2010 most of the students’ starting points with respect to race equality are left unchallenged and unmoved by their initial preparation to teach (Lander 2008).

In 2004 the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) funded professional resource network, called Multiverse, which produces web based resources on achievement and
diversity. The network commissioned a report on 'Diversity and Teacher Education' (Davies and Crozier 2005) which looked at the training provision in this area. The Report found that:

- There was very narrow interpretation of diversity and that coverage was patchy;
- Providers interpreted race and ethnicity in terms of making provision for pupils who had English as an additional language and there was very limited coverage of issues related to racisms 'or the implications of working in predominantly White contexts' (Davies and Crozier 2005:5); other areas were not covered, such as asylum seekers and refugees, traveller and Roma and social class;
- providers cited that there was a lack of time and staff expertise to cover diversity issues and that any aspects taught on the course could not be sufficiently followed up in school due to mentors' lack of knowledge and understanding of these issues which could be further compounded by the geographical location of the provider;

Whilst the existence of such a resource as Multiverse could be considered supportive and a force for changing practice, Wilkins and Lall (2010:25) note that it did not,

'fill the vacuum in teacher training but we maintain that Multiverse actually sustained the vacuum by enabling too many teacher educators to believe race and social justice is not their responsibility'.

They argue that such a resource helped teacher educators to side-step their responsibility with respect to examining aspects of race and ethnicity within ITE. In a recent study examining the teaching of 'race', inclusion and diversity on PGCE courses Bhopal et al (2009) reported that student teachers understood the three terms and knew how to apply each to the classroom; the student teachers reported that these aspects should be a central part of their preparation to teach and it should include guidance on how to deal with racist incidents. In addition the report notes that there should be staff development for ITE tutors in the areas of equality and diversity legislation, ITE tutors should evaluate how well these aspects are included in their teaching and tutors should have opportunities to share good practice.
ITE does not exist in isolation from schools. I would contend that currently the curriculum and the tutors do not prepare student teachers to work with the increasing ethnic diversity of the pupil population in schools today (approximately 20-25% see Appendix 2). The ethnic diversity of the pupil population is not reflected in the teacher population where approximately 4% are from Black or minority ethnic groups (see Appendix 2). The statistics attest to the fact that there are few minority ethnic teachers within the workforce whilst the BME pupil population is about five times greater. The teaching workforce is largely White and the BME student teacher population was 12% (TDA 2010). When recent research and media reports are considered with reference to the attainment gap (Strand 2007), exclusion rates (DiES 2006) and the number of headteachers who are from minority ethnic groups (Marley 2009) it is evident that long standing aspects of race and ethnicity still prevail within schools and the teaching profession. As Mirza (2005) puts it, ‘the more things change, the more they stay the same’! Such as the DiES Priority (2006) Review ‘Getting it, getting it right’, which showed that Black youngster were three times more likely to be excluded from school and that there were factors in schools such as teachers’ perceptions of these pupils which influenced the treatment they received in comparison to their White or Asian peers. The Review (ibid) noted that some children mattered more than others. Media reports (Marley 2009) on the lack of BME headteachers in schools claim that racism influenced the proportional representation of BME teachers within the top level of school management. So not only has there been an issue in the recruitment of minority ethnic teachers into the profession and the changes in the ITE curriculum, but schools themselves have failed to meet the needs of some BME pupils in terms of improving their attainment and participation in school which, in part, could be due to the lack of teachers’ understanding of inequality and how it operates, which in turn is due to deficiencies in their initial preparation to teach.

In my reflections as a teacher educator examining one aspect of initial teacher preparation, the face of ITE has changed over the last thirty years. The shift from higher education institutions where staff with the theoretical knowledge to support student teachers’ understanding of equality issues have been divested of this responsibility which has passed to a government ‘quango’, the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), with its tight control of ITE in England.
This shift in control has rendered ITE staff and institutions as mere conduits of government policy and the erosion of educational theory has served to reproduce an impoverished teacher workforce who can, ‘tick the boxes’, but cannot define, or wrestle with the educational philosophy, which may, or may not, underpin their teaching, or ‘doing of teaching’. Jones (2000:63) implores that ITE has a role to play in creating teachers as agents of change and as such ITE courses should include provision on race equality, stating that, ‘Left unchecked, the profession faces the prospect of an entire generation of technicists who lack any real understanding about children’s lives’. In fact, I would argue that we have already reached this point. The historical changes to initial teacher preparation have served to transform ITE which is now founded on achieving the Qualifying to Teach Standards (TDA 2008) rather than understanding how schools operate in society, or how schools reproduce society with its attendant structural inequalities and how these affect the lives of children daily especially those from minoritised groups.
Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature

Introduction

The theory which frames this work is drawn from a relatively new area related to race and education, namely critical race theory (CRT) (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). This was developed largely in North America and arose from the area of legal studies and is now fairly well established in the field of education in the United States of America (USA) (Taylor 2009). It is only beginning to gain a foothold within the English educational context. In this study CRT is coupled with Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic violence (Webb et al 2002) since the operation and persistence of racism within society is established through pedagogic work which establishes the dominance of one group in society. The persistence of institutional racism as a hidden dimension of this dominance underscores the link between CRT’s central belief that racism is a permanent aspect of society and institutional racism is the constant which reflects the symbolic violence of a long established system of dominance. The chapter will examine the tenets of critical race theory (CRT) and its applicability in ITE. The work will then establish how themes related to CRT such as whiteness and White supremacy perpetuate the on-going cycle of racism within society and education. The notions of whiteness as a mechanism of symbolic violence and the attendant manifestations of it in everyday life form the basis of the analytical categories which will be used to examine the data. The chapter will conclude by drawing out and identifying themes which describe whiteness particularly themes related to resistance and structural inertia in relation to race equality.

Most liberal White people, particularly those involved in education, find it difficult to accept that racism is a part of everyday life (Frankenberg 1993, Srivastava 2009) since their approach in schools and ITE is probably associated with a soft-edged multicultural approach of accepting cultural difference, or indeed embracing it, even counteracting acts of racism in the street or playground and assuming that by adopting this stance they are anti-racist in their thinking and actions. The lack of race equality and diversity within the ITE curriculum and the focus on recruiting BME teachers illustrates the inherent contradictions within the field, for whilst the teacher education curriculum is defended from apparent dilution the idea of targets...
for the recruitment of BME candidates to train as teachers is promoted since it serves the interest of the majority to claim that action is being taken to redress the ethnic imbalance evident within the current teacher workforce. The misrecognition\(^3\) of the power of whiteness which serves to promote BME teacher recruitment whilst hindering the development of the ITE curriculum with respect to more components on ethnic and cultural diversity highlights how symbolic violence operates within ITE discourse.

There is very little written about teacher educators and race equality within ITE in England but a few studies have looked at the experiences of BME student teachers in ITE and particularly their experiences on school placement (Blair and Maylor 1993; Carrington and Tomlin 2000 and Basit et al. 2006). Other studies have shown how student teachers have little awareness or even racist understandings (Wilkins 2001; Cole and Stuart 2005). Wilkins and Lall (2010) contend that race equality legislation has little effect on the ITE curriculum and the experiences of BME student teachers noting the persistence of ideas such as they have to be more resilient and better than their White colleagues which arise from the ‘anxiety of the potential for racism on placement’ (Wilkins and Lall 2010:22); how they feel they cannot report racism on the school placements, that the nature of the ITE curriculum with respect to race equality and diversity was ‘superficial’ (Wilkins and Lall 2010:23) and how ITE tutors within their institution showed, ‘some reticence about actively promoting a culture of openness about racism, lest this exacerbate anxiety about the potential for racism’ (ibid:23). It is such reticence and contradiction which needs to be examined and unpacked using the tools of a theoretical framework which will reveal why such reticence may exist and how it might be maintained.

**Critical Race Theory (CRT)**

CRT is a theory, described by Taylor (2009:1) as ‘a form of legal scholarship’ which was developed in the United States by Black, Latino and scholars in the field of American law. Taylor (2009:1) describes CRT arising from,

\[
\text{A long tradition of resistance to the unequal and unjust distribution of power and resources along political, economic, racial and gendered lines in America}
\]

\(^3\) Jenkins (1992:104) describes misrecognition as ‘the process by which power relations are perceived not for what they objectively are but in a form which renders them legitimate in the eyes of the beholder’. Webb et al (2002:24) note misrecognition is ‘a form of forgetting’.
and across the globe, with the support and legitimacy of the legal system which makes possible the perpetuation of the established power relationships of society.

There are three key strands or tenets of CRT as shown below but they are inextricably linked to the notion of White supremacy, whiteness and white privilege. This section aims to discuss the three strands of

- racism as an ever present and normal aspect of society
- interest convergence which illustrates how BME people have been afforded advances where they benefit the White majority;
- the importance of counter story-telling or Black narrative as a means to establish a minority perspective to counter claims of objectivity from White people. (Taylor et al 2009).

The discussion of the first two elements will provide the back drop for the related discussion of whiteness, white privilege and White supremacy.

**Racism**

The central and key strand of critical race theory is the notion that racism is a part of everyday life, 'the starting point for CRT is a focus on racism' (Gillborn 2008:27). CRT highlights that racism is not just an aberrant act of race hatred demonstrated in violence or name calling; it is evident and nowadays more prevalent in actions or inactions such as the silent act of omission or deletion, of exclusion; of apparently innocent and polite inclusion which fails to recognise the racialised experience of either White or BME people; it is glaringly present to minority ethnic people when in the act of enveloping us within a cloak of invisibility we are deemed colourless to the colour blind thus enabling us to engage on a supposedly equal footing as those that bestow such an honour upon us. The violent acts of racism, or essentialist racism (Frankenberg 1993) are abhorred and denounced by the majority of both White and BME people but the pervasive and persistent presence of passive racism, 4 (the term passive here is used not to imply that such racism is benign but to indicate that it operates for the White majority in less obvious ways and indeed for some of

4 Tatum (1999) notes that staying silent about racism, not challenging exclusionary behaviour or laughter at racist jokes and accepting the majority perspective within the curriculum describes passive racism.
them is not there at all), which is ever present in the lives of BME people and embedded within policy and everyday practices goes unnoticed and largely unchallenged. Gillborn (2008:27) describes these as, 'hidden operations of power that have the effect of disadvantaging one or more minority ethnic groups'. The ‘hard-edged’, ‘next-step’ approach presented by CRT challenges the soft anti-racist/multicultural position assumed by most ITE tutors. Wilkins and Lall (2010) note how racist comments received by BME student teachers were cast as ‘unwitting prejudice’ rather than examining them as racist because the notion of intentionality outweighed the impact and outcome. They note how a comment such as ‘did you have an arranged marriage’ have become ‘normalised’ rather than be cast as racist. The shift in emphasis from the outcome or effect on the minoritised ‘Other’ to the intention of usually a person from the White majority serves to negate the racist effect, thereby centring whiteness and its silent domination. CRT challenges ‘normalised’ constructions and perceptions of racism, equality and inequality. It could be said that ITE attracts a middle-class group of people to become teachers and teacher educators, who usually consider themselves as liberals in the broadest sense of the term. It is this group that feel they are being attacked and threatened by the implication that they are complicit in these acts of passive racism that are ingrained within society. It is the very act of illuminating the hidden and unrecognised racism which exists in society that poses the threat to the equilibrium which White society feels has been established with respect to the presence of BME people.

King (2004) observes that in teacher education in the USA student teachers extol the virtue of celebrating diversity but that this does not in itself lead to the eradication of racism. She explains how such an approach merely leaves intact all their taken for granted norms, assumptions and privileges without addressing their understanding of inequity. She names such a position as ‘dysconscious’ racism and explains that it is a state in which its proponents ‘tacitly accept dominant White norms and privileges. It is not an absence of consciousness… but an impaired consciousness’ (King 2004:73). The impaired state of dysconscious racism is one in which the person is unquestioning and uncritical in their thinking and actions regarding racial inequity, they accept certain stereotypical assumptions and beliefs about minority groups especially if such myths provide an explanation about the advantages that White
people have gained. This position is uncritical of White people or their contribution or complicity in racial inequity.

Whilst dysconscious racism may be seen and applied to individuals, institutional racism can be identified through tangible evidence which indicates structural or in-built inequity. It is a term which has existed since the late 1970s and early 1980s. The term is frequently used to describe unintentional racism which can arise from ignorance, unfamiliarity with the cultural traditions of minority groups, or a lack of understanding, people can be well intentioned but use patronising language or apply patronising treatment to someone from a BME background; it is also associated with negative racist stereotyping about certain groups for example Black males or Gypsy Roma people. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson 1999) described institutional racism as

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.
(Macpherson 1999 Paragraph 6.39)

In examining the ideas of dysconscious racism and institutional racism it can be seen that a common aspect is the uncritical thinking, ignorance and lack of self-consciousness which fuel the operation of each. Kohli (2009) likens the omission of a minority perspective within the ITE curriculum as a form of institutional racism. In the section on whiteness, behaviour such as ignorance and lack of self-awareness of White people in maintaining the social construct of whiteness is explored. But there is no doubt that whilst institutional racism is evident within society the pervasive nature of whiteness operates at a micro-level and manifests itself in the inequalities and disadvantage which impact on the lives of BME people. Such revelation leaves White people feeling guilty and angry and BME people even more vulnerable, vindicated, yet still injured by the symbolic violence inflicted and endured throughout their daily lives. This is why CRT is used in this study.
Interest convergence

The notion of interest convergence as a part of CRT arises from the American context and is closely aligned with the change in civil rights legislation and particularly to the introduction of Affirmative Action which was initially designed to promote the interests of Black people within recruitment and employment, but as Gillborn (2008) asserts has in reality benefitted White women. The idea of interest convergence was coined and defined by Derrick Bell in 1980. Briefly, the notion of interest convergence is a mechanism by which those in power, in other words the largely White hierarchy, ‘save face’ and maintain the façade of equality through advances in race relations legislation, or in America, changes to civil rights laws. Delgado and Stefancic (2001:18) note that such ‘civil rights gains for communities of color coincide with the dictates of White self-interest’. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) and Gillborn (2008) argue that Affirmative Action in the USA is by no means based ideologically on the need for equality per se, but that it was initiated by those in power in such a way that not only was White interest served and preserved but that such decisions also ‘safeguard their position’ (Gillborn 2008:32). Indeed, they argue, it is false to suppose that those in power positions are neutral players in the field.

A closely aligned idea to interest convergence is the ‘contradiction-closing case’ (Gillborn 2008). This is where aspects of inequality are highlighted in ‘big cases’; they are in the news and they become large and visible, so to ignore them is not an option since such cases threaten the stability of equality as promoted by those in power. To allow such cases to escalate also threatens the edifice of equality rhetoric. Therefore, they are usually ‘dealt with’ publically and drawn on frequently to maintain the falsehood of racial justice and fairness. In most instances after the media attention has dimmed the ‘business-as-usual’ racism (Gillborn 2008) continues silently and unabated. In the UK the ideas of interest convergence and contradiction-closing case are encapsulated in the Stephen Lawrence story at a human level and a wider societal and institutional level. An analysis of the Stephen Lawrence case using the ideas of interest convergence and contradiction-closing case serve to offer ‘A powerful way of understanding the dynamics of race and social policy’ (Gillborn 2008:119). Gillborn (2008) explains how the installation of an inquiry was a means to serve the interests of the majority because so fervent was the
pursuit for justice from the Lawrence family that it started to highlight racism within the Metropolitan Police. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson 1999) was an act of interest convergence since it served the interest of the incoming Labour Government to be seen to be doing something about the issue of racism as highlighted by the case.

The notion of interest convergence may seem unrelated to the area of teacher education. But Milner (2008) delineates how interest convergence and, as he calls it, interest divergence can be used as a tool to examine teacher education practice and policy. Milner’s (2008:336) argument is twofold. Firstly, that ‘interests in’ teacher education have to be guarded, which is established through a number of strategies which help to maintain whiteness, and secondly, that, ‘interests in teacher education’ is maintained through white privilege. Milner (2008:334) asserts that essentially ‘a loss-gain binary is also inherent in the interest convergence principle’. He (ibid) suggests that to lose hold on a teacher education curriculum, which could be considered to enshrine ‘intellectual property’, which works as it is without the dilution of this curriculum with multicultural or race equality perspectives, is a position to be defended. Within teacher education in England the need to meet BME recruitment targets serves to illustrate how such targets meet the interest convergence of both the majority, since something is being seen to be done, and partially for the minority, since the need for more BME teachers is being facilitated at policy level. But as the data related to this study later shows, everyday practice in ITE, in some cases, illustrates a deficit model of BME student teachers or worse the notion of the ‘professional ethnic’ (Wilkins and Lall 2010:23). Milner advocates that interest convergence ‘serves as a valuable analytic tool to study policy and practice in teacher education’ (2008:342).

**Liberalism**

The fundamental beliefs of equality and meritocracy are persistent features in the narratives of student teachers and their reflections on either the multicultural education components of their pre-service teacher training or in their responses to the lack of progress by BME groups. Levine-Rasky (2000a, 2000b), Solomon et al (2005), Wagner (2005), Marx (2006) and Aveling (2006) all show in their work with student teachers that the notion of meritocracy pervades their understanding of
equality of opportunity. They regularly assume that because they have succeeded within the education system, especially those from minority White groups such as Italian Americans or Jews, that there is no excuse for others not to succeed and by implication that there must be something that relatively unsuccessful minoritised groups are unable to do or are just unsuccessful. This narrative is also evident when English student teachers talk about BME children. By promoting the meritocratic idea that merely working hard and trying promotes success ignores the structural barriers that impede the success of some BME groups and student teachers.

But when such notions are examined using the evidence of inequitable outcomes as in the case of Black pupils’ underachievement, or the disproportionate exclusion of Black boys from schools, or indeed the lack of justice in the case of Stephen Lawrence, then liberalism seems to be hollow. Cochran-Smith (2004) stresses that teacher education agendas are inextricably linked to the different outcomes for minoritised children one cannot be divorced from the other. Since the structures of society such as education and the law uphold the ideal of equality, the prevailing understanding of this notion amongst the majority centres on ideas of fairness. Such ideas are espoused and enacted by individuals, albeit well meaning ones, yet the structures within which they operate function on a colour blind understanding of equality which ultimately serves to disadvantage minoritised people. Critical race scholars claim that liberalism does not work. For example, Ladson-Billings (2004:54) notes the eradication of racism requires wholesale change and that liberalism has failed to deliver such a change. She argues that trying to gain rights for minorities has been a struggle. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) outline how colour blindness, an approach associated with liberalism, can only manage to address outward acts of racism but that it does not enable those with liberal tendencies to tackle the ‘business-as-usual racism’ (Gillborn 2008) evident in everyday interactions. In relation to ITE, Crozier and Menter (1993) observed how the relationship between the student teacher, the university tutor and the school mentor represented an asymmetrical power relationship, but when the student teacher is one from a BME background the power asymmetry becomes distorted further (Wilkins and Lall 2010). If we then perhaps add to this dynamic the rhetoric of meritocracy and a colour blind approach to the training of BME teachers, we can begin to see why there may be fewer BME student teachers and teachers within schools. Critical
race theorists are suspicious of liberal claims such as 'equal opportunities' but when attempts are made to 'assure equality of results' these are opposed (Delgado and Stefancic 2001:23). Gillborn (2008:73) outlines themes associated with changes in policy in the UK related to race equality over the last sixty years and he suggests that, 'many of the key ideas have a disturbing resilience despite the changing rhetoric at a superficial level'. He goes onto to assert that the underlying belief that minority ethnic people should integrate has been the mainstay of the liberal rhetoric and that indeed the interests of the White majority should be 'kept centre stage' (ibid:88).

Sleeter (2008) notes how neoliberalism has influenced the teacher education curriculum and eroded the focus on equality thereby centring whiteness. The notion of whiteness is a key concept within the theoretical framework for this study.

**Whiteness, White identity and White Privilege**

This section seeks to define and delineate the key concepts associated with this study. Whilst the key organising theory that is drawn on by this work is critical race theory, the concepts of whiteness, white privilege, colour blindness and the links between these aspects to dysconscious racism need to be teased out in order to establish a theoretical framework on which the empirical evidence can be mapped and against which it can be analysed. The task of separating closely intertwined concepts is not an easy exercise but essential to understand the complexity and interconnectedness of these ideas, which when enacted are so powerful in their effects; or indeed when the silent presence of them is illuminated, the pervasive and unspoken effects of whiteness, white privilege, colour blindness, dysconscious racism and institutional racism are starkly revealed to illuminate the underlying symbolic violence.

**What is whiteness?**

The presence of racism in society as delineated by CRT merits greater examination. When looking for the factors which contribute to everyday racism the concept of whiteness emerges as a key organising and sustaining notion. It is whiteness which upholds and maintains the systemic racial inequalities prevalent in society today. The study of whiteness shifts the spotlight from BME people, mistakenly thought by some to be the cause of racism and the engineers of their own demise and failure, to White people as a racialised group who are not neutral observers of others as
racialised beings but key proponents and beneficiaries in their racialisation. In her study of White student teachers, Marx (2006) notes how the women stressed the neutrality of being White and worked to deny any privileges associated with their White identity. Aveling (2006) outlines the sheer hostility of student teachers when they were asked to examine their own position as White people. She describes the challenge this presented as ‘hacking at our very roots’ (ibid: 261) indicating that the trauma of examining White identity as a racialised and advantaged position struck at the very centre of their understandings of their own identity. Such reactions are common place in my experience. Cochran-Smith (2004:163) calls for the need to know more about how teacher educators ‘theorize the practice of teacher education for social justice’ noting that there is little work in this field even in the USA. It is the operation of whiteness in everyday interactions such as conversations with colleagues, student teachers and teachers at the University, in schools which requires further investigation. For me, whiteness is evident in the following ways:

1. Colour blind and neutral ideology; the language of being normal/neutral;
2. Niceness and complacency
3. Defence and denial
4. Embarrassed silences
5. Bliss in ignorance
6. Playing the game where the talk is of equality but where action is absent.

The history of how whiteness was established and maintained is linked to the conquering, domination and enslavement of other peoples, to the process of imperialism and the colonisation of lands which belonged to others. The establishment and maintenance of whiteness has resulted in the subjugation of others and the creation of a dominant discourse which has served to valorise and sanctify the position of White people and whiteness as superior whilst casting the racialised ‘Other’ as inferior. In delineating the dominance of a European whiteness Bonnett (2000) traces how other groups categorised as White, such as Arabs and Chinese got marginalised and deleted as White by the dominance of ‘hegemonic European-identified racialised whiteness’ (Bonnett 2000:3). Bonnett (2000:17) describes this whiteness as constructed from aspects of the Bible which was ‘a triple conflation of White, European and Christian’ and so this construction of whiteness had ‘cultural and territorial content’ (ibid). To add to this construction skin colour and nobility led
to 'a colonial discourse of white superiority and non-white inferiority' (Bonnett 2000:17). The history of the construction of this discourse can be traced through the violence used to maintain it; Garner (2010a) refers to it as the terror used to enslave Africans to the work of Victorian eugenicists which promulgated White racial superiority; he notes,

By the late nineteenth century, not only was there a notion of the racial superiority of Whites over everyone else but putative league tables of superiority within which each of these 'races' had been put forward (Garner 2010a:122)

Leonardo (2002:32) notes how the, 'assertion of a white racial identity has had a violent career'. Dyer (1997:65) shows how images have led to the association of White skin as a symbol of purity and morality. He notes that 'To be White is to be at once of the White race and 'honourable’ and ‘square dealing’'. In fact Srivastava (2009) argues that white skin became associated with virtue and has come to symbolise morality implying that those without such skin colour are cast into possessing the opposite qualities thus racialising the notion of virtue, goodness and power. The beginnings of whiteness as a construct clearly lie within this historical context. Hence whiteness became the 'central signifier of status and power' (Bonnett 2000:22).

The notion of whiteness as a social, political and cultural construct underpins the existence and operation of structural racism (Garner 2010a). Whiteness is not the same as ‘White person’ or ‘White identity’ it is defined in terms of a racialised discourse which has been established over time to privilege those who are deemed to be White and to promote and sustain the interests of the White group. In this way it is linked to White people and how they gain from the maintenance of whiteness as a discourse. Whiteness can be seen in terms of a discourse or even as a property which has 'material and social value' (Ladson-Billings 2004:57). Dyer (1997) describes it as a cultural construction, yet Marx (2006) notes that whiteness is not often defined so much as described more by what it is not, rather than what it is. Leonardo (2002:31) indicates that whilst White people and White culture are perceived as neutral he describes whiteness as a 'racial discourse, whereas the category 'White people' represents a socially constructed identity usually based on skin colour'.
The reference to colour can often confuse the argument associated with the concept of whiteness. Leonardo (2002:32) goes onto describe whiteness as a ‘social concept’, not a culture, it is ‘different from White culture but connected to it through historical association’; he notes how whiteness has, ‘historically stratified and partitioned the world according to skin colour’ and that the ‘assertion of the white race is intimate with slavery, segregation and discrimination’; but White culture is a collection of various ‘White ethnic practices’ and that ‘whiteness is the attempt to homogenise diverse White ethnics into a single category for the purposes of racial domination’.

Frankenberg (2009:519) argues that whiteness is,

the location of structural advantage, of race privilege. it is a ‘standpoint’ from which White people look at ourselves, at others and society... Whiteness refers to a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed.

Frankenberg (2009) confirms that ‘naming whiteness’ helps to shake it and expose it from its ‘unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance’ (ibid: 523). In doing so, as Marx (2006) would have it, one reveals the invisible, the taken for granted privilege, dominance and normativity of whiteness. In the act of exposure White identities are revealed as racialised positions which are in themselves constructed through the racialisation of the ‘Other’. Thus the revelation that White identity is itself associated with a White ethnicity shatters its invisibility and normativity. In the revelation its normative position is expunged and so is the hierarchy of ‘measuring’ others by this so called norm. One of the powers of whiteness was to differentially cast BME peoples as invisible when it was convenient to do so, but at other times to cast BME people as inferior and deficient as a collective group. So in exposing White identity as a racialised position, the ‘Other’ can no longer remain as an invisible individual and simultaneously visible as a group which can be castigated for wrong doings or failure, because the exposure reveals a complicity with this system of advantage and disadvantage (Garner 2007).

Marx (2006:6) insists that whilst whiteness is seen by some as racial performance which leads to inequity; or a racial discourse (McIntyre 1997) it is an entity which reproduces power and privilege which benefits White people; she notes that it is, ‘an amalgamation of qualities including cultures, histories, experiences, discourses and
privileges shared by Whites', yet whilst Whites can reject the racism associated with it, reject colour blind approaches, or ‘white talk’ (McIntyre 1997) they cannot reject the privilege whiteness affords them neither can they escape it; they have to pledge to reveal it, ‘be critical of it’ and ‘work against the racism related to it’ (Marx 2006:6). Clearly Marx (2006) feels that whiteness is an inherent part of being White and that even anti-racist Whites cannot be free from white privilege associated with their identity. Gillborn (2008) asserts that whiteness involves the maintenance of White interests, it excludes non-Whites; it denies that White people are racialised and also denies racism. Whiteness assumes a normal and neutral position acknowledging that a White ethnicity is one that is only claimed by extremists groups and in this way it distances itself from racism and casts it as an aberration perpetrated by extremists such as White supremacists. In this way the business-as-usual whiteness continues every day it is a silent misrecognised domination structure which sustains the symbolic violence of everyday racism. This whiteness is evident in the narratives of student teachers and tutors as attested by studies undertaken by Solomon et al (2005) where student teachers rejected notions of white privilege as depicted in McIntosh’s (1990) article; and in Aveling’s (2006) study where the examination of whiteness led to student hostility, defence and denial. Leonardo (2002:43) casts whiteness as a ‘nodal point in the triumvirate with capitalist exploitation and patriarchy’. He (ibid: 32) refers to the linking of whiteness and globalisation as ‘multinational whiteness’ noting how it is the process and product of ‘(neo)colonisation’ which manifests itself in ‘global White supremacy’ (ibid: 33). He warns that it is the central premise of the normativity of whiteness amongst Western and non-Western people which enables it to proceed unchecked and unchallenged. Leonardo (2002) asserts that this is how whiteness has maintained its hegemony, in its ability to adapt and be flexible. Such capacity indicates how the power of whiteness is misrecognised by the majority and thus symbolic violence, as delineated by Bourdieu (Webb et al 2002), associates with racism which CRT maintains is an ever present aspect of society.
Whiteness, privilege and White supremacy

The notions of white privilege and White supremacy accompany any discussion about whiteness. Ryde (2009:36) reveals how as a White person she became aware of advantages associated with her ethnicity,

Whiteness has become less neutral and more figural for me. It is as if staring at a blank page I have begun to notice contours and shades that were not at first apparent. So what have I seen? I have noticed that I am advantaged by being White in many subtle ways.

McIntosh (1990) outlined forty-six ways in which she was advantaged as a White person. She lists mundane things such as buying a house in any area she wants; to acknowledging that as a White person the criminal justice system does not discriminate against her. Ryde (2009) notes how the active realisation of such advantage left her feeling guilty. Marx (2006) shows how white privilege is merely a corollary of whiteness. The advantages associated with whiteness are seen by non-Whites, but not by White people, who use their privilege, or advantage in conscious and unconscious ways. White privilege is an advantage afforded to one group in society which by its very nature means that there are others in society disadvantaged by it. The advantages mean that the power of whiteness to permeate structures of society inevitably leads to the exercise of that power resulting in the maintenance of racism and the perpetuation of inequity (Marx 2006, Gillborn 2008 and Garner 2010b). It is this aspect which most White people have difficulty understanding and accepting since they feel neither advantaged, nor can they believe they are complicit in racism.

Whiteness and cultural capital

It is clear that whiteness is not only a property (Harris 1993) but can also be likened to Bourdieu’s (1986) notion of cultural capital, or the notion adapted to be termed ‘White cultural capital’ or maybe ‘White capital’. The notion of cultural capital was devised to show the other gains from being positioned as middle class other than material wealth. So cultural capital describes non-economic gains but also alludes to advantages which accompany class status. For example, cultural capital can be certain forms of knowledge, ‘unequal access to employment, education etc’ (Garner 2010a:120). In looking at the intersection of a concept such as whiteness through
the lens of an established universal theoretical framework such as cultural capital which is associated with class, class structure and stratification of society the notion of whiteness can be seen as pervasive and divisive. Thus we can refer to a White cultural capital which encompasses privilege, position and power. The power of White cultural capital and the flexibility of whiteness are exemplified by Reay et al (2007). Their study showed how middle class White parents actively sought to send their children to multicultural schools where they would meet BME children and acquire a ‘multicultural capital’ which could be used appropriately to gather gains for these individuals in later life, for example, in employment or promotion situations. This is a good example of how the White middle classes, in their normative privileged position use the power of class, whiteness and consumerism, or acquisitiveness, to gain knowledge about BME people and how to engage in a multicultural milieu is not only as a means to gain further advantage but also as a means of distancing themselves from working class Whites. In acquiring multicultural capital they concentrate privilege and power within a particular stratum of society and only extend that privilege to those who are the same as them.

The term White supremacy (Garner 2007, Gillborn 2008) is usually reserved for White extremist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan or the British National Party. But when whiteness is examined and exposed its underlying foundations and functioning are based on the notions of one racialised group being superior to others. Gillborn (2008:167) insists that the ‘drive to classify, control and exclude is not merely an unfortunate by-product of events; it is a defining characteristic of whiteness’. As such it represents a system of control and expression which is designed to maintain its superiority and that of people associated with it. He is unremitting in his use of the term which for some is a step too far due largely to the association of the term with extremist groups but also the Nazis in Germany. Our reaction to the term ‘White supremacy’ should not diminish the analysis undertaken by Gillborn (2008) and others (Garner 2007) to expose the small acts of White supremacy which lead to the disadvantage of many BME groups, such as Black boys, in the field of education. It is the ‘race-neutral’ policies premised on the neutrality of whiteness and the invisibility of its power which contribute to the failure of certain minority groups to succeed in society.
In my reading of Bourdieu and Passeron’s work (1977) I was struck by the notion of symbolic violence. It resonated, on a micro-level, not only in terms of how the two words that comprise the term, encapsulated my experiences as a BME tutor within a predominantly White university, but also how the tutors’ stories may reveal aspects of whiteness which could be classified as symbolic violence through everyday acts of micro-aggression and domination. On a macro-level the term symbolic violence began to reveal the possible reasons as to why, the mandatory duty placed on all public bodies via the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000, which (Gillborn 2006:16) describes as ‘among the most radical equalities legislation on earth’, whilst generating institutional policies has had little effect on the lives and life chances of BME people. Whilst CRT names the everyday presence and persistence of racism and acknowledges the need for a minority perspective, the coupling of CRT and symbolic violence, particularly through the maintenance of whiteness in this study, represents a move to examine how the minutiae of the processes which undergird CRT and critical whiteness studies can be delineated by tracing the persistence of symbolic violence as a feature of society. The two theories together lend added gravitas to the framework for analysis in this study. One without the other would be sufficient, but together, I believe they serve to unequivocally reveal the mechanisms, persistence and perpetuation of everyday racism and its corrosive effects on the education of teachers.

**Whiteness and Symbolic violence**

Symbolic violence describes the passive or unconscious form of cultural or social domination evident within a particular field (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). Jenkins (1992:104) explains Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic violence as the imposition of a culture, or cultures on ‘groups or classes in such a way that they are experienced as legitimate’. Hence the notion of whiteness is seen as an unquestioned aspect of the dominant culture and as the measure by which the ‘Other’ is graded but also how the notion of assimilation is in itself a way of cultural imposition and a means by which to maintain cultural dominance. Jenkins (ibid) indicates that in Bourdieu’s theory, symbolic violence can only be ‘inflicted’ through ‘misrecognition’, or a ‘form of forgetting’ (Webb et al 2002) that is through the non-recognition of the power relations that underpin it and so it passes as ordinary and legitimate. Thus the denial
of white privilege and the defense of whiteness as neutral are part of the instruments of such misrecognition. Webb et al (2002:25) note that misrecognition, 'is the key to what Bourdieu calls the function of 'symbolic violence'. They illustrate this with an example of how patriarchy has prevailed through the domination of one gender over another but also because women ‘misrecognised the symbolic violence to which they were subjected’ (Webb et al 2002:25) seeing it as part and parcel of the world.

Similarly, the domination of whiteness as a discourse through the maintenance of White as a neutral identity constitutes the misrecognition of the symbolic violence that minoritised people are subjected to. The neutrality of whiteness is so deeply embedded within the structures and systems of society that the symbolic violence has become invisible. However, the effects of this ‘violence’ are evident in the unequal outcomes across the field of education and particularly in ITE. For example, the low numbers of BME people training to be teachers, the low numbers of BME teachers and the even fewer BME ITE tutors. But the most revealing effects of this violence are manifest in the limited reference to ethnic and linguistic diversity within the ITE curriculum or indeed its complete absence. As Kohli (2009:241) asserts,

> Promoting White cultural values and perspectives in the absence of the culture and perspectives of Communities of Color is a subtle, but powerful, form of racism.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) note how symbolic violence is exercised through pedagogic action which is the imposition of a cultural arbitrary through the exclusion of some ideas and the inculcation of others through the processes of diffuse education, family education and institutionalised education, such as ITE. Pedagogic action enables the self perpetuation and reproduction of culture and power. Each of the forms of education described above have pedagogic agency to assert the ideas associated with the culture. In order for pedagogic action to be successful it needs to be underwritten by pedagogic authority which is the arbitrary power to act (Jenkins 1992). It is in this way that the ITE curriculum is defended and maintained so that aspects of race equality and diversity are minimal (Wilkins and Lall 2010). This power is misrecognised as legitimate by users and recipients. The very fact that it is assumed to be legitimate is false but its perceived legitimacy facilitates its function. Such misrecognised power within the theoretical framework for this study can be conceived to be the power of white privilege which is embedded in the dominant
discourse of whiteness. In addition Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) assert that the perceived legitimacy of such power or pedagogic authority renders it as a neutral or natural part of the social world and leads to its positive value. They note (ibid) that no pedagogic action is neutral or culture free therefore by extrapolation neither is pedagogic authority or white privilege. The ideas that pedagogic action serves to promulgate are accepted or rejected on the basis of how well they align or reinforce ‘pre-existing dispositions’ or habitus (Jenkins 1992). Such dispositions result from pedagogic work, work which is required to underscore the ‘misrecognition of culture as arbitrary and bestows upon it the taken-for-granted quality of naturalness’ (Jenkins 1992:107). So the pedagogic work done to hide white privilege or the discourse of whiteness as pedagogic authority is part and parcel of asserting pedagogic action whereby that action reflects the interests of the dominant group within the taken for granted nature of the world. The pursuit of, and the exercise of white privilege in the pursuit of such interests is misrecognised and thus symbolic violence of whiteness pervades the everyday lives of people of colour. The mechanisms of symbolic violence as delineated in much greater detail by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) provide the sociological workings of how and why racism is considered a part of everyday life by critical race theorists. In revealing the discourse of whiteness and privileging minority stories CRT seeks to show the stark contrasts not only in the lived lives of the minoritised but how the symbolic violence of whiteness results in the reproduction of a society where there is an unequal distribution of cultural capital and the persistence of unequal outcomes for some.

Finally, Owen (2007:211) offers the following definition of whiteness which links the notions of normalcy as an unrecognised aspect of whiteness. He notes that,

Whiteness is a social structure that normalises the interests, needs and values of those racialised as White. The consequences of a system structured by whiteness is that Whites occupy a location of structural advantage that generates material and psychological privileges and benefits.

He goes further to state that whiteness in itself generates White supremacy thus underscoring Gillborn’s (2008) argument regarding the concept of White supremacy as a resulting system of advantage. If such a system is to be disrupted and dismantled then we have to examine ‘the consciousness and practices of those in the racially dominant position in a white supremacist society’ (Owen 2007:217). It is
not just the examination of racially dominant positions that require scrutiny but how the curriculum, the actions or inactions of those in such positions within the field of ITE can preserve whiteness and how this in turn can impact and contribute to the symbolic violence of racial inequity within education.

How does whiteness operate in everyday life?

In an attempt to delineate whiteness as a construct it is necessary to identify it through everyday operations such as actions or behaviours; inactions; or words and the maintenance of an unthinking and uncritical stance which in itself is thought to be right. The work of many writers writing about whiteness and teacher education [Frankenberg (1993), Schick (2000), Ladson-Billings (2004), Sleeter (2005), Marx (2006), Picower (2009), Rodriguez (2009), Ryde (2009)], have influenced my observations of ITE tutors' interactions with me and helped me to construct a list of 'whiteness in everyday life' which is by no means exhaustive.

The following section is a key part of this work because through the analysis of the literature and through the combination of perspectives I have augmented the framework proffered by Picower (2009). In her study of White student teachers she classified how ‘hegemonic understandings’ (Picower 2009:202) and the ‘tools of whiteness’ are used to protect and maintain dominant and stereotypical understandings of race. They could also constitute the tools of pedagogic action which underpins symbolic violence. The tools of whiteness are identified as emotional, ideological and performative that work together to constitute resistance, both passive and active resistance to assaults on, and the maintenance of, the hegemony of whiteness or White supremacy. She describes hegemonic understandings as ‘internalised ways of making meaning about how society is organised’ (Picower 2009:202) which concurs with the notion of a White habitus and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1993). Such understandings, premised on, and within whiteness, incorporate stereotypical views about BME children and people. For example, there is a clear dependence on the deficit model of urban schools as having poor standards. Such internalised understandings generate fear when her White participants talked about such neighbourhoods. The fear was premised on ‘different as dangerous’ (Picower 2009:203). Another aspect of such understanding is the belief that Whites ‘are the real victims of racism’ within the hegemonic stories of her
participants was a ‘dominant narrative of reverse racism’ (Picower 2009:204). Another common understanding is that people should succeed on their own merits and hard work. However, meritocracy in itself is not a flawed concept, but it does not operate fairly across all groups in society, clearly there is a ‘raced effect’ (Gillborn 2008:30). These hegemonic understandings when used in conjunction with the tools of whiteness are a means to uphold white privilege and maintain the discourse of whiteness which could be likened to the pedagogic authority that underpins symbolic violence.

These hegemonic understandings according to Picower (2009) perpetuate and maintain whiteness which is embodied within the life experiences and White identities of her participants. Other writers, such as Frankenberg (1993), Levine-Rasky (2000b), Marx (2006), and Srivastava (2009), as well as Picower (2009), have highlighted how the life experiences of student teachers, the majority of whom are White, usually middle-class, and who have little contact with, or experience of minoritised people and their communities, influence and reinforce their hegemonic stories of whiteness. In a similar vein this work seeks to discover the hegemonic stories of ITE tutors and to identify the tools of whiteness which maintain whiteness in the ITE academy.

Picower’s (2009) classification of the tools of whiteness provide part of the theoretical and analytical framework for this study. Therefore it merits clarity and depth of treatment here since there is a resonance with the empirical work. The distinction between internalised understandings of the values related to whiteness and the performativity of whiteness is not always clear. It should also be noted that the categories below are by no means mutually exclusive and there is overlap between them. Gillborn (2008) suggests that whilst whiteness is a construction that White people play out, either consciously, or subconsciously, whichever it is, the performance of whiteness based on its associated values perpetuates the inequalities that are central to its maintenance. So in order to disrupt and dismantle the inequity one has to understand how it is manifest in the everyday.

Picower (2009) subdivides the tools of whiteness into three categories:

1. The emotional tools of whiteness
2. The ideological tools of whiteness
3. The performative tools of whiteness

**The emotional tools of whiteness** – these relate to feelings of the White students. These emotional tools are used to obfuscate concepts such as white privilege, racism etc. They manifest themselves in anger, defensiveness, crying and guilt. These reactions are designed to protect the person, who is usually White and cast the person who asks the questions, or challenges their standpoint, who is usually BME, as the ‘bad guy’, the person who is wrong, or mean, or racist. Leonardo (2002) suggests that the act of crying in response to a challenge, or perhaps to feeling guilty (Frankenberg 1993) is a means of self-defence, or protection, as well as a means by which to deflect attention away from the topic of race or racism. It is a very effective act since it often shuts down the discussion and draws the attention of the audience to the crying person thus reinforcing their victim status and position of assumed innocence.

It is interesting to note how these emotional tools of whiteness depend on the emotions associated with judgements such as guilt and innocence; anger (attack) and defence, and of course, denial but no admissions because admissions would signal complicity in a society where racial oppression exists on a day-to-day basis. Ryde (2009) has examined the feelings of guilt, shame and denial which were aroused in the self-examination of her own White identity. She pointedly notes that perhaps, ‘most of the population is in denial about the responsibility White people have for racism. It is quite common to hear a White person say, ‘I’m not racist but..’’ (ibid: 51). She casts this as a form of denial and indicates that whilst all people seem to be very aware of racism there is, ‘an accompanying tendency to deny’, and she thinks that most people are stuck at this stage in their thinking (Ryde 2009:51). Marx (2006:89) would note that such statements of, ‘I’m not racist but’, are signifiers of passive racism since the person using such a phrase casts racism as violent, aberrant behaviour which they do not associate with themselves and indeed Marx says, ‘essentialist racism is easier to deal with’. Levine- Rasky (2000b) in her study of student teachers states that denial is a strategy used by those who hold, or have an assimilationist viewpoint or values. Vaught and Castagno (2008) in using the notion of whiteness as property show how White teachers’ denial of racialised power merely serves to hide white privilege as a structural aspect of society and since whiteness as property is also the right to determine meaning the denial of power can
cast White teachers into a ‘powerless’ state and thus reinforce their innocence. In itself denial is a revealing process which needs to be explored with White teachers. Solomon et al (2005) in their study of White student teachers found that when their respondents were challenged to examine their own positions as White people and to examine whiteness, a discourse of denial emerged which ranged from holding positions of ideological incongruence, to expounding the virtues of meritocracy and denying the existence of White cultural capital.

The two quite powerful aspects of the emotional tools of whiteness are those of guilt and innocence. The former is a response when White people are asked to examine personal and structural racism, or are asked to consider that they may occupy privileged positions within a racialised society. The guilt normally provokes defence, defence of innocence and non-complicity. Ryde (2009) explains that guilt and usually the accompanying shame are feelings which warn us that something is wrong. They should provoke us to move beyond it rather than to defend our positions but she notes that this is usually not the case since guilt and shame alert White people to their complicity in white privilege. In fact if such guilt and shame persist in a racially mixed group Black people are usually compelled to absolve White people of their guilt and shame! The intersection of guilt, shame and innocence is important because the maintenance of white innocence is in itself an important aspect of whiteness. Srivastava (2009:537) discusses how the, ‘national discourses of tolerance, benevolence and nonracism’, not only reveal a liberal position of equality but beneath the surface lies denial of structural racism and how it affects the lives of BME people. She elaborates on the theme of white innocence linking it to its historical roots, also to the discourse of liberalism and what she terms, ‘the production of the ethical self’ (ibid: 540) which is part of a moral identity which we create for ourselves. The need to maintain this ethical, moral and non-racist identity is paramount and hence when it is threatened it produces emotional resistance. Tellingly, the person feels accused of being racist and responds tearfully, ‘You’re calling me a racist’, which Srivastava (2009:542) adeptly analyses as the presenting face of ‘racialised power relations’. She feels that this is a ‘strategic innocence’ which is defensive and protects against attack.

This links well to the work of Schick (2000) where she claims that teachers demonstrated how whiteness and innocence were fixed and linked to the teachers’
good intentions and that White identity is dependent on these claims of innocence.
In Marx’s (2006) work the notion of the teacher as good and as the saviour were
expounded by her nine student teachers working in inner city schools. But it is the
work of Rodriguez (2009) that provides further analysis of the notion of white
innocence. She claims that there is a psychic investment in innocence and defence
of this innocence. The innocence originates from racial denial of White people, a
refusal to know or accept themselves as racialised beings; if you invest in such not
knowing you cannot then be accused of being racist. If you know, it implies you are
complicit in racism and then you are bound to examine the causes of it which would
in turn reveal the advantages of white privilege. Therefore there is greater
investment in not knowing, or ignorance, promoting your ethical self as colour blind
and investing in denial than there is in knowing. Rodriguez (2009:501) challenges
her student teachers by saying, ‘Are you happy then to be an ignorant teacher?’
Tatum (1992) suggests that this state of blissful ignorance is adhered to because if it
is given up feelings of guilt and shame and at times anger and denial replace it. In
maintaining white innocence, or ignorance, the student teachers in Schick’s
(2000:97) study would find themselves making contradictory remarks which she
notes was a part of the process of identity construction; an identity constructed to
distinguish it from the ‘Other’; from the abject White and their racism. In engaging
with this construction, not only did the participants reveal the performativity of
whiteness but at times adopted contradictory positions for ‘psychic survival’. So the
need to preserve ignorant innocence is an important form of self-preservation and
maintenance of whiteness.

*The ideological tools of whiteness* – these aspects relate to the ‘beliefs that people
adhere to in order to protect their hegemonic stories’ (Picower 2009:206). Such
beliefs can include lines of argument which run ‘we are all equal now’, and ‘things
are so much better now’. These utterances are designed to stall discussions of racism
and can also be considered a protection strategy designed to protect white innocence.
Other beliefs may be, ‘it’s personal not political’, in other words, racism is personal
and not associated with institutions; racism applies to extremist groups and so the
argument runs that, ‘I don’t belong to one of those groups so I can’t be racist’. This
is a way to deny structural or institutional racism and any personal complicity with
it. It is also a means by which supremacy is maintained. Another belief is, ‘well it’s
all out of my control’ and the continuation of this is, ‘I can’t change anything so why bother?’ As Picower (2009) points out this is a powerful argument for doing nothing thereby rooting the dominance of whiteness.

The most insidious and disarming ideological tool of whiteness is one which promotes ‘being nice’ (Picower 2009, Rodriguez 2009, Srivastava 2009). This links to the maintenance of the ethical, good self. It is an individual response to racism, as an anti-racist strategy it is ineffective, but nevertheless very plausible to untrained observers such as novice teachers. If you are nice to everyone that is all that matters is how adherents of this position would argue the point. It fails to deal, not only, with systemic racism, but also maintains supremacy through ineffectiveness and upholds white innocence, so remaining untainted by accusations of racism, or of any complicity with it. The façade of white innocence is maintained by drawing on the deficit model, so if these Black children are failing I have done my best by being nice to them but they still keep failing it must be something to do with them! (Picower 2009, Rodriguez 2009).

Colour blindness is often considered as the appropriate response to the presence of BME people. It is also thought by many to be a nice approach. Colour blindness as described by Frankenberg (1993:142) is

> a mode of thinking about race organized around an effort to not “see”, or at any rate not to acknowledge, race differences – [it] continues to be the “polite” language of race.

Frankenberg (1993:143) analyses this approach and concludes that such an approach which she terms ‘color evasion’ represents a selective engagement with the issues of race. It illustrates, not as initially perceived an anti-racist approach to race and racism, but a ‘power evasive’ (ibid) approach. It is an approach evident not only in the USA, in my experience, it is evident and in operation within education in schools and universities across England. The deployment of a colour blind approach by individuals is designed to distance them from essentialist racism but to the experienced BME observer it merely indicates a silent complicity in structural, institutional racism (Frankenberg 1993) and so contributes to the system of domination and symbolic violence. The ability to simultaneously see colour and not see colour is a privilege which White people enjoy. Colour is not seen if the person
is deemed acceptable, or good, but starkly noticed if there is societal transgression (Garner 2007). Frankenberg (1993) asserts that colour blindness is itself just as destructive as essentialist racism since the power structures determining each are the same and remain intact.

**The performative tools of whiteness** - are designed to protect and preserve beliefs and rely on the ideological tools of whiteness (Picower 2009). They can manifest themselves in silence. Silence is a very powerful tool which Picower (2009) claims is learnt in childhood when a child notices a person’s skin colour they are often silenced, or shushed, by their parents. They internalise this and the effect is that racism often goes unchallenged. Silences can also signal disengagement, or reluctance to engage in the discussions of race and racism. Mazzei (2008:1127) talks about the, ‘racially inhabited silences’ which occur when student teachers are asked to discuss issues related to ethnicity and diversity. She theorises that such silences occur when ‘the normativity of their world’ is challenged and the silences are a means of protection and control (ibid). Mazzei (2008) suggests that these silences can reveal student teachers’ often negative attitudes to race. But Rodriguez (2009:492) indicates that silence does not always signal denial, or resistance, it could be part of the thinking process as new information is assimilated.

As I have built and developed the theoretical framework for this study from critical race theory, whiteness studies the themes of violence, dominance and the maintenance of power through the performativity of whiteness have resonated with my understanding of other key sociological concepts associated with Bourdieu (1993), namely the notions of habitus and symbolic violence. This study is clearly located within the field of ITE and its focus to examine the narratives of White ITE tutors is an attempt to examine how whiteness plays out in their hegemonic understandings (Picower 2009) and their everyday professional lives. Bourdieu describes ‘habitus’ as a ‘system of dispositions’ or ‘the feel for the game’ which requires,

an inclination and the capacity to play the game, to take an *interest* in the game, to be taken up, taken in the game.
Bourdieu (1993:18)
So is this ‘feel for the game’ centred on whiteness and how does it manifest itself in the tutors’ stories? Do their stories reflect how they ‘play the game’ in their field (ITE) with respect to race equality? The notion of habitus links well with whiteness since it links dispositions to the internalisation of cultural or social interactions. Bohman describes the dispositions which contribute to habitus as, ‘they tell one who one is’, noting that habitus describes the socialisation of individuals, ‘into their particular identity and social relations with others’ (Bohman 1999:132). Could whiteness be part of the ‘system of dispositions’ or socialisation (Bourdieu 1993:18) which ITE tutors bring to the field? Do the White tutors’ stories not only show the everyday whiteness in operation but do they also show the ‘symbolic violence’ which may result from their White habitus?

In conclusion, whiteness as a concept encapsulates the system of advantage, privilege, power and position which has over the course of history been gathered and secured by White people through colonisation, imperialism and latterly through globalisation. The misrecognised advantage and power associated with White people’s domination over non-White subjects in the colonies has led to the perpetuation of advantage for White people within the current structures and systems of society. This is further compounded by the idea that being White is seen to be a neutral position, one without racialised connotations; a position that racialises others but not White people. This is almost an accepted fact of life, a taken for granted assumption that seems closed to question, or scrutiny such is the success of its misrecognition long established through the historical legacy of domination and cultural imperialism.
Chapter 3 Methodology

The Research Questions

The study of the literature and my own experience has led me to identify the following research questions for my thesis:

1. How is institutional racism revealed in the narratives of the White tutors and BME tutor?
2. How is whiteness illustrated in the stories of ITE tutors?
3. What are the links between institutional racism and white privilege in ITE policy and practice?

This study seeks to tap into the constructed reality of race equality in ITE via the stories or narratives of White ITE tutors and to contrast those with the narrative of a BME tutor (mine) within the institution where I work. The juxtaposition of these narratives enables the researcher to gain some insights into how this constructed reality is perceived by participants and how it plays out in the maintenance or disruption of hegemonic structures which sustain the status quo of inequity within education and ITE. Solorzano and Yosso (2002:31) acknowledge that 'many teacher education programs draw on majoritarian stories to explain educational inequity through the cultural deficit model'. It should be noted that the constructed reality within the context of this study is that which is built in an interview situation between a White tutor colleague and a BME tutor, colleague and insider researcher. This complex dynamic requires further examination as does the synergy between the theoretical framework of CRT and the methodology employed in this research.

The research questions clearly indicate that it is not only the White tutors' thinking and understanding of race equality which is being examined but how their ethnicity and racialised position as White professionals influences their approach to this aspect of initial teacher preparation. So the individual participant's narrative becomes an important part of the social reality of ITE in one institution (Mason 2002). It is through analysing their narratives that I can begin to identify how the hegemonic discourse of whiteness is both embodied and internal; and how it is performed or external. In seeking to do this barriers and bridges with respect to the ITE race equality curriculum may become evident and so contribute to the development and
implementation of additional professional development for tutors, mentors and students in this predominantly White university.

**Narratives and stories**

The terms narrative and story are used throughout this work to denote the construction of reality created within an interview space rather than creations of fiction. In using the term ‘narrative’ or ‘stories’ I draw on the work of theorist in the field of narrative inquiry which Webster and Mertova (2007:1) describe as

...set in human stories of experience. It provides researchers with a rich framework through which to investigate the ways humans experience the world depicted through their stories.

They note how narratives reveal the experience, attitudes, values and choices made by participants and how narrative inquiry can be used to understand a life journey. They also note (ibid) how analysing stories can show biases that are hidden in the normal course of life but can be highlighted through the use of narrative inquiry. In the case of this study my professional life journey is charted in terms of the race encounters within ITE and compared to that of White tutors. Indeed Clandinin and Connelly (2000:8) note that, ‘all of us lead storied lives on storied landscapes’ and through narrative inquiry one can gain a holistic understanding of our experiences and make sense of them (Webster and Mertova 2007). This is strongly supported by Clandinin and Connelly (2000:20) who argue that narrative inquiry is ‘a way of understanding experience’. Parker and Lynn (2009) assert that the use of narrative in feminist research can extend and link to CRT. So the storied lives of White tutors in the storied landscape of ITE may reveal insights into how their experience has contributed to their way of knowing and being which in turn may reveal the storied landscape of whiteness in ITE. But also that the process of storytelling is a collaborative one involving the participant’s and the researcher’s stories and so in this way the co-creation of knowledge in context occurs via this method. In essence, in the context of an interview, the co-created story provides an insight into the White tutors’ understandings of race equality in ITE.

Writers in the field of narrative inquiry assert that this way of knowing is also applicable to the researcher (Clandinin and Connelly 2000, Hollway and Jefferson 2000; Webster and Mertova 2007). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) note that
narrative inquiry starts with the researcher's autobiographical story and how it links to the research in question or question(s). In this sense part of the story has been told via the introduction to this work and other aspects of it arise later through the recount of critical events which contribute to my story. Webster and Mertova (2007:77) note how such events impact and affect the person involved; they are unplanned, unanticipated, uncontrolled, are recognised as critical after the event and have an 'important preservation and confirmatory function' for the person experiencing them. In recording the tutors' narratives about race equality and ITE similar critical events may be recounted across the tutors, or they may reveal stark dissimilarities. By asking participants to recount their story I will be asking them to reflect and analyse an everyday aspect of their professional lives and in doing so the stories may reveal hidden assumptions which may be telling about the invisible nature of whiteness in ITE.

**Narrative – story telling as a methodology in CRT**

Solorzano and Yosso (2002:27) note how racism and white privilege are embedded in the 'master narrative' and how such a narrative at an epistemological and methodological level is not neutral and thus neither is the majority story. This narrative is one of privilege that conceals 'layers of assumptions' (ibid) which have been party to the construction of such a narrative. The associated stories are then merely seen and heard as normal and taken for granted. As such any epistemological position or methodology which employs the use of CRT not only has to illuminate these majority stories but enable the telling of counter stories that seek to disrupt the dominant discourse of white privilege and whiteness.

In the interface between CRT and narrative inquiry lies the development of an epistemology of liberation (this is my own term to describe the construction of knowledge that seeks to reveal oppression and build knowledge to overcome it) for people of colour through the revelation of everyday assumptions embedded in the stories of White tutors. Solórzano and Yosso (2002:31) note that, 'it is crucial to focus on the intersections of oppression because storytelling is racialised, gendered and classed'. The methodology of narrative inquiry which encourages the participant to tell their story from their perspective not only enables the process of
illumination but also revelation for BME people who are enabled to tell their stories in order to disrupt the dominant discourse of whiteness.

The use of minority narratives is a basic methodological tool within CRT (Gillborn 2008). It is when story telling or counter story telling is used to reveal the interest of Whites or whiteness that the reactions of denial, defence, sadness and shock surface (Taylor 2009). The use of storytelling is designed to usurp the majority story, or the dominant discourses which prevail regarding race, ethnicity and education. Such methodology privileges the experience and lived reality of BME people. It is designed to forefront the ‘other story’ or the ‘Other’s story’. In using such a methodological tool CRT acknowledges the subjectivity of the perspective and asserts that without it the majority story would be the only one to prevail as it does under the guise of portraying the ‘truth’. Such narratives also serve to reveal the inadequacy of notions such as colour blindness and merit (Taylor 2009).

The strength of such a methodology lies in its ability to affirm narratives of struggle, persistence and opposition against the pervasive forces of colour blindness, or liberal niceness and as Taylor (2009) acknowledges casts a spotlight on areas which were difficult to expose through traditional statistical research methods. Solorzano and Yosso (2002:37) assert that methodologies which have been used to silence marginal voices can be used to ‘turn the margins into places of transformative resistance’. The use of storytelling or narrative gives voice to my minoritised experience within the whiteness of the academy specifically within the field of initial teacher education. As a BME researcher my experiential knowledge of being the ‘Other’ is part of the meaning making process and the use of such knowledge is part of CRT methodology (Ladson-Billings 2004). In fact, Vickers (2002:608) advocates the position of researchers as storytellers and describes it as, ‘writing on the edge- and without a safety net’. Bhopal (2010) contends that as researchers we are part of the research process. Vickers (2002:615) asserts that the act of storytelling by the researcher is not narcissism, nor self-indulgent but creates a space that others can go to. In this sense the act of telling my story not only resonates with the chosen theoretical framework but also with the liberatory epistemology of CRT.
Being a BME insider researcher – walking a tightrope

The place I occupy as a female BME ITE tutor researching her White colleagues in a predominantly White institution is one that I have always likened to that of an insider-outsider. It is also an integral element of my own story. The term insider/outsider aptly describes my position of insider tutor and senior member of staff; and outsider in terms of my ethnicity and as the researcher. This insider-outsider status affords me advantages but there are inherent disadvantages too. Griffiths (1998:41) suggests that in such a position, ‘there is a risk of exploitation and betrayal’. In terms of gaining access to the participants, their willingness, or obligation to help out, or support a colleague and the use of the University’s facilities are all advantages which could be argued that I am exploiting in order to conduct this study. In terms of some of the participants I am also their line manager so they may have felt obliged to help me; with others I am a colleague and for some they are my managers either directly or indirectly, so as colleagues they may have felt obliged to participate. It is appropriate to acknowledge that my professional relationships and a sense of reciprocity is part of the unwritten script with which I operated as an insider researcher and this is perhaps also applicable to the participants. This complex dynamic is part and parcel of conducting research in one’s own institution complicated further through the dimension of ethnicity, gender and the topic under discussion. In terms of the disadvantages I have to note that researching race in any context is a sensitive undertaking but especially in a predominantly White institution. I have to continue to work within this institution and feel bound to support it to promote the better integration of race equality within ITE and improve the preparation of student teachers to teach in a multietnic society. It could be argued that my colleagues would much rather that ‘one of their own’ researched this topic within the institution because they would be more comfortable talking to someone they knew and perhaps take more heed of the findings from someone who knew the context; or perhaps feel that an insider is less likely to betray them (Bishop 2005). To be honest, I have to, essentially walk a tightrope, balancing the need to advance practice in this area through the exposure of whiteness, work ethically and honestly whilst ensuring that the findings do not alienate my colleagues from me and vice versa.
This study seeks to explore how the racialised positions and experience of White ITE tutors as revealed in the context of an interview can influence the preparation of student teachers to teach in a multicultural society. Griffiths (1998) highlights this as a complex dynamic since it involves three dimensions: human agency, power and ethics. So a study based on researching race within one’s own institution as an insider researcher is going to pose a challenge in terms of these three aspects. I have a professional relationship with my colleagues but I noted that when I was in the interview context and became the researcher my demeanour and that of some of my respondents changed. The latter sometimes became quite formal and at the end of one interview I said to one of my colleagues, ‘I hope that wasn’t too bad’ and he responded that there ‘wasn’t anything untoward’, implying perhaps that there may have been a hint of anxiety about what I may have asked. Brown and Dowling (1998) note that moving positions from being a colleague; to being the researcher not only changes one’s perspective in that role, but in my case I think it also changed my colleagues’ perspective of me within the context of the research situation. Griffiths (1998) indicates that research participants have human agency and as such will create their own meaning of the research context and topic. In one sense this is borne out, for in subsequent chapters I mention the language used by some tutors and how comfortable they appeared with the topic but as a BME insider researcher I am not sure they would have divulged all their feelings about the context of the research and their interpretations of it to me, as they might have done to a White researcher. Indeed, Bhopal (2010:193) suggests that the power relationship can shift in a situation involving the insider-outsider research such that participants can withhold information from the researcher so ‘controlling what they disclose’. What is clear is that in interpreting the data I have to maintain an ethical stance and interpret the data rather than bring to it any other knowledge I may have of the individuals. The interpretation of the data is part of the knowledge construction process (Griffiths 1998) and the position of the insider may subconsciously affect this construction because as an insider female BME researcher I have a vested interest not to upset my colleagues but still find ways in which to use the data to improve practice. It could be argued that this situates me as the insider researcher in a position where I have to protect my own interests as an employee of the University and as such my level of critical analysis may be tempered to protect my employment. However, Shah (2004) asserts that the insider researcher has the inside knowledge and understanding to
create meaning and a more accurate picture may be painted because they have a better understanding of the context. Another dimension of the insider researcher role is the notion of power, in this case, the power relations between my colleagues and me. They may perceive the role of researcher as a powerful position and Griffiths (1998:37) notes there are power relations ‘in any human interaction’. It is difficult to negate the effects of power within the context of an interview regardless of whether the participant is a senior or junior member of staff; the interview context is one in which the researcher is in a powerful position. I think that my ethnicity as a British-Indian tutor researching the topic of race did not necessarily impact on the power dynamics of the interview situation but in the case of some tutors I think it made them wary of how they responded to questions or comments. This is alluded to in the findings and analysis chapters.

My ethnicity and gender as a colleague and researcher are inseparable from my position as an insider researcher. I focus more on my ethnicity as a researcher than on my gender because as Parker and Lynn (2002:12) observe, ‘in the case of Black women, race does not exist outside of gender and gender does not exist outside of race’. It is important in a study on race equality and whiteness to focus on my ethnicity as a researcher especially when I was working with White participants and examining the dominant discourse of whiteness. In the context of my own workplace I am unsure whether all my colleagues perceive my ethnicity or whether they apply colour blindness to my specific professional position. There is no doubt that within this study it is important to acknowledge that my ethnicity may have affected some participants’ responses. Gunaratnam (2003) suggests that within a situation involving researchers and participants from different ethnic groups the race-of-the-interviewer effect merits discussion because the absence of such examination would merely serve to underscore the ‘normality’ of research involving White participants and White researchers and strengthen the discourse of whiteness. However, she cautions that the solution does not lie in matching the ethnicity of researcher or participant especially if the participants are from BME backgrounds. But both Gunaratnam (2003) and Shah (2004) acknowledge that where the researcher is from a BME background and the participants are White then responses to questions which focus on race are likely to be influenced by the ethnicity of the researcher implying that in the context of this research the data gathered may have
been different if I had been a White researcher. The participants may have felt that they did not want to offend or upset me and Gunaratnam (2003) acknowledges that in such situations the researcher is likely to gain responses that are more liberal. Merriam et al (2001) conclude that the position of the insider-outsider researcher is not one of a simple binary relationship but one which is complex and multidimensional and that as an insider-outsider the position itself creates a 'marginal lens' (ibid: 410) which in turn affects knowledge construction. Shah (2004) sounds a conciliatory and conclusive note about the topic observing that the debate about insider-outsider researchers is ongoing and inconclusive. The awareness of the multidimensional nature of my position as researcher and colleague was one I took into the research interview situation. I was aware that some tutors engaged with me as the researcher adopting a more formal stance than usual; others sought my advice wanting me to affirm what they had said or gain advice on recruitment of BME students and others were wary of my role as researcher which was evident in the care with which they phrased their responses contrasting with their everyday engagement with me.

**Ethical issues and considerations**

In discussing my position as a BME insider researcher I have already alluded to the ethical dilemmas incorporated in this research. In addition qualitative research must consider the ethical aspects of a study involving participants especially if there is a relationship between the researcher and the researched. I feel I have a responsibility towards my colleagues and my institution. In following institutional ethical protocols formal ethical approval was gained from my institution and the Institute of Education. In advance of the formal approval I sought verbal consent and access to the participants from a senior manager at the University.

The ethical approach applied in this research is informed by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) guidelines (www.bera.ac.uk) and the concepts of harm, confidentiality, anonymity, informed consent, privacy and deception were very closely considered to ensure the guidelines were followed. Gunaratnam (2003) alerts us to the greater burden of responsibility and accountability with respect to research involving race and this is particularly pertinent in this study since it has been partly financed by the University and involved people I work with on a daily
basis within a professional capacity. In considering this aspect the participants were not misled about the purpose of the research, or the methodology, or the next steps regarding how the research would inform further institutional development. There is no intention to harm the participants as individuals or as a group. In the ethical approval documents I mention that the results of the study may not constitute comfortable reading but that the empirical findings could challenge the institution and inform the way forward with respect to race equality in the ITE curriculum and tutors’ preparations to address this aspect. The tutors’ identity has been hidden through the use of pseudonyms and at times no names are used at all (this is deliberate) and all material related to the interviews has been kept in a locked filing cabinet away from my workplace in order to maintain confidentiality. Piper and Simons (2005:57) note that ‘anonymization is a procedure to offer some protection of privacy and confidentiality’. To ensure anonymity pseudonyms have been used for each participant throughout the analysis and in some cases no pseudonyms have been cited to further protect the identity of the participant. The use of composites characters was considered as advocated by Solórzano and Yosso (2002) to further conceal and protect the participants’ identity but the limitations in terms of drawing conclusions from such constructions outweighed their use.

The participants gave their consent to participate either verbally or via email. All participants read and signed a written consent form prior to the interviews (see Appendix 3). The form indicates the purpose of the research and its use. In order to ensure continued participation and openness the interviewees were asked to validate their interview transcript. The analysis was not undertaken until the transcript had been validated. The participants were asked not to change the transcript but to note via ‘track changes’ any factual inaccuracies and to validate that it was a true account of their interview and that they were content for me to proceed with the analysis; Webster and Mertova (2007) note that participants’ validation of the transcript is an important aspect of conducting narrative inquiry. I was open and honest at all times because as a BME insider researcher examining issues of race I felt the highest standards of professional integrity and honesty needed to be demonstrated and maintained.
The setting and sample

This research is sited in a post-1992 new university. It is a comparatively small institution offering degree programmes across the ‘liberal arts’ domain. It offers a range of initial teacher education programmes in partnership with approximately 800 schools. The University was graded by Ofsted as an outstanding provider. The research was conducted within the University with academic staff involved at all levels of the management structure and across all the ITE programmes offered at the University.

After ethical approval had been obtained tutors were invited to participate in the research via email. In total approximately thirty emails were sent over the course of two months to individuals who were part of the core ITE university-based management and teaching teams on the primary and secondary programmes. The decision to approach core members of staff was taken for pragmatic reasons; there was insufficient time to interview all staff involved in ITE. For example, some staff only work for the university assessing and supervising students in schools; other staff teach for a small proportion of the time on ITE courses whereas the ‘core’ staff teach student teachers at the University as well as assess and supervise students in school. As such they had knowledge of all aspects of the ITE curriculum and thus were approached via email (see Appendix 4). Twenty-five tutors (this represents 46% of permanent staff involved in ITE) agreed to be interviewed the others did not respond or said they did not know much about the subject or were too busy. The sample included nine males and sixteen females reflecting the gender balance of staff in the department. Their ages ranged from late thirties to late fifties and they had three to eighteen years experience in ITE.

The Interviews

Interviewing was selected as the most appropriate method to gather data which would help to answer the research questions. A questionnaire or structured interview would not have elicited the detailed information required, nor provided the epistemological and methodological coherence to chime with the CRT framework. Kvale (1996) describes the context of an interview as the exchange of ideas and one in which knowledge is constructed. I have always been taken by Kvale’s (1996:4) metaphor of an interviewer as a traveller on a journey which befits the
constructionist epistemology on which this work is premised. As the interviewer I travelled with the participants as they told their stories of race equality in ITE and now having travelled through the tutors' storied landscapes and explored the territory of their tales through my questions I return home to tell their tales in this work. Brown and Dowling (1998) indicate that the personal engagement involved in an interview allows the exploration of complex ideas, the opportunity to gain detail and depth as well as gain clarification from the participant. Mason (2002:62) notes how qualitative interviewing is a dialogue designed to produce 'situated knowledge' in a social situation which requires the interviewer to be attentive, responsive, sensitive and flexible. It was important to be sensitive in a situation involving my own colleagues because outside the interview situation I still had to conduct everyday professional business with them. As such each interview was different since I responded to the individual participant within the dynamics of the interview. Sometimes the responses were to challenge their views, or ask for clarification as a means of gaining further details about their ideas and at other times it was important to move on since I sensed through the participant's non-verbal signals that they seemed to be uncomfortable. The interview process was an expedient way to create a physical space within which a narrative about race equality and ITE could be created. Parker and Lynn (2002:11) note that, 'the interview process can be pulled together to create narratives'. The contrast between the stories of the White tutors and my own minority story is designed to reveal how whiteness may be embedded within ITE.

In total twenty-five semi-structured interviews were carried out with ITE tutors. There were fourteen interviews conducted with tutors involved in primary ITE, eight interviews with colleagues involved in secondary ITE and three interviews with staff in management positions within ITE. The interviews lasted between 40 minutes to 1 hour 38 minutes. Each participant agreed to the interview being recorded and each participant validated their interview transcript. The length of the interview was determined by the depth of the individual participant's answers and the subsequent discussion they invoked with me as the interviewer. The interviews were conducted within the University at a date and time convenient to both parties. They were either conducted in the participant's room, a room within the University or in my room. The participants were given the choice of venue and some selected to come to my
room for their interviews. The semi-structured interviews were designed to elicit information to answer the research questions. Below is each research question and in italics, the interview questions asked of participants related to each area:

1. How is institutional racism revealed in the narratives of the White tutors and BME tutor?
   
   *Tell me about your journey into ITE?*
   
   *Did you have much experience of race equality training in your own ITE?*
   
   *Have you had much experience of teaching in multicultural/multiethnic schools or settings?*

2. How is whiteness illustrated in the stories of ITE tutors?
   
   *I want to explore the bridges and barriers to race equality in ITE can you tell me how you see these?*
   
   *What sort of awareness do you think our students come in with of multicultural settings and working with people from different ethnic groups?*
   
   *What do you think our schools' awareness is like of these issues?*
   
   *What do you think other ITE tutors' awareness is of the issue of race equality in ITE?*

3. What are the links between institutional racism and white privilege in ITE policy and practice?
   
   *In exploring tutors' responses I used the story of student teachers not seeing a child's ethnicity and using the concept of 'White by proxy' as coined by Jones (1999) to explore tutors' understandings of it.*
   
   *In exploring how the tutors perceived the ITE curriculum with respect to race equality I used a story of an in-service session on multicultural education I was involved in within the early years of my career. In an attempt to undermine the content of the session one colleague said, 'There's nothing multicultural about maths'. This story helped tutors firstly to reflect on the utterance itself and then on the current ITE curriculum at the University.*

It should be noted that the questions were not always asked in this order but asked as the topic naturally moved towards these areas. As such the linear progression of the

---

5 Jones (1999:45) describes how in his research one respondent based their relationship with a BME pupil 'on systematic disregard for his ethnic identity', noting that 'the quality of any relationship where one participant is perceived as white by proxy must surely be dubious, but when that relationship is between teacher and learner, the underlying assumptions are worrying'.
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questions is not evident within the transcripts but all aspects were included within the interviews.

The interviews all started with an explanation about the purpose and use of the research which was followed by a ‘warm-up’ question (Bryman 2004) about the tutors’ professional history and their experiences of working in multiethnic settings. This usually led to talk about ‘race’ related experiences in school and on the course which sometimes involved recounts of racist incidents. Denscombe (2003) underlines the importance of interviews as a means of privileging the participants’ thoughts whilst acknowledging that the rapport between the researcher and the participant, which in this case was already established through a professional relationship, is designed to gain information. Bhopal (2010:193) notes that there is a need to develop such a rapport so the, ‘respondents feel comfortable and safe’, whilst also to maintain a distance from them in order to, ‘ask respondents to explain issues that are ‘taken for granted’ and assumed’. In some ways the interviews, whilst semi-structured sometimes took on an unstructured and conversational direction. Denscombe (2003) notes that in an unstructured interview the interviewer has little control in terms of length and content and notes that it is a situation which empowers the participant. All the interviews were recorded using a digital recorder. Denscombe (2003) and Bryman (2004) have noted that some participants are put off by the recorder because it is a reminder about the formality of the situation and the importance of the interview. But none of the participants seemed overtly distracted or perturbed by the recorder.

All the interviews were firstly noted in a research log by number, date and the duration of the interview. This was done to ensure that the anonymity of the participants and the data started at this early stage. It is at this stage that I mapped each interview for emerging themes. I use an adaptation of mind mapping to create for myself a topology of the interview. This visual representation of the interview helps me to hold a holistic picture of each interview in my memory which aids the later analysis. All the recordings were professionally transcribed due to time constraints and confidentiality was insisted upon to the transcriber. The transcriptions were then analysed for recurring themes and patterns.
Throughout my time as a doctoral student and indeed before that I have kept a journal-cum-research diary to record my reflections and thoughts on any race encounters that have taken place in my personal and professional life. The research diary has helped me to reflect not only on these race encounters but also on the process of the research and my role as researcher. These reflections are used later to tell my story. This is an important aspect for me as a researcher as it represents CRT methodology of privileging minority voices but also giving voice. In this research the voice of the White tutors is heard and is deliberately brought to the forefront, their stories need to be heard but they are interpreted through my position as a female BME tutor and insider researcher. But the voice of this research position also needs to be heard in order to provide a counter-perspective and enable reflexive engagement with the data.

The Data Analysis

The analysis of the transcripts started immediately after the interview with the mapping exercise. On receipt of each transcript the accuracy of the transcription against the recording was checked and then the transcript was sent to the participants for validation. The trustworthiness of the researcher’s account of participants’ stories is verified by the participants through checking the transcript or account (Webster and Mertova 2007). It was only after the validation had been received by email that the first level of analysis started by corresponding interview map with the transcript and using different colour pens, to depict different themes which were identified through Picower’s (2009) tools of whiteness in the first instance, to mark up the transcript and identify the themes. The dominant recurring themes were then placed in a grid to map the data against the themes associated with whiteness which had been identified in the literature. These themes were:

- Colour blindness and neutrality
- Defence and denial
- White innocence
- Niceness and complacency
- Bliss in ignorance
- Use of stereotypes

It was important to draw on the theoretical framework to analyse the data since researcher self-defined categories for analysis may be subject to criticisms of bias.
However, some themes did emerge from the data itself. In addition, Webster and Mertova (2007:78) note that the corroboration of like events in narrative analysis is referred to as ‘verisimilitude’, or ‘the appearance of being true’, as a means to verify the critical events of a story. So in this way the most prevalent themes were identified and sorted according to the resonance and match with the literature and the like stories of the White tutors and thus the like stories of whiteness in ITE emerged from the data. I had intended to create composites from the data to proffer greater anonymity for the participants but realised that this would be reductionist and limit the conclusions which could be drawn from such constructions. I also explored the notion of using Weber’s (MacRae 1974) ‘Ideal types’ but this was too close to the typologies used in the IFS and I wanted to work with the data through the identified themes (Picower 2009) and other themes that emerged from the data.
Findings and Analysis

Chapter 4 Setting the Scene – Whiteness and wider discourses

Introduction

The tutors’ narratives are multi-layered and complex. The chapters outlining the findings and the analysis will be like unpeeling an onion! The layers will be peeled away to reveal the discourse of everyday whiteness in the ITE academy.

This chapter will firstly present the wider discourses related to ITE emerging from the interviews and then focus on the facets of whiteness which emerged from tutors’ narratives. When asked about their professional history and whether in their own training or subsequent school based experience they had any knowledge and understanding of teaching in multiethnic settings nineteen of the twenty-five tutors had none, or limited experience related to this context. These tutors could have been training when the CATE criteria (1984 in Gaine 1995) promoted a technicist teacher training model so it is not surprising that there was little training in this aspect. The assimilationist ideology which may have influenced the tutors’ training could contribute to their present lack of understanding. Six of these tutors trained to teach within the institution that they are now working in. In the mid-1980s this institution was thought to model good practice, yet the memory of those when asked about their training with respect to race equality seems to have faded and the training does not seem to have left any lasting impressions. In addition, twenty of the twenty five tutors had limited or no experience of teaching in multiethnic schools or areas. Two tutors had gained experience working either in an international school or with Voluntary Service Overseas; one had taught in West London and two in culturally diverse areas in the Midlands. The tutors’ own limited training related to race equality, for some their limited, or lack of experience teaching in racially and culturally diverse areas, combined with the limited contact some of them had with minority ethnic pupils and people serves to compound the Eurocentric and White-centric curriculum on offer to student teachers at this institution. Indeed the patchy provision with respect to race equality noted by Gaine (1995) is reflected in these tutors’ stories and perspectives.
In nearly all the twenty-five interviews the initial training of teachers with respect to teaching in a multicultural society was linked to wider societal changes and specific changes to the nature and content of ITE. Since some of the tutors’ narratives reflect the changes that have taken place, their reflections on these changes provide an insight into the impact of these changes on the practice of one institution. The broader narratives relate to changes in society and changes in ITE, the role of schools and the importance of the locality. These form the backcloth for the everyday stories of racism and whiteness which pervade ITE.

**BME teacher recruitment, issues for a White institution, White students’ awareness and racist incidents**

The recruitment of White and BME candidates into teaching emerged as a theme which juxtaposed interest convergence with maintaining a business-as-usual attitude to the predominantly White student intake and the existence of racist incidents. In looking at how the experiences of BME student teachers, as illustrated in the tutors’ narratives, and how the awareness of White students influences their learning, this section will also recount the racist incidents that were part of the tutors’ stories as a means to counter the claims of some tutors and reinforce the perspectives of others. The racist incidents are not included to shock, or to claim that the University is a racist organisation but to illustrate how such racist incidents are part and parcel of the life of a predominantly White university. The purpose of this section is not to analyse these racist incidents but to utilise them to illuminate how they are part of the ‘institutional wallpaper’.

For some of the tutors the fact that there were very few BME student teachers on the ITE courses was a barrier to developing other students’ understanding of race equality. Charlotte recounts how an encounter with one prospective BME student encapsulates the issue for her, which seems to be about having BME staff and students to attract other BME candidates. When she asked the student why she had chosen to go to an inner city university rather than the institution in this study the student responded that there were more people like her at the inner city campus. Molly thinks that BME people do not apply to come to the university in this study because, ‘they would feel safer going to an institution within the city area that is cheaper’. There is an implication here that BME people are safer together and poor.
This could be a stereotype that she may apply more widely. Helen also reflects this theme of, ‘they want to stay with their own kind’, by relaying the story of a Muslim young man who left the University ‘because we couldn’t offer the support, but it’s difficult isn’t it?’ Yet Sam captures the essence of an institution with its well meaning intentions, or more analytically in serving the interest convergence idea of recruiting more BME candidates into teaching, which is a TDA target, that has merely served to illustrate a self-fulfilling prophecy stereotype to itself and the schools that it works with, namely that BME teachers are not very good. In a drive to meet institutional and national targets the majority of BME candidates at this university are recruited to a particular subject attracting mature home and overseas BME students. Yet when some of them have failed to complete the course, largely due to failure on school placement, stereotypes have been drawn on to explain such failure. This deficit understanding is apparent in one tutor’s narrative, quotes have not been used here because they would identify the subject and the tutor concerned.

The predominance of stereotypes and deficit models has occurred because, firstly, there is insufficient training provided for ITE tutors and school-based mentors to help them support BME students and secondly, whilst adjustments have been made to accommodate religious requirements for some students, the racism prevalent in schools has been left unseen and unchallenged for the student teachers to negotiate for themselves. So a Muslim student can be placed in an all White school and noting that such a setting appears to be sufficient to support him because the school has ‘supportive staff’ is not sufficient in itself (Wilkins and Lall 2010 and Kohli 2009). There is little understanding of the issues related to ethnicity and racism on the part of the tutor and I would suggest on the part of the school too. It is no wonder then that the University has difficulty attracting and retaining BME students especially when such apparent neglect and ignorance about the issues is prevalent.

**Student teachers’ awareness of race equality**

When the lack of BME students is contrasted with the nature of the student intake which is predominantly White then other issues such as students’ predispositions and receptivity emerge from the tutors’ narratives. A majority of tutors noted that the student teachers the institution attracted and recruited are nearly all White (95-98%) and this was the case because a White institution attracted more White students and therefore maintained the status quo. Several tutors noted that most of the
University’s recruitment is from the local area so the student intake reflects the local demographics and they explain that this has its disadvantages in that students recruited from the locality seem to demonstrate a parochial or insular approach to ethnic diversity. For example, they say, students’ awareness is:

‘varied and patchy’ (Helen);

‘it’s a mix... South Coast dwellers are far less informed...have got a narrow background...feel quite vulnerable’ (Nora);

‘there is a certain amount of naïvety’(Emma);

‘our local students are a bit blinkered and unaware they have lived in a very White, middle class area... they want to teach in the area they come from... they don’t want to stray very far from the garden gate’ (Alf);

As indicated by Helen earlier it appears that the White students want to stay with their own kind too. Others noted,

students’ awareness is ‘an incredibly mixed bag... it depends on their background’(Henry).

Yvonne says, she feels, ‘very depressed most of the time about students’ level of awareness of race equality issues’. She gives an example of a newly qualified teacher who had trained at the institution, ‘who couldn’t see anything wrong with [the term] gollywogs, she couldn’t see a problem with that...her understanding of issues of ethnicity, racism and social justice were nil’. She says she is, ‘very worried’ about the attitude of ‘young White teachers’ who she describes as being, ‘aggressive, very assertive and very sure of their views’. Rona noted how she felt student teachers of today did not have any political awareness yet here Yvonne describes young teachers as aggressive in their views. Tom talks about getting ‘subtle vibes’ from students when he talks about their awareness of race equality noting that there is, ‘an underlying racism’, which is probably, ‘to do with family background’. Molly talks about the student intake as ‘Caucasian, White working to middle class...and perhaps we are not proactive enough to make them aware’, clearly indicating a complicity in maintaining the status quo.

These perceptions about the students who are recruited to train as teachers at this institution is contrasted with one from Lionel who casts them as undeniably well intentioned people. He says,
‘Students are so...they become so conscious about wanting to do it right, they are good people they get nervous about it [race equality]. They don’t want to make the mistake whatever the mistake is in terms of things like offending people in error and doing something foolish that doesn’t kind of help some kind of communication between cultures. They are fully aware of the ethics of it but there is a kind of nervousness as well unless you are immersed in the practice of it’.

This statement exemplifies whiteness. There seems to be some imploring that because they are good people they should be left as such relating to Dyer’s (1997) and Srivastava’s (2009) association of White and innocence. Yet such student teacher and school innocence is not evident when some of the racist incidents which the tutors talked about are recounted. Many tutors suggested that students needed to be aware of their starting points, but another tutor seemed to want to protect the White students as we talked about teachers’ identity and how this may be perceived to shape teacher response to pupils he says,

‘I think the most reliable way of doing it is to treat children as individuals, people as individuals....I think I am a traditionalist....the trouble is I don’t really know the answer to that [question about student positionality]. I think it might add another layer of worry to student teachers. They have got enough to worry about in the first place without worrying, well I happen to be female and I happen to be well educated, so whenever I am in front of this group how is that going to convey itself almost unconsciously and they think well I can’t do anything about it. I’m still their educator, I am still female, I am still White, I am still Black, I am what have you [and] it is beyond my control. So all you do is add something else to worry about’.

Such a statement encapsulates a white perspective which is protective of the White student teachers’ position. It could be a statement of a ‘traditionalist’ position in maintaining the innocent status quo of whiteness which ought not to be troubled by a layer of worry. In articulating this position the dominant discourse of whiteness is not only protected but privileged and as Garner (2010b) notes serves to exemplify the success of neo-liberal discourses.
Racist Incidents

One of the most revealing aspects of the tutors’ stories was how they recounted racist incidents but in most cases how such incidents seemed to disappear into a void without being reported, analysed or used to develop tutors’, or students’ understanding of the issues. In some instances the racist incidents are classified as such by me rather than the tutors themselves. They range from students’ ‘embarrassed laughter’ when shown a website for Gypsy, Roma Traveller children to students using the term ‘pikey’ when referring to this group of children in a presentation. Helen describes how the students seemed to use the term quite extensively and without any apparent discomfort. As the tutor she did point out the error of their ways. However, such incidents appear to be part of the everyday discourse, little attention is drawn to them, and they appear to be unreported and are not used as part of staff development. They serve to illustrate one of the dominant tenets of CRT that racism is part and parcel of everyday life (Delgado and Stefancic 2001).

Bethan alludes to a past incident and implies the students were perhaps treated unfairly for playing Hangman with the word Muslim. She describes the students as, ‘not thinking at all’ and states that the staff were unaware why on this occasion it was, ‘such an issue and so did the students’, who she described as initially thinking, ‘this is just an innocent game’. In her interview, she seems to give the impression that the person who found the students playing this, ‘innocent game’, had, ‘made a big deal’ out of it. Yvonne describes an incident in a lecture where she was engaged in raising students’ awareness of pictorial representations of society and the absence of BME people in visual images which was part of a session on race equality. She says,

‘But anyway, so the outcome was me talking about representing Britain as it really is, which includes all sorts of views, all sorts of ethnicities, all sorts of sexualities, sexual orientations.... And someone shouted, ‘Bollocks’. So I said, ‘Sorry’... I said, ‘Sorry, the person who just shouted bollocks what is your issue?’ ‘Oh this is doing my head in’. And it then turned into bear baiting and afterwards I found out that all the people who were most aggressive were in the.....department’.
This incident is alarming. But to this day I am unaware as to whether this student was talked to and whether this was recorded as a racist incident. Kirsty describes how she and another tutor had cause to talk to one student about views they had expressed about homosexuality in an essay. After discussing the issues the student decided to withdraw from the course. Kirsty says,

‘that’s one that decided to walk, but others keep their heads down, other students report what they say in the canteen, such as, ‘it is political correctness gone mad’, or other such disparaging comments’.

The notion of keeping your head down appeared in Tracey’s interview. She notes that whilst students are,

‘aware of race and culture issues.. they’re aware of broad, kind of acceptable norms almost, but until it affects them personally, then I don’t know what’s actually going on in their thinking....’

She reveals that she is not sure that a student would not draw on racist language if ‘a Black kid was pushing them to the limit’. There seems to be a duality of thinking revealed in recounts of racist incidents, from race equality is not an issue, to it is an issue under the surface, a hint here of passive racism as shown by Marx’s (2006) participants. Since an ‘innocent game’ of Hangman and shouting ‘bollocks’ do not constitute violent acts of racism for some White people these events seem to have just passed by as part of an institutional narrative of whiteness. The participants did not convey that there was an institutional record noting that these incidents took place and that as a consequence certain actions were implemented. The institutional rhetoric of equality serves to protect and conceal everyday racism in a White institution, as evident in these incidents.

We can do race equality. Or can we? Tutors talking about tutors

In tutors talking about themselves and other tutors the shortcomings in the tutors’ own experiences was shown to be an impediment, as was their own understanding, or lack of it as perceived by their colleagues. The tutors also identified themselves as a collective group in need of additional support and further staff development with respect to their understanding of race equality and some tutors indicated that others were either not committed, or unaware of race equality. About a quarter of the tutors (6) said that further staff development was necessary in this area because as Charlotte indicated most tutors were probably like her, with limited experience and
understanding of the area; she felt, ‘race gets pushed to the bottom of the agenda’; that ITE tutors talk about equal opportunities but that there is little action, ‘not everybody would be able to take the next step and say because of that I would act in this particular way’. This respondent felt that,

‘You’d have to start with staff because unless the staff truly believe it and are able to make it sound as if they truly believe it, as opposed to saying what they think they ought to say, then there is no way the students’ attitude is going to change....It’s really nice to sit and think about those sorts of things which I have to be perfectly honest and admit, don’t turn up at the front of what I am thinking, or talking about either’.

Other tutors echoed this lack of attention to race and ethnicity by their colleagues by noting that tutors were like the students, those with greater awareness ensured that the students were conversant with all aspects of race and ethnicity; ‘the tutors’ awareness is reflected in the students’ attitudes’; another claimed that possibly, ‘staff were dated’; others noted that tutors stayed in their comfort zone and another stated, ‘we don’t always want to be challenged’. Vince said,

‘I’ll be straight with you until that period of time [when I and another member of staff implemented a staff development session on race and ethnicity], I don’t think I had even thought about it’.

So it seems that unless you are truly committed to the issue it does not seem to appear on the radar of most White tutors and one of them affirms this in the following extract:

VL: the bit I am interested in is how tutor awareness impacts and whether there are bridges and barriers, there, which we need to unpack because in a similar way to schools....

Interviewee: I don’t know if there are barriers. I think there may be perhaps, a lack of understanding, lack of knowledge and in some cases because people have been working in one particular area for quite a lengthy time, very easily you slip into the normal code, whatever that may be, but, it’s very easy to get into that you know. Perhaps [it] just needs that sort of consistent input from the wider area to develop and making sure that one is not taking things for granted, one is tackling the issues that need to be tackled, by and large. So it’s not about barriers, it’s about updating, up-skilling that constantly needs to be visited so that we don’t slip into a culture which could be perceived as ignorant.
It seems that just as with the students, the tutors also need to have their ‘normal code’ disrupted. It appears that ‘normal’ is code perhaps for the dominant colour blind, White discourse which prevails. Yvonne exclaims that, ‘people are terrified, by the time they get to be tutors they should know the answers and they don’t...I am appalled by the understanding of tutors here...’ Rona is more condemnatory. She says,

‘I think it is the notion of quite comfortable White people who’ve probably, with a few notable exceptions, have never considered the issue of race and probably don’t wish to. I think on the surface they’d probably be horrified to think of themselves as racist, but I think, nonetheless they are racist, in that I think if you dug a bit deeper, they would shy away, or become quite hostile to the idea that... ‘I don’t see why we have to bother’, in inverted commas with ‘these issues’ and I think that’s quite an interesting thing to unpick about what people mean. I mean I have heard staff say, ‘I don’t’, [changes voice to mimic] ‘I don’t’, I can quote from one, ‘I don’t really understand why we get so embroiled in these issues’ [emphasis on original recording] which I find ultimately incredibly alarming because ‘these issues’ ‘others’ it any way. It’s like it’s nothing to do with her. You know a total lack of understanding and a lack of a wish to engage. Whereas there is also amongst other staff a real hatred. I mean, I do use that word advisedly, I don’t think that’s amongst many. I think a lot of it is an uneasiness, a lack of willingness to engage, they don’t understand and they don’t really want to understand...so it’s just, push it away. But there are, one, or two, that I would say, there is a real hatred, and I mean a real hatred and I think those issues are there as well’.

This is not only a very strong and analytical statement which clearly shows the operation of whiteness amongst tutors but also possibly illustrates how some tutors may have hidden their real feelings or understandings during the course of the interviews but maybe within their teaching too. Katy theorises well why White tutors would be reluctant to move their own positions. She notes,

‘I think part of the challenge is colleagues have a lot of cultural capital. They have a lot of standing and really they don’t have to give up anything of themselves. There is nothing necessarily personally for them to be gained, to embrace a different way of thinking and they may actually lose something because reflecting is painful and does require... I mean, they will have achieved in their lives to this point doing things the way they have done it, and as I say, they can present the material and say I have done it. I have shown students how to do this. I do know how to work with children with EAL, so in a sense the professional world protects them. They could make a good case and I think some of them possibly realise that they are using that to protect them and some genuinely don’t understand that is the kind of barriers that...’
When Tracey is asked about tutors’ level of awareness she responds by saying, ‘That’s a really good question’, then laughs and in a quieter voice she says,'This is my perception I don’t think we’re very strong as a department in actually overtly addressing, not just race equality but other social issues. We need to be flagging them up because if we don’t believe in them enough we’re not going to be embedding them in our modules. I don’t think as a team we are very strong on that to be honest'.

There emerges a picture of tutors who talk about their own and others’ lack of knowledge, understanding and experience as a barrier, but then, what can only be referred to as excuses, are used to justify the status quo, whilst other tutors call for staff development, a small minority directly talk about the power of tutors’ investment in their own cultural and professional capital that not only maintains the status quo, but how it is guarded (Milner 2008) just as one would protect property which here is not only professional capital but White cultural capital and whiteness as property (Harris 1993) to be protected as a possession.

**Wider discourses about race equality and ITE**

When tutors talked about the changes to ITE they mentioned the curriculum and the influence of schools on the training of pre-service teachers. Their views exemplified their positions and ranged from a belief that the curriculum reflected a post-racial society to one who bemoaned the lack of in-depth coverage of issues related to equality and another who noted the inadequacy, or rather the impotence of competencies noting they failed to develop truly reflective practitioners who could act based on their understanding of sociological concepts.

Eight of the 25 tutors felt that the ITE curriculum within the institution did not do enough to develop students’ understanding of race equality; 13 tutors felt that the curriculum was good or at least good enough with respect to preparing student teachers for race equality, three tutors were ambivalent with one appearing not to know what the curriculum content included with respect to race equality and did not seem to care overly about her lack of knowledge. One tutor felt that there was too much on race and not enough emphasis on other aspects.
We don’t do enough

Rona describes how in the late 1980s and early 1990s all student teachers had to undertake a module which examined inequalities associated with class, race and gender. She describes how it was ‘a very powerful module’, which was challenging and she observes that there was some movement in the student teachers’ attitudes because there was time, space, the right staff and how ‘more politically aware’ students enabled a shift in attitudes. Gaine (2001) asserts that if it did ‘not hurt’ then it did ‘not work’ alluding to the cognitive conflict associated with race awareness training and that without it there is no shift in students’ attitudes. Bob, Katy and Rona all believe that preparing student teachers for a multicultural society requires dedicated time and space on the ITE curriculum with Bob saying that, ‘I probably didn’t do enough, I would have thought to challenge some of [the] exclusionary attitudes’. He also notes that it is very difficult to develop ITE students’ philosophical understanding when time on the ITE programmes is so limited alluding to the high proportion of time students spend in schools. He suggests,

‘for me it’s let’s train these teachers really well in what we are statutorily required to do. Let’s do it so well that they are confident enough they have the tools to subvert, to analyse and to explore the unintended opportunities in these things’ [i.e. the statutory curriculum].

For Bob it is about developing a deeper understanding though this is hindered by time constraints. This limitation was the intended effect of the changes to ITE (Menter 1989, Siraj-Blatchford 1993). Katy acknowledges that ‘we are good at raising the issues and moving them [students] on in terms of their thinking....but they don’t know what they don’t know’. She appositely analyses the extant ITE curriculum approach within the University as one which is based on a deficit model. She describes it in relation to how pupils with EAL are referred to by other tutors, ‘as if the child has an affliction, for example, like children with chicken pox, or bow legs!’ She indicates that there is a prevalent attitude amongst students and tutors alike that, ‘this is aberrant, not the norm, we have to fix it, the problem of EAL is the child’s, not mine’. She calls for students and tutors to, ‘step outside their comfort zone’ alluding to the need to inflict cognitive conflict in an attempt to disrupt the discourse of whiteness.
Other tutors who did not feel there was enough coverage of race equality within the ITE curriculum provided more pragmatic solutions. Charlotte felt that race issues ‘were not dealt with openly’ and whilst she was unaware of how the issues were covered on the curriculum she did not feel confident that the students would know what to do if there was a racist incident in their classroom, she felt they did not know the procedures and in thinking back she voiced,

‘I think I’m not sure we have made a particularly long journey. I think part of the problem is that the majority of staff are probably quite like me and have had little practical experience and probably had very limited training and also part of the problem is it is sometimes very difficult to link the theory, if you then have no practice to put it into. I think that is a problem for both staff and students; and it is still the case that we have a very limited number of students of different races; and your good self excepted, we have very limited staff from different races and I think as long as that continues we are going to perpetuate the problem identified donkey’s years ago, as the ‘no problem here’ and I think it is a predominant attitude. That it isn’t a problem’.

She links the curriculum as a place for procedure as a means of theory transfer which is enacted in practice which is a very different stance from the ‘challenge the attitudes’ type approach voiced by other tutors, like Katy. However, Charlotte does connect students’ and tutors’ lack of knowledge about race equality as a barrier to change linking it to the ‘no problem here’ syndrome identified by Gaine (1987) and evident in the attitudes of some students and tutors.

Kirsty echoes the frustrations associated with time constraints and the curriculum. She bemoans the technicist approach and the absence of critical thinking with respect to students asking themselves, ‘how am I doing anything to reflect life in a diverse society?’ She reflects how she worked with staff to change the curriculum so that it is now a ‘drip, drip’ affair with respect to race equality and aspects of identity. Some tutors talked about how they included cultural influences on the history and development of their subject and how such dimensions could be transferred to the classroom; whilst others noted that they did not do enough hoping that it was covered in the Professional Studies element of the course. Tom notes that, ‘students need a broader philosophical perspective about the nature and make-up of society’. He felt that the broader underlying aspects of social justice were not covered well saying it, ‘was a bit hit and miss.’ He was very clear that,
‘if we do value multicultural education and preparation for such, then we perhaps should do something a little bit more..what we have here isn’t necessarily the best version’.

When asked, ‘So we don’t prepare them [students] for a multicultural society?’ He responds, ‘Guilty as charged your honour’, indicating that students are inadequately prepared to teach in a multicultural society.

We do enough

Other tutors recounted how they felt that the ITE curriculum within the institution offered good enough opportunities to develop students’ understanding of race equality. These tutors focussed on the details of tasks or minutiae of the curriculum; demonstrating their own technicist leanings rather than the philosophical approach adopted by the others. So, for example, Peggy, recounts in detail each task students are asked to complete within her subject discipline and reinforces it with affirmative statements of, ‘how much they get out of them’, but reflects Charlotte’s stance regarding the theory-practice gap; ‘they [the students] value it [the task] but can’t apply the skills, the knowledge, or gain experience’. But she acknowledges that it is not just the aspect of practice that is missing to apply theory but the students have to be taken out of their ‘comfort zone’ just as Katy stated earlier. Peggy notes, ‘It is good to be put in an uncomfortable position, recognise where you are at....be more reflective’. This is contrasted with Alf who carefully delineates the difference between the terms BME and EAL and thinks that this is an important part of the learning process with respect to race equality. Later, he says, ‘I am very encouraged by the attitudes the modern student has towards BME. I think it’s very encouraging really’. He notes, ‘we are doing probably as much as we can do in ITE for the time we have with them, without making too much of a song and dance of it’. He thinks that, ‘we send them off with an appropriate attitude towards accepting difference, diversity I think’. There seems to be an ‘enough is enough’ attitude here, or may be a tick-box mentality. In talking about preparing students to teach in a multicultural society, one tutor, Sam, talks about the work he undertakes within his discipline with respect to the way different cultures have shaped the study of the subject and how he examines the place of pupils’ achievements within a cultural domain rather than talk about race or ethnicity. He says,
‘Actually I have never made it a Black, ethnic issue I make it a cultural issue and I am very careful to do this I never mention colour, race or ethnicity at all and I think that’s because I’m scared of doing so, which is probably quite a typical thing. I talk about cultural issues’.

In such a statement is an admission of avoidance with respect to aspects of ethnicity and the safer cultural approach is adopted which Menter (1989), Gaine (1995) and others would typify as a soft multicultural and power-evasive (Frankenberg 1993) approach. The students within this subject discipline do not have the opportunity to question why they have never heard of some of the developments within this subject at an earlier stage of their education and notions of power and knowledge control are avoided for the apparent comfort of the tutor. This is a very stark example of the power and control of whiteness over the ITE curriculum.

It is even more worrying when three tutors voice ignorance of the content of the ITE curriculum with respect to race equality. Fiona notes that student teachers have time to reflect while they are at university on the practice they have seen in schools. This contrasts with the view of other tutors who state there is insufficient time for reflection. She says, ‘the students and me, certainly, when I arrived still do not have sufficiently good understanding of the issues...about understanding the legislation, understanding their legal responsibilities, understanding how diversity and inclusion come together all of those things’. This links to Bethan’s view which seems to be oblivious to the nature of race equality within her subject. It appears to be an issue which she gives very little time to. She even implies that the QTS Standard related to pupils with EAL is not specific but a ‘whole inclusion Standard’, noting ‘that it’s generic’. The most worrying response with respect to the ITE curriculum came from one tutor who said, ‘here as an institution there isn’t any prejudice towards language, colour, race or culture. We tend to think student awareness will just occur’. The complacency of this approach could be damaging for the institution and the student teachers this tutor teaches.

Even more disturbing are the reflections of another tutor, Lionel, who is concerned that race is privileged over other inequalities within the ITE curriculum. He says;

‘My only concern.. it’s a kind of problem with what the University does is there are lots of issues that can influence children’s well being whether they all get as much exploration as they could do I am not sure. Well I don’t know.. what I am trying to say without getting it wrong in the way that I say
it. It's like, I don't really know... I know your interest here is in race. I think of that as one of many issues. If any one of the issues could be within that mix—becomes the issue, I think that it can be problematic for the students who recognise other issues'.

This tutor is the only one who voiced such concerns. When asked if he thought we do too much on race there is some hesitance and then he says,

'Well as a member of staff working here I wouldn't say that, but I think that some students have responded in that way. They think we are hitting the kind of heavy button on this and enough is enough. One student said in an evaluation that it was 'political claptrap'. I think if I were a student I might have written that myself sometimes because some of the ideas about education overall that come out are from the Left'.

He suggests that students should be given a balanced argument with ideas from the political Left and Right (but it could be that he is using a student position to present his own stance here). Whilst this may seem quite a reasonable stance what is missing within the ITE curriculum is the time to develop students' understanding of philosophical and sociological ideas in order to undertake an intellectual exercise in 'weighing up' the different perspectives. The changes to ITE over the last thirty years have led to the diminution of the curriculum in terms of the intellectual underpinnings required for student teachers to critique educational policy and changes to the school curriculum. The changes to the ITE curriculum have forced tutors into delivery mode, or as Rona has it, into a 'tick box culture', leaving new teachers impotent in critiquing approaches to education and defining their own philosophical positions.

**It's the schools and locality**

Since ITE courses at both primary and secondary level involve students spending three-quarters of their time in schools, many of the participants thought that this was a key factor in students' lack of awareness about race equality. They appeared to hand over the responsibility for this omission to the schools. There were two aspects to the tutors' stories with reference to schools and the part they played in developing student teachers' understandings of race equality; firstly that students did not have an opportunity to be placed in ethnically diverse schools due to the lack of ethnic diversity within the locality, implying that students needed the opportunity to put their knowledge and understanding into practice; and secondly, the schools themselves were not sufficiently aware of, nor conversant with the area of race
equality due to the lack of ethnic diversity and therefore students could pick up on the schools’ ‘no problem here’ approach.

Tutors who had been headteachers in the recent past noted that in their role there was, ‘no time to look at issues of diversity’; ‘we run the risk that students will learn from the schools’ and Tillie notes,

‘I think where our barrier is, is when our students go out to schools. Schools have limited experience of working with BME/EAL pupils. All students need a broader experience. At the moment provision is patchy.’

Another tutor explains why it is important to have a placement in an ethnically diverse school, ‘People in schools where all the cultures of the world are represented get more confident in it. They are immersed in it’. Nearly all the tutors interviewed thought that a school placement in an ethnically diverse area would be beneficial for the students. They justified it in terms of linking theory with practice and felt that it was, ‘more powerful than the tutors telling students’ (Charlotte). Kirsty theorised the increase in school-based training,

‘[w]as a way of getting schools to address particular issues. ITE has the potential to get schools to question practice. but it also has the potential to alienate schools and make them very defensive and to make them very frightened.’

Indeed Peggy’s recount of the ITE curriculum in terms of the tasks and sessions related to ‘diversity’ she notes that the school-based task which is a mandatory requirement that students to plan for a bilingual or multilingual child in their class even if they do not have one, is seen by the mentors ‘as a chore for the students’. Tracey describes how her trainees gain invaluable experience in one of her multiethnic schools, ‘it is an eye-opener for me how a school community can marry and blend the key issues.... and it’s a very different attitude’. Bethan also notes that when she visited a multiethnic school that, ‘it was an eye-opener, my own background is just White middle class’. Molly says how much we rely on ‘their [student teachers’] exposure within school placements’. There is an overwhelming tide of opinion that placements in multiethnic schools would benefit the students but some tutors do sound a note of caution stating that it has to be, ‘a meaningful experience with tutors on side’. Other ITE tutors mention not only their own lack of experience but also that of other ITE tutors and staff in schools. Tillie says,
staff who have expertise in schools in low diversity areas cannot give guidance to students on issues related to race equality, or BME, or EAL matters and some link tutors have limited experience and knowledge of BME, race equality and EAL matters.’

Angela and Wendy present the two sides of the coin regarding teachers’ expertise. Angela has worked in ethnically diverse areas and currently works with schools in such areas. She feels that, ‘the teachers are so entrenched in diversity that it rubs off on the students’; whereas Wendy is more sceptical, ‘A lot of teachers have a fairly narrow world view’; Walter also suggests that ‘there are pockets of teachers who are really set in their ways’; which echoes Rona’s feeling that in some mainly White schools certain attitudes are merely reinforced. Kirsty notes how in such schools there is still the ‘no problem here’ (Gaine 1987) syndrome as Charlotte identified. It seems that tutors feel that the students need their ‘eyes opened’ through a multiethnic school placement but none of them mention the work that would be required in terms of students examining their attitudes prior to such a placement. The exposure to minority ethnic pupils is cast as a way of acquiring a ‘multicultural capital’ to enhance a White cultural capital. Such acquisitiveness (Reay et al 2007) is cast as unproblematic and as an act of consumption on the part of student teachers which leaves intact existing predispositions of whiteness.

In Emma’s narrative, which is corroborated by another participant, she describes how a Muslim student wearing a hijab was not succeeding in school and how eventually the school managed to ‘send the student away without failing her’. She feels sure it was due to the school’s racism but describes it as,

‘we get into the uncomfortable territory of a school pushing a student away, but giving us a reason that isn’t the real reason, so we are almost revealing an amount of racism within the school’s management structure that is terribly difficult for us as an institution, with a parity of partnership, to find a way into’.

Emma felt the University could not discuss the situation with the school, or offer staff development on race equality. She likened this suggestion of mine as being perceived by the school ‘as a wrap over the knuckles...it’s quite sensitive territory’. This encapsulates the dilemma of school based ITE and partnership with schools. Kirsty comments that ITE is used as a conduit to improve schools, but it seems when it comes to racism, the ITE provider is hamstrung in a situation where they are dependent on the goodwill and capacity of partner schools to provide placements and
so improving practice via ITE can only occur with ‘safe’ topics such as assessment, thereby reflecting the structural limitations on individuals’ actions. This situation reflects Menter’s (1989) trepidations with regards to the changes to ITE instigated in the 1980s.

**Personal and structural**

Tutor stories about ITE and wider society emerged as a way of explaining good or poor practice in ITE within the University. The stories are two-fold. Firstly, there are the stories which encapsulate whiteness in operation and secondly, others which reveal a greater awareness of issues related to inequality. For example, a small minority of tutors bemoaned the lack of political awareness amongst student teachers nowadays and two thought teaching was an apolitical profession. Three tutors, Bob, Katy and Rona professed their own political stances in their interviews. All three noted their interest and adherence to notions of social justice and the need for ‘self awareness and reflexivity’ (Bob). Each denied that teachers could be neutral. In fact Bob and Rona were able to theorise the changes in society which they both felt had little appreciation of difference. Some tutors with a strong personal philosophy used it to explain their responses. Bob confirms that as an ITE tutor, ‘I don’t think it is possible to separate the personal from the structural’, referring to his own approach.

This was a common theme with those who felt their personal philosophy drove their pedagogical approach. Rona felt that she was definitely, ‘left wing with my interest in gender’ and felt that ITE was now in a ‘backlash situation’ where it appeared to be delivered in supposedly an apolitical space, or in a space which reflected the neoliberal discourse prevalent today. Bob showed the greatest theoretical understanding of his position as a White male and how this may be perceived and how it may have shaped his views. He openly talks about his own position as an ‘un-reconstituted left-winger’ and how he has worked hard to challenge his own ‘racist and sexist attitudes’. Bob acknowledges that his approach was influenced by his ITE tutor and Kirsty also mentioned the same tutor as providing a perspective which encouraged reflexivity with regards to your own position as a teacher thus underscored the important role of the ITE tutor. Rona asserted that it was her interest in gender which later led to her interest in race equality issues. Whilst on the one hand these tutors present a picture of how changes in society have not eroded
their philosophical positions they do acknowledge that the world of ITE has changed since their own training and that it is a changed landscape of compliance which Bob and Rona feel ought to be subtly subverted to better prepare student teachers for a multiethnic society.

The other tutors either did not mention wider political contexts, or they made indirect references to it. For example, one noted that, ‘we would all put our hand up and profess to equal opportunities’, or that, ‘Ofsted is promoting the diversity agenda’ as Fiona articulates, but Helen echoes the post-race narratives evident in the sub-text of some tutors stories such as Alf, or Molly. Helen says,

‘so it’s interesting but there are other issues now aren’t there to do with people who have White skin or whatever. They [students] are not aware that, that actually is just as important as racism’.

She alludes here to the issue of Gypsy, Roma and Travellers which she links to a story of student teachers displaying racist attitudes to this group within a session. But yet she feels race and racism is a ‘done deal’ with respect to visible minorities.

Henry exudes passion about social justice, teachers making a difference and, ‘of a fairer society and a more decent society, a society of equal opportunity, a society where we do recognise individuals as individuals’. In these utterances which concur with those of Molly who appears to acknowledge class and her own roots as ‘White working class’, but who later notes,

‘I think it goes back to identity, you’re actually proud of where you have got to, not ashamed of where you have come from, we had to work very hard and when I think of colour and I think of religion in a way and you think of EAL students, students with special needs it’s that battle, because you are fighting for your own identity really and somehow as a society we put constraints on class, colour constraints’.

Here she implies that society somehow restricts your identity into class and colour. So the individual is defined by these and not an individual in their own right. Henry and Molly both stress the notion of society as one which should be just but as one that constrains individuality. In their interviews, unlike those of Bob or Rona, whilst there is some recognition of their own positions as either White middle class, or White working class people, they present the idea of the individual as separate yet
affected by society. This focus on the 'individual' is a key feature of Molly's interview and reflects neoliberal constructions of identity as noted by Garner (2010b) who notes that whilst people acknowledge that there is a class system they are reluctant to assign themselves to a class (unlike Molly);

I suggest this is evidence of the success of the neoliberal project in its British guise. Popular understandings of identity have been saturated to the point where the norm is for identification as an individual rather than as a member of a collective (Garner 2010b:3)

The postmodernist, left-wing confessions of Rona, Katy and Bob are contrasted by the neoliberal positions of Helen, Henry and Molly. The wider political influences within society appear to be reflected in the stories of these tutors.

In summary, so far the findings have provided the background to the institution and how tutors respond to questions about the race equality in the ITE curriculum. They indicate that it is influenced by changes in wider society, that changes to the ITE curriculum have constrained the ITE curriculum to mitigate against developing a depth of understanding; that schools in less ethnically diverse areas are not equipped to develop student teachers’ awareness of the issues especially when the nature of the student intake is taken into consideration representing a local White middle to working class demographic. Tutors indicate that they themselves, or their colleagues are inexperienced, that some are not committed; and others are insufficiently prepared to advance students’ and schools’ understanding of race equality. Yet silently in the background racist incidents occur which remain largely unreported and appear to be swept under the carpet. This is an appropriate back drop from which to reveal the next layer of the story, one of whiteness and the perpetuation of whiteness by ITE tutors.
Chapter 5 Whiteness speaks – ITE tutor talk

In this chapter the manifestation of whiteness in the tutors’ narratives will be analysed using Picower’s (2009) notion of the ‘tools of whiteness’ which are designated as instruments of active resistance and a means by which hegemony or white privilege and supremacy is protected. The chapter will show how some tutors’ narratives reveal the existence of institutional racism and how they use the tools of whiteness to maintain the status quo, whilst the narratives of others show their insights into structural inequality.

The emotional tools of whiteness

This section will analyse how the emotional and performative tools of whiteness emerge through the White tutors’ narratives. The analysis of the transcripts revealed approximately key features which could be classified as the emotional tools of whiteness. Understandably in a conversation with me as a fellow colleague none of the tutors employed crying, or hostility, or anger as resistance strategies. They were in a professional role and acted as such in the interviews. The emotional tools of whiteness used were denial, or deflection, as acts of defence in the maintenance of innocence, or the ethical good self. In some cases there was ignorance shown in the way the participants used language to refer to Black and minority ethnic people. Indeed the participants’ use of language could in itself form the subject of another study based on discourse analysis which may reveal how comfortable they were with the ideas under discussion. The following examples are offered as observations in terms of how the tutors used language to convey their narratives. Indeed the use of terms such as ‘neutral’ or ‘normal’ appeared to unconsciously affirm whiteness as a ‘norm’ and yet to indicate in a coded way its superiority and that issues of race and racism are associated with the racialised ‘Other’, namely BME people. Another semantic mismatch which some tutors employed was the use of umbrella terms such as diversity, or inclusion, to refer to race and ethnicity. Bonilla-Silva (2002:61) notes how White people have learned to use language, or ‘semantic moves’, which betray their colour blind thinking and this is discussed later in the text.

Deflection and Denial

Denial was most evident in the way some participants dealt with the topic of Black boys’ underachievement which arose during the course of the interview. One tutor
did not respond to the question but moved the discussion on to White working class boys’ underachievement. The same tutor, Fiona, felt there really was no more time to devote to aspects such as EAL and for her, ‘dyslexia is an issue to do with diversity’. In a discussion about Jones’ (1999) notion of ‘White by proxy’, which is discussed in the section on colour blindness later, one tutor offers the explanation that a weak student may well not notice a child’s ethnicity. Here the quality of a student teacher is used to deflect the discussion on colour blindness and passive racism. In talking about her area of the curriculum Bethan notes how her modules do not lend themselves to the issue of culture and creates a picture of almost a culture free zone implying that it (aspects of race equality) probably comes up in modules such as Professional Studies. She seems uninterested in the issues and when I asked if she could name any BME people in her field, or had thought why there were so few in that area she is unmoved and cannot offer an explanation. When asked if White students’ attitudes shift after the work one tutor undertakes in his area he starts to talk about a group of Black students on his courses which show no movement in their racist attitudes. Another tutor, Katy, surmises that ITE tutors not only want to defend their capital but also that their fear of issues related to race and ethnicity lie in the fear associated with the dilution, or perhaps contamination of White British culture, or indeed the fear that they are being asked to give up, or relinquish aspects of their culture (Milner 2008). This adeptly captures the essence of whiteness as exemplified by Bonnett (2000) and Garner (2007). There may have been specific examples of deflection which linked closely to maintaining the ethical self or white innocence (Rodriguez 2009) and simultaneous rejection of any feelings of guilt or shame that may have arisen as part of the interview but they did not overtly reveal themselves in the tutors’ narratives.

**White innocence**

The maintenance of the good self, or the ethical self, or innocence, manifests itself in expressing shock at the presence of, or acts of racism; in projecting innocence onto the student teachers and in a narrative about ‘the individual’. There is no doubt that maintaining white innocence is also linked to the ‘being nice’ approach which Picower (2009) notes is a strategy employing hegemonic understandings. As stated earlier one tutor felt that student teachers really did not need another ‘layer of worry’ to burden them when asked if students needed to be aware of their own positionality.
he asserts, ‘they are good people’. Since the majority of students at the University are White it follows therefore that they are also good and should not be burdened by the supposed guilt they may encounter when their position of power and privilege is revealed. This association is stressed by Bonnett (2000), Srivastava (2009) and Rodriguez (2009) who noted that the investment in innocence is important in upholding whiteness and particularly white privilege.

Another way of maintaining white innocence is by expressing shock at the existence of racism, or racist acts, or indeed to recount how some tutors dealt with racist incidents themselves. In such acts these tutors uphold that racism is acts of hatred yet at the same time in their interviews they maintain a colour blind perspective, or seem oblivious to institutional racism. Bethan exclaimed shock and surprise when she learnt that a Black lecturer had suffered overt racism at the University.

Interviewee: I was massively surprised when I was told about the ... lecturer that a student or students have said they would not have seminars with him.

VL: What surprised you about it? That racism still goes on or...?

Interviewee: I think because, I think my own experience makes me naive about things like that, you can read things, but it’s not the same maybe and so, yes, I suppose just not having had experiences, or being made aware really, just surprised me, because I think that everyone would be all nicey, nicey.

The tutor notes how her experience blankets her and the racism she learns about shakes her assumptions that everyone is nice, like her. It implies a disruption of her innocence that racism exists and that it may even exist within the nice world of a university. As well as protecting the innocence of the student teachers, Lionel recounts how in his work as a teacher he dealt with racist incidents and how he was, ‘utterly, utterly shocked. Shocked because I was thinking it’s the 21st Century so to think that in the 21st Century people can still say, ‘clear off’ on the basis of skin colour essentially just utterly shocked me. I can’t tell you how much it shocked me...I can’t tell you how much that shocked me. Just appalling’.

The verbal enveloping in shock is almost like the protective blanket of ‘nicey, nicey’ (used by Bethan above) and a reinforcement of the good ethical self through distancing oneself from such overt acts of racism and then to state shock and disgust further reinforces a position of innocence and naïveté.
The ethical self is seen in the colour evasive (Frankenberg 1993) narrative which upholds the status of ‘treating people as individuals’. Three tutors in particular repeated the mantra of treating people as individuals.

‘Yes we are all individuals and I think that at the individual level that’s what you do. My worry about any kind of label that suggests you are in this group, you are in that group, you are in that group, you are in that group, and all these groups are different and have different needs’. (Lionel)

‘When you work with youngsters you see them as people...you see them as individuals’. (Molly)

‘The point is I need to focus on the child not the colour of their skin’. (Fiona)

This clearly overlaps with colour blindness but I want to highlight it here as an emotional tool of whiteness because if I were a young female White student teacher such an approach would be so plausible and acceptable. It would befit my innocent good-self stance and strengthen my personal justifications for becoming a teacher. Such a student would not have a critical analytical framework, denied by the erosion of time in the university by ITE requirements, to examine how the mantra of the individual conceals power laden effects of racial inequality and, is in itself, a power evasive strategy (Frankenberg 1993). But also as Garner (2010b) suggests it is a neoliberal construct because if you focus on the individual and not the group they belong to, in the case of this research, the ethnicity of the child, or the student teacher, or tutor, then one can side-step examination of individuals as belonging to a group. Thus any inherent analysis or accountability for that group which may reveal its difference, or supposed difficulty, could in turn also reveal White culpability and so disrupt the position of innocence. The maintenance of white innocence arises from the need to conceal fear, ‘the fear that in the shadows is our own racism’ (Schick 2000:96). Schick (2000) postulates that to lose the claim on white innocence is in turn to lose the claim on white privilege and its associated benefits; and as such maintain whiteness as property to be guarded.

**The performative tools of whiteness**

The narratives of the tutors did not often involve silences due to the nature of the interview situation. Since silence was not a tool which could be employed some of the tutors used linguistic devices such as using the term, ‘I don’t know’, or ‘I really
don't know', when they seemed to be stuck in responding to a question or comment. In some cases they may not have known what they thought about the question but in others I can only assume it was a way to close that part of the question or topic.

However, other ‘ploys’ seem to be used as performative tools of whiteness which employed white privilege, for example in some tutors’ narratives they appear to contradict themselves, or appear ambivalent, or even have contradictory views about certain aspects of the topic. Schick (2000:96) maintains that contradictory positions are needed for ‘psychic survival’ to dominate and protect the ‘Other’ which is a practice of liberal whiteness. Levine-Rasky (2000a) concurs that contradictory positions are an expression of whiteness. Some participants oscillated in their interview from ‘I think we do a good job’, to ‘they [the student teachers] can prepare a dual language resource but they are not actually going to refer to it’; one tutor who focussed her narrative on the individual (Molly) contradicted herself by noting, that, ‘once they [the student teachers] are here [the University] they are people... we had a lad who just left who...English was not his first language and we didn’t realise until he left’. Here the mantra of the individual, cast as White no doubt in the psyche of the tutor, was so powerful that this student’s individual trait of being bilingual was missed. This does not value the individual as she forthrightly asserts throughout her interview. The privilege which accompanies whiteness is exercised here to define what is implicitly the definition of an individual in this tutor’s understanding, and individuality is defined by a colour blind approach, or a colour and a power evasive approach (Frankenberg 1993) which casts the individual as ‘White by proxy’ (Jones 1999).

**Colour blindness and institutional racism**

In order to examine this intersection, the emotional and performative tools of whiteness are not ignored, since as Picower (2009) asserts the tools work together to protect whiteness. Here linking with the notion of power and the passive racism encapsulated in institutional racism and white privilege I will employ Picower’s (ibid) third tool of whiteness, namely the ideological tools of whiteness which draw on hegemonic understandings such as: things are better now; the use of colour blindness and stereotypes and the most slipperiest of notions niceness. It is the well intentioned and innocuous nature of these tools which renders them difficult to counter because if you attack niceness, or being nice, you are cast then as the baddy,
or not nice. And if you happen to be a person of colour who attacks ‘whiteness niceness’ as demonstrated by a White colleague, or student, you, of course, reinforce the hegemonic understandings of White people’s stereotypes about BME people being confrontational, or having the proverbial chip on their shoulder.

**Colour blindness**

Some tutors’ narratives are heavily impregnated with colour blindness, or it appears in another guise through the use of the term ‘norm’ or ‘normal’ where normal is not defined, but, by implication seems to mean White. The detailed analysis of each example is beyond the scope of this work so a few examples have been selected to demonstrate the permeation of this perspective within the tutors’ stories. Some examples of colour blindness have already been illustrated previously in narratives about the individual and white innocence.

**Colour blindness story 1**

In order to encourage tutors to explore the place of race equality within ITE I used an example from practice to illustrate how some of our student teachers seemed to overlook a child’s ethnicity within predominantly White schools and classrooms. I asked tutors to reflect on this and the notion of ‘White by proxy’ as proffered by Jones (1999). It must be noted that whilst the majority of the tutors’ stories drew on colour blindness seven tutors knew about, or agreed that ‘White by proxy’ was a notion that they saw operating. Some tutors who did not agree with the notion, others voiced neither agreement nor disagreement but were pragmatic in their response as a means of providing a remedy for the situation. For example, to get the student teacher to write a child’s ethnicity in their monitoring and assessment files, but this does not recognise, nor address the power dimensions within this deficit mode of operation. So they suggested that because the teacher and the student in my ‘White by proxy’ example did not know the child’s ethnicity that perhaps the child did not have any needs thereby exposing their operation of the deficit model. The concept of inclusion as it relates to pupils with special needs was often conflated and applied to BME pupils.

In the interview conversation with one participant, Fiona, the term diversity is explored and she says how she prefers this term because it implies ‘no norm’. Yet
later in the interview she talks about a ‘norming set of principles’ that govern professionalism and how ‘schools are norming places’. This tutor seemed unsure of why the term BME was used with reference to Government documents. She recounts,

‘Well I suppose my question is why is it distinctive to be Black? What is the Government agenda on this? Is it a recognition that Black boys tend to be an underachieving group? But I think defining an underachieving group in terms of the colour of their skin is not terribly helpful. I am not sure I understand. I think there is a potential to set up negative connotations there whereas I suppose there is a potential to set up stereotypes that I am not convinced are helpful. I think if little children are, for want of a better description, underachieving, there are all the nuances surrounding what it means to be underachieving. The colour of their skin is not important. The issue is that they are underachieving; and that’s the issue that needs to be addressed. They are an individual and not a colour. Does that make sense?’

Here in operating a colour blind approach she thinks that this is the best position to adopt to see the child as an individual and not to associate the underachievement with his colour which only leads to negative stereotypes. Whilst on first reading this may seem very laudable it fails to recognise that such underachievement is historically premised on racist stereotypes based on the colour of the child’s skin and stereotypical traits associated with it. This type of colour blind racism is detrimental to the child, the school and student teachers. It fails to address and dismantle the historical and hegemonic structures which have resulted in low achievement as an outcome for these pupils. Another tutor, Henry, mirrors the approach above when he talks about, ‘it doesn’t hurt to know a child’s ethnicity’. The following conversation takes place with Henry in response to the ‘White by proxy’ example:

Interviewee: I would hope that they would know all the students (pupils) in their class regardless of their ethnicity. Because in many senses that shouldn’t matter to them as a teacher, a child’s ethnicity, what they should be about is the child’s learning progress. And doing whatever is necessary.

VL: But should we not know their ethnicity?

Interviewee: I don’t see that it hurts. I don’t see...should we know it, in what sense?

VL: Well, if someone didn’t notice that I was Indian, then, this is a dilemma that the students have, and then I would think well hang on a minute that’s actually quite a vital part of my identity, why is it you don’t notice it. What is it that I become that suits you?
Interviewee: Of course, you notice a person’s physical appearance, you notice a person’s gender, their height, their colouring, whether they have...whatever, the clothes they are wearing. But I think my view would be that’s basic information. What I find more interesting about VL is her learning and her progress at [subject] and how can we help that. That may well be through things which are peculiar to you, the fact that you are Indian or female, which I can use as a way to help progress your [subject] knowledge. Or which may be a hindrance in which case I have got to help overcome that. But that’s what you would do with any child. A child with language difficulties, then you would try and scaffold around the language difficulties to get the [subject] concepts developed and built in.

[The subject that this tutor refers to has been omitted since he may be identified via the subject taught]

The focus here is on the subject and the recognition of ethnicity is secondary to learning and appears to be divorced from the learner’s identity unless it is an impediment to their learning. The colour blind approach seems rather embedded in both these tutors’ minds.

**Colour blindness story 2**

Only one tutor completely rejected the notion of ‘White by proxy’. As I challenged a bit more during the course of the interview the narrative moved from ‘we all have a common humanity’; to ‘we should not emphasise difference’; to, ‘I don’t like labels’. I noticed that as an interviewer as I added further observations the narrative changed. This was an interesting aspect of this interview because it reads, and felt at the time, like verbal wriggling in an attempt to escape the issue.

VL: Sometimes those children I think almost become invisible, that because they speak English perfectly well, they have friends, they merge into the background of something that a researcher called Russell Jones has said there is a tendency to make them ‘White by proxy’.

Interviewee: Yes I am not sure I, I have obviously heard you and various other staff talk about the ... the other student. I am not sure I agree with that perspective I have to say. Because I think, I am not convinced by the notion of ‘White by proxy’. I think the notion is human by definition and the notion is that there is a common humanity. It’s not necessarily a White common humanity. I think that’s an assumption.

VL: By?
Interviewee: Well in the notion of the theory ‘White by proxy’. Are we also going to say male by proxy? I am not convinced by it. I know that the kind of the notion, is to be very respectful to diversity and appreciate exactly all these important aspects of people’s identity quite right. But there is also something which is common humanity. My worry about it, I think you can emphasise diversity at the expense of emphasising common humanity. The two should go together.

VL: I don’t see them as mutually separate anyway.

Interviewee: Well no, I think they are not because it takes all kinds to make the world, the kind of everybody is there and we are bound, we are bonded because we are human. We have the notion of human rights, and so anything, almost ethics actually in a nutshell has that bond. You and I are human and therefore we are bonded like this and we have this kind of ethical duty towards each other actually which doesn’t depend on all these things. Do you see what I mean? That’s there anyway. The thing is, I think, we are probably getting away from your question. My worry is, rather the other way, that if you emphasise say I am from a [...] family, so you emphasise that over every other aspect of who I was, that is also not quite right. It’s not quite a right reading of me. Do you see what I mean? And it would emphasise this person is different to those people.

VL: But you are.

Interviewee: No.

VL: You are different.

Interviewee: Yes we are all individuals and I think that the individual level that’s what you do. My worry about any kind of label that suggests you are in this group, you are in that group, you are in that group, you are in that group and all these groups are different and have different needs.

VL: But we always label in school.

Interviewee: Well I worry about labelling generally.

VL: Labels are there in school. I don’t think that’s what I am saying. It worries me that student teachers for whatever reason don’t see that child, whether we are going to call it ‘White by proxy’ or invisible. Either way they melt into the background somehow.

Interviewee: It’s difficult, from the quality of a student teacher, i.e a good student teacher probably knows more of the individuals of the class than a less good one.

VL: I have asked the question of good ones and less good ones and they all come up with similar sorts of responses.
Interviewee: I wonder if some of it is to do with a kind of notion of privacy in the sense that your private life is there and meanwhile we are doing this, and we are working towards SATs and we are working towards this school agenda and meanwhile what you do at home is out of our domain.

So the story goes from ‘White by proxy’ is unacceptable because it is common humanity and it is not a ‘White common humanity’ that is important, to human rights and ethics, to not emphasise difference, to, not liking labels, to, the quality of the student teachers. This is a good example of how whiteness operates. It is slippery. It draws on different aspects to avoid the spotlight being cast on White identity, white privilege and whiteness as a dominant discourse. It is only in such a position that one can employ such a shifting argument, one that seems incoherent and draws on other external aspects such as labelling, the quality of the student rather than examining the racialised position of being White. I deem this interchange as a classic example of how institutional racism is embodied in everyday whiteness and how such micro-aggressions which draw on the physical and mental strength of BME individuals illustrates the notion of symbolic violence through misrecognition, the misrecognition and abuse of power to maintain whiteness.

Another tutor, Molly, also disliked ‘labels’ yet at the start of her interview was very comfortable to let me know she was ‘White working class’.

VL: Two things really, if I was to come and do [subject], I would want you to notice I was an Asian woman, who spoke another language, I would want you to have that awareness of who I was rather than treat me as if I was White.

Interviewee: Yeah. Because that’s treating you as a person isn’t it? Without a label.

VL: I am confused when you said, you said, ‘treat them equally’, I got the impression that you were saying, ‘well actually we don’t take any notice of what colour you are?’

Interviewee: It’s not a sausage factory. It’s treating them as individuals, if that individual wants a label put on..... I am reluctant to label people.

VL: Why do you call it a label?

Interviewee: I don’t know

VL: You just called yourself White working class
Interviewee: I know [laughs]

VL: It’s interesting isn’t it?

Interviewee: Yeah. I don’t know. I don’t know.

Here the power of whiteness enables the tutor to simultaneously label herself but is then reluctant to label others who are the ‘Other’, where the ‘Other’ has associated with it perhaps ‘issues’ and as stated earlier the discourse of ‘it’s about the individual’ is drawn on in this case as above to avoid examining racialised positions.

**Colour blindness story 3**

This particular story about colour blindness is based on the narrative of one tutor, Alf, who throughout the interview was very careful about how he phrased his responses. But in some parts of the interview his use of language simultaneously reveals that Black and minority ethnic people as ‘Other’ and requiring ‘inclusion’.

For example, through the following phrases:

‘I was very much exposed to BME pupils’;

‘to be working with some of the challenges that face working with BME pupils’;

‘I have been exposed to BME pupils in large conurbations where there’s a dense population in urban areas’;

‘Well several things that you take for granted working with White, British citizens is that you can really, these are the things you can do, but without warning.... a classic example, I went into watch a ..... lesson which was dominated by Muslim girls;

‘I believe it’s more to do with specific BME, it’s more to do with diversity and training people to accept differences, and accept the diversity of backgrounds, and being able to draw the distinction between somebody whose using it as an excuse for not doing something, or doing something, making the distinction between that, and somebody who is genuinely following a work ethic, a religious belief something that is specific to their race, creed or culture that is different but I think it’s having that attitude of mind to be able to know how to respond in that situation. I don’t think it’s about specifics it’s about an attitude that things, these people have different ways, they have different customs, they have different habits and we must recognise them and help them and err..help them to engage fully in the learning activities that we are doing which may be different to their cultural expectations’.
Then in the discussion about ‘White by proxy’ he says,

Interviewee: It’s a difficult one because what you want...in a way your goal is actually to make them invisible.

VL: Umm in what way..? What do you mean by that?

Interviewee: Because what you’ve been saying is, we have got 30 children in the class and let’s say we have got all different ethnic origins and different needs and one thing or another, but we don’t need to, because if everybody is well integrated and everybody is well supported, so nobody stands out as being in need of anything specific. That’s surely what we are actually aiming towards, to have a group where we are not, where somebody does not stand out like a sore thumb, we are not catering for those persons’ needs. What we want is everybody is getting what they should be getting in terms of access to learning, access to curriculum, and support for any particular needs, so it is this accepting different, difference, which is what...we are getting there. You’re not getting people saying, ‘well I’m not doing that, I don’t believe in this’. So we are accepting differences, and it’s then saying... well...I can see what you’re saying, but I think we have got to be careful that... was there any evidence that this child’s needs were not being met, in any shape or form? Or was it just the fact that student did not know enough about the child?

This view is premised on the assimilationist and deficit model and more recently the inclusion model of providing for differences and when that’s done the child’s needs are met they then are invisible. Later he adds that to be colour blind means that there is no racism. The language is steeped in otherness, simultaneously accepting yet not accepting difference so illustrating the contradictions which whiteness draws on and apparently thrives on (Schick 2000). It is misrecognitions such as this, whether they are conscious or unconscious, it is hard to determine, that constitute the symbolic violence which upholds the dominance of whiteness.

Stereotypes
The use of stereotypes was not overtly evident in the majority of the stories. But there were two examples which give insights into how tutors’ life and professional experiences have conditioned them to appraise BME people, particularly Black people. One tutor said that she felt she would have to cross the road if she saw a Black youngster approaching her. She was aware that this was a stereotype fuelled by the media. Another tutor talks about her experience of visiting an inner city school and clearly this was an eye-opening experience, which she describes as a ‘bit
of a culture shock’, but not necessarily one that led her to change her teaching, or her personally naïve approach to the area of race equality and ethnicity within the ITE curriculum. Her assumptions about the geographical area in which the multiethnic school was sited were that it would be rough and the school would be rough, with racial tensions and with underachieving youngsters. She was surprised to find that the pupils wore blazers and that they were really well behaved.

In some of the interviews it is clear that inadvertently the tutors are operating a deficit model for BME pupils. It is clear in the examples above where they focus on the learning and getting the pupil to learn where their ethnicity has no relation to the learning process. Katy, a tutor who seems to understand the issues related to race and ethnicity talks about one seminar and says,

‘the whole thing was constructed to problematise these children (pupils for whom English is an additional language) and it didn’t say this but it almost feels [as] if you are unlucky to have one in your class’.

This example illustrates the embedded nature of the deficit model within ITE teaching and the curriculum. Such implicit racist assumptions constitute an example of institutional racism and the misrecognition that leads to the symbolic violence which may later be played out in the classroom via student teachers’ teaching, or their attitudes, or even in the schools’ ‘no problem here’ approach.

Niceness

Whilst the specific examples of colour blindness and stereotyping can be addressed through challenging individuals, or through staff development, the ‘being nice’ (Picower 2009), or niceness as an ideological tool of whiteness as exemplified by the example of the tutor who rejected ‘White by proxy’ in order to promote ‘common humanity’ or ‘ethics’, is more difficult to tackle. You cannot assert that it is not good to be nice because this is counterintuitive and this is not what I would want to advocate. In highlighting niceness as a tool of whiteness it is important to focus on the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of such an approach and in doing so you also disinvest the individual of their white innocence. Therein lays the inherent difficulty of exposing and attempting to dismantle this tool of whiteness. There were two elements to being nice that emerged from the data; firstly being nice is all that matters and we are nice people; and secondly, if you are a nice BME person you fit
in and are approved. In the latter example, it was difficult to ascertain for the purposes of this analysis, whether to categorise the nice BME person as an example of colour blindness or here in the section on niceness. The decision to examine it here is that the description of nice, or lovely, is applied by the tutors to students and in one case to a minority ethnic professor. In such an action the tutors notice the ethnicity of the person but simultaneously cast them as lovely as a mark of acceptability.

In the first instance that being nice is good was linked closely to teachers being good people. For example, one tutor who had recently come into ITE from schools seemed to find the idea of racism in schools as experienced by BME student teachers a difficult idea to grasp because as she says,

‘Because I’ve always believed... in an open, honest and friendly school where children, staff, parents, if they were concerned about anything, students had a right of voice and so for me I kind of wanted to get to a principle which was about everybody has a right of voice, everybody has a right to express when they feel hurt and upset when someone has been unkind, or when someone has been insensitive. And so the difficulty for me was getting past my own experience’. (Fiona)

Later in the interview I mention the case of an Asian woman student teacher who had to be taken out of the school placement because the headteacher said she was too quiet to be a teacher. In response to this the tutor says, ‘That’s so sad, so sad’. She later goes on to affirm her belief in the goodness of teachers when I suggest that the headteacher of the school was looking for a norm;

‘There’s a bit of me that believes deeply in the fundamental goodness of primary school teachers..... I would be horrified to think that primary school teachers want somehow to establish a typical group of survivors for all of this.... But I don’t know what goes on underneath’.

The notion of teacher as saviour (Marx 2006), or Picower’s (2009) performative tool of whiteness which she calls, ‘I just want to help you’ emerge as the prevalent aspect from this participant. The goodness and niceness of primary teachers is a deeply held notion which is difficult to disrupt or dislodge.

As cited earlier in the example regarding being shocked at racism, Bethan said,

‘I suppose just not having had experiences, or being made aware really, just surprised me, because I think that everyone would be all nicey, nicey’.
She admits that her lack of personal and professional experience with reference to race and ethnicity have left her naïve, but as an ITE tutor there is no indication in her story that she feels compelled to do anything about this deficiency in the hope that she can continue being naïve and nice. She seems to have got by like this so far.

This same tutor when discussing the Hangman incident which she thought was blown out of proportion responds in the following way,

VL: In your own reflections on that, did you feel that it was something that was blown out of proportion or was it satisfactorily dealt with?

Interviewee: I did think initially that it was blown out of proportion. But maybe it had to be dealt with in the way it was. But, yeah, but, I did initially think that, it is quite difficult it’s how you look at things and again if any sort of awareness, if awareness of any issue that might relate to race isn’t something that usually you would think about, then I think when something crops up like that, it’s quite difficult to know where you stand on it because maybe you haven’t thought of how it could be perceived. Does that make sense? Because the people that I work with, we do sort of joke about a lot of things not in a nasty way, or anything, not to do with race, for example, but sometimes things can be, and I am not saying you would laugh at this, but sometimes the camaraderie the staff have, the way you approach issues can be sort of, I think, I’m digging a hole here. But do you know what I mean? We are quite light hearted people, but not, yeah..I don’t know if you know what I mean?

VL: No. You’ll have to unpack if for me.

Interviewee: Ah OK. No, maybe I don’t know what I mean because it wouldn’t be quite in this context.

VL: Do you mean using culture, race and gender?

Interviewee: No, I don’t mean that. I just mean that as a group of people would sometimes you can overcome difficulties with humour but I don’t mean necessarily about that....

In this extract she tries to explain that there was an overreaction to the incident, but in trying to explain that the team is light hearted and implying that they thought it was over played she suddenly realises that she is perhaps revealing too much, perhaps she becomes aware of the situation, or my ethnicity and admits she is digging a hole. In this extract is revealed the real face of ‘nicey, nicey’ which is not nice at all. Other examples of niceness came from the tutor who said that student
teachers were good people, but as another tutor put it, ‘just smiling at them [BME or EAL pupils] is not actually doing the job’. Yvonne challenges, ‘ok so what is being fair, we value everyone’s opinion what does that look like? How are you going to do that?’

On the other hand the application of the descriptors ‘nice’, or ‘lovely’ are applied in a number of cases to BME students and staff and the terms are used to confer acceptability and approval. So one tutor describes an Asian student who declared he wanted to teach because he wanted to be a good role model and how this ‘shocked’ the tutor and she notes this student has ‘had a really good influence’ on the other students, ‘they are very different in the way they conduct themselves’. In talking about a BME student another tutor, Molly, describes him as saying he wanted to be ‘the best Asian footballer’ and she says,

‘it’s quite interesting when I think of the interaction of the group with him, they all love him. He is very popular, I don’t think that anyone sees him as any different...but they all love him’.

In describing how students reacted to a BME member of staff the tutor says, ‘it was easy for them because he was so nice’. So niceness is a quality in the discourse of whiteness which invalidates the need for anti-racist, or multicultural education ‘because as long as they acted like good people they could maintain their positions of innocence in the cycle of racism’ (Picower 2009:208). Conversely, if the BME person is nice, or cast as nice, then all nice people, White and BME, can be saved from the cycle of racism. As an ideological tool of whiteness niceness hides complicity in structural racism and under the guise of niceness people can continue to inflict symbolic violence through everyday interactions. For me the discourse of whiteness associated with niceness is a discourse of ignorance and negligence and the sinister maintenance of a White hegemony.

**Institutional racism embedded in whiteness**

In this section it is important to call on all aspects of the research data to examine how the tutors’ narratives draw on whiteness and how whiteness contributes to institutional racism. It is clear that the performance of whiteness and the embodiment of it contributes to institutional racism. Within a CRT framework the persistence of racism is evident as a feature of the institution and Picower (2009) would note that the hegemonic understandings of the tutors are borne out in the
examples of institutional racism. Such understandings are premised on white privilege and the advantage it affords them to ‘play the game’ (Bourdieu 1993). In Bourdieu’s terms the majority of the tutors’ narratives show that they are ‘playing the game’ and in playing the game they invest in the discourse of whiteness and its protection whilst appearing to be ‘on message’ with regards to meeting their duty on race equality.

In the recounting of the Hangman incident the tutor excels in the performance of whiteness. In the first instance it is cast as an innocent game, then the method by which the incident is handled is described as an overreaction and finally in an attempt to explain the comment about the overreaction the tutor tries to explain that the team are a good humoured bunch perhaps implying that they do not take things too seriously and that perhaps the incident was cast in that light. But as she continues to explain she realises that perhaps what she has to say is not appropriate, or that she perhaps has not gauged her audience appropriately and admits she is ‘digging a hole’. In this utterance she is aware that her perceptions may not be mine and so she stops short. Had I been White would she have continued? Would the rest of the story have revealed anymore? In my experience in such situations I am assumed to be White within this predominantly White institution by those who are colour blind. It is when the realisation dawns that I am not White that the story changes or stops. This an example of white privilege, firstly to classify it as an innocent game and secondly to try to explain it away in an attempt to maintain white innocence.

In fact the racist incidents outlined in an earlier chapter indicate how the people who have dealt with them, have been White tutors and they have alleviated the situation for the student, such as the Muslim woman wearing a hijab, but failed to tackle the systemic issues of institutional racism within schools and the University. Surely, if the University were to uphold its race equality policy then working with a school that discriminated in this way is untenable. But it does not best serve the University to tackle this situation because in doing so they may lose a school placement and thereby disadvantage the majority of students, who are White, who could be placed there. The incident where the student called out, ‘bollocks’, can be considered an example of where white privilege prevailed, disguised as freedom of speech. As far
as I am aware there was no action taken against this student despite the fact that his outburst upset other students and the tutor.

The need to move beyond the equality rhetoric is paramount. But until a situation arises which tests the University's resolve it is unlikely to move on. Tutors in ITE will continue to play the game by notionally promoting race equality through examining issues such as 'identities'; 'diversity' and 'the needs of children with EAL'. This will be a deficit discourse embedded in notions of white privilege and supremacy. In no sphere will tutors have the knowledge, understanding, or experience to challenge these taken for granted assumptions and myths which prevail and when they do they certainly are more wary of doing so due to the White student backlash as illustrated by the use of the term 'bollocks'. An insult hurled from a position of power, from a student teacher who will be teaching youngsters in school in the next academic year, who will not see the need for race equality because although he will have been challenged, the challenge was short-lived, his interruption was not addressed and he will continue to perpetuate his racism in schools which may well serve to reinforce it through colour blind or 'no problem here' approaches. He and others will continue to play the game of espousing equality whilst perpetuating everyday racism through the maintenance of whiteness.
Chapter 6 Race Encounters - the counter-story

In charting the stories of White ITE tutors there is also a need to chart the minority story, my counter story as a minority ethnic teacher educator within a largely White university. The need to tell a counter story arises from the encounters in my professional life which have left me reflecting on the chasm between rhetoric and reality. These encounters have led me to theorise the institutional situations that have given rise to my reflections and responses to these situations. I am sure if these incidents were recounted to White colleagues that they would provide alternative explanations for the encounters. I refer to these incidents as encounters because it was not until I analysed and applied theory to these incidents that I realised the power dynamics involved within them and the effects of these dynamics on me personally and professionally. The need to record and analyse these encounters is not intended to serve any cathartic or narcissistic purposes. Telling the stories of race encounters from a White perspective would show how whiteness pervades everyday life thus privileging a ‘White story’ again. There is a need to highlight the minority experience to counter the dominant mainstream discourse of whiteness (Delgado 1989 as cited in Ladson-Billings 2004). In recounting my story I am aware that some scholars would feel that it was merely a subjective account without academic rigour or basis. But CRT promotes the telling of the ‘Other’s’ story to counter balance the dominant White story and ‘the use of voice or ‘naming your own reality’” (Ladson-Billings 2004:55) is part of the process. Dixson and Rousseau (2005:11) assert that there is a need to encourage ‘voice scholarship’ because it ‘subverts reality’. I would contend that privileging the minority voice reveals the reality of pedagogic action whereby the inculcation of appropriate values of whiteness, as part of the arbitrary culture, are promoted through the misrecognition of this process and that the dominant discourse of whiteness is an exercise of symbolic violence. As noted earlier the resonance of this theoretical notion with my own experience has led to the telling of my minority story. My story shows how institutional racism operates and how the resulting symbolic violence is represented and embodied in my race encounters within the ITE academy. My story involves the analyses of incidents that superficially leave you feeling injured and seeking an explanation. This counter story is closely linked to the personal academic journey I have made through the EdD and it is inextricably linked to my professional journey.
It is in essence the narrative which reveals how the symbolic violence of racism is experienced within the field of academia by a BME ITE tutor. It is here within the body of my narrative that the dynamic interplay of whiteness, symbolic violence and institutional racism emerge as the instruments of subjugation of the ‘Other’ in all White spaces. So my story is justified in terms of the theoretical framework related to this study and the professional orientation of my doctoral studies.

The decision to include this story has arisen after much thought and agonising because there may be repercussions for me or my institution; but to give way to the possibility of negative consequences would be to privilege silence to survive which is a strategy I have used for many years and is no longer sustainable. Silencing my story in this work would merely serve compliance and complicity. Maylor (2009) suggests the experiences of Black researchers are absent within academic work. She draws on the work of Black feminists such as Phoenix (1994) and Mirza (1997) to justify her story and race encounters as a Black researcher. Vickers (2002:619) advocates the telling of one’s story justifying it in terms of the insider perspectives which should not be ignored insisting that ‘sharing our stories can also help explore experiences that are difficult to capture adequately from another or that may be unique’. Maylor (2009:62) asserts that in chronicling her experiences as a Black researcher takes as much ‘intellectual and emotional effort as if I had let them remain hidden’. This counter story represents an act of intended resistance without which this work would be just another study of whiteness. As hooks (1994) asserts one needs to identify minority experiences in order to counter hegemony and most importantly to resist it and define another path from it. My story is intended to illustrate how many White people simply do not recognise nor appreciate the everyday racism which BME people experience in their lives, as part of their roles, in my case as a professional in the academy, a place most people would not associate with the existence, let alone, the persistence of everyday racism. In terms of professional growth there is a need to identify racism in the academy as a means of defining and finding my voice and place within it (Yosso 2005). Vickers (2002:619) argues that the voice of the researcher and their story is just as important as that of a respondent and we should not labour under ‘the pretence of neutrality and political correctness’, in qualitative research by asking the respondent to ‘take risks’ when as researchers we are not prepared to do so. She (ibid) advocates that,
The voice reporting qualitative research should be the personal voice of the situated author with a story to tell...[to] put it quite bluntly – those of us in academe need to write about what we know.

It is not merely the symbolic violence of whiteness as a dominant discourse, or the colour blind racism which underpins the telling of my story but as Maylor (2009) notes it is the misrecognition of one’s identity as a BME person which adds to the injury of such violence. It is the misrecognition not only of my identity as a Black person, but also the misrecognition of the pedagogic authority and power of whiteness which perpetuates the symbolic violence evident in my story. In conducting pedagogic work to assert the taken for granted nature of white privilege and the naturalness of whiteness as a dominant discourse the stories reveal not just personal injury but how symbolic violence serves to maintain the dominant discourse.

The counter story which follows is based on research diary entries over the last five years which served as a recording tool providing scope for discharge and analysis. It served also as a survival tool. CRT aims to forefront Black stories because they have been muted, silenced and filtered by white hegemonic structures embedded in institutions which reflect white privilege. I believe the encounters serve to illustrate institutional racism and corporate colour blind racism. Yet as a member of this institution I must also be complicit in some way in this failure not necessarily in terms of my story but perhaps in the lack of personal action, hence the need to break the silence. The accounts which comprise my story are recounted in factual detail and then followed by the analysis which deploys Picower’s (2009) tools of whiteness in an attempt to create cohesion between the analysis of the White tutors’ narratives and my story. I am also aware as Maylor (2009) points out that the explanations my White colleagues may offer as supposedly conciliatory gestures in response to my race encounters would range from, ‘I am being over sensitive’, to ‘you are so much into race’ that you can’t see anything else’, to the age old idea that I simply ‘have a chip on my shoulder’. In this way they also serve to underscore the symbolic violence embodied within my story.


**Multicultural education – it is political indoctrination**

This story is about the individual and institutional response to an effort to introduce multicultural dimensions to an ITE programme. I have long been aware of the fact that the students receive very little input on race equality, or even multicultural dimensions within the ITE curriculum. I decided that one cohort of students had an opportunity to undertake some workshop activities which could help them to develop their understanding of global citizenship and multicultural dimensions. These workshops were designed to get student teachers to think about multicultural issues and to meet the QTS Standards, the National Curriculum requirements, Ofsted inspection criteria and the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 particularly the Duty to promote good relations. Most tutors were fairly positive towards this suggestion but I received an email from one White colleague who objected to this suggestion. He complained that he did not want to be part of a political agenda, whilst I could promote multicultural education as a way forward he was entitled to his opinion and to voice his objection to the whole notion. His argument suggested that multicultural education was not the only way; that living in peace and harmony with other human beings and treating them ethically was equally valid. In the email he argued that education was about producing literate, numerate, moral individuals who could construct their own approaches to the world implying that they did not need to be told about multicultural education. He felt it was not our (ITE’s) duty to indoctrinate the student teachers into one approach. He described multicultural education as political proselytism whilst extolling the virtues of freedom of speech and intellectual freedom which he implied he was guarding by sending the email. He wanted me to be aware of his conscientious objection to the multicultural approach I had taken insisting he would take no part in the workshops. The email was copied to fourteen other colleagues in the department. It was probably designed to undermine the initiative and perhaps to encourage others to withdraw from the project. I responded with a, ‘I am very disappointed’, type email. But unbeknown to me the email caused outrage amongst a few colleagues who went to see a senior manager. I received emails and verbal comments of support from colleagues. However, I was left feeling humiliated. I was left with the need to explain and justify myself. I wrote the following questions in my research diary:
How many other professionals in my position have to keep justifying themselves? Why did he think he was right to do this? What was his understanding of multicultural education?

Was this an example of White hegemony? It felt more like oppression. Was he trying to drum up support amongst like minded colleagues? How could he justify that this email was part of his academic freedom or right to do this? He has rights but I don’t seem to. Did he feel he had the moral imperative to do so? Why does he think he occupies a morally justifiable position?

I decided to see this tutor myself. When asked what was his understanding of multicultural education he mentioned that it was about telling people what to say, how to think. He mentioned that it was about political correctness. After further discussion I closed the meeting by telling him that I would be reporting this incident to a senior manager. The matter was taken seriously and this tutor received a verbal warning.

In the interviews for this study with the White tutors unprompted two of them mentioned this incident. Yvonne said,

‘I went straight to [senior manager] about that and I complained about it as I hope other people did but again some people probably thought it was the right thing to do. And I suppose he clearly did. But you see I would have trouble with that because I wouldn’t have accepted that person ever again....someone like that shouldn’t be in a teacher training. You need people who have understood what is legal, what is not legal and what is required in the National Curriculum. And that is all the stuff that you are doing and I am doing. And yes people are entitled to their own views I suppose, yes I have to accept that. On the other hand I don’t see how you could hold a view publically like that. That doesn’t square with what we as educators are supposed to be doing.

I would have sacked him. The thing is I don’t know what happened to resolve it but I would have axed him out of the college. It was very open and maybe the shock was anyone could be that stupid and that racist, and that ignorant. I mean that was a shock’.

In his interview Vince talks about the hostility of some staff to a staff development session delivered by a national well known speaker on multicultural education. He recalls,

‘some negativity to the whole principles, in fact some people saying quote, ‘I don’t believe in multicultural education, I don’t believe in it as an aspect. Almost to the point of hostility about the notion that we shouldn’t even be doing it almost I think’.

This also links to Rona’s extract where she says there is ‘hatred’ of the issue. It seems that such dislike for the notion of multicultural education from one member of
staff was directed at me for suggesting that it should be a theme for the students. The member of staff clearly felt strongly to write his thoughts in a public email. He felt that he had the right to do this. In doing so he exercised his white privilege and supremacy in an act of aggression and oppression to inflict symbolic violence on a minority ethnic member of staff disregarding the effects it may have on me as a person and as a professional. Using Picower’s (2009) framework of the tools of whiteness this encounter not only demonstrates on a broad level the need to assert White supremacy by making claims of freedom of speech, the entitlement to opinions and views but it deploys the emotional tools of whiteness in a defensive act designed to protect the white innocence of the individual, the students and perhaps other staff. It is a classic example of how attack is deployed as a defensive mechanism. In the attack, multicultural education is discredited as political indoctrination and as the instigator of the initiative I am cast as the indoctrinator thereby rendering my position as invalid. In the supposed act of indoctrination I serve to disrupt the status quo of whiteness and undermine the hegemonic stories (Picower 2009) that sustain it. This tutor casts himself as the protector of such an equilibrium by drawing on the ‘ethical good self’ (Srivastava 2009) and linking it to his role as an educator as someone who promotes working productively with one’s fellow human beings and treating them ethically. Here he draws on Picower’s (2009) ideological tool of whiteness namely niceness. If you are ethical and nice there is no need for any multicultural education. Being nice and ethical negates the need to examine structural inequalities and maintains innocence and ignorance (Rodriguez 2009).

The position I found myself in was again as a victim of White supremacy which is the pedagogic authority underpinning the symbolic violence of this act. Rodriguez (2009:488) notes how ‘whiteness-as-innocence ideology perpetuates a sense of white arrogance’ [emphasis as in original text]. She goes onto say, ‘White arrogance permeates every facet of my life in the academy’ (Rodriguez ibid). These words describe the reality of the race encounter recorded here. The psychic injury associated with such symbolic violence is left unrecognised and untreated by the academy. As a BME member of staff the academy responded appropriately in ‘dealing with the issue’ but there was no other further support offered to me. It was business as usual after that.
That’s not very professional!

Linda hung around at the end of one of my lectures with a friend, clearly wanting to ask something. She was hesitant and appeared confused but nevertheless stayed behind to ask her question. She wanted to know what terms were acceptable to refer to ‘coloured people’ or people from minority ethnic groups. I talked through the answer to the question but she did not seem satisfied by the response. One of her friends said, ‘Go on ask her’. I wondered what more I could say, or what further clarification I could offer. Linda told me about a lesson in her placement school and how she had put on the board the sequence of lessons for that day and said to the children that after playtime there would have RE. As she went through the order of the day’s lessons one child said, ‘Is RE where you learn about people with funny things on their head’? Linda tried to clarify what the child meant and as she was trying to do so another child said, ‘Yeah it’s about those Pakis’. Linda described how she dealt with this racist comment, explaining that this was an unacceptable term and why. She went on to talk about it with her mentor who advised her to record it in the racist incident book which she did with support from the Deputy Headteacher.

Linda thought it wise to retell the incident to her supervising tutor. The tutor’s response surprised Linda. The tutor said that it may be a totally acceptable term because Asian youth were using it in an effort to reclaim the term just as Black rappers had reclaimed the N-word through their music. This seemed to confuse Linda who checked her understanding with her mentor who again re-iterated that the word ‘Paki’ was definitely unacceptable. This tutor led the race equality group and I was a member of the group. I was now in a difficult position because I felt duty bound to report the incident. I asked Linda’s permission to report the incident to a senior manager explaining that it could be considered a racist incident which needed to be recorded just as she had done in the school. The senior manager’s response was not a reaction of horror, but suspicion, of me.

There was an investigation which concluded that this was not a racist incident and the student’s account was cast as suspect. I knew this student well she was an honest, straight forward and hard working woman. In my meeting with the senior manager I responded that I could no longer be part of the race equality group.
because I had no confidence in the leadership of the group. I was told that I was being unprofessional. The injustice meted out to the student was undeserved. I felt terribly sorry for her she had been brave enough to support my reporting of the incident and her account had stayed the same throughout. I felt I had to make a principled stand against such injustice only to be accused of being unprofessional. I responded that it was quite astonishing that as the only BME member of staff in the department and involved in this incident merely by doing my duty and reporting this incident that I should be accused of being unprofessional. In response to this the senior manager visibly reeled.

This was an example of the perpetuation of institutional racism and the exercise of white privilege. As the BME member of staff involved there was no consideration of my position with respect to race equality. In recounting her own reflections on the, ‘ongoing racial drama’ as Baszile (2008:372) describes it, she alludes to the, ‘complex ways in which racism is institutionalized and enacted through academia’s dominant discourses and practices’. In the earlier counter story the institution dealt with the issue. Here there was an investigation, the results of which I was expected to accept and when that did not materialise the contradictory nature of whiteness (Levine-Rasky 2000a, Schick 2000) reveals itself in assigning the label of unprofessional to my act of withdrawal and conscientious objection to the situation whilst insisting on my silence. It seemed that the academy deployed the tools of whiteness to protect the tutor and the institution. It prioritised the tutor’s judgement about the use of the word Paki over mine. As an institution, rather than examine such an incident against its duty to promote good relations as stipulated in the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 and promote some kind of staff development to advance staff knowledge and understanding about the area, the institution merely chose to evade the issue and underscore the hegemonic understandings which underpin, ‘the internalized ways of making meaning about how society is organized’ (Picower 2009:202).
Four and one ‘Other’—White supremacy in the lecture hall

This account outlines the dangers of being a BME member of staff in a predominantly White institution and trying to teach about race, ethnicity and education. I had prepared and was delivering a lecture on race equality to a group of students. They had all been given various articles to read prior to the session. As part of the session the students were asked to discuss the article they had read with other people. One group, who had read Peggy McIntosh’s (1990) article on white privilege were discussing why they did not agree with it. I stood on the edge and listened to their discussion. Then I tried to move them on by adding my perspective on the article and provided examples of where I had been disadvantaged. It is important to remember that I am the tutor and they are the students so a tenuous power relationship exists which was thrown asunder in what can only be described as the attack which followed. This incident brought to mind the notion of, ‘being a body ‘out of place’’, (Mirza 2006:137) in terms of being a BME woman in higher education in a predominantly White institution. Mirza (2006) notes how such a position, ‘has emotional and psychological costs’ for the ‘Other’. The students rounded on me saying I had chosen to live in a White area, I had got on in my career, they had been victims of racism in all Black areas etc. I left their table because they were talking over me, but I left injured since the power relationship had changed, I had moved from tutor to racialised Other and they exerted White supremacy to maintain their white arrogance (Rodriguez 2009). The attack was possibly in response to feelings of guilt and anger (Solomon et al 2005, Ryde 2009) on reading the McIntosh article. In Picower’s (2009) classification the emotional tools of whiteness were used to assuage their guilt and protect white innocence. The fact that I, as a successful BME person, stood in front of them served to support their approach since I was proof that there was no privilege and as one student said she had been racially abused when she lived in an ethnically diverse area. In the details of the interchange the students drew on their hegemonic White habitus to position themselves as victims of racism, to take the opportunity to assert the stereotype of successful Asian female and to misrecognise their position of white privilege within this situation thereby exercising symbolic violence. In reading the McIntosh article the possible feelings of guilt, initiated a defensive response which resulted in micro-
aggression in an effort to regain innocence. As Baszile (2008:381) so poignantly highlights,

I have spent many years teaching about race; that is a lifetime of wounding and being wounded...what I have come to understand is that it is impossible for me to teach about race without wounding or being wounded’.

So in challenging these students’ whiteness it seems that the challenge needs to be countered through attack and the defence of maintaining white innocence and thus to distance themselves from any issues of white privilege that McIntosh presents in her article. This challenge or wounding is then retaliatory. The incident left me thinking that any lecture I did on race equality could only be conducted in the future if I had a White ally with me and thus reduce such injury. But that in itself is not the solution. For in denying their access to, or advantage from, white privilege and in drawing me into the discussion based on their appraisal of me as a successful Asian woman these White female students wanted me to ‘play the game’ in accepting that I too was party to advantage in order to re-establish the status quo of whiteness. They needed to cast me back to a stereotypical role they were familiar with to re-establish the dominant discourse of whiteness which has underpinned their hegemonic understandings of race and ethnicity and formed their White habitus.

In each of these stories the symbolic violence exerted to maintain a White hegemony is a prevailing theme. In analysing these incidents through the application of a theoretical framework arising from literature associated with CRT and whiteness I cannot help but hear the echo of Bonnett’s (2000) work on White identities. He appositely notes that the perpetuation and maintenance of whiteness and White supremacy has historically, and I would contend contemporaneously, been established through the use of violence, whether that is through enslavement, colonisation, imperialism or the symbolic violence of institutional racism and white privilege. It would appear that the dominant discourse of whiteness prevails within the academy through pedagogic White authority and action within institutionalised teacher education.
Chapter 7  Discussion and Conclusions

At the beginning of this work I used the well worn metaphor of a journey to describe my professional and academic development during the course of my doctoral study within the area of race, ethnicity and teacher education. The near completion of this work does not represent the cessation of the journey but the beginning of another phase. This study has served to provide some explanation for a question I have long puzzled about in my career as a teacher and then as a teacher educator, namely why was there such little progress in the field of ethnicity and education when there was legislation to promote good relations, there were institutional policies which stated good intentions and signalled a preparedness to make a difference. Although the journey has taken some time to complete, I have found that CRT, critical whiteness studies and the work of Bourdieu have enabled me to identify the possible reasons why there is a rhetoric-reality gap between policy and practice within the area of race equality and teacher education. I am reconciled that while there may be a will the way is still to be explored and charted in such a way as to provide teacher educators with opportunities to exercise greater agency and urgency in preparing pre-service teachers to teach in a multiethnic society.

There is no doubt that ITE plays its part in the cycle of on-going passive and institutional racism through the inertia of whiteness as a discourse which pervades the thinking, action and inaction of ITE tutors in one predominantly White university. There are a number of factors at different levels which contribute to the picture of neglect with respect to developing race equality as a dimension within ITE. On a pragmatic level these factors include the life and professional experiences of ITE tutors; their personal philosophy and approach; the student teachers and their predispositions with respect to race equality; the ITE curriculum and its technicist underpinning and finally the ethos of the wider institution. On a practical level these dimensions overlap and intersect to create a complex dynamic which serves to facilitate the operation of whiteness as a dominant discourse which in turn promotes the maintenance of the status quo or as one participant would have it the ‘no problem here’ syndrome which prevails untroubled within a predominantly White institution and its partner schools.
Whiteness and Institutional racism

There is a need to reflect on the research questions and tie together the research data with the theoretical framework. There is a need to establish that the notions of habitus and whiteness are linked since the predisposition of the White tutors is influenced by the dominant discourse of whiteness. This is evidenced in some tutors’ narratives by their dispositions to race equality through their lack of experience and for some their lack of interest. For others their narrative demonstrated a ‘feel for the game’ which was influenced by the discourse of whiteness. For example, in one narrative there is the notion that enough is done in ITE about race equality and another tutor who simply talked about race equality in terms of BME people as a finished chapter and that there needed to be more training on Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children in school whilst acknowledging it was difficult especially in a predominantly White institution. In terms of a feel for the game as part of the White habitus this tutor envisaged the work of race equality done in one field with a need in another but did not recognise the nature of systemic inequalities or how ‘it’s difficult’ signified an excuse for the lack of further action in ITE. Jenkins (1992:74) explains that Bourdieu described habitus as, ‘an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted’. Within the tutors’ narratives the acquired system or predispositions are revealed through their hegemonic understandings, which are part of who they are (Picower 2009). For example, some tutors drew on deficit models within their work, one talked about her fear of Black people and that she would cross to the other side of the road, or they equate Black areas with deprivation and danger. In essence built into their understandings is a fear of the ‘Other’ based on stereotypes. They play the game by deploying the emotional, ideological and performative tools of whiteness (Picower 2009) to maintain their hegemonic understandings and such tools are deployed in pedagogic work to ensure that whiteness, as part of the cultural arbitrary (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977), is misrecognised and remains as a taken for granted aspect.

The tutors’ narratives revealed the prevailing discourse of whiteness and within these narratives are the seeds of institutional racism. The Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 defines institutional racism as processes, attitudes or behaviour which lead to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance or stereotyping which results
in the disadvantaging of BME people. Such unwitting behaviour and attitudes were prevalent in the White tutors’ narratives. For example, some worked with the assumption that theirs was a neutral position, some defended a colour blind approach, others were ignorant about why playing Hangman with the word Muslim was an issue, some merely were ignorant about issues related to ethnicity and drew on whiteness as a familiar and embedded discourse to expound the virtue of being nice. There was for some tutors the need to be proactive with respect to race equality but for others there appeared to be no issue, or that it was another layer of worry. The narratives of some tutors revealed how individual narratives of whiteness contribute to institutional racism and how this in turn results in symbolic violence as experienced by Linda the student and myself as a BME member of staff.

The need to assert an order which is understood by all, to re-establish a familiar equilibrium appears to drive some tutors’ narratives. The tutor who sent me the email had to draw on the tools of whiteness (Picower 2009), such as the guardian of free speech, the White tutor as saviour (Marx 2006) of White students and the need to protect their innocence from political indoctrination. This pedagogic work within the academy may go on in this tutors’ classes every day, work which serves to perpetuate whiteness as a taken for granted, neutral and natural state of order. The defensive actions could well constitute such pedagogic work but as a minoritised person the symbolic violence of such work is felt as visceral and psychic violence. This was evident in the three counter stories presented in this work which served to illustrate the embodied effects of such institutional racism and symbolic violence.

In the first instance the agency of the tutors is affected by their ethnicity, their own training and lack of experience in multiethnic settings as well as more broadly their conditioned way of being in the world which is influenced by the dominant discourse of whiteness. The operationalisation of CRT as a theoretical framework in this study has served to bring into sharp focus how everyday explanations about the situation with regards to race equality in ITE are superficially very plausible, such as the approach one respondent described as we do a good enough job, ‘without making a song and dance of it’, could be considered very suitable and appropriate especially since there is very little time spent within the University on theoretical elements of education and teaching. But such reasonable explanations can mask the hidden operation of racism within an institution. Racism runs like a subterranean stream
through the academy, unseen and unheard until excavations reveal its existence even then it goes unchecked and unchallenged as witnessed in my story about Linda. For example, what was meant by ‘without making a song and dance of it’? The neoliberal discourse about the individual pervades the plausible explanations of tutors and under the surface of such nice concern for humanity the business-as-usual racism continues. It seems that most tutors fail to draw students’ attention to their colour blindness in the classroom for it is a case of the colour blind leading the colour blind in this instance despite the nice concern for the individual especially if they are the only Bangladeshi child in the school. The tools of whiteness or white resistance such as colour blindness, neutrality, niceness and others merely serve as a smoke screen to cloud the examination of white innocence, privilege, power and the operation of institutional racism in the academy. There is a need to challenge such positions within the ITE academy where it seems the model of the technicist teacher is promoted by technicist teacher educators.

The picture emerging about the students recruited to this University from the tutors’ narratives appears to reinforce the discourse of whiteness. The students appear to be unaware and unschooled with reference to race equality and according to one tutor some would not hesitate to use racist language, ‘if a Black kid pushed them too far’. There seems to be an overwhelming reinforcement of the rhetoric of equality which students do not seem to be able to critically analyse nor implement in their classrooms in order to make the difference they profess a desire to achieve on induction to the profession as a novice. They are left with their misconceptions and any racist thinking is left unchallenged in any meaningful way. They can shout ‘bollocks’ when a tutor is providing them with another perspective and seemingly ‘get away’ with such an attitude. Others have a thirst to know more but this goes unquenched for time constrains the depth of coverage particularly of sociological issues which may support and help student teachers to analyse educational discourses and empower them to act as genuine agents of change. The student teachers and the children they teach are impoverished by overall national and institutional ITE policy and process. The ignorant neglect (Rodriguez 2009 and Race Relations Amendment Act 2000) to embed minority perspectives within the ITE curriculum signals the protection of whiteness and the perpetuation of unwitting
racism. Such policy neglect could be considered as contributing to the misrecognition of the domination of White perspectives within the curriculum whether that is in schools or in ITE; and thus the reinforcement of whiteness is labour used to establish the symbolic violence as constituted by institutional racism. Whilst the student teachers accomplish their goal to gain a qualification they leave with a tool kit of professional skills which enable survival in the classroom. It is only their initial predispositions to aspects of equality which may assist them to make a difference in their own classrooms but not beyond.

The ITE curriculum is largely based on the QTS Standards but as one of the respondents advised we need to subvert this and another talked about a 'drip, drip approach'. Here these two tutors choose to use individual agency to affect the ITE curriculum on offer in order to broaden the student teachers' education and understanding. But laudable as this is, it does not seem to be sufficient to effect lasting change which perhaps requires the 'drip, drip' approach to carry on into the first and subsequent years of a teacher's career. The time to change student teachers' attitudes with regards to race equality simply does not exist on postgraduate ITE courses. But through a collective team commitment the curriculum could indeed be subverted to embed broader and more specific dimensions of race equality. This would require a professional and human catalyst, a champion within ITE departments. An ITE curriculum which incorporates a conceptual framework to analyse racism in education would help to bridge the race equality rhetoric and reality chasm. Such a curriculum would have to examine whiteness because failure to do so 'facilitates the maintenance of its incorporeal nature thereby re-inscribing its dominating power' (Solomon et al. 2005:148). To make student teachers more critically aware of structural factors in society that affect their role as teachers, ITE would have to be less technicist. But the draconian inspection framework which affects ITE providers’ allocation of training places in combination with the need to meet the QTS Standards impedes many providers, as does the lack of expertise in the area of race equality and teacher educators’ own narratives of whiteness. The changes to teacher education since the 1980s have severely curtailed teachers’ and teacher educators’ ability to educate for, and promote racial justice. So through some tutors’ narratives of whiteness, the counter story of a BME tutor within the same institution, the resistance to change practice and shake unwitting prejudice and
ignorance within the University in itself constitutes, and is evidence for, institutional racism. It is so embedded within the pedagogic work of whiteness that it is difficult for the uninitiated to identify and challenge. So, institutional racism and whiteness are both evident in the White tutors' narratives and the embodiment of its effects are evident within the BME tutor’s narrative.

In this discussion it is important to identify how whiteness and institutional racism are linked. As I have analysed the data using Picower’s framework of the tools of whiteness, phrases from the definition of institutional racism have resonated with me. For example, how would we define unwitting? Could the emotional, ideological and performative tools of whiteness constitute such unwitting prejudice? The term unwitting implies unknowing or a dysconsciousness which could concur with King's (2004) notion of dysconscious racism. The discourse of whiteness seems to be part of the habitus of some White tutors who may act in an unwitting way in their teaching, or formal pedagogic work within the institution to perpetuate the discourse of whiteness and further compound the unwitting prejudice and ignorance of student teachers. It is clear within the narratives of the majority of tutors that everyday whiteness was in operation. They did not always challenge student teachers' perspectives, for example, when a group of students laughed at a Gypsy Roma website. The tutor did not seem to challenge their perspectives. It is unclear why this was the case. But could it be they lacked the courage or conviction to do so? As Rona has it some tutors have a ‘true hatred’ of race equality and it may be why this laughter was perhaps overlooked. In my story the need to protect white innocence through white arrogance was evident in the story about the four White students. They used the ideological tools of whiteness such as ‘but we are all equal look at you’ and their hegemonic White habitus to underscore the notion of Whites as victims of racism in order to maintain the pedagogic authority of whiteness and in doing so they rejected the notion of white privilege because it contrasted too sharply with their way of knowing and being in the world. In asserting such power the narratives of the White tutors serve to illustrate not only the embodiment of whiteness but to show how unwitting prejudice is part of such embodiment and when the lens of CRT is used to expose the taken-for granted assumptions of white privilege, the workings of institutional racism, or endemic racism, the revelation of the tools of whiteness uncovers the symbolic violence of the domination of the
majority cultural arbitrary on those who are deemed as the minority. It is no wonder that there is such defence, denial, silence, or panicked out reaching for the tools of whiteness which will assist in its defence; tools such as niceness are used to re-establish and ensure the misrecognition of whiteness.

The existence of institutional racism is an example of how the tools of whiteness are used to maintain the warp and weft of this everyday presence of racism and thus illustrate such misrecognition. This is why any examples of institutional racism are usually denied, covered up, or deemed as unfounded. It serves as a label of liberal rhetoric. Jenkins (1992:109) draws on Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic violence and asserts that education, and I would adapt this to ITE, contains systems of symbolic violence since education serves to merely reproduce a state for its own existence through ‘reciprocal reinforcement between structural processes of institutionalisation and the professional interests of those who monopolise the pedagogic work’, namely White ITE tutors, who Katy acknowledged had too much invested to lose when they came to higher education. In extrapolating Jenkins’ commentary on the nature of ITE as a system of symbolic violence, it could be postulated that the monopoly of whiteness serves to keep institutional racism invisible, it does not concur with the professional interests of some White tutors or the White institution, which in this case is ITE and its partner schools, and in the pedagogic work undertaken to maintain this interest there is a prevailing notion of ‘homogeneous and orthodox schooling’ (Jenkins 1992:109) which standardises and embeds whiteness, thereby reinforcing the values of most White tutors and student teachers. The tutors’ narratives also signal how much agency is possible within powerful structural constraints. The accounts of ITE tutors who seem to understand the nature of the issues are also subject to some degree by these structural constraints but they appear to effect some change. There is an element of individual agency keeping things in place for the majority of tutors. The presence of whiteness in societal discourse is misrecognised and such misrecognition, I think, is evident in the lies that White people tell themselves to maintain whiteness (Leonardo 2002). So, institutional racism and whiteness are the exercise of symbolic violence which is part and parcel of some tutors’ narratives.
The contribution and uniqueness of this work

The combination of CRT and symbolic violence is a unique contribution to the field, as is the study as a whole since there does not appear to be another study which examines the narratives of White, or BME ITE tutors with respect to race equality. The combination of CRT and symbolic violence is intended to show critics of CRT that it is not an essentialist theory that merely names racism as a part of everyday life and privileges the minority story. The link to the notion of symbolic violence and misrecognition through the active discourse of whiteness serves to show how such racism has become so pervasive and as the racism which people do not like to tackle or talk about. The racism evident in everyday society does not just appear as some would have it because of the presence of BME people. It is established through a system of domination which is the result of the pedagogic authority of whiteness and through the implementation of the tools of whiteness to undertake pedagogic work which builds the misrecognised structures of domination. Racism is embedded in the policy and structures of ITE which the theoretical framework and literature review have illustrated. But evidence from the empirical work can be used to support the notion that white privilege is a contributory factor in the existence of institutional racism in ITE as illustrated in the narratives of the White tutors. Garner (2007) drawing on the work of Charles Mills asserts that it is White supremacy, a structure of systems from which Whites gain privilege which in itself is a system of seeing and not seeing. In relation to this research a classic example of seeing was evident in the narratives which drew on the experiences of BME student teachers, especially the teachers that failed their school placements or were taken elsewhere to complete it due to the institutional racism within the school. In these cases the students were seen as ‘problems’ yet at the same time the whiteness discourse of colour blindness prevailed with respect to student teachers recognising BME pupils in their classrooms and the not knowing, or as Rona has it, the not wanting to know, was a feature of some tutors’ narratives. The ideas of seeing, not seeing and not knowing constitute a system of White supremacy which maintains such a system. Institutional racism is not seen because to do so would reveal the nature of not knowing, or a not wanting to know, which simply described I would refer to as ignorance and also as Rodriguez (2009) aptly puts it to her student teachers, but in this case it applies to some tutors and the institution, it would appear that some are happy to be ignorant. It is the system of White supremacy and white privilege that
serve to maintain institutional racism. In this study this is shown in the White tutors’ narratives of resistance, ignorance, defence-protection and niceness, as well as in the BME tutor’s counter story. In establishing the dominant discourse of whiteness the system of White supremacy serves to name institutional racism without seeing it, it maintains the misrecognition of whiteness as a discourse of subjugation and in doing so exercises and perpetuates symbolic violence.

**Reflections and Improvements**

In a small way this thesis has shown why there is a rhetoric-reality gap in terms of race equality policy and provision. The tools of whiteness are deployed to undertake pedagogic work to sustain the symbolic violence of whiteness as a misrecognised dominant discourse. The study has shown the interplay between professional experience, knowledge and understanding and the personal standpoint of the tutors with respect to race equality. Some of the tutors noted at the end of their interviews how much they had relished the opportunity to have time to reflect on such ‘an important issue’, whilst others enjoyed the professional dialogue. I have gained a lot from undertaking this research in terms of my development as a researcher and as a professional. I know that this work could have been improved through gathering the narratives of White and BME tutors in other institutions and indeed comparing an all White institution with one in a more ethnically diverse setting. I know that the use of Picower’s (2009) tools of whiteness is a framework with its own inherent weaknesses and that with a wider and larger sample I could have devised my own framework from the data. I consider this research as the beginning of another chapter. The preparation of teachers and ITE tutors to work and engage with race equality is an area that requires further research in order to impact on the ITE curriculum and practice.

**Dissemination and Professional Implications**

The necessary theorising about institutional racism and white privilege is not a separate aspect of this study removed from the reality of practice. Whilst the theory has enabled a detailed analysis of the White tutors’ narratives it has also sparked ideas for staff development that needs to be undertaken within my own university and more widely across ITE. As an EdD study it is important that this work impacts
on professional practice. Staff development on race equality in ITE and the ITE curriculum will not in itself change the tutors' attitudes but it can begin to raise questions about their predispositions, their habitus and begin to challenge stereotypical or colour blind and neo-liberal discourses that they draw on. Change within ITE is also dependent on tutors' agency which may be limited by structural constraints that serve to maintain the dominant discourse of whiteness. I know as a result of this study I will change my approach to the one lecture on race equality which I am asked to deliver each year to student teachers. But that is insufficient. Wagner (2005) advocates a challenging approach which not only encourages student teachers to find a place within the anti-racist discourse but she also suggests an accompanying meta-cognitive approach which provides a safety net for students to be aware of, and cope with the inevitable reactions of anger and denial. In a similar fashion staff development is needed for ITE tutors and it may have to employ similar strategies.

This work needs to be disseminated firstly within the University to the Equality and Diversity Committee, to groups of ITE tutors and managers. As a colleague I will need to ensure that the dissemination is conducted in a way to encourage collaboration to identify the next steps for the ITE staff. Secondly, the need to move on policy and practice has to be a central aspect of further dissemination beyond the University. This will be achieved through the publication of papers and delivering papers at key conferences. The wider dissemination may initiate debate and further suggestions for staff development for ITE tutors. Is there a need to go back to the Swann Report (1985) recommendations that ITE tutors should have experience of working in ethnically diverse settings, or that they should gain recent and relevant experience in ethnically diverse schools? Such experiential requirements will not in themselves serve to educate ITE tutors beyond their comfort zone of whiteness. The provision of a resource such as Multiverse has not initiated wide scale changes in the ITE curriculum since tutors can choose to ignore it. There has to be an institutional commitment beyond policy level to initiate any change through engaging with tutors, their perceptions, their own starting points and identifying their 'gaps' with a view to developing their professional knowledge, understanding and commitment to race equality and so in turn better prepare the teachers of tomorrow to teach in an ethnically diverse society.
As a result of this work there is a need to devise a staff development programme for ITE tutors, firstly within my own organisation and then beyond. I would seek the support of senior managers at the University, through the Equality and Diversity Committee to gain permission to trial a programme for staff based on developing their understanding of race equality within ITE and then broader aspects of equality. There is currently a one day workshop for new staff on Equality but it does not provide further development or support. There could follow a plan to gain some accreditation for such staff development and the need for ‘top-up’ training and development which could lead to better training for school-based mentors. It would be difficult to ask all tutors at the University to undertake the staff development on race equality as part of an induction programme for new tutors but it could be a compulsory requirement for all ITE tutors whether they are new or not. There are tutors who have expressed an interest in becoming the team of trainers who would develop and deliver the staff development on race equality for ITE tutors and plans are underway to realise this aim. In my professional role I will continue to push the boundaries of this topic within my own institution and beyond.

It is important to remember that this study was sited within one predominantly White institution. The suggestions for dissemination and staff professional development may not be applicable across all ITE providers, but applicability may be dependent on the knowledge and expertise of tutors within another institution, the locality of the institution and partner schools. However, although this study is limited to one institution, in my experience of other ITE providers the themes apparent in the narratives of the White tutors within this study are also apparent elsewhere. The EdD has served to strengthen my professional voice and empower me. CRT has provided access and legitimacy for that voice in a way that was not evident in my professional role before the EdD.

**ITE policy implications**

Husbands (1987) discusses how the ‘new racism’ (as it was termed twenty-three years ago) has moved from a debate about superior and inferior to a neo-conservative, neo-liberal discourse based on culture, an aspect which is non-negotiable and immutable. Therefore when there is the presence of many cultures and people who belong to that culture wanting to maintain it alongside the majority
culture they pose a threat to it. He asserts that the ‘New Right’ ideas are a collection of notions that draw on commonsense, taken-for-granted, popular majority beliefs that appear to be rational and reasonable, indeed almost natural, plausible and acceptable. The prevailing discourse which then seeks to preserve the majority culture transforms into discussions of nation and nationhood which in turn defines who belongs and who does not belong. The fact that the debate appears to be reasonable renders it part and parcel of the fabric of society and as such it normalises inequality, disadvantage and white advantage so embedding whiteness as a discourse and perpetuating institutional and dysconscious racism and the system of symbolic violence. In this way these covert forms of racism become part of the discourse of reasonableness which affects ITE policy and practice and as such they therefore become invisible and thus harder to reveal and surmount.

The reasonableness of ‘we do enough’ sounds plausible and is beguiling to the uninitiated in aspects of race equality. It is this ‘enough is enough’ attitude on which ITE policy and practice are based. This is encapsulated in the tight regulation of the ITE curriculum as delineated by the QTS Standards and Requirements (TDA 2008) which stipulate the curriculum content and the statutory time student teachers should spend in school. Such central control of ITE which is subject to the system of White supremacy serves to develop teacher technicists, straightjacket ITE tutors to become technicists and ill serves the needs of schools and their communities. The pedagogic authority of the regulatory body for teacher training is reinforced by the pedagogic work of the school and the ITE academy. In promoting a deficit model of BME pupils and those for whom English is an additional language, the QTS Standards serve to reinforce the hegemonic understandings of whiteness and lay bare the falsehood of White liberalism.
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Appendix 1

An overview and background of current Initial Teacher Education provision in England

Teacher education in England is governed and regulated by the Training and Development Agency for Schools or commonly known as the TDA. Whilst the word ‘training’ appears in the title of this regulatory body it should be noted that amongst teacher education tutors the term teacher education is much preferred since the word ‘education’ implies a wider preparation for the profession and it is used to refer to initial teacher preparation in the context of postgraduate and undergraduate programmes provided by higher education institutions such as universities. The term ‘training’ is used to refer to initial teacher preparation provision which is employment-based. Candidates who wish to enter the teaching profession in England can do so via a number of routes (see below). There are currently 240 providers of ITE or initial teacher training (ITT) and approximately 40,000 people enter to train as teachers. About 85% of ITE places, mostly postgraduate places, are allocated to higher education institutions and the rest to other providers (House of Commons Select Committee Report 2010). The majority of the teacher education and training occurs within universities or colleges of higher education. There are about 85 universities offering ITE programmes. It then follows that in these institutions student teachers would receive the theoretical knowledge and understanding to underpin their practice in relation to ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity.

The TDA Requirements outline the statutory elements of a teacher training programme in England. Students all have to meet these ‘Qualifying to Teach’ Standards (TDA 2008) commonly known as the ‘Q Standards’. These Standards cover three key areas of teacher preparation and competence: Professional Attributes; Professional Knowledge and Understanding, and Professional Skills. If these Q Standards are analysed in terms of how well student teachers are required to meet the educational needs of Black and minority ethnic pupils, or those for whom English is an additional language (EAL) and indeed to ascertain how well these Standards directly or implicitly indicate that student teachers should be prepared to teach in a multicultural society then there are no direct references to the terms race
equality or racial diversity within the thirty-three 'Q' Standards. However, there are two standards related to diversity one related to 'ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity' (TDA 2008:8) and one related to the education of pupils with English as an additional language which is incorporated within a Standard that also refers to student teachers and trainees meeting the needs of pupils with special educational needs. They are listed below:

Q18 'Understand how children and young people develop and that the progress and well being of learners are affected by a range of developmental, religious, ethnic, cultural and linguistic influences';

Q19 'Know how to make effective personalised provision for those they teach, including those for whom English is an additional language or who have special educational needs or disabilities, and how to take practical account of diversity and promote equality and inclusion in their teaching'. (TDA 2008:8).

It is clear that 'ethnic and cultural influences' and 'taking account of diversity and promote equality' (TDA 2008:8) appear as merely part of a list. These two Standards may provide some impetus for ITE providers to address these aspects in the taught elements of the programme and for student teachers to respond to them when on school placements with the help of their school-based mentor. Since there are several issues and aspects of meeting pupils' needs encapsulated within these two Standards it can be very easy to overlook the specific parts that refer to ethnic and linguistic diversity. In areas of low ethnic diversity it has been known for both student teachers and mentors to state that these particular parts of the Standards are not applicable but other aspects of them have been met thereby justifying the attainment of these two Standards. In fact this has been my experience. In ignoring these aspects of the two Standards both the student teachers and the mentors absolve themselves of the professional responsibility to address aspects of ethnic or linguistic diversity in the predominantly White, possibly monolingual schools in which they work and practice. In this way they maintain the 'no problem here' syndrome (Gaine 1987). However, in voicing such a position or even in the act of silently accepting it these teachers and student teachers maintain the implicit and embedded power of whiteness (Marx 2006, Picower 2009).
The Ofsted Grade Criteria for inspection for initial teacher education 2008-11 (2008) are used to inspect initial teacher education programmes. ‘Promoting equality and diversity’ which forms a small part of the inspection framework is inspected through the following question: ‘To what extent does the provision promote equality of opportunity, value diversity and eliminate harassment and unlawful discrimination?’ (Ofsted 2008:4). The area of Equality and Diversity outlines what is expected from providers in terms of grading the provision. For example, to be graded ‘Outstanding’ a provider must fulfil the following aspects:

‘High-quality training promotes equality of opportunity, values diversity to ensure that:
- Trainees are prepared fully for teaching in a culturally diverse society and have a well-developed understanding of relevant issues;’ (Ofsted 2008:17)

This is only part of the statement delineating the characteristics of an outstanding provider with respect to the element of equality and diversity. The other aspects relate to how the provider itself ensures equality of outcome for different groups of students. However, it is questionable that an instrument of inspection should compel providers to address or improve their response to race equality especially since they will have paper policies which indicate the institutional position with respect to meeting their obligations under equalities legislation. The inspection evidence is likely to provide some information on provision with respect to race equality but it is unlikely that this aspect will be found wanting since all providers have to work within an institutional race equality policy and inspectors themselves have a limited understanding of race equality issues (Osler and Morrison 2000). As Vaught and Castagno (2008) argue the structural aspects of the education system within which lurks the spectre of institutional racism cannot be transformed by the presence of criteria within a document; the very roots of the structural racism need to be dug up. In this case Ofsted which is designed to inspect quality in terms of ITE providers’ adherence to national and institutional race equality policies against the outcomes of institutional practice are unlikely to find any discrepancies and it is likely that equality and diversity across ITE providers will be at least satisfactory.

The only national statistic or measure of how well ITE providers prepare student and trainee teachers for teaching in a multicultural society can be related albeit rather crudely to two questions on the Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) Survey (TDA
which is conducted each year with NQT teachers in their first year of employment. The participants are required to respond to a number of questions related to different aspects of their initial preparation to teach. The only two questions that can provide some measure of teachers’ preparation in relation to ethnic and linguistic diversity are:

1. How well did your provider prepare you to teach pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds?
2. How well did your provider prepare you to teach pupils for whom English is an additional language? (TDA 2009)

Over the last six years (2003-2009) this survey has shown that in 2003, 32% [44% in 2009] of secondary NQTs felt their preparation with respect to question one was good or better and 18% [40% in 2009] reported this with respect to question two (TDA 2009). For primary pre-service teachers in 2003, 29% felt that their preparation to teach pupils from minority ethnic groups was good or very good [42% in 2009] and 22% [38% in 2009] felt that their preparation was good or very good with respect to the second question. It is very interesting that across all the components of the NQT Survey it is only in these two questions where the ‘good’ and ‘very good’ rating is 40% or below for primary student teachers; and below 50% for secondary student teachers. It is the lowest rated component on the survey across both phases (TDA 2009). However, the positive progress over six years in these two elements should be noted since it has continued to improve for each phase and such progress needs to be acknowledged and good practice highlighted. However a HMI survey (Swann Report 1985:550) conducted in 1982 with probationary teachers (newly qualified teachers) showed that only 29% of primary teachers and 28% of secondary teachers thought that their initial training prepared them well to teach children from different cultural backgrounds with 52% overall noting that they were not prepared at all. It appears that over twenty five years this proportion has changed very little when compared to the NQT Survey data. In fact it is an increase of 13 and 16 percentage points respectively over 25 years!

However, this means that, on average, approximately two-thirds of newly qualified teachers felt that their preparation was satisfactory or worse. There are many criticisms of the NQT survey for example the low response rate; the phrasing of the
questions and the over-emphasis of these statistics as institutional indicators of success in terms of teacher preparation overall. However, it is the only national benchmark for comparison of different elements of teacher preparation across providers. The interpretation of the first question in terms of how well the provider prepares student teachers and trainees to teach pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds may be interpreted by the NQTs to mean whether or not they have taught this group of pupils on their school placements. Indeed Jones (1999) notes that even student teachers who may have one or two pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds appear not to recognise or acknowledge the ethnicity of these pupils choosing instead to make them, as he calls it, ‘White by proxy’. The implication being that if they do not see the child’s ethnicity they do not see their needs or ‘problems’, since in his research student teachers associated ethnicity with aspects of difficulty or problems which needed to be addressed. For some NQTs they may not relate these two questions to the taught elements of their programmes. Their response may well be influenced by whether or not their placements had occurred in ethnically diverse areas or not. It is clear that this question and its related counterpart need to be re-phrased and more aspects of the survey need to capture data on how well student teachers can teach all children to live and work in a multicultural society. By maintaining these questions as they are there is an implication, or indeed it may be interpreted by the provider that there is a deficit associated with the education of minority ethnic pupils or those who have EAL that needs to be addressed. The inclusion of these two questions within an official central instrument designed to gain data on the preparation of NQTs to teach pupils from minority ethnic and linguistic groups conveys a hidden imperative to providers that they need to improve in this aspect since such data will reflect their performance in terms of teacher preparation. This may explain the improvement in the statistics over the last seven years. Whilst it may have created an onus on providers to address this element of their ITE curriculum, the coverage, depth, quality and effectiveness may be quite variable. It should be noted that the focus of the questions reinforces a deficit model related to the education of minority ethnic and linguistic minority children. It is important to eliminate this misconception from a national instrument since it serves to compound negative preconceptions and stereotypes of minority ethnic pupils and those who have EAL.
Routes into Teaching

1. Undergraduate Primary and Secondary teacher education programmes which offer the qualification of a Bachelor in Education (BEd) or a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree with the recommendation for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Students entering via this route will study for three or four years at a higher education institution (HEI) such as a college or university;

2. Postgraduate Primary or Secondary teacher education programmes, or Postgraduate certificate in Education (PGCE) with the recommendation for QTS are one year (or in reality nine months) programmes which are offered by universities. Student teachers who opt for these routes can also be awarded up to sixty Masters level credits;

3. Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (known by the acronym PgCE) can be offered either as a default position for students who do not wish to attain a postgraduate certificate with Masters level credits is offered by universities but also school based initial teacher training providers.
   a. School based teacher training programmes can be offered by School centred Initial Teacher Training providers known as SCITTs which are comprised of a consortium of schools; or,
   b. The Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) which euphemistically provides ‘training on the job’ and is an employment based initial teacher training (EBITT) route. The teacher trainee (as they are known) undertakes their preparation to become a teacher in a school where they work usually as a supernumerary teacher gaining the professional attributes, knowledge and skills to become a teacher mainly in one school although they now have to statutorily complete a second school placement. The GTP training route can be offered by SCITTs and higher education institutions. This route is known as an EBITT and the providers as EBITTs. But because of the nature of this route which is largely based in school with little theoretical content it is referred to as a training route, and candidates on this route as trainees, rather than as teacher education programme.

NB: After writing this section the Coalition Government White Paper published in November 2010 may transform the landscape of ITE in the next five years.
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Table 1 Percentage of Pupils by Ethnicity in Primary, Secondary and Special Schools in England January 2009 DCSF (www.dcsf.gov.uk)
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Table 2  Teacher Ethnicity in England 2008 DCSF (www.dcsf.gov.uk)

TABLE REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES
Appendix 3

Interview Consent Form

I agree to participate in the research on ITE tutors’ perceptions and reflections about race equality within initial teacher education programmes. I understand that the context of the research is based at [name of institution] and that the purpose of the research is to assist the researcher with their doctoral study but also to improve the knowledge base about this topic within England and to improve this aspect of initial training at [name of institution] and within the wider field of ITE.

If I wish I can withdraw from the research at any point without having to state my reasons. I will communicate my withdrawal to the researcher. I am content/not content (please delete as applicable) for the research interview to be recorded. The researcher has informed me that I will receive a copy of the transcript to agree its accuracy.

I know that I will not be named in the research and that my anonymity will be protected through the possible use of characters, fictional people, which do not bear a direct resemblance to me as a participant, but will be composed from the interview data provided by 2, or 3 participants. These characters may be used to present the research findings. I understand that the characters will be given fictitious names and that the gender, background, subject taught, phase of training of the character may not correspond to my gender, or background or my work profile. I am aware that this is an innovative aspect of this work which concurs with the theoretical framework (Critical Race Theory) employed by the researcher. I have been assured that confidentiality will be maintained for the participants and the University through the use of pseudonyms.

I understand that the research findings will be disseminated within professional and research fora and journals.

Name:

Signature:

Date:
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Email Invitation to staff to participate in the research

Dear

As you know I am doing research for my EdD thesis on race equality in ITE. In particular I am interested in the perceptions and views of tutors on improving the teaching of race equality and diversity on our courses. This is a timely topic given the new equalities legislation due in the Spring 2010 and the current Ofsted Framework for Inspection.

I would value hearing your views and would like to invite you to an interview to discuss them with me. The interview will last approximately 45-60 mins and will focus on your professional history and your reflections on tackling race equality issues in ITE. The interviews will be conducted using the University of... and the Institute of Education ethical codes of confidentiality and anonymity.

I would like to arrange a time with you in the next 2 weeks and if you are happy to participate please let me know via email/phone.

I am available to conduct an interview on the following days please let me know if one of these dates is convenient:-

Many thanks
Vini