ANTI-RACISM FRAMEWORK FOR INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION/TRAINING
ANTI-RACISM FRAMEWORK
WHAT IS THE ANTI-RACISM FRAMEWORK?

This framework was developed through a research project commissioned by the NEU and supported by internal funding from Newcastle University. The project was led by Dr Heather J Smith (PI, Newcastle University) and Professor Vini Lander (Co-I, Leeds Beckett University) with research support provided by Marsha Garratt.

The research project undertook a global literature review into anti-racism in teacher education, which informed the development of a survey open to all initial teacher education providers in England. The survey was shared via UCET and NASBTT to capture all University and school centred providers. We worked with partners (Centre of Race Education and Decoloniality; Show Racism the Red Card; Universities of Sanctuary; BAME Ed Network; NEU; NALDIC) as consultors, co-producers and disseminators.

The framework was devised in light of the findings of the global literature review and survey analysis. The research-informed framework is supplemented by the following sources of evidence and resources from the research project:
We began this project to generate new data and evidence for the publication of a freely available and widely disseminated, trusted, accessible and research-informed anti-racism framework for Initial Teacher Education/Training (such as PGCE and SCITT courses) in England. We understood this to be of vital importance to education given that reference to anti-racism is absent in current policy and there is no current guidance for ITE/T providers on anti-racism in ITE/T.

This has led to a situation in which the most recent DfE survey, mirroring previous results, revealed that only 53% of newly qualified teachers, six months into their first post, felt well prepared to teach pupils “from all ethnic backgrounds” [sic] (53%) and only 39% felt well prepared to teach pupils with English as an additional language.

And yet continued differential patterns of education access and outcomes for pupils from BGM (Black and Global Majority) heritage persist, as revealed in the government’s own Race Disparity Audit and associated statistics. The way that we educate current and future teachers has a central role in enacting change in the classroom and in curriculum and policy development to break this cycle. We hope, therefore, that the framework will be used to inform policy development.

The framework is divided into three sections:

A. **Overarching Values and Understandings**
B. **Executive Summary of the Global Literature Review**
C. **Themes:** Pedagogy and curriculum; Student teacher and placements; Leadership in Teacher Education; Staff training – teacher educators and school-based mentors; Course evaluation processes.

The themes are presented as a series of questions to support critical reflection and course development and are linked directly to the sources of evidence and practice in the:

- Literature review
- Practice notes and examples from the literature review and from survey respondents
- Global Literature summary chart
- Further useful external links

The icons are hyperlinked to the supporting documents/links when the framework is read digitally.
DESIGNING THE FRAMEWORK

In designing the framework we drew on ideas from: Wellcome’s anti-racist principles and toolkit: Wellcome’s anti-racist principles, guidance and toolkit | Wellcome.

HOW TO USE THE FRAMEWORK

We suggest that you draw on this framework alongside the Teacher Standards and Core Content Framework in ways appropriate to your course context. You can address the themes holistically, or separately as per your course needs. You may also like to refer to the NEU anti-racism charter: Anti-racism charter | NEU We hope to add further resources as the framework begins to be used. Please contact Heather Smith or Vini Lander with any ideas for additional resource materials.

TERMINOLOGY

For a full breakdown of the terminology employed in this document, please refer to the glossary on pages 3-4 of the Global Literature Review.
Racism is a real and prevalent feature of our society.

Racism is about power and oppression.

Racism has psychological and material effects.

Racism takes many forms and is constantly being reshaped.

Racism is visible and elusive; it is overtly and covertly, knowingly and unknowingly enacted; and it is individualised and systemic.

Racism can be present through omissions, obfuscations and silences.

Racism interacts with other forms of oppression in intersectional ways.

Being anti-racist is not the same thing as being non-racist; anti-racism requires vigilant action, prioritisation and embedded practice.

Being anti-racist means to actively look and see, to describe and understand, and to dismantle racism.

Educators working with all age groups, in all places are therefore crucial to anti-racism work.

Teacher educators are of fundamental importance to enabling anti-racist teachers of and for the future.

“The opposite of ‘racist’ isn’t ‘not racist.’ It is ‘anti-racist.’ What’s the difference? One endorses either the idea of a racial hierarchy as a racist, or racial equality as an anti-racist. One either believes problems are rooted in groups of people, as a racist, or locates the roots of problems in power and policies, as an anti-racist. One either allows racial inequalities to persevere, as a racist, or confronts racial inequalities, as an anti-racist. There is no in-between safe space of ‘not racist.’ The claim of ‘not racist’ neutrality is a mask for racism.”

(Kendi, 2019, p.9)
SURVEY RESPONDENTS’ VIEWS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF ANTI-RACISM IN ITE/T

“...unless we interrupt racism in classrooms, we stand no chance of having a just society.”

“It is vital to take an anti-racist stance because racism still exists. Education systems are institutionally racist and need to be dismantled. New anti-racist frameworks need to be put in place.”

“Because we can’t expect teachers to be anti-racist if we haven’t taught them how to do this.”

“Schools can change pupils’ lives which is why it is important to have an inclusive and supportive approach. Education is crucial to challenge the normalisation of many forms of racism.”

“Trainee teachers, as those new to the profession, are in a position to make changes from the ground up. Teachers are in a position to influence the lives of children and, as such, should be championing anti-racist practices in a system which is systemically racist.”

“Training teachers need to learn and understand about anti-racism in order to challenge racist stereotyping within school approaches, systems and curricula. This is essential for developing racial equality in education.”

“Learning at degree level is also an opportunity to step away from schools and be able to identify, and know how to challenge, systemic racism which is inbuilt in society and educational institutions.”

Anti-racism framework
The literature review analysed research specific to anti-racist teaching in Initial Teacher Education/Training (ITE/T) (or equivalent global terminology) from the UK, US, Ireland, South Africa, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In summary, the need to embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T was stressed, with an emphasis on consistent provision. The review found that ‘one-off’ or stand-alone anti-racist workshops were ineffective in developing student teachers’ critical thinking and proactive responses to racism in education.

Despite the apparent need, the literature revealed that anti-racist pedagogies are rarely embedded across ITE/T provision. Where anti-racism work existed, responsibility tended to rest with one or two ITE/T tutors who had the skills and confidence to deliver anti-racist pedagogies. Lack of tutor knowledge and confidence was cited in several studies as a barrier to anti-racist teaching in ITE/T, along with lack of time. Training on anti-racist teaching for ITE/T tutors was cited as a need in several studies, along with greater encouragement from the institution/provider to embed anti-racist teaching.

Alongside and possibly underpinning the lack of tutor knowledge and confidence, the literature review found a lack of support for specific anti-racist pedagogies in England, given that anti-racism is absent in policies produced by the DfE and in the Ofsted framework.

The impact of not teaching anti-racism in ITE/T was identified in several studies in the review:

- Lower admission and higher non-completion rates for Black, and Global Majority (BGM) student teachers.
- BGM student teachers described experiencing racism on the ITE/T course and on school placement.
- Student teachers’ lack of confidence and knowledge to challenge racism and/or embed anti-racist teaching in their practice.
- Racism remains a problem in schools reflected in some school policies and continued differential outcomes in education for pupils of BGM backgrounds compared to white school pupils.

The review showed most student teachers are racialised as white, a persistent pattern in ITE/T despite an increase of racial diversity among school pupils in historically majority white countries. This makes developing and embedding an anti-racist framework in ITE/T even more important for student teachers as the school student population continues to diversify.

In contrast, effective anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T recorded shifts in student teacher’s knowledge regarding race, racism and anti-racism. ITE/T tutors in the UK, US, Australia and Canada utilized a variety of pedagogical tools (specified in the review) underpinned by knowledge of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Critical White Studies (CWS).

The long-term impact of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T could not be determined from the literature review, but ITE/T tutors committed to delivering anti-racist pedagogies stress the importance of education in either reproducing racism in education or dismantling it. Data from the literature review underpins the creation of an anti-racist framework to embed anti-racist pedagogies into ITE/T to ensure equitable education for all and to disrupt the reproduction of racist or discriminatory practices.
### PART C: THEMES

This framework was created in light of both the global literature review (to which the themes below refer) and the survey [please refer to the survey analysis here].

#### I) PEDAGOGY AND CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>THINGS TO THINK ABOUT (WITH LINKS TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL LINKS AND PRACTICE NOTES AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of the Equality Act and your responsibilities as reflected in the National Curriculum, Ofsted framework for ITT, Teacher Standards and the CCF? What does the legislation and what do the policies mean in relation to the understanding of race, racism and anti-racism on your course?</td>
<td>What is your understanding of racism? Do you understand racism as manifested in interpersonal interactions and systems, processes and policies? See for example, p.47 – racial realism Is your understanding of racism founded on the voices of racially minoritized people? E.g. critical race counternarratives, p.42 Do you draw on critical theory? See arguments that Critical Race Theory in ITE is essential in challenging racist norms in education, p.47, p.48. See p 31 for a quote by Mirza (2018), in relation to the writing of Ahmed (2012)</td>
<td>Practice notes: Student teachers are introduced to the statutory equality frameworks, given key readings e.g. Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack by Peggy McIntosh; introduced to the language of race and racism Practice note: Primary and secondary students attend a session with staff from the Black Curriculum <a href="https://theblackcurriculum.com/">https://theblackcurriculum.com/</a> Practice examples: CRT with Primary PGCE students Example professional Studies work with Secondary PGCE students <a href="#">Resource 2</a> LINKS: For an overview of CRT, race and education listen to the Talking Race podcast from the Centre for Race, Education and Decoloniality [Talking Race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anti-racism framework
Do you consciously model anti-racism practice in your own teaching when teaching student teachers (in all teaching)?

Anti-racism pedagogy refers to how and what you teach; it is therefore relevant to all subject areas.

Based on your understanding of racism, what are the central tenets and tensions you explore with your student teachers relevant to your subject areas to support their developing critical racial literacy?

**For example:**
- colour-blindness or race cognisance (LR, pp. 44-48);
- race/racism as a-historical versus historical creation of whiteness; (LR, p. 43; 50-51)
- debt versus the discourse of closing the gap? (LR, p.43)
- meritocracy (myth or reality)
- assumptions/discourses of deficit, lack of expectations, hard to reach families, lack of cultural integration, or structural or institutional racism as explanatory factors for education disparities (LR p. 50; 52-53; 54)
- questions around whose knowledge is legitimised, how this is shared and who has/had access (LR p. 42-43; 50).

**Practice notes:**

In one HEI the PGCE secondary programme develops student teachers' conceptual understanding of race and racism and why they persist via a lecture, a seminar, readings and directed tasks designed to initiate students' thinking about the curriculum. The tasks also contribute to the students' portfolios. This HEI also introduces students to CRT and normative whiteness. These approaches are evident in some of the subject teaching as well.

An HEI noted on an UG programme there are distinct modules within which race, racism and anti-racism are featured.

**LINK:**
Reflecting Realities Reports 2017-20
Representation in Children's literature
https://clpe.org.uk/research/reflecting-realities
Do you teach your student teachers how to become anti-racist educators?

PRACTICE EXAMPLES [from the Literature Review]
- 3 dimensional narrative enquiry space [LR, p. 44]
- Neo-abolitionist pedagogy [LR p. 41-43]
- Pedagogy of discomfort approach [LR, p.50-51]
- Critical reflections of whiteness [LR, p.44+]
- Emotion as a tool of whiteness and in pedagogy, [LR, p.45-47]
- Kegan’s constructive development model, [LR, pp. 46-47]
- Racially diverse placements [LR, p. 40]
- BGM-led youth conferences [GLC, p.77]
- White ally approach [LR, pp. 52-53]

LINK:
See responses to the Sewell report, for example:  
this article by Kalwant Bhopal - The Sewell report  
displays a basic misunderstanding of how racism  
works | Kalwant Bhopal | The Guardian.

or The Runnymede Trust youtube event:  
Sewell Reports : Runnymede Responds - YouTube

How do you counter student antipathy/fears of 'uselessness' towards action? [LR, pp. 47-48 as an example of practice]

How do you prepare for student denial, anger, and defensiveness? E.g. understanding racially coded language, LR, p.54; sincere fictions and tools of whiteness [LR, pp. 54-55]

And how do you counter it? [LR, p. 40; 53; 54-55]
E.g. providing an opportunity for student teachers to ask their own questions and be honest about their understandings [see narrative approach, LR p.44; 55]. Be conscious too of what this might mean for their own family relations [LR p. 45].

Particular objections may revolve around class and race given recent government reviews, e.g. CRED [LR, p. 39; 60]

Whilst supporting students to self-reflect, do you transform student teachers’ understanding by going beyond individual student teacher critical reflection/introspection? [LR, p.39] Concerns about this leading to white saviourhood [LR, p.41; 51].

To what extent should teaching about anti-racism be a comfortable/safe environment, and for whom? E.g. think about critique versus being critical, making judgements without being judged see rationale and practice examples for a pedagogy of discomfort, LR, pp. 50-51; 53.
Be wary about imposing the responsibility for counter-narratives and exemplification on Black student teachers (LR, p.53, and notion of ‘academic native informants’ in Johnson and Joseph-Salisbury, 2018: *Are You Supposed to Be in Here?’ Racial Microaggressions and Knowledge Production in Higher Education [SpringerLink]) whilst being also aware of the possibility that without current lived experience student teachers can distance themselves from the realities of everyday racism in education. Hence, students must be supported in connecting understandings with teaching practices, (LR, p.51), without assuming that teaching practices in multiracial schools is in itself sufficient (LR, pp. 40-41).

To what extent do you support your students’ ability to use their critical reflections and knowledge of theory in their own classroom practices?

**Practice Example:**
One HEI uses a laddering activity ([Resource 3]) to support students’ understanding of the dialectic between theory (in this case critical race theory) and practice to support their development as an anti-racist teacher.

Do you support your students to develop inclusive teaching practices for specific groups such as pupils with EAL; Roma pupils; Traveller pupils; those who have refugee/asylum seeking experiences?

What do you know about how racism is manifested against specific groups in relation to for example, language this is sometimes known as linguicism or ethno-linguistic racism (see pp.32-33; 51 utural heritage (e.g. Romaphobia, anti-gypsyism); nationalism?

What do you know about pedagogical approaches such as translanguaging which are intended to support learning for pupils with EAL whilst acting against linguicism?

What do you know about the impact of seeking sanctuary and trauma on children’s development and needs?

**LINK**
For resources relating to Roma education and to translanguaging, see [ROMtels](https://www.romtels.ncl.ac.uk); [Newcastle University](https://www.ncl.ac.uk/)

**Practice Note:**
One HEI noted that too often race and EAL are conflated.

**LINK**
For a resource on trauma associated with sanctuary seeking experiences, see YoungMinds: [Resources For Supporting Refugee and Asylum Seeking Children | YoungMinds](https://www.youngminds.org.uk/)

Anti-racism framework
Do you support your students’ knowledge of different forms of racism?

Do you support students’ knowledge of, for example, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-gypsyism/Romaphobia?

**LINKS:**
Excellent videos to support understandings of:
Islamophobia: What is Islamophobia? - YouTube or Anti-Semitism: Anti-Semitism

Also see this report from Runnymede - AVeryLightSleeper-1994.PDF [runnymedetrust.org]

**SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

What are you doing well?

What do you want to change and why?

What barriers do you face and how can you overcome these? (See SA, pp.111-112)

What changes will you make?
Please note there were very few examples of practice that provided holistic and systemic consideration of race and racism amongst providers who completed the survey or who agreed to share their practice with the research team. The absence of evidence in itself is noteworthy.

Practice notes:
One HEI asks students to find out about their placement schools’ race equality policies. They shared examples of how they have supported BGM students when they have encountered racism – where one student suffered a series of racial microaggressions, they changed the placement school.

One HEI is looking at better matching BGM students with appropriate placement schools – i.e. race cognisant placements.

They noted there is no policy at departmental level to address racist incidents and that racist incidents involving BGM students in school are ignored.

One HEI report noted that one student had suggested ITE/T providers within a region should work together in supporting student teachers and local schools to deal with reports of racism in schools.

**Practice Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well do you [ITE/T providers] know your placement schools in terms of their policies and practices around racism and anti-racism to ensure all students are learning in a safe environment to protect their wellbeing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are BGM students/trainees effectively supported to succeed on school placements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are student/trainee teachers informed of their rights and responsibility to report racist incidents on placement? How do you support the reporting of such incidents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Student teachers supported to identify and deal with racist incidents?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a clear statement in the Partnership Agreement with schools about racism towards visiting BGM centre-based staff or students on placement, and how to deal with racist incidents and recording racist incidents? (Also see course evaluation theme.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the health, safety and well-being of BGM students and staff safeguarded in the centre and on school placements through race cognisant/ literate placements and practices? (ITE/T providers and schools are responsible for BGM students/trainees do not suffer racism on placement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Black, and global majority students and staff have confidence that school and centre based staff will deal effectively with any racist incidents experienced by them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are student teachers/trainees confident that they will be supported if they report racism on school placement without fear of repercussions which may affect their placement or future employment prospects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are student/trainee teachers confident the reports of racist incidents will be taken seriously, investigated in a timely and rigorous manner?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Please note there were very few examples of practice that provided holistic and systemic consideration of race and racism amongst providers who completed the survey or who agreed to share their practice with the research team. The absence of evidence in itself is noteworthy. |

**Anti-racism framework**
Are student/trainee teachers confident that action will be taken regarding overt racism, microaggressions and institutional racism?


See GLC p.73-74

Do schools and school-based staff show respect and accommodate the religious and cultural traditions of BGM students on placement?

How do the placement schools and school-based staff show respect, and accommodate the religious and cultural traditions of BGM students on placement? For example, can a Muslim trainee/student teacher be given leave to celebrate Eid?

See LR, p.31; 40 Bhopal and Rhamie, p.56.

Practice Note:

Of the providers who agreed to be interviewed about their courses, who were asked about religion, all noted that there was no provision to accommodate students’ religious or cultural traditions. One provider noted there was no recognition of Eid on placement.

**SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

What are you doing well?

What do you want to change and why?

What barriers do you face and how can you overcome these? [See SA, pp.111-112]

What changes will you make?

**Anti-racism framework**
### III) LEADERSHIP IN TEACHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>THINGS TO THINK ABOUT (WITH LINKS TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL LINKS AND PRACTICE NOTES AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there committed and courageous leadership within ITE/T to advance anti-racism?</td>
<td>What is your personal understanding of how anti-racism can be embedded into the fabric of your department/school/faculty/SCITT? Does embedded practice consider expert knowledge across subjects and hence teacher educator training, as well as the wider institutional focus? Does it consider the support required by the institution and the course especially for BGM teacher educators? Example journal articles, See GLC pp. 73-74. See LR, p57-58: Research on the use of video-cued ethnography by Campbell and Valauri (2019) This could be used to develop a collective understanding of how racism affects the experiences of BGM people. This could be used to generate discussions about how well attuned and prepared your department/school/faculty/SCITT is to the experiences of BGM student teachers within your care. The research on leadership within the lit review refers largely to the lack of BGM people in leadership positions in schools (LR, p29). A similar, if not, worse situation prevails in ITE/T. How can ITE/T diversify its own workforce? How can ITE/T talent-spot and develop its own teacher educators and future teacher education leaders of colour? See LR p37 (Davies and Crozier 2006, Arday and Mirza 2018)</td>
<td>LINKS: Reports on the lack of BGM teachers in schools and in leadership positions: Visible Minorities, Invisible Teachers Runnymede Trust/NASUWT Runnymede Trust / Visible Minorities, Invisible Teachers Making Progress? The Employment and Retention of BAME Teachers in England UCL Retention of teachers from minority ethnic groups in disadvantaged schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice notes:

Of the HEIs who agreed to be interviewed about their practice, many noted there were institutional Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies but not specific departmental policies. One HEI noted the lack of leadership and understanding about race and racism within the education department and across the institution as a whole.

An institution monitoring placement grades noted fewer students from BAME heritage groups gaining higher grades. This resulted in an inspection of the grading criteria and the introduction of 3-way conversations between students, placement and university tutors as a means of gaining a better overview of students’ achievement on placement.
SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

What are you doing well?

What do you want to change and why?

What barriers do you face and how can you overcome these? (See SA, pp.111-112)

What changes will you make?
### PRACTICE QUESTIONS

Are the ITE/T staff and partnership committed to anti-racism?

Do all staff, including mentors, receive training on anti-racism and do they have an understanding of how race and racism operate to disadvantage BGM students and staff in ITE/T?

Are BGM staff expected to lead this staff development or are White staff leading on anti-racist staff development?

### THINGS TO THINK ABOUT (WITH LINKS TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW)

When providers interview new staff for teacher educator posts, do they ask candidates about knowledge and understanding of race and racism?

Have senior managers undertaken a needs analysis related to staff confidence, knowledge and understanding of anti-racism?

Has the needs analysis led to staff training on anti-racist pedagogy and practice with centre and school-based staff?

If expertise lies with only one or two staff members, what would happen if they left or retired? Will this education and training still take place?

See LR p.35, p.37-38, p.44 p.47, p53


See LR p35 – just as student teachers use the ‘tools of whiteness’ [Picower, 2009] to counter anti-racism teacher educators can also use the same tools for the same purposes.

### EXTERNAL LINKS AND PRACTICE NOTES AND EXAMPLES

#### Practice Notes:

Of the HEIs that agreed to be interviewed who were asked about training, none offered specific staff or mentor training on anti-racism.

One HEI noted that the mentors were aware of the content of the taught programme and that they were sent the readings. Mentors are also asked to comment about any aspect of the taught programme within the students’ online portfolios.

Another HEI noted most of the ITE tutors were White and did not have the confidence to deal with issues related to race. There was no tutor or mentor training related to race.

#### LINKS

See Middlesex University Reverse Mentoring Framework [Middlesex University Reverse Mentoring Framework (mdx.ac.uk)]

Is there continuous development for centre and school-based staff which incrementally builds their confidence, knowledge and understanding about race, racism and anti-racism?

How has the development of staff anti-racist practice, knowledge and understanding been evaluated and fed into on-going staff training?

As a partnership ITE/T do your staff should work with mentors and students to develop a culture of anti-racism?

- Is your ITE/T workforce predominantly white?
- What challenges does that pose for developing anti-racist ITE/T for you as a provider?
- Also see LR p37-38; GLC, 73-76.

**SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

What are you doing well?

What do you want to change and why?

What barriers do you face and how can you overcome these? [See SA, pp.111-112]

What changes will you make?
### V. COURSE EVALUATION PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>THINGS TO THINK ABOUT (WITH LINKS TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL LINKS AND PRACTICE NOTES AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of evaluating the effectiveness of your anti-racism teaching on the course, do you conduct an appraisal of, or formally reflect on your own or other colleagues’ experiences of teaching anti-racism on the course?</td>
<td>As a course, how do you support and protect colleagues who teach anti-racism against negative student reactions? [see evidence about Black teacher educators, LR, p.57] How do your critical self-reflective conversations with colleagues work to support an embedded approach and ‘training’ related to anti-racism? (see, for example, LR, p.38)</td>
<td><strong>Practice note:</strong> One HEI evaluates the course content and within that the specific sessions on race, racism and anti-racism to inform subsequent course planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you conduct a specific appraisal of the experiences of student teachers from BGM heritage groups in relation to the teaching of anti-racism on the course?</td>
<td>How do course evaluations impact your work with schools, especially regarding placements for BGM student teachers? See LR, p.41+, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anti-racism framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you record any student experiences/witnessing of racism during the course (including on placement)?</th>
<th>If you do not have a formal system for reporting and recording racism during the course (by teacher educators, fellow students, placement teachers and pupils, and within systems and processes, and in pedagogical practices and policies), how will student teachers learn to recognise the manifestation of racism and its disadvantaging effects? How would an absence of a formal system for reporting and recording racism during the course be perceived by BGM student teachers and tutors? See LR, p.54-55 for lived experiences of BGM student teachers and white student teachers’ experiences of witnessing racism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINKS:</strong> [A useful guide for Bystander training: Bystander Intervention Resources</td>
<td>Hollaback! End Harassment (ihollaback.org)](<a href="https://ihollaback.org">https://ihollaback.org</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you perceive as the main obstacles or barriers to teaching anti-racism in your course?</th>
<th>How can course and self-evaluations enable you to overcome perceived barriers to teaching anti-racism? <strong>See leadership section</strong> How can you more effectively build in and make time for anti-racism work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINK:</strong> The book ‘Anti-racist Scholar-Activism’ provides a manifesto which may help address tensions in anti-racism ITE/T in Universities: <a href="https://manchester.ac.uk">New book: Anti-Racist Scholar Activism</a></td>
<td><strong>Practice Note:</strong> One HEI reported insufficient time on the course to develop students’ in-depth understanding of race and racism. They noted there needed to be a better link between HEIs and induction of early career teachers and ECF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anti-racism framework**
SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

What are you doing well?

What do you want to change and why?

What barriers do you face and how can you overcome these? (See SA, pp.111-112)

What changes will you make?
GLOBAL LITERATURE REVIEW
The aim of this review is to support the creation of an accessible and trusted research-informed anti-racism framework for Initial Teacher Education/Training (ITE/T) in England. This is of vital importance given that a concern for racial inequities in education is absent in current policy and hence also guidance for ITE providers in England. This has led to a situation in which the most recent DfE survey, mirroring previous results, revealed that only 53% of newly qualified teachers, six months into their first post, felt well prepared to teach pupils “from all ethnic backgrounds” [sic] and only 39% felt well prepared to teach pupils with English as an additional language.

This absence in ITE policy occurs at a time of continued differential patterns of education access and outcomes for pupils of Black Asian Global Majority (BAGM) heritage as revealed in the government’s own Race Disparity Audit and updated figures. The way that we educate current and future teachers must change in order to break this cycle.

The global literature review informed a National survey of the current ITE landscape revealing best practice and needs and accompanies the survey in informing the anti-racism framework for ITE/T for England. As such, it is consistent with the following UN (United Nations) Sustainable Development Goals:

4 – quality education
7 – reduced inequalities
12 – peace, justice and strong institutions.

The concept of race and how racism manifests in society is complex due to the multitude of infrastructures and institutions which subtly and explicitly reproduce racism. We are taught that the totality of racism is overt (physical and verbal abuse) and individual, which ensures that the
BAME/ BME being created as ‘safe’ terms to avoid concerns about anti-Black racism, to the homogenization of racially diverse people.

The terms BAME or BME are used in this report for consistency across sources using a range of acronyms, and in recognition that these terms are recognised by policy makers and academics. In the literature review author’s own commentary, the term Black, Asian and Global Majority (BAGM) is employed instead.

Limitations on the study of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T

As most studies into anti-racism in ITE/T tend to be small scale, even though course content can be analysed from a wider anti-racism perspective, large scale and longitudinal evidence to inform the development of an anti-racism framework in ITE/T has been difficult to source. This is exacerbated by societal anxieties in critically and authentically talking about race and racism. It is, therefore, also worth noting that some of the anti-racist pedagogies are new, which means that the long-term impact on student teachers has not yet been assessed. It must also be acknowledged that the studies referred to in this literature review are those written in English.

Use of acronyms in this report

Numerous academics, researchers and other institutions reflect on the use of the term BAME (Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic)/ BME (Black Minority Ethnic) in research and policy. In 2019/20 alone, Zamila Bunglawala (2019), deputy head of unit and deputy director policy and strategy for the Race Disparity Audit (2018), Professor Kehinde Andrews (2020) of Birmingham University and Nora Fakim and Cecilia Macaulay (2020) to name just a few, highlighted problems with the acronym BAME/BME. Concerns range from
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PGDE – Postgraduate Diploma in Education – a professional teaching qualification in Scotland and the Republic of Ireland. Completion of this qualification allows one to register to teach in Scotland or in Ireland for the Irish equivalent.
PTs – Preservice Teachers – those undergoing teacher training.

**GENERAL TERMS**
BAGM – Black, Asian and Global Majority – this term is used in discussions but is generally not the term used by the authors of the literature review.
Black mixed – People who have Black African and/or Caribbean, and White European ancestry.
BAME – Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic.
BME – Black Minority Ethnic.
CALD – Culturally and Linguistically Diverse
CRT – Critical Race Theory.
CWS – Critical White Studies.
DBE – Department of Basic Education – a national body overseeing schools in South Africa.

DfE – Department for Education – a UK ministerial department overseeing children’s services and education.
E and D – Equality and Diversity.
EAL – English as an Additional Language.
EAR – everyday anti-racism.
Everyday racism – day-to-day experiences of racism, from microaggressions to the racial violence people are subjected to on the basis of race (BAGM).
Institutional racism – racism, discrimination and inequities occurring within an institution, where the inherent structure and organisation of the institution is built to benefit white people and marginalise BAGM people.
NCES – National Centre for Education Statistics.
Ofsted - the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills, a regulatory body in England responsible for inspecting services catering to children and young people.
People of Colour – people who fall within the BAME and BAGM categories.
Racial literacy – the knowledge and skillset that enables one to identify and tackle the latter.
SCITT - School-Centred Initial Teacher Training.
SEN – Special Educational Needs.
Students of Colour – students who fall within the BAME and BAGM categories.
Systemic racism – similar to institutional racism, it refers to racism, discrimination and inequities encoded within the legal formations of society, from governmental policies to judicial systems.
White privilege – privileges white people hold on the basis of race.
White supremacy – the belief in a racial hierarchy where white people are viewed as the superior race and therefore dominate in all spheres of the social order.
Whiteness – an ideology based on white normativity whereby white people are afforded normative privilege.
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BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

The information collated and presented in this literature review generates new data and evidence to inform a much-needed policy development in the publication of a freely available and widely disseminated, trusted, accessible and research-informed anti-racism framework for Initial Teacher Education/Training (ITE/T such as PGCE and SCITT courses). This is of vital importance to education given that policy and hence guidance for ITE/T providers on a concern for racial inequities is entirely absent in current policy (Smith, 2021). This has led to a situation in which the most recent Department for Education (DfE) survey (2018), mirroring previous results, revealed that only 53% of newly qualified teachers, six months into their first post, felt well prepared to teach pupils “from all ethnic backgrounds” [sic] and only 39% felt well prepared to teach pupils with English as an additional language.

In 2018 the DfE noted that 92% of teachers in England state funded schools were white and only 3% of heads came from an ethnic minority background (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020). Similar statistics have been found by the National Centre for Education Statistics in the United States (US), with 83% of the national teaching force identifying as white (NCES, 2012 quoted in Matias et al, 2014: p.290). Additionally, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership recognised the Australian teaching workforce does not represent the population, with only 2% of teachers coming from an Indigenous background (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2019).

Essentially, the teaching workforce in the West is overwhelmingly white, reinforcing the concept of power inequities vis-à-vis the superior/inferior binary, with the superiority of whiteness marked as the white ‘teacher’, and inferiority marked as the non-white ‘learner’. The lack of BAGM teaching staff has been identified as an area of concern by several academics (see Flintoff et al., 2014; Riley and Solic, 2017; Warner, 2018; Marom, 2018; Joseph-Salisbury, 2020), as is the lack of BAGM recruitment and retention in ITE. In fact, Olsson-Rost et al (2020: blog) note that in the UK, the retention rates for BAME student teachers between 2015 and 2018 has consistently been 4%; 5% lower than for white students. An improvement in retention in 2018-2019 was followed by a disappointing decline in 2019-2020. A semi-structured discussion with secondary BAME student teachers revealed micro aggressions and overt racism from white peers and stereotyping whilst on placement (ibid).

The racialised impact of a predominantly white teaching population can be evidenced in school policies (see The Race and Racism in Secondary Schools (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020) and YMCA report (2020) entitled Young and Black). The Young Black experience of institutional racism in the UK (2020), found that school policies needed to be reviewed through the lens of race and ethnicity to ensure they are inclusive. To demonstrate the shortcomings of school policies, in 2018 a 12-year-old Rastafari boy in the UK won a case of discrimination against his school, who had told him that his locs (dreadlocks) were against school policy. This case evidenced that the school policies were not inclusive of racial and religious diversity, as dreadlocked hair is a part of the Rastafari religion. In fact, the intensity of the discrimination on the basis of hair specifically is worth noting as the YMCA report found that 70% of young black people felt the need to change their hair due to school policies.

The YMCA used quantitative and qualitative data via focus groups and surveys to investigate the experiences of young Black people in the UK. The report found that 95% of surveyed young black people had heard and witnessed racist language at school and expected to experience racism because of the colour of their skin:

“Young Black people shared experiences of other White students telling them in the presence of teachers that ‘Black skin is not desirable’, and shared experiences of other students calling them derogatory names. Young Black people felt that racism could be veiled as a joke and shared their experiences of hearing what they described as ‘subtle racism’, whereby students and teachers would joke about stereotypes associated with young Black people” (YMCA, 2020: p. 10).
The YMCA focus group also found that young Black people felt that addressing racism in school is difficult because they feel that racist language is commonplace.

A similar study conducted in Australia looking into racism in schools found that “67% of 698 secondary students surveyed in Victoria who had experienced racism had had that experience at school” (Mansouri and Jenkins, 2010 in Forrest, Lean and Dunn, 2015: p.619). Another survey of 263 primary and secondary students found that “32% experienced racism monthly and 72% had been a witness to racism” (Priest et al, 2014 in Forrest, Lean and Dunn, 2015 p.619).

These surveys on racism in schools show that racism and the response by teachers remains a problem in schools. It could therefore be argued that anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T are urgently needed. This is echoed in the executive summary from the Race and Racism in English Secondary Schools Report (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020: p.2):

“Drawing upon the perspectives of secondary school teachers across Greater Manchester, the report focuses on the schoolteacher workforce, curricula, police and school policies. Showing that racism is deeply embedded in schooling, the report argues that schooling must be radically reimagined to place a commitment to antiracism at its core.”

There remain continued differential patterns of education access and outcomes for pupils from BAGM heritage, as revealed in the UK government’s Race Disparity Audit (Cabinet Office, 2018) and latest DfE statistics. These racial disparities are not specific to the UK or majority white countries; in South Africa, a 2011 review from the Department of Basic Education (DBE) found that 75-80% of the poorest performing schools had majority Black school populations (DBE, 2011 in le Roux, 2016 p. 1). Similarly, in the US, the National Assessment of Educational Progress identified disparities in outcomes for students of colour, evidencing that racism/white supremacy is global and systematic. This data can, therefore, be interpreted as demonstrating the role schooling plays in reproducing white supremacy. Joseph-Salisbury (2020: p.2) notes:

“By their own admission, many teachers are ill prepared to teach in ways that promote anti-racism, and this can include BME teachers. Racial literacy therefore needs to be placed at the centre of teachers’ role and teacher training. It is important that all teachers take responsibility for teaching in ways that promote anti-racism.”

Joseph-Salisbury (2020) also noted that individual teachers had taken on the task of developing their racial literacy (see page 17 for a definition of racial literacy in ITE/T), using work from authors such as Reni Eddo-Lodge, Akala and Afua Hirsch. Books written by BAGM authors about racism should form part of the resources to develop anti-racism in ITE, removing it from an individual choice to a necessary collective learning experience.

If anti-racist pedagogies were embedded into ITE, it would prevent what Joseph-Salisbury identified in his research as ‘catch up’ leading to fatigue, where teachers are faced with extra pressure to develop anti-racist pedagogies after they have already been teaching in the field with limited anti-racist training. Therefore, the way that we educate current and future teachers regarding anti-racism, must change in order to break this cycle.

The social importance of anti-racist education, and the role teachers and preservice teachers play, in that respect, is summarised by Paulo Freire:

“Education either functions as an instrument to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the current [white supremacist] system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of the world.” (Freire, 1996 p. 10)

Having considered some racial inequities in education, this review will now turn to consider the policies and procedures currently in place and how they have shifted overtime, along with their impact on developing anti-racism in ITE/T.
II) POLICY AT PLAY: RACE AND RACISM IN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AND THE IMPACT ON DEVELOPING ANTI-RACISM IN ITE/T

Despite racial diversity increasing in historically majority white countries, schools in England can still get an outstanding grade from Ofsted without demonstrating anti-racist teaching, as long as they have an Equality and Diversity policy. This poses the question: what impetus is there to include anti-racist teaching in ITE/T? The short answer is to increase the low number of BAME teachers (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020; Maylor, 2009; NCES, 2019), to change the reality of disproportionate exclusions amongst BAME pupils (Gillborn, 2002; Wright, 2010; Wright, 2013; Marom, 2018), to address the attainment gap between white and BAME pupils (Mirza and Reay, 2001; Maylor, 2014; Ramalingham and Griffith, 2015; Gillborn, 2018), and to support anti-racism in the wider public realm by preparing school pupils to live and work in a racially diverse society.

In the UK, race equality legislation has moved from specific race relations acts, such as the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000, to the Equality Act 2010. This change in race equality legislation requires a commitment for public sector organisations to actively promote race equality within institutional cultures and practices. This requirement should have a significant impact on anti-racism pedagogies within ITE/T, yet evidence shows that the focus is on policies as opposed to action. The use of policies to avoid embedding anti-racist actions and processes in education is discussed by Mirza (2018) in relation to Ahmed’s work (2012):

“The huge swathes of equality policies and diversity practices effectively function as the ‘master’s tools’. Equality and diversity documents that circulate from the boardroom to the classroom constitute ‘non-performative’ institutional ‘speech acts’ in which simply having a good race equality policy gets translated into being good at race equality. Thus, we find in the ‘master’s house’ saying you are for equality, becomes as good as doing equality, which explains why, when it comes to policy solutions, ‘the more things change the more they stay the same!’” (Mirza in Arday and Mirza, 2018 p. 17)
By contrast Ofsted’s Race equality in education report (2005), prior to the change in equality legislation, championed good race equality in education in a sample of schools surveyed between 2003-2005. Although not specific to ITE, this report is relevant in analysis of the findings by Wilkins (2013) who identified an absence of acknowledgement of race equality in Ofsted guidance for ITE/T. The Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) was frequently referenced in Ofsted’s Race equality report as being a “formal structure to guide and stimulate work that was often already under way to tackle attainment gaps between groups of pupils” (Ofsted, 2005).

Given that the report was called Race equality in education, the language used however, reinforces the need for consistent anti-racist pedagogies in ITE; for example, ‘under achieving’ is specifically applied to BAGM pupils, and the phrasing ‘race related incidents’ is used as opposed to racist incidents, which connotes a mitigation of the racist nature of the incidents covered within the report. Osler and Morrison’s (2000: p.7) research on the ability of OFSTED to report on race equality found that school inspectors often “failed to recognise race equality as an essential component of quality in education”, and that “even when there is compelling evidence of a school’s problems with racial inequality, issues concerning ethnic differences in attainment and exclusion rates [and] racial harassment...are rarely reported.”

There is also a section within the 2005 Ofsted report on schools demonstrating race equality by working with the police. Drawing connections between race equality work in schools and criminality has been heavily criticized by Joseph-Salisbury (2020; see ‘Race and Racism in English Secondary Schools’), and by the Kids of Colour and Northern Police Monitoring Project (2020). Instead of pioneering and/or demonstrating effective anti-racist education practices and race equality thinking in schools, the 2005 report focuses instead on the production and visibility of race equality policies in schools, supporting similar assessments by Wilkins (2013), Ahmed (2012), and Arday and Mirza (2018).

The subsequent impact of the focus on policy as opposed to explicit anti-racist action is summarised by Osler (2009: p.14):

“If schools promote a depoliticised multiculturalism which does not encourage political literacy or critical analysis, there is a real danger that this will leave unchallenged [and possibly disguise] the considerable inequalities within schools, while allowing individual institutions to assert that they are fulfilling their duty to promote community cohesion.”

Maylor (2016) adds that the focus on newly qualified teachers demonstrating knowledge of British values further diminishes the importance of developing racial literacy in teachers. As a result, there is less likely to be a focus on matters relating to race, ethnicity, diversity and inclusion in ITE/T programmes.

In his review of Ofsted teacher education reports and race equality, Wilkins (2013) analysed:

1. Data produced from 203 primary and secondary inspection reports of university-based ITE programmes over a five-year period (2007 – 2012).

2. Policy frameworks for standards in education produced by Ofsted, frameworks for the inspection of ITE Standards for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and statutory Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Requirements (including guidance for inspectors).

3. Survey outcomes from Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs)

In line with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, Ofsted’s 2007-2010 strategic plan stated a commitment to “put equality and diversity at the heart of everything” (Ofsted, 2009 in Wilkins, C, 2013 p. 9), yet Wilkins identified a total absence of acknowledgement of race equality or anti-racism in both, the Ofsted guidance, and within the 2012 Teacher’s Standards produced by the Department for Education.
The terms equality and diversity were significantly scarce in the headlines of the 203 reports Wilkins (2013) analysed, with only five specific mentions of race, which again focused on ‘monitoring race equality policies’ and ‘procedures for recording and reporting racialist incidents.’ Similar to the wider public domain, more emphasis is placed on using the ‘correct’ words – taking an ambivalent minimalist approach as opposed to critical reflection of racial bias and anti-racism within a critical race theory framework:

“Although policy publications and review reports signal a commitment to a proactive approach to addressing equality issues, these emphasise the establishment of policies, and the effectiveness of how providers raise student teachers’ awareness of these policies. Race equality issues are rarely addressed directly, being more commonly subsumed into broader ‘equality of opportunity’ and ‘diversity’ issues, whilst racism as a phenomenon is virtually ignored. The Ofsted guidance for inspection is particularly deficient in this respect. What emerges from this study is a significant gap between government rhetoric on race equality and the policy enactment of government agencies involved in ITE……. Although outcomes are given attention, the emphasis is still largely on policy awareness and procedural compliance, where good intentions are seen as being as important, if not more so, than good practice.” (Wilkins, 2013: p. 466)

While pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL) are mentioned in the Teachers Standards, it has been done so from a problematic perspective, where they have been bracketed with pupils identified as having Special Educational Needs (SEN) and those with disabilities.

Since the replacement of the RRAA (2000) with the Equality Act (2010) in the UK, the schools and ITE/T inspectorate, Ofsted, (2021) has published the Initial teacher education inspection framework and handbook. The most recent iteration of this handbook lacks explicit reference to race or anti-racism, mirroring earlier findings by Wilkins (2013), Gillborn (2005) and Warmington et al., (2017), in their research of wider education policy. Within the 2021 Ofsted framework and handbook, only 1 paragraph is dedicated to Equality and Diversity out of 63 pages, with an emphasis on ITE/T providers showing compliance with their legal duties under the Equality Act. Compliance comes in the form of producing evidence that the ITE/T provider meets the requirement of the Equality Act, without a clear directive of what this looks like. An ITE/T curriculum is highlighted many times in the framework without any reference to anti-racist pedagogies, although one sentence uses the word ‘inclusion’.

From this evidence, it would appear that the change from specific race relations legislation to all-encompassing equality legislation has served to further diminish the reality of racism in education and the development of anti-racist pedagogies, including in ITE/T. The lack of clear anti-racist directives in Ofsted trickles down to a lack of anti-racist teaching in ITE. As Gillborn, (2005) argues, “Regardless of the political persuasion of the incumbent political party, therefore, race equity has constantly to fight for legitimacy as a significant topic for education policy-makers. This is a key part of the way in which education policy is implicated in white supremacy” (Gillborn, 2005 p. 493).

Without a clear directive from the state to embed anti-racist pedagogies, ITE/T tutors may choose to avoid anti-racist teaching. Therefore, this review will now proceed to explicate the need for anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T.
III) RATIONALE FOR DEVELOPING ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGIES IN ITE/T

Through research, a multitude of academics have expressed the real need for specific, coherent and consistent anti-racist pedagogies in ITE (see Malin, 1997; Nieto, 2000; Rezai-Rashti and Solomon, 2008; Crozier and Davies, 2008; O’Brien, 2009; Daniel, 2009; Milner, 2010; Pollock et al., 2010; Lander, 2011; Wilkins, 2013; Matias et al, 2014; Flintoff et al., 2014; Mansfield and Jean Marie, 2015; Arday and Mirza, 2018; Joseph-Salisbury, 2020). As Bhopal and Ramie (2013: p. 310) note:

“Research has shown that teachers are not well prepared to teach diverse students whose cultural values are different from their own, and that many White teachers hold negative stereotypical views about minority ethnic children and have little knowledge of cultural diversity. Such trainees then attribute those children’s academic failure to home and cultural backgrounds, rather than questioning their own pedagogies. Many programmes that try to deal with diversity are simply ‘add ons’ that do not deal directly with issues of diversity and inclusion.”

The need for consistent anti-racist pedagogies in order to improve understandings of, and responses to, issues of race for student teachers is promoted by Crozier and Davies (2008), Leonardo and Porter (2010), Brown and Kraehe (2010), Smith and Lander (2012) and Bhopal and Ramie (2013). Research by Pollock et al (2010) emphasizes that preservice teachers should engage specifically with everyday racism anti-racism in schools as part of their training. The inquiry into teacher education led by Brown and Kraehe (2010: p.92), noted the expansive literature about the complexity of preparing teacher candidates to work with diverse pupils:

“Literature in the teacher education field abounds with reports about the difficulty that university teachers have in helping teacher education candidates develop [a] the requisite background and sociocultural knowledge and [b] personal beliefs, dispositions, and habits needed to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population”.
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These difficulties highlight the responsibility of ITE providers to work with student teachers to recognise the role sociocultural influences have on schooling and teaching and the need to embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE.

The significance of teacher educators is highlighted by Leonardo, (2002; 2009), Martin, (2006), Okagaki (2006), Ryan and Dixon (2006), Lachuk and Mosley (2012) and Flintoff et al. (2014) who refer to the critical role of teacher educators’ pedagogy in shaping their own and their student’s understanding of race. If pre-service teachers are to become more critically aware of the limited parameters of their thinking, Lachuk and Mosley (2012) suggest that teacher educators should engage pre-service teachers in “continual opportunities for dialogue and storytelling” (ibid: p. 327) about themselves, their internalised ideologies, the influence of White privilege and power and issues concerning ‘race’ and racism:

As a consequence, “teacher education remains impelled to educate all pre-service teachers to unconditionally provide their future learners with equitable and high-quality education so that they may become critical and productive members of their societies.” (le Roux, 2016 p. 1)

Maylor (2014) also comments on the role of teacher educators and the critical role they play in ensuring that beginner teachers develop an understanding of race and racism, arguing that they should be afforded opportunities to examine their own attitudes and assumptions.

As Joseph-Salisbury [2020: p.8] notes:

“Often, low levels of racial literacy were perceived by research participants to be the consequence of inadequate teacher training [see Lander, 2011; Maylor, 2014]. Teacher experiences of training varied greatly: some teachers could not recall a single session on race and racism, while others felt that race was given some consideration. However, even for those who did recall race being included in their training pathways, there was a sense that issues of race and racism were often subsumed under inequalities more broadly, and were sometimes marginalised by considerations of class, and the ‘white working class’ specifically. As such, there was a general consensus that – across the various pathways to teaching – anti-racism needs to be given a much more central focus.”

The difficulties in developing anti-racist pedagogies in ITE highlight that they are often regarded as ‘scary’ and met with a deafening silence or are derailed and denied (Lopez, 2007; Lander, 2011; Smith, 2013; Gillborn, 2019). Picower (2009), describes the strategies used by predominantly white students to avoid (or evade) engagement in conversations and/or explorations about race and racism, as ‘tools of Whiteness’. In her study of pre-service teachers, she states that participants responded to anti-racist pedagogies, which challenged their idea of self, by relying on the ‘tools of Whiteness’ designed to protect and maintain dominant and stereotypical understandings of race – tools that were emotional, ideological, and performative. (Picower, 2009 in Callender, C. 2019: p. 19). Therefore, to consider the difficulties in developing anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T, this review will now focus on how the difficulties in teaching anti-racism in ITE/T may manifest, the perceived constraints this imposes and, therefore, what is needed to counter such perceptions.
IV) CONSTRAINTS, COMPLEXITIES AND THE NEED FOR A RACIAL LITERACY

Understanding how the tutors of student teachers approach anti-racism in ITE/T courses is necessary to assess the extent to which anti-racism is (or isn’t) incorporated into ITE/T. A lack of clear anti-racist directives from the ITE/T curriculum or regulators body does not negate the reality of an increasing racially diverse population, including school pupil population, nor the need for ITE/T teachers to develop a racial literacy. When applied to ITE/T, Lander's (2011) definition of the need for racial literacy as part of an anti-racist framework is, therefore, useful:

"To educate student teachers to use appropriate language to refer to a child’s ethnicity and to develop their awareness of race issues in a predominantly White area is a function of ITE/T. We need to be aware that educating student teachers in a predominantly White area poses additional challenges in terms of their starting points regarding race and need to educate some of them to develop a positive disposition to the presence of pupils from BME backgrounds, or those for whom English is an additional language and not to perceive them as a problem to tackle or ignore" (Lander, 2011 p. 358).

In a 2004-2005 study of course content of various PGDE’s in Ireland, O’Brien (2009: p.198) found “that the issue of racism was at best only briefly covered, largely in lecture format.” O’Brien focused his research on lecturers in university education departments that were involved in the PGDE programme. He selected a sample of lecturers from the colleges that produce the largest number of PGDE graduates. Of the 63 lecturers identified only 18 took part in the research. This is a recurring theme in studies on race, racism and white supremacy; a lack of willingness and/or fear to engage with the topic.

Using semi structured interviews, O’Brien reviewed four broad themes of analysis:
recognising and addressing the reality of BAGM students who experience racism and difficulty in accessing the PGCE course:

“Somewhat surprisingly for a university with a ‘diverse’ student make-up, tutors were not confident and received very little training and support about issues to do with multiculturalism, bilingualism, inclusive pedagogy and practice. Topics such as talking about Islam and ethnic and religious difference were consciously avoided in classroom discussions.”

Fear and lack of knowledge regarding anti-racism within ITE provision impacts how student teachers broach anti-racism. As noted by O’Brien (2009) and Bhopal and Rhamie (2013) respectively:

“The lack of expertise among teacher educators is a barrier to such an approach becoming a component in the PGDE curriculum” (O’Brien, 2009, p.12).

“The curriculum review on diversity and citizenship found that teachers lack confidence and knowledge about these issues and often sidestep them” (DCSF, 2007 in Bhopal and Rhamie 2013, p. 3).

Lack of knowledge and time to develop anti-racist pedagogies for ITE/T students is fundamental given that without tutor led anti-racist pedagogies, ITE/T students will struggle to adopt anti-racism in their teaching. Absence of anti-racist pedagogies also reproduces ‘fear’ of dismantling white supremacy and discussing racism (Devine, 2005; Picower, 2009; Leonardo and Porter, 2010; Lander, 2011).

It is critical that ITE tutors develop anti-racist pedagogies as findings from Lander (2011), Bhopal and Rhamie (2013), Wilkins and Lall (2010 and 2011), Mayor (2014), and the YMCA (2020) show that many ITE courses do not prepare student teachers to deal with racist incidents. The impact of this is that racist incidents are not effectively dealt with leading to disengagement and trauma in education for BAGM pupils and within ITE for BAGM student teachers:

- Institutional racism in the post-primary system.
- Adequacy of the PGDE in preparing teachers to counter racism.
- A proposed anti-racist approach (pedagogies in PGDE).
- Challenges and barriers to the proposed anti-racist approach.

He found that:

- A majority of those interviewed felt that there are some aspects of the Irish post-primary education system that are institutionally racist.
- The majority of participants felt that the PGDE did not constitute an adequate preparation for teachers in tackling racism.
- When participants were asked if they thought there was adequate scope and space in the PGDE for student teachers to examine their own value system and how this value system might have an impact on the teaching process, the majority of respondents did not feel there was adequate space built into the PGDE for critical evaluation but some of the respondents felt that it could be built in.
- When participants were asked if they felt there was a need for such an anti-racism approach in the PGDE, while most interviewees agreed, time and lack of knowledge about anti-racist pedagogies were cited as constraints (O’Brien, 2009 p. 194-205).

Further, Arday and Mirza (2018) found that ITE tutors lacked racial literacy and anti-racist training as part of her study at a higher education institution in a multicultural English city. One tutor stated, “tell us how to tackle cultural, faith-based and familial tensions without being racist or patronising?” (Arday and Mirza, 2018, p. 188). ITE tutors felt confused between being neutral vis-à-vis supporting all students equally, as well as recognising and addressing the reality of BAGM students who experience racism and difficulty in accessing the PGCE course:
That assimilation to whiteness will be reproduced when they are qualified teachers, thwarting anti-racist pedagogies and reinforcing the white supremacist norm.

2) They will not complete the course.

What was identified as ‘best practice’ in race equality in ITE/T by the white tutors who spoke to Arday and Mirza (2018) essentially reinforced racism and racist stereotyping. A Nigerian student who struggled to get access to the course, was ‘saved’ by his white tutor, who individually supported him to get access. The white tutor felt they had embodied anti-racism in their support for the student, which allowed the structurally racist enrolment process to continue. Another student who was hijab-wearing Muslim was subjected to ‘tough love’ by her white male tutor. She was treated with suspicion, and her ability consistently questioned by the tutor who viewed her through a racist western lens of what Muslim women can do.

Hobson and Whigham (2018, in Arday and Mirza, 2018) note that embedding anti-racism within their teaching requires critical self-reflection on whiteness and systems that work to promote the interests of whiteness. The need for CWS in order to develop effective responses to racism in ITE is reaffirmed by studies conducted by Crozier and Davies (2008), Lachuk and Mosely (2012), Bhopal and Rhamie (2013), Smith (2014), Flintoff et al (2014) and Matias and Mackey (2015). (Note, this will be considered in greater depth in the upcoming sections (see section VI)).

Hobson and Whigham (2018, in Arday and Mirza, 2018) also provide an honest account of the difficulties (real or perceived) of being a white tutor in ITE/T while teaching whiteness and endorsing anti-racism in higher education. Notably, fear of causing offence or ‘getting it wrong’ caused anxiety for the tutors. Hobson remedied this by checking his course material with a black peer working in the same field. Others including Lachuk and Mosely (2012), Smith (2014), Flintoff et al (2014), note the need for ITE/T tutors to engage with CWS to understand and overcome the basis of anxiety regarding anti-racist teaching. Whigham and Hobson (2018) summarised:

“This raises challenges for educational systems that may not respond appropriately or at all because they are often designed to fit white-majority interests and mind-sets” (Warner, 2018 p. 9)

This does not mean that the desire for anti-racist teaching within ITE is absent, as Arday and Mirza (2018) note on PGCE tutors and anti-racism:

“The white tutors were united in wanting more open dialogue in their institutions about tackling issues of racism that went beyond simple compliance with the law, they however found little time to do so. They expressed a desire to challenge their professional practice by developing an inclusive classroom pedagogy underpinned by culturally relevant curricula and desired a ‘safe space’ for open and frank dialogue about tackling issues of racism at a personal and professional level” (Arday and Mirza, 2018 p. 188)

In Arday and Mirza’s (2018) study, a lack of racial literacy meant that; "the external materiality of the Black and Minority Ethnic student’s situatedness (i.e., the political, economic and social structures that produce inequality) is constituted, reconfigured and lived through their corporeal representation as seen by the white tutors (i.e., as ‘undeserving’, ‘needy’, or ‘oppressed’ racialised others” (Arday and Mirza, 2018 p. 178). This had real impact on BAME ITE/T students in particular who felt ‘othered’ on the PGCE course. Wilkins and Lall (2010), Bhopal and Ramie (2013) and Mayor (2018) identified similar patterns of being ‘othered’ in their studies of BAME pre-service teachers.

Arday and Mirza (2018) used CRT in their approach to reviewing the experiences of ITE/T tutors and BAME ITE/T students. The data obtained was qualitative, and was analysed using a CRT framework, which promotes storytelling and involves the anonymisation of participants to remove ‘fear’. Arday and Mirza (ibid) identified what other academics (Williams, 1991, Collins, 1998, Poku, 2018; and Marom, 2018) have found in terms of a supposed need for Black and Brown students to ‘assimilate’ into the white culture of the higher education establishment. The potential impact of this for BAME ITE/T students is two-fold:

1) That assimilation to whiteness will be reproduced when they are qualified teachers, thwarting anti-racist pedagogies and reinforcing the white supremacist norm.
“Whilst my attempts to encourage learning through the ‘affective domain’ and the development of skills of empathy for white educational practitioners or students may have good intentions, I will always remain unable to provide an authentic and complete understanding of the lived experiences of other racial groups who occupy the ‘liminal space of alterity’” (Whigham and Hobson in Arday and Mirza, 2018 p. 20)

In fact, the impact of whiteness in ITE/T that has incorporated forms of anti-racism can be seen in evaluations from ITE/T students engaging with Aveling’s (2006) anti-racist pedagogies. They demonstrate that there will always be resistance and defiance amongst some white students when reflecting on their white privilege. ITE tutors developing anti-racist pedagogies have to be prepared for this, which links back to the need for ITE/T tutors to have anti-racist training that combines CRT and CWS before delivery. This would be beneficial on two counts—first, to develop their own knowledge on the reality of racism and its evolution, and second, it will allow the ITE/T tutors to identify and manage resistors and challengers. Student teachers can move back and forth between these two roles as they navigate anti-racist pedagogies. A ‘resistor’ resists critical white studies and any notion of white privilege, institutional racism and white supremacy. A ‘challenger’ may at first embody denial, however through the process of evaluations, they may also demonstrate a shift in self-perception as a direct result of critical white studies within anti-racist pedagogies:

“The first time I answered these questions I didn’t have much knowledge, or much of a sense of my whiteness, but now I seem to have a whole new perspective. … In analysing my earlier responses I would have to say the answers were made out of ignorance. I really had no sense of what my life meant in the context of racial differences and ultimately I have never been in a situation that has forced me to question my whiteness. I hope to be able to use the things I learned in my teaching.” 

(Aveling, 2006 p. 269)

Effective anti-racist pedagogies require excruciating honesty and, especially if delivered by white tutors, have to take into account that not all ITE/T students will instantly comprehend or accept it. Vaught and Castagno (2008) and Webb (2001) promote coherent anti-racist pedagogies that do not rely solely on the reflective process, as this can work to substantiate bias and resistance by focusing on the individual. For example, a white student who has grown up experiencing poverty will struggle to identify white privilege as a factor in their lives, unless their knowledge on the concepts of race, colonialism and the evolution of racism, is developed. The work of Allen (2008) is useful in presenting a wider socio-political context to the denial of racism with regards to ‘the white working class’ concern. He states that affluent white people only tend to express interest in poor white people when white racial privilege is being denied.

Additionally, the lack of knowledge and experience with racial diversity and racism in the personal lives of preservice teachers is raised as both a barrier, and a further indicator of the need to embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE (Leavy, 2005; Aveling, 2006; Smith, 2013; Matias et al., 2014; Subban and Mahlo, 2016; Riley and Solic, 2017). Essentially, if pre-service teachers have little experience of racial diversity, including a conscious awareness of how whiteness operates, how can they effectively teach racially diverse pupils?

To delve into this deeper, it is worth considering the discourse around ‘tolerance’ within the Teaching Standards, as set out by the DfE, which effectively functions as a mechanism of avoidance in terms of dealing with issues around racism and racial diversity (or a lack thereof)—and, in essence, serves as a hindrance towards further racial literacy. Leavy (2005) identified that the term tolerant, repeatedly used in the DfE Teachers Standards (2011), appears as the ‘get out of dealing with racism’ card as shown in responses of 286 pre-service teachers in Ireland. It is a problematic term, as one can tolerate something without understanding, respecting or valuing it.

Taking the ‘I am tolerant’ approach removes accountability and responsibility for addressing racial bias in preservice teachers, and in turn impacts how racist incidents in schools are dealt with. Being able
to effectively deal with racist incidents, according to Ofsted, is reflected in monitoring and reporting absent qualitative data about how racist incidents were effectively dealt with from the perspective of victim or perpetrator. Consequently, schools wishing to show they are ‘racism free’ learn that they must keep the numbers of reported racist incidents low. This can be done by not classifying an incident as racist or, as the YMCA (2020) found, justifying or minimising racism with statements such as: “it was just a joke”.

In majority white countries, teaching placements in racially diverse schools have been identified by pre-service teachers as potentially ‘pushing’ them to face diversity:

“For many of the trainee teachers, it was the type and mix of the school where they were located which affected their attitudes towards ‘race,’ gender, class, religion and the ‘other.’ If they were in a school which was ethnically and culturally diverse, they were forced to think about diversity, multiculturalism and how their teaching would affect students who may be different to the ‘norm’” (Bhopal and Ramie 2013 p. 318).

Yet Lander (2011: p.352) warns that teaching placements in racially diverse schools cannot be viewed as a short-cut to effective and consistent anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T:

“The training of new teachers to prepare pupils to live in a culturally and ethnically diverse society cannot merely be dependent on the locality of the teacher training provider and its partner schools”.

Lander’s observation is echoed by this preservice white student:

“If you are in a school that is ethnically mixed with all cultures and religions, you have no choice as a school but to address these issues. If you were in a school that was all White the assumption would be and has been that you don’t have to deal with these issues – because it doesn’t affect your school – and that is wrong, because these kind of things [race, diversity and inclusion] affect all schools no matter who is in them or where they are located.” (Bhopal and Ramie, 2013 p. 318).

To counteract the notion that teaching in racially diverse schools equates to race equality in the classroom, Picower (2012, p.561) advocates for teachers (and it makes sense to also include ITE tutors) to engage with educator activist groups, and to become teacher activists:

“Findings show teacher activists made three overarching commitments: to reconcile their vision for justice with the realities of injustice around them; to work within their classrooms to create liberatory space; and to work collectively against oppression as activists.”

Returning to Lander’s warning, even in countries with a majority Black population like South Africa, le Roux (2016) found that white preservice teachers on placement in majority Black schools viewed themselves as ‘white saviours’, and their Black pupils as ‘grateful inferior recipients’, which reproduces white supremacy. There is clearly a need, therefore, to also include BAGM experiences, both student teachers and tutors. Accordingly, this review will now shift its lens to centre BAGM voices on experiences of institutional racism.
V) CENTERING BAGM EXPERIENCES IN ITE/T: INSTITUTIONAL RACISM, AND THE EMERGENCE OF NEO-ABOLITIONIST ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGY

To further expand on the need for anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T—or, perhaps, the consequences of not having sufficient anti-racism embedded within ITE/T, it would be pertinent to consider BAGM students’ experiences of racism in the current ITE/T climate.

In terms of the experiences of BAME student teachers and ITE/T enrolment, Wilkins and Lall (2010), Warner (2018) and Marom (2018) identified that the number of BAME people enrolling to ITE/T is increasing, however completion rates are lower than their White counterparts. In Wilkins and Lall’s (2010) study, socio-economic factors and age (more mature BAME ITE/T students) were considered as contributing to non-completion rates, however these factors could not explain the persistent pattern of underachievement for BAME students in ITE/T. Olsson-Rost et al (2020) note that providers of teacher education in north west England identified that Ofsted policies (see section II) and the teacher standards do little to bring actual change regarding BAME students and racism in ITE/T:

“The new ITE framework, the teacher standards and Ofsted are all prominent influences when it comes to course development in ITE. Unfortunately, how to advance anti-racist practices to enhance experiences of BAME students, have not been prominent drivers in these developments to date” (Olsson-Rost et al, 2020).

Olsson-Rost et al’s findings are echoed by Wilkins and Lall (2010), who note (p.382):

“Despite the major changes in race equality legislation, the supposed attention given by public sector bodies to developing ‘best practice’ in promoting diversity and good race relations, and to embedding robust anti-discriminatory principles into their work, BME students of ITE/T continue to face additional challenges in an already intensively demanding professional arena, ‘To be ‘tougher than the rest’ or else to ‘wither away and hide’ is not an acceptable choice.”
Olsson-Rost et al’s research interviewed both BAME students in ITE and newly qualified BAME teachers. Institutional racism was identified as a key factor in non-completion, and newly qualified BAME teachers shared that they struggled to find work after completion, which led to many leaving the profession entirely. Disparity in career progression for BAME teachers has also been identified in studies led by McNamara and Basit (2004), Shah and Shaikh (2010) and Marom (2018).

Similar to the research interviews carried out by Wilkins and Lall (2010), Poku (2018), Marom (2018), Warner (2018) and Olsson-Rost et al (2020) consider the testimonies of BAME students to be essential in ITE/T course design:

"The students made two specific recommendations: more university sessions addressing diversity, race and racism, ‘not just one or two’ (Doran, 2019, p. 3) and that incidences of racism, especially among student teachers, be unequivocally dealt with” (Olsson-Rost et al, 2020, blog).

Wilkins and Lall (2010) noted that a cross curricular day led by BAME teachers from partner schools, where language, communication and identity were explored was received positively. The presence of BAME teachers working in the field proved motivating for some of the student teachers, as was the content of the session, which promoted and embraced the knowledge their diverse racial and cultural backgrounds can bring to the profession. Although reviewed positively, as already identified, ‘one off’ s do not equate to a commitment to embed anti-racist pedagogies.

Marom’s (2018: p.1) study of preservice teacher education, although based in Canada, provides a good example of “covert racism under a cloak of professionalism”. She interviewed post graduate teachers who attended a well-established and leading university in the field of Indigenous studies. Given the university’s reputation, it is particularly notable that indigenous students still experienced racialised microaggressions regarding competency and stereotyping. Her study, using CRT as a framework to encourage counter-story telling, highlights what has already been identified as a barrier to anti-racist pedagogies, and in turn the development of anti-racist structures: the focus remained on the ‘right words’, not the right actions.

ITE graduates in Marom’s study took on the task of challenging white supremacist norms in a strategic, albeit mentally exhausting manner. They demonstrated assimilation on one hand, whilst consistently and diplomatically working to embed Indigenous knowledge and history into mainstream education. Marom’s assertion of covert racism within ITE in Canada was also identified and thus further substantiated by Wilkins and Lall (2011); Maylor (2018), and Warner (2018).

To increase and better support BAGM student teachers, ITE tutors could adopt a neo-abolitionist pedagogy combined with opportunities to access BAGM led peer networks, underpinned by the same range of professional development opportunities as white peers. This is due to the fact that a neo-abolitionist pedagogy works with counter storytelling to move away from the ideology that the totality of racism is interpersonal, and instead highlights how BAGM student teachers can be pigeonholed, or have their competency questioned. This is particularly important given that racism experienced whilst on school placements is a significant problem, as is the incidence of racialised micro aggressions on the ITE course.

Adopting a neo-abolitionist pedagogy where both student teachers and ITE/T tutors, “work together to name, reflect and dismantle discourses of whiteness” (Leonardo, 2002: p. 31) would be beneficial in the recruitment and retention of BAGM student teachers. Within a neo-abolitionist approach, counter storytelling would provide the knowledge needed by ITE/T tutors to disrupt the dominant narrative of whiteness (Aronson et al, 2020), and in turn develop their understanding about how racism manifests for BAGM student teachers.

Therefore, there is a need for ITE/T tutors to understand how racism makes BAGM student teachers feel, and, crucially, they need to be
equipped with the knowledge on how to effectively challenge it.

Aronson et al (2020), reviewed the impact of critical race counternarratives over 2 years with 57 preservice teachers. The researchers sought to understand how student teachers managed any conflict as they taught counternarratives of history, which challenged the dominant or master narratives that they entered the course with. Under a CRT framework, student teachers were presented with revisionist history texts in critical literacy workshops. The tension created by alternative narratives to the mainstream enabled student teachers to develop critical stances in education, which in turn allowed them to “understand their past in order to think effectively about our present and future” (Loewen, 1995/2007, p. 9 in Aronson et al, 2020 p. 301).

Neo-abolitionist pedagogies also include teaching history which shows how the creation of race socially and economically benefitted whiteness. This history is not to induce guilt, but to highlight the importance of creating anti-racism in teaching so that BAGM pupils have positive school experiences which do not treat them as inherently ‘lacking’. As Ladson-Billings (2019) points out: “That is why I want to really focus on the concept of debt as opposed to the gap” (Ladson-Billings, 2019 in Weschenfelder, 2019 p 3).

There is a need for BAME teachers to be recognised and accepted as knowledgeable and skilled educators; otherwise, the side-lining and underemployment of BAME teachers will persist. This, in turn, will essentially lead to a continuation of a teaching workforce that lacks representation, as well as curricula lacking in critical education for all pupils (Alexander et al, 2015). One way to challenge this impact on BAGM members in education is through considering CRT and CWS as anti-racist pedagogies to dismantle whiteness itself. CWS is considered here as it often emerges in discussions on teacher education given that most of the student teachers are, indeed, white. Further, as showcased in the following section, the literature also reveals CWS, and CRT, as valuable anti-racist pedagogical approaches. Therefore, the next section will consider CWS and CRT as anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T.
VI) CWS AND CRT AS ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGIES

Picower (2009: p. 199), asks, “How do White, middle class, prospective teachers make the transition from being unaware of their culture to a critical understanding of the role of culture, power, and oppression? Her response to this question is positioned within a CWS framework:

“The literature in the field of culturally relevant teacher education argues that it is imperative that White teachers develop this awareness, or critical consciousness, around issues of race, privilege, power, and oppression in order to be successful with students from diverse setting.” (Picower, 2009 p. 199).

CWS as an anti-racist pedagogy is championed by numerous academics (see Allen, 2004; Gillborn, 2005; Gillborn, 2019; Leonardo, 2004 and 2009; Smith and Lander, 2012; Smith, 2014; Flintoff et al, 2014; Warmington et al, 2017; Aronson et al 2020) to deconstruct the reality of being a racialized white in a white supremacist society, and how that confers advantage in all areas of people activity (Welsing, 1991).

Flintoff et al (2014) notes the importance of ITE tutors in engaging with CWS to reflect on their own experiences in teaching, and in life in general:

“The study highlights some of the challenges of addressing (anti)racism within PETE (Physical Education Teacher Educators) and argues that a focus on whiteness might offer a productive starting point. White teacher educators must critically examine their own role within these processes if they are to expect student teachers to engage seriously in doing the same” (Flintoff et al, 2014, p.560).

Their study of themselves as white PETE revealed what O’Brien (2009) also recounted, that the topic of race was avoided as they grew up. They argue they were taught colour-blindness as children, and thereby became fluent in it; this essentially reproduces white supremacy through denial, and an avoidance of racism. They combatted their ‘invisible’ racialised experiences through CWS, identifying three discursive techniques by
Therefore, critical whiteness studies uses a transdisciplinary approach to investigate the phenomenon of whiteness, how it is manifested, exerted, defined, recycled, transmitted, and maintained, and how it ultimately impacts the state of race relations. Whiteness need not be only indicative of white folks since people of color can inhabit whiteness ideology—albeit for different reasons; yet, whiteness is indeed most prevalent in whites themselves. (Matias and Mackay 2015, p.34).

In recognition that emotions are themselves racialised, Matias and Mackey (2015) opted for an emotional-based approach to embed CWS as an anti-racist pedagogy in ITE, “one that explicitly identifies and defines emotionality, addresses the emotions that will be felt in the course, and included lectures on theorizations of emotions” (Matias and Mackey, 2015 p.36). Similarly, African American ITE tutor, Milner (2007), studied the impact of emotional counter storytelling and narrative inquiry as he reviewed his own pedagogies. Milner (2007; US) and Joseph-Salisbury (2020; UK) recall similar experiences of being questioned in the higher education institutions they work as professors due to their skin colour. Milner (2007) found telling the story of when he was asked if he was a janitor evoked empathy in his student teachers doing an MA. Before being able to articulate his experience, Milner took time to reflect on how it made him feel and spoke to other non-white colleagues who identified similar experiences. Conveying the emotions he felt during his racialised experience was important to get the student teachers to connect to the topic of institutional racism, as opposed to denying its existence.

Matias and Mackey (2015) also recognised the relationship between whiteness and emotions in their efforts to understand why white teacher candidates consistently use the ‘tools of whiteness’ (Picower, 2009) when learning anti-racist pedagogies. They understood that if a student teacher is not emotionally prepared to undertake anti-racist teaching practices, then they will not be emotionally secure enough to engage in long-term racial justice in teaching. Their project was split into three emotional phases underpinned by a questioning framework, which focused on the cognitive and emotional development of the student teachers:

“Making space for storytelling and dialogue within teacher education contexts requires teacher educators to adjust their positions in the classroom.” (Lachuk and Mosley, 2012: pp 327)

A narrative inquiry does not require preservice students to shed their perspectives and take on the tutors’—an act which is seen as ‘violent’, adding to denial and anger which Bhopal and Rhamie (2013) identified from student teacher evaluations on anti-racism; instead, it seeks to enhance and expand their perspectives. A narrative inquiry develops understanding of the narrative histories of pre-service teachers regarding race, while also developing the perspectives of ITE/T tutors.

Specific to ITE/T, Matias and Mackey (2015) led interesting research using CWS as an anti-racist pedagogy for predominantly white preservice teachers in the US. Their application of CWS recognises how the concept of race—specifically the notion of white as naturally superior—can be internalised by non-white people, ultimately for the benefit and reproduction of whiteness:

In recognition that emotions are themselves racialised, Matias and Mackey (2015) opted for an emotional-based approach to embed CWS as an anti-racist pedagogy in ITE, “one that explicitly identifies and defines emotionality, addresses the emotions that will be felt in the course, and included lectures on theorizations of emotions” (Matias and Mackey, 2015 p.36). Similarly, African American ITE tutor, Milner (2007), studied the impact of emotional counter storytelling and narrative inquiry as he reviewed his own pedagogies. Milner (2007; US) and Joseph-Salisbury (2020; UK) recall similar experiences of being questioned in the higher education institutions they work as professors due to their skin colour. Milner (2007) found telling the story of when he was asked if he was a janitor evoked empathy in his student teachers doing an MA. Before being able to articulate his experience, Milner took time to reflect on how it made him feel and spoke to other non-white colleagues who identified similar experiences. Conveying the emotions he felt during his racialised experience was important to get the student teachers to connect to the topic of institutional racism, as opposed to denying its existence.

Matias and Mackey (2015) also recognised the relationship between whiteness and emotions in their efforts to understand why white teacher candidates consistently use the ‘tools of whiteness’ (Picower, 2009) when learning anti-racist pedagogies. They understood that if a student teacher is not emotionally prepared to undertake anti-racist teaching practices, then they will not be emotionally secure enough to engage in long-term racial justice in teaching. Their project was split into three emotional phases underpinned by a questioning framework, which focused on the cognitive and emotional development of the student teachers:
Students reported being unfollowed by family and friends, and in some cases Facebook deleted the comments after complaints were made. This method gave the student teachers a real insight into denials of racism and anger, and demonstrated how the experiences of non-white and marginalized people can, quite literally, be deleted and erased.

Other methods used in the CWS program included the Marshmallow Activity (building structures using marshmallows and pasta) and the Chorizo test (a multiple choice test paper where the questions are based on non-white dominated cultures)—always with reflection time built in. Responses pre- and post- the CWS aspect of the course showed the candidates found “the teaching and learning of whiteness intrinsically valuable” (Matias and Mackey, 2015 p. 45).

As a white teacher educator invested in radical, critical teacher education in the UK, Smith’s (2014) study complements Matias and Mackey’s (2015) approach, as well as the findings identified by Matias and Zembylas (2014) regarding emotions of pre-service teachers in the US. Smith uses documentaries to stimulate emotion, leading to critical reflection amongst student teachers and, “the relationship between emotion and transformed student thinking in relation to each documentary viewed” (Smith, 2014, p. 218). Though documentaries are not necessarily presenting ‘facts’, how they convey the information can make them appear as factual, for Smith’s (2014, p. 221) focus was on, “documentary form as a pedagogic tool to shift students’ conceptions of the world and possibilities for their role within it”. In order to assess emotional response and ‘shifts’ in the student teachers, Smith emphasises the importance of how the teacher shapes the viewing process, as well as supporting critical student reflections through carefully constructed questions, selection of documentaries, the order of documentaries shown, and personal diaries. In fact, Smith’s study showcases how the ‘tools of whiteness’ are exhibited in response to watching documentaries, including emotions such as anger, sorrow, and defensiveness. She does, however, note some caution in adopting such an approach; Smith suggests that teachers using documentaries as
a transformative tool to shift student thinking should “read beyond the face value of students’ emotional responses” (ibid: p234). As such, it is necessary for tutors leading anti-racism sessions to develop their own knowledges on anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T, including emotional based approaches.

In terms of defensive emotional responses, Aveling (2006) notes that resistance can come in the form of student teachers feeling they cannot express opposition to anti-racist pedagogies, which can lead to silence and withdrawal. Given the all-encompassing and dominant nature of white supremacy, Endres and Gould (2009) remind us that tutors cannot expect all teacher students to instantly ‘get it’. It may take months or years before they begin to accept, understand, and work on undoing.

In response to white preservice students’ resistance to anti-racism, that which King (1991) calls dysconscious racism (an uncritical acceptance of the status quo), Puchner and Markowitz (2014) applied Kegan’s constructive-developmental model to white pre-service teachers’ difficulties in understanding racial dynamics in US society. Kegan’s model describes how people develop the ability to make meaning, including cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal dimensions (Kegan, 1980 in Puchner and Markowitz, 2014). Building on previous work on cognitive development in children, Kegan’s model considers emotions in relation to the social world, not just the personal:

“...A key aspect of the theory is Subject–Object distinction. Individuals can’t think about or control Subject, because it is us. Object is what we make meaning of, since we can think about, control, and act on Object. Development involves Subject and Object changing at each level, so that part of what was previously Subject becomes Object, hence as we move through the levels we have an increasing ability to reflect on what we previously were too enmeshed in to see.” (Kegan, 1980 in Puchner and Markowitz, 2014 p. 1052).

There are 4 levels to Kegan’s model, with personal autonomy being level 4. At level 4, individuals can “analyse situations in which the cross-categories conflict, and you can see a self that is different from though related to and influenced by external sources” (Kegan, 1980 in Puchner and Markowitz, 2014 p. 1053). Further, an individual can manage personal conflict between what one believes to be true, and evidence that counteracts that ‘truth’; for example, belief that the criminal justice system is indeed ‘just’ versus racial disparities in that system.

Using Kegan’s model to analyse responses from white preservice teachers engaging in anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T, tutors can better understand contradictions in student responses to anti-racist course material. In Puchner’s and Markowitz’s study, Kegan’s constructive developmental model helped them to understand how a student teacher could engage positively with certain aspects of anti-racist pedagogies, but not with others. One student in their study was operating at level 3, where they could listen to and integrate other perspectives, although not necessarily reflect or exam them. So whilst CWS can offer a different perspective, students at level 3 cannot apply that knowledge entirely to themselves as this would involve relinquishing core beliefs, particularly about who they are, or how they see themselves.

Of particular interest in the application of Kegan’s model for ITE/T tutors developing anti-racist pedagogies is that it can support tutors to understand that resistance to anti-racism education from ITE/T students is not just resistance to anti-racism—it is also a lack of capacity to understand any concept that requires disassociation to self.

In addition to CWS, the application of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in ITE courses is fundamental to challenging racist norms both in education and wider society. Anti-racist pedagogies, using a CRT framework, dismantles the racist status quo by promoting deep learning and critical self-reflection, including subconscious internalization of racism, leading to an understanding of how racism is reproduced and what actions need to be taken to end it.

Given that there are multiple tenets of CRT, Larkin et al (2016) highlights...
three that are most salient to analyses of individual preservice teacher learning. First, there is racial realism; this constitutes the notion that racism is endemic, pervasive, and permanent in all aspects of society, institutions, and human relations. It also acknowledges that whilst race is a social construct, racism is real and consequently has real effects (including adverse material effects). Second is Whiteness-as-property, where Whiteness and White privilege confer particular rights and privileges, including the right to enjoyment and the right to exclude. The third encapsulates how CRT challenges the notions of objectivity, colour-blindness, and meritocracy common in educational discourses (Larkin et al., ibid: p290).

Despite some condemnation of the relevance of CRT in the political sphere, Leonardo (2009: p.4), proposes that critical race theory in education is the "intervention that aims to halt racism by highlighting its pedagogical dimensions and affirming an equally pedagogical solution rooted in anti-racism". Within an anti-racist framework, CRT thus has the potential to support teachers to recognise their own power in producing change, as well as their responsibility to do so for all pupils (Bell, 2007).

Milner’s (2010) research supports a consistent approach to anti-racism and diversity training for student teachers by examining the current landscape regarding ITE and anti-racism and prioritising those examples as indispensable to the teaching curriculum (p.119):

“Teacher education, whether university based or otherwise, has a great deal to do with teaching. And teacher education programs need to be better structured, especially from a curricular perspective, to prepare teachers for diversity”.

Milner (2010) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) suggest teacher educators come together to share a vision of culturally responsive teaching which understand the following five conceptual repertoires of diversity: (a) colour-blindedness; (b) cultural conflict; (c) myth of meritocracy; (d) deficit conceptions; and (e) expectations. Examining these concepts through a CRT lens combined with Critical White Studies (CWS) could work to dismantle their reproduction in teaching pedagogies.

Similarly, Pollock et al. (2010) led a review of a mandatory preservice teacher course called, Everyday Anti-Racism (EAR), taken by 50 preservice teachers (majority white) in their first year of teacher training at a university in the US. 10 post-doctoral, racially diverse fieldworkers observed both delivery of the EAR course and smaller group discussions. Student teachers who participated (33), were informed of 2 core questions (supplemented by additional questions anonymously recorded in student journals) pertinent to the research team: 1) What are the skills educators need in order to successfully negotiate the racial issues and situations they encounter? (2) How might PD [personal development] experiences on issues of race and diversity, such as this course, be improved? (Pollock et al., 2010: p. 214).

Three core tensions were identified by student teachers on the EAR course in the form of the following questions: What can I do? What can I do? What can I do?

Students identified tension between abstract theories on race and concrete examples of anti-racist practice. As a result, the EAR professor devised the following three levels:

1. The level of principle: big ideas about antiracist teaching and the pursuit of equal opportunity.
2. The level of strategy: general actions that seem compelling or not compelling for classroom use.
3. The level of “try tomorrow”: specific solutions that seem to hold potential for a specific classroom or school at a given time, depending on the local setting and its specific personalities and dynamics (Pollock et al., 2010 p. 216).
The professor encouraged students to write weekly reflections on their personal development through the course in recognition that concrete examples could come from their own interactions with abstract theories on race and racial inequality.

To explicate the findings further, the questions ‘What can I do’ and ‘What can I do?’ have been elaborated below:

- **What can I do?**
  When reviewing the totality of racism (moving beyond the personal or interpersonal), student teachers felt overwhelmed, questioning if they could bring structural change through their teaching regarding racial inequality. Student teachers were encouraged to understand that individual anti-racist teaching practices had the ability to do both, initiate change in themselves as individuals and within institutional racism. Essentially, small steps matter.

- **What can I do?**
  Students expressed a need to examine their personal thoughts on racism through the course, before looking at racism in society.

What transpires through these questions is a reflective practice that fits with CWS approaches in terms of the process of racializing whiteness; by turning inwards, Pollock *et al.* (2010) encourage the practice of critical whiteness amongst the preservice teachers in terms of their positionality as white teachers in education. Therefore, to consider CWS further, the following section assesses if, and how, CWS can be used to develop racial literacy and, in turn, if that is sufficient to cultivate ‘safety’ in ITE/T.
VII) USING CWS TO DEVELOP RACIAL LITERACY IN PRESERVICE TEACHERS AND ITE/T TUTORS: CONSIDERING SAFETY

Much is said about creating safe learning spaces in education in general, but is it truly possible, or even correct to ensure that a space developing anti-racist teaching is safe? Who does the space need to be made safe for? Using a Fanonian theory of safety in race dialogue, Leonardo and Porter (2010) provide a framework to understand race dialogue and safety for ITE/T providers, tutors and students:

“Against much of anti-racist writing, we do not suggest that a pedagogue’s goal is to encourage white discomfort. Rather, whites must take ownership of feeling uncomfortable in critical race dialogue. Pedagogues can encourage them to take responsibility for their feelings of inadequacy and defensiveness. When paired with clarity in purpose and solidarity with the other, where judgment is practiced but one is never judged, discomfort can be liberating because it enables whites and people of color to remove the mask. They may end up knowing each other more fully as complex human beings rather than the shell of one: whites assumed to be more superior than they are, people of color more inferior than they are. After many years of experience in the university setting, we have learned that this apostasy – of creating risk as the antidote to safety – leads to more transformative learning opportunities. It humanizes students of color because it legitimates their voice and affirms whites’ incompleteness, for it is guided by an ethic of concern for and not a desire to expose whites as simply racist.” (Leonardo and Porter, 2010 p. 153)

As we have seen embedding CWS as part of an anti-racist pedagogy supports the development of racial literacy in ITE/T tutors and student teachers (see page 17 for a definition of racial literacy in ITE/T). CWS can be avoided as an anti-racist pedagogy as it is impossible to create a totally ‘safe’ environment for ITE tutors and student teachers, in terms of demands made by white institutions that anti-racism training be comfortable. Leonardo and Porter (2010) exposes the problem of trying to be ‘safe’ in anti-racist pedagogies:

“Safety discourses on race are a veiled form of violence and it will require a humanizing form of violence to expose contradictions in the discourse of ‘safety’” (Leonardo and Porter, 2010, p. 140)

On the other hand, ITE/T tutors using CWS understand that effective anti-racist pedagogies will be uncomfortable and difficult for students as they seek to dismantle power structures that whiteness benefits from, as identified in research conducted by Chris Gaine (2001) in his article ‘If it’s not hurting, it’s not working’. According to Leonardo and Porter (2010) a CRT approach using CWS will be violent, although not in the manner many of us interpret violence:

“A humanizing form of violence is a pedagogy and politics of disruption that shifts the regime of knowledge about what is ultimately possible as well as desirable as a racial arrangement. It is not violent in the usual and commonsensical sense of promoting war, injury, or coercion. Insofar as the theory of violence we put forth is positioned against racial domination, it is violently anti-violence. To the extent that racial violence is structured in discourse, we argue that dislodging it will require a violent undertaking in order to set pedagogy on a humanizing trajectory” (Leonardo and Porter, 2010, p. 140)

With this understanding, ITE/T tutors can both recognize the need for and develop anti-racist pedagogies, absent of fear, in the knowledge that anti-racist pedagogies should disrupt student teachers’ sense of self—that is, a sense of self created within a white supremacist system. Developing knowledge of the construct of whiteness, white privilege, white supremacy, and racism, CWS does not guarantee an individual’s ability to renounce or change practices (Endres and Gould, 2009 p. 424), yet le Roux (2016) maintains that the lack of such an awareness may certainly impede change in the school classroom. Studies of white preservice teachers show that even when a white student associates their racial group with privilege, they do not think it will impact their teaching practice (Bhopal and Rhamie, 2013, Matias et al, 2014, Puchner and Markowitz, 2014).

In Leavy’s (2005) study, the majority of student teachers, upon entering the course, used the expression ‘tolerant of racial diversity’, however they also saw diversity as a problem. Using racial literacy, we can recognise...
that they have been taught to see racial diversity as a problem, and not whiteness. Picower (2009) argues that unexamined whiteness could contribute to white teachers’ maintaining and enacting dominant racialised ideologies (see also Solomon et al., 2005; Lewis, 2016). If, in ITE, there is an absence of the histories of the constructions of race as a concept, and how that concept justified exploitation and subsequently brought great wealth to Western Europe and North America by developing their socio-economic infrastructures, it will be easy for white pre-service teachers to deny the existence of structural racism and thereby distance themselves from their complicity in the reproduction of racism.

This ‘distancing’ is evidenced in qualitative studies of white pre-service teachers done by Aveling (2006) in Australia, and Le Roux (2016) in South Africa with students using comments such as, “it’s not my fault”, “I wasn’t there” or “I was born after apartheid”. Distancing from a racialised past and denial of a racialised present reinforces the ideology that society is a meritocracy in which BAGM people have the exact same opportunities as white people. This will negatively impact the perception and treatment from pre-service teachers towards BAGM pupils who disproportionately have the worst outcomes in education. More specifically, the belief that every single person, regardless of privilege or marginality, has the same set of opportunities (in education and beyond) supports a deficit model that attributes poor educational outcomes to the individual pupil’s ‘low ability’ (Gillborn, 2002); in turn, what is overlooked is the racialised social systems built on, and furthering inequities, which essentially ensures those systems are reproduced.

Consequently, if student teachers believe that we all have the same opportunities, poor educational outcomes will use a deficit model to attribute the poor outcomes to the individual pupils’ ‘low ability’ (Gillborn, 2002), not racialised social systems built on inequities, which in turn will ensure those systems are reproduced.

Le Roux’s (2016) study of four white pre-service teachers in South Africa gives an example of how preservice teachers have internalised the ideology of a meritocracy whilst reproducing racist norms. Le Roux identified a desire from all four participants to work with black pupils over white pupils. In examining this preference, Le Roux analysed the fact that the pre-service teachers recognised the racialised history of South Africa, however they did not feel that history had an impact on the present. This shows a cognitive dissonance of the reality of racism in the present; for example, the pre-service teachers expressed that Black pupils were more respectful than white pupils, which directly relates to the racialised history of South Africa. Under white domination, Black South Africans were taught to always show respect and give prestige to white South Africans, yet the pre-service teachers interviewed did not make this connection. Finally, the student teachers’ responses demonstrated a ‘white saviour’ ideology reasserting white dominance, which carries the following essence: we feel good about helping ‘less able/inferior’ Black students to become more like us.

Le Roux’s (2016) conclusion reinforces findings from Cochrane Smith (2004), Milner (2003a; 2007; 2010), Aveling (2006), Picower (2009), Smith and Lander (2012), Lachuk and Mosely (2012), Smith (2014), Maylor (2006 and 2009), Riley and Solic (2017), that teacher education programmes must create space for white pre-service teachers to examine their own whiteness. ‘Posing the tough questions’ (Milner, 2003a) about race and racism, oppression and privilege—including how our racialised history directly informs the present—goes to the very core of our socially constructed identities.

We must also consider safety for BAGM ITE/T teachers. This literature review has revealed that race, racism and anti-racism are not given consistent attention or seen as a priority within ITE/T policy; instead anti-racism is side-lined as a specialism—not a fundamental aspect of teaching (Whigham and Hobson, 2018 in Arday and Mirza, 2018). Some tutors of student teachers like Aveling (2006), Milner (2007) Smith (2014), Lander (2011) and Matias and Mackey (2015) embed anti-racist
pedagogies by devoting themselves to a consistent and coherent anti-racist program, combining CRT with CWS. However, support to embed anti-racist pedagogies must come from the wider institutions producing ITE programs, with an understanding that the ‘tools of whiteness’ will be used in critique of anti-racist teaching by pre-service teachers, leading to difficulties particularly for BAGM ITE/T teachers.

For example, research led by Milner (2007), Matias and Mackey (2015) in the US, and Smith and Lander (2012) in the UK demonstrate the denial Black ITE/T tutors face in embedding anti-racist pedagogies. Milner was cognisant that his self-inquiry anti-racist pedagogy could be used against him by the institution, and Lander’s ‘Blackness’ was a source of fear, leading mainly white preservice teachers to deploy the tools of whiteness through silence and anxiety, which Smith (white tutor) did not experience. This research further supports the need to embed anti-racism across ITE. It is also notable that in Milner’s (2007) study on emotional counter storytelling, he was acutely aware that his skin colour (Black), may work against him in his anti-racist pedagogies if white students chose to raise a complaint with the dean of the institution. Aveling (2006), also had concerns about her job security based on negative student evaluations of her anti-racist pedagogies.

To, thus, further interrogate this notion of safe learning spaces in ITE/T specifically, how whiteness responds, or rather resists anti-racist pedagogies will be considered next.
VIII) ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGIES AND THE RESPONSES OF WHITE PRESERVICE TEACHERS

The works of Aveling (2006), Smith (2014), Puchner and Markowitz (2014) provide insight into how white student teachers can respond during anti-racist teaching. Aveling’s (2006) report, ‘Hacking at our roots’, focuses on the challenges and possibilities of working with teacher education students in Australia—most of whom are White—to critically deconstruct Whiteness (CWS) as part of the larger project of antiracism. Aveling’s findings come with an honest warning for tutors of student teachers: that to go against the grain (white supremacy) is risky. Dissecting whiteness and what this means incurs conflict, and Aveling states that tutors designing anti-racist pedagogies must, “take its inspiration and approaches from the specific social contexts within which we work” (Ibid, p.262).

Aveling’s approach to anti-racist pedagogies in ITE adopts CWS to recognise the complexity of race and the invisibility of ‘whiteness’ as a racial group. Emphasising the importance of deconstructing whiteness, omitting the popular focus on the shortcomings of BME pupils (which Ofsted guidance on E and D policies focus on), which serves to place BAME as the “study down” ‘other’ (Aveling, 2006 p. 263). This was also identified by le Roux (2016).

Aveling navigates resistance to anti-racism by taking a white ally approach to her anti-racist pedagogy in ITE. Lander (2011, p.354) also endorses this approach, stating that “white student teachers need to be able to identify their ability to be an ally in anti-racism, able to change the status quo.” A white ally in anti-racist pedagogy avoids placing BAGM as needing to be saved (inferior) and challenges the ideology of whiteness as the saviour (superior). The white ally approach supports white ITE/T students to understand that anti-racism is not just for the ‘other’; rather, it is for everyone, including the self: “I want to enable White students to move beyond positions of guilt and resentment to a space where they can become effective White allies” (Tatum, 1994 in Aveling, 2006; p. 272).

In recognition of time constraints in ITE/T, Aveling, built in a white ally approach to anti-racism by incorporating 1 hour of teaching per week which, “examined past and present policies concerning Indigenous people and non-Anglo minorities, as well as social and cultural information” (Ibid, p. 265) On the one hand, teaching the colonial history of Australia, and the inherent racism of colonialism, was praised by some students who questioned why they did not receive this knowledge in schools; on the other, it was denied by other students who wanted to hear more positive stories of what does and does not ‘work’, regarding anti-racism.

Akin to Lander’s (2011) recommendations, Aveling (2006) responded to the ‘shock’ of learning about the violence and racism of colonialism by following up mass lectures with small group discussion, initiated by tightly structured discussion questions, which also supported critical storytelling. Space and support to encourage storytelling is an essential component of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T as they encourage students to, “explore their own histories, value positions and make connections with the stories of others. Thus, the stories we listen to and tell each other are always contextualized within our histories to avoid the dangers of ‘me-too-ism” (Ibid, p.265).

To ensure the momentum and application of critical storytelling in ITE/T, Aveling uses the biographies of BAME authors and spoken word of BAME guest speakers who want to share their racialized experiences. It is important to note that personal reflective stories of racism can be traumatic and triggering, and thus should not be an expectation placed on BAGM staff or students working within the institution. Personal storytelling combined with the racism of colonial history, however, only go so far in anti-racist pedagogies; as Aveling notes, difficulty comes when students are asked to “critically consider their own positionalities” (Ibid, p. 265).
Fear, avoidance through colour-blindness, anger and denial are all aspects of anti-racist pedagogies identified by Van Ausdale and Feagin (2002), Devine (2005), Picower (2009), Smith (2014, 2016), Callender (2019) and Gillborn (2019), which cannot be swept away. External reflections on racist colonial histories are ‘safe’, as none of the students are implicated in its creation. An internal critical reflection of how the ‘self’ reproduces this racist history, and is therefore complicit in the evolution of racism in a myriad of ways, is far more difficult; ITE/T tutors need to be mindful of this. In doing so, it is useful to draw on the work of Leonardo and Porter (2010) to identify some of the defining characteristics of whiteness, which are likely to be present in ITE/T anti-racist teaching:

- ‘An unwillingness to name the contours of racism’: inequity (in employment, education, wealth, etc) is explained by reference to any number of alternative factors rather than being attributable to racism or the operation of whiteness.
- ‘The avoidance of identifying with a racial experience or group’: whiteness draws much of its power from ‘Othering’ the very idea of ethnicity. A central characteristic of whiteness is a process of ‘naturalization’ such that white becomes the norm from which other ‘races’ stand apart, and in relation to which they are defined.
- ‘The minimization of racist legacy’: seeking to ‘draw a line’ under past atrocities, as though that would negate their continued importance as historic, economic and cultural factors. (p. 32)

Several studies of preservice teachers, regardless of the phase or subject of education they were being trained in, demonstrate that fear of race in the classroom leads to avoidance of the topic as much as possible. In their study of two preservice science teachers in the US (1 white and 1 white presenting but Filipino), Larkin et al. (2016) found that ensuring a safe, ‘comfortable’ class environment was the reason why the notions of race as a social construct and systematic racism were avoided. Both preservice teachers constructed race as an individual rather than a social, institutional and structural issue. Larkin et al. (2016, p.316) revisited the 2 preservice science teachers over the course of a year and identified no shifts in their pedagogies towards race and racism as they struggled to link the history of race and racism to their field of education:

“One role of teacher educators, then, will be to help prospective teachers to build explanatory models for race that draw upon historical, systemic, and institutional racism that have broader explanatory power and help them make sense of the prior knowledge that their students bring to the task of learning.”

Larkin et al (2016), Harris (2012) and O’Brien (2009), recommend reviewing teacher student’s prior knowledge and experiences with race, racism and racial diversity. This complements suggestions made by Matias et al (2014) to centre the Black imagination via counter storytelling, which identifies the oppressive reality of white supremacist systems as an anti-racist pedagogy for preservice teachers. The study conducted by Matias et al on preservice teachers (predominantly white) took place in a large US urban university’s teacher preparation program where the majority of preservice teachers would go on to teach in racially diverse schools. Matias et al identified that the white imagination was maintained in the ITE/T course program through a refusal to recognise or dismantle what whiteness means in society and education. The course rarely used the terms white or whiteness, which works to both normalize whiteness as the norm and render it invisible.

Applying CRT and critical white studies to examine race amongst preservice teachers to centre the black imagination via counter storytelling (Matias et al, 2014) should form part of the foundation of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T. Critical white studies as anti-racist pedagogy in ITE, exposes how whiteness is prioritized in all areas of people activity and how being white impacts on socio economic opportunities. These opportunities include advantages in housing, wealth acquisition, social mobility, education, health and with the criminal justice system.

To thus consider the responses of white teachers in more detail, Harris (2012) conducted a three-year action research project exploring white
trainee teachers and diversity at a university in the UK. He found that the life experiences of predominantly white student teachers led to difficulty in embracing diversity in the curriculum. Based on his research, which consisted of 31 interviews at the beginning, middle and end of the course with 13 participants, he contends that attempts to alter trainee teacher’s attitudes and beliefs regarding diversity is very much dependent on the quality of supervision and facilitation by the ITE/T provider.

Further, several of the participants in Matias et al’s (2014) study stated they had not ‘seen’ racism in their student placements, which highlights their white privilege and belief that the totality of racism is personal. Their experiences are in stark contrast to the experiences of BME teacher students identified by Wilkins and Lall (2010), both on the ITE course and in their school placements. They identified experiencing racism via microaggressions, ‘othering’, questioning of their ability, and schools not addressing racist incidents (Wilkins and Lall, 2010).

Similar patterns of experiences of racism by BAGM student teachers have been identified by Cole and Stuart (2005) and McNamara and Basit (2004), supporting the view that BAGM student teachers continue to experience negativity, stereotyping based on ignorance or prejudice, and in a minority of cases, racist harassment and abuse. Anti-racist pedagogies within ITE/T work to challenge the denial of this reality for BAGM amongst white preservice teachers.

In line with the tools of whiteness and rhetoric from the state/ institutional policies regarding race equality and racism, several of the preservice teachers studied by Matias et al (2014) racially coded their language; replacing ‘hard’ but truthful terms such as ‘racism’ and ‘racist’, with ‘soft’ avoidance terms such as ‘ignorance’ and ‘oppression’.

In this way, white student teachers can reaffirm whiteness as the overriding authority in all areas of people activity, particularly race and racism. If white student teachers do not think an incident, behaviour or action is racist (or if they cannot say it) then it isn’t, which reproduces racism in school and wider society. Smith (2016) also identified a reluctance from student teachers to employ race-related terms, whilst simultaneously expressing a ‘them’ and ‘us’ ideology via grammatical specification: “In the majority of cases, .... otherness is attached to some unspecified, nebulous culture, race or religion” (Smith, 2016 p. 21). Therefore, BAGM pupils learn their racialised experiences and understanding of racism (the Black imagination) are not valid, whilst they continue to be racialised and othered by teachers claiming colour-blindness.

The concept of colour-blindness is worthy of further consideration here. Van Ausdale and Feagin (2002 in Bell, 2007 p. 3) uses the term sincere fiction to describe how whiteness pushes a colour-blind narrative. White fictions about racism are not simply individual constructions; rather, they are supported by an entire social fabric that reinforces white dominance, while concurrently professing commitment to equality and opportunity (Bell, 1992 and Delgado, 1995 in Tate, 1997). Their very sincerity makes them dangerous in that they prevent white people from questioning their own assumptions about race, recognizing the normative whiteness on which these assumptions are based, and consequently understanding structural racism and responsibility to address it.

White fictions contribute to the reproduction of racism by denying its existence akin to the tools of whiteness identified by Picower (2009). Denial is one of what can be termed the 3D’s of white supremacy – deny, defend and distract. The 3Ds can be used individually or in combination to shut down discourse on the reality of white supremacy/racism. The colour-blind narrative is a form of denial, an example of defence is dismissal of racism with statements such as ‘it’s just a joke’. Distraction can come in the form of progress; a policy or report on institutional racism such as the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (MacPherson, 1999) following the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993. The report was highly publicised as bringing real change in an institutionally racist police force, yet 19 years later the
same racial disparities in stop and search, prison sentencing and deaths in police custody persist as per the Race Disparity Audit (Cabinet Office, 2018)

Solomona et al. (2005) in Canada, Aveling (2006) in Australia and Matias et al. (2014) in the US all identified discomfort from white student teachers when faced with discussion about racism, racialized history and European colonialism. Their research identifies the use of the ‘tools of whiteness.’ In their study of predominantly white preservice teachers in Canada, Solomona et al. (2005) identified several areas that require addressing in order to prepare white preservice teachers to work with racially diverse pupils:

“These include the importance of prior knowledge of the teacher candidates; providing spaces within the program wherein which they can address their questions and concerns; preparing them for the range of emotions they may experience; and providing concrete strategies for including anti-discriminatory practices in their classroom. Finally, the study highlights the role that knowledge regarding one’s racial identity development can play in learning to work with racially ascribed differences in society.” (Solomona et al pp 162)

Therefore, their findings also support the need to fully embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T.

Having extensively considered the current constraints in developing anti-racist pedagogies including responses of white student teachers to critical studies of whiteness, and safety issues in anti-racism work for BAGM students and ITE/T teachers, this review will now turn to consider anti-racism pedagogies that have been demonstrated as effective through research studies.
The next part of this review will present an analysis of creative teaching methods used to develop and embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T. These pedagogies work with the difficulties already identified in this review. The pedagogies presented use a CRT framework combined with CWS, counter storytelling and a centring of the Black imagination.

Video-cued Ethnography (VCE) is an interesting addition to anti-racist pedagogies as a form of counter story telling which centres the Black imagination. The counter-story is a tool for ‘exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege’ (Solórzano and Yosso 2002, p. 32). VCE is being utilised by teacher educators Campbell and Valauri (2019) in the US to help facilitate anti-racist preservice teaching, using the stories of parents of colour experiencing the school system (explained below). As VCE is a recent development in ITE/T anti-racist pedagogies, Campbell and Valauri can only present preliminary findings. The concept is worth greater implementation into anti-racist teacher training as Ladson-Billings (in Weschenfelder, 2019) also asserts the importance of using the experiences of parents of colour to develop teacher education.

Tobin et al (2009), and Adair (2014 in Campbell and Valauri, 2019), stress the power of video-cued ethnography in its ability to reveal participants’ “core beliefs” through elicited responses (Campbell and Valauri, 2019: p. 649). Using video recordings of student teachers to develop critical inquiry into teaching practices is also advocated by McNamara and Basit (2004). VCE was split by Campbell and Valauri (2019) into 4 phases over a short time frame (exact time allocated was not mentioned in the study).

**Phase 1**

Campbell and Valauri audio recorded three parents of colour who had children in school, asking the following questions:

1. How do you address race with your child?
2. How do you feel about your child’s school addressing topics like race?

The interviews were then transcribed.

**Phase 2**

26 predominantly white preservice teachers were split into 2 groups, with each group being given a parent transcript to discuss. Discussions were led by what stood out from the transcripts regarding race and how the preservice teachers would respond. Anxieties and concerns from several students were expressed. The students’ recorded discussions were then transcribed.

**Phase 3**

The parents were given the preservice teacher transcripts to review and provide feedback on their responses to their (the parents) original interview.

**Phase 4**

The written feedback from the parents was given back to the student teachers, split into the same two groups they were in before. The groups then discussed the parent feedback and what they had learned. The preservice teachers then made visual representations of their reflections of the VCE process and shared them with the group.

In their analysis of the study, Campbell and Valauri recorded 2 ‘shifts’ in preservice teachers’ response to race and racism:

- Shift 1: The Necessity to Participate in Racial Conversations to End Racial Oppression – preservice teachers recognized they could not avoid
thinking about race or discussing race as a teacher. Fear of challenging the school status quo by engaging with race was raised as an area of concern, yet through the discussion, the preservice teachers identified that should not deter them.

- Shift 2: Importance of Recognizing and Challenging Structural and Institutional Inequities – preservice students recognized the contradiction in school policies of promoting a colour-blind ‘we are all equal’ ideology, yet asking pupils to identify racially on enrolment via the tick box. The students also identified how the school curriculum reinforces white supremacy via some of its teaching and the assignments pupils had to complete – something which many of them had never considered before the VCE program.

The use of VCE could combat difficulties already identified (colour-blindness, defensiveness, denial, white centred privilege and whataboutism) without subjecting people of colour to traditional panel type voyeurism, with the expectation they relive racial trauma for a white audience.

In Australia, Scrimgeour and Ovsienko (2015) reviewed anti-racist pedagogies that they have been developing over 8 years with over 3500 preservice teachers at an Australian university. Their teaching team, like so many other ITE/T tutors in this review, identified resistance from students towards anti-racism using the tools of whiteness (deflection, individualism, belief in a meritocracy). Their response was to adopt an intersectional approach to anti-racist pedagogies, or intersectional privilege studies. Using conclusions derived from Pederson et al (2003), Scrimgeour and Ovsienko (2015) concur that changing behaviours is more useful than focusing on changing attitudes in anti-racist pedagogies.

Their approach to anti-racist pedagogies involved “The adoption of intersectionality as an organising principle that provides the opportunity for a more nuanced and critical approach to issues of racialisation, racism and oppression” (Nash, 2008 in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015 p.33). By adopting an intersectionality approach to anti-racist pedagogies Scrimgeour and Ovsienko (2015, p.33) state that resistance from preservice teachers is reduced:

“We have observed that student resistance to the anti-racism component of our course has diminished over time as we have paid closer attention to what Rattansi (2007) describes as ‘the bounded relationship between racism and myriad other divisions, especially those of class and gender’.”

Preservice teachers who hold privilege—such as white, heterosexual, male and able bodied—resist a one axis approach to anti-racist pedagogies, and struggle to recognise their privilege. An intersectionality approach to ‘privilege education’ (Perrin, 2013 in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015 pp 39) incorporates more nuance and thus intersections of identity. Resistance is reduced when anti-racist teaching incorporates the myriad ways that privilege manifests and can be unacknowledged (race, gender, class, sexuality), rather than simply being a position of ‘racist’ or ‘anti-racist’. Scrimgeour and Ovsienko identify that taking an intersectional approach to anti-racist pedagogies risks preservice teachers shifting discussions to areas they feel more comfortable e.g., the white working class, avoiding critical reflections on racial privilege.

Rattansi (2007 in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015) provides the following rationalisation for incorporating a range of vectors when teaching about ‘race’ and racism:

“Racialisation tells us that racism is never simply racism, but always exists in complex imbrication with nation, ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality, and therefore a dismantling of racism also requires, simultaneously as well as in the long run, a strategy to reduce relevant class inequalities, forms of masculinity, nationalisms and other social features, whereby racisms are reproduced in particular sites” (Rattansi, 2007 in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015 p. 40).

McIntosh (2013 in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015) suggests that human oppression may be altered by recognition of the workings of privilege
systems, and provides a rationale for support of privilege studies as an important education approach:

“We have not been taught to see privilege systems. In fact we have been rewarded not to see them and rewarded for not talking about them. But the myths of meritocracy, monoculture, manifest destiny, dominant group neutrality, and dominant group superiority lack explanatory power in accounting for suffering.” (McIntosh 2013, p. xvi in Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015, p 40)

In Scrimgeour’s and Ovsienko’s, privilege education program they begin by working with preservice teachers to critically analyse constructs such as identity, socio economic status, class, ‘race’, racialisation and gender. This provides the platform to move into the more challenging components of the privilege course, and introduces intersectionality, removing the homogenous label applied to marginalised groups. An adaptation of Peggy McIntosh’s, ‘Walking through White Privilege’ is introduced with additional examples, incorporating class, gender, religion and ability.

Linking back to Olsson-Rost et al (2020), about the importance of listening to students, Scrimgeour and Ovsienko (2015) incorporate more groups to the White Privilege activity as recommended by the student teachers. Following this activity, preservice teachers are given theoretical explanations of privilege mechanisms followed by watching A girl like me – documentary about the lives and experiences of a group of African American teenagers, including internalisations of the concept of race (them as inferior). According to Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, reflections on this documentary from student teachers are emotional, providing a significant breakthrough in understanding (Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015, p 41) akin to Smith’s (2014) findings from her use of documentaries as an aspect of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T.

Concerns that privilege studies dilute the reality of racism and endorse a colourblind ideology is noted by Scrimgeour and Ovsienko (2015, p. 41), however they conclude:

“We advocate for this approach on the basis that student engagement with complex ideas about educational and social equity increases when they engage with concepts of privilege and disprivilege” (Scrimgeour and Ovsienko, 2015, p 41)

Harris’s (2012) three-year research study of 13 white preservice history teachers in an education institute in the UK, suggests a focus on the purpose of teaching curricular topics:

“By purpose, I mean trainee teachers and teachers need to understand the rationale and/or possible range of rationales for teaching particular curriculum topics, and to understand how the rationale(s) actually informs curriculum choices” (Harris, 2012, p. 221)

Using questions based on scenarios that focused on an aspect of diversity and history, Harris asserts that purpose is neglected in teacher training, but he contends that:

“Change is more likely to occur in a teacher’s ideas and actions if they appreciate the need for change and that change is more likely to occur where it is closely linked to a teacher’s sense of identity, which is often centred around their identity as a subject teacher” (Ibid)

Harris uses the work of Barton and Levstik to identify ‘stances’, which provide different reasons for the study of history. These are labelled ‘identification’, ‘analytical’, and ‘moral response’ (Ibid, p. 223), and according to Harris, diversity is incumbent in each of these stances. Under identification, the roles of diverse people and cultures should be examined to understand how history shapes our identity. Under ‘analytical’, the past is studied to make sense of the present, which requires students to review the familiar (white supremacist status quo) and unfamiliar (history of marginalized people), and how this informs the present. Under the ‘moral response’ stance, moral questions and values are explored. Values such as fairness are explicitly promoted, so studies of marginalized groups, which have been exempted from fair treatment, must be studied:

Thus, when exploring the rationale for studying history, diversity has a
place in each of these ‘stances’. Importantly, this allows teachers to hold different ideas about the point of studying history but emphasizes that diversity is inherent in each position. This helps trainees see the value of teaching a more diverse curriculum so hopefully helping them see a need to accommodate such ideas in their practice; this can also sit within their existing beliefs, rather than threatening them, which would probably result in resistance (Harris, 2012 p. 223). It is important to find ways which connect with teachers’ beliefs, attitudes and values in order to exert change. This is why a focus on purpose appears to offer a productive line of enquiry; by working from a teacher’s sense of purpose, linking this to diversity and showing how they are compatible is more likely to induce change than adopting a confrontational approach, which is more likely to result in resistance.

Results from the interviews Harris led identified three dimensions connected to purpose.

1) Purpose as reinforcement - student teachers who had higher levels of engagement with diversity prior to the course remained committed to incorporate it in their teaching. Importantly, these students identified a need for the government and entire school body to demonstrate the same commitment to bring real change.

2) Purpose as challenge to preconceptions – the majority of student teachers interviewed fell into this dimension, all with limited experience of diversity prior to the course. As the student teachers in this dimension progressed through the course the infusion of diversity in the ITE pedagogy helped develop their understanding of purpose i.e., why diversity should be included in history, as well as developing a critical analysis of what is currently taught.

3) The final dimension identified was purpose as one of many competing demands, where student teachers struggled to identify purpose behind incorporating diversity in their teaching. These students were struggling on the course in general, thus identifying purpose felt like an addition as opposed to an essential. In conclusion Harris found that a focus on the purpose approach reduced resistance, and was more likely to lead to internal change in attitudes.

A focus on purpose appears to offer a productive line of enquiry; by working from a teacher’s sense of purpose, linking this to diversity and showing how they are compatible is more likely to induce change than adopting a confrontational approach, which is more likely to result in resistance. It seems to promote what Korthagen et al. (2001, in Harris, 2012 p. 236) see as one of the key factors in bringing about change in teachers' conceptions and actions, namely for teachers to appreciate an internal need for change (Harris, 2012, p. 236).

It is important to highlight that how history in particular is taught is currently under scrutiny from a decolonising perspective, and thus the need to expand and develop diversity is more obvious in this particular curriculum area. Harris’s assertions for student teachers are worth exploring, particularly in reference to other curriculum areas.
X) CONCLUSION

The evidence presented in this review showcases a need to embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE in order to develop the following: equity in education for all pupils, racial literacy amongst teachers, confidence to teach racially diverse pupils, and effectively manage racist incidents. As racial diversity increases, particularly in historically majority white countries, this review demonstrates the negative impact of omitting anti-racist pedagogies on Black, Asian and Global Majority pupils, and recruitment/retention of Black Asian and Global Majority student teachers. Crucially, this review provides a summary of the importance of anti-racist teaching in ITE/T and best practice - how tutors can and should use Critical Race Theory and Critical White Studies to embed effective anti-racist pedagogies within teacher training. The Global Literature Chart shows the consistent themes identified in this review, specific to anti-racism in ITE combined with the impact of either embedding or omitting anti-racist pedagogies.
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GLOBAL LITERATURE CHART
# Table of Consistent Themes Identified Through the Review by Country Context

Written by Marsha Garratt, Research Project RA

## Colour Key by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Cyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Literature Chart
### Key Themes

Directives from the state focus on equality and diversity, avoiding specific reference to anti-racist pedagogies in ITE.

### Impact

- Reality of institutional racism is diminished
- Too much focus on knowledge of the Equality Act 2010 and placement schools/ITE providers EandD policy as opposed to developing and embedding anti-racist practice
- Racist or Eurocentric narratives are reproduced

### Authors/Key Reports

- DfE, Teachers Standards *(2011)*
- Ofsted, ITE inspection Framework *(2021)*
- Ahmed *(2012)*
- Osler and Morrison *(2000)*
- Smith *(2013, 2021)*
- Wilkins *(2013)*
- Osler *(2009)*
- Warmington et al *(2017)*
- Olsson-Rost, Sinclair and Warner *(2020)*

### Anti-racist pedagogies in ITE are not embedded across institutions

- Reproduction of institutional racism in ITE
- Poor BAGM recruitment and retention in ITE – assimilation to whiteness
- Stifled career progression for BAGM NQT's
- ITE students do not feel confident to challenge racism
- Continuation of 'one off multicultural days' or anti-racist seminars which do not effectively challenge racism as evidenced by the high number of ITE students and ITE tutors who lack confidence to challenge racism and develop anti-racist pedagogies

### Authors/Key Reports

- Joseph-Salisbury *(2020)*
- YMCA: Young and Black *(2020)*
- Flintoff et al. *(2014)*
- Riley and Solic *(2017)*
- Warner *(2018)*
- Marom *(2018)*
- Olsson-Rost et al *(2020)*
- Le Roux *(2016)*
- Leonardo, *(2002 and 2009)*
- Martin *(2004)*
- Okagaki, *(2006)*
- Ryan and Dixon *(2006)*
- Lachuk and Mosley *(2012)*
- Maylor *(2009 and 2014)*
- Indigenous Control of Indian Education Policy *(2019)*
- Wilkins and Lall *(2010)*
- McNamara and Basit *(2004)*
- Shah and Shaikh *(2010)*
- Arday, and Weekees-Bernard *(2015)*
- Bhopal and Rhamie *(2013)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Literature Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITE tutors lacking knowledge and confidence to develop anti-racist pedagogies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproduces avoidance of race, reflecting the narrative in mainstream society.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction of institutional racism in ITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor BAGM recruitment and retention in ITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE students do not feel confident to challenge racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The responsibility to develop anti-racist pedagogies falls to the staff who have the motivation and knowledge to embed it removing responsibility from the institution to embed anti-racist pedagogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction of institutional racism where individual ITE tutors, in the belief they are being anti-racist by supporting individual BAGM ITE students, without challenging the institutional processes which contribute to poor BAGM recruitment and retention in ITE – namely anti-racist pedagogies not being embedded in the ITE provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL pupils are positioned as inferior in policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **One-off days which employ BAGM speakers/teachers reproduce racism by laying the responsibility of dismantling on the shoulders of BAGM individuals** |
| One-off days via large anti-racist lectures work with the tools of whiteness to make racism appear irrelevant |
| Anti-racist pedagogies cannot rely on reflection alone |

| **King (1991)** |
| **Solomona et al. (2005)** |
| **McNamara and Basit (2004)** |
| **Webb (2001)** |
| **Rodriguez-Mojica et al. (2020)** |
| **Marrun et al. (2019)** |

| **Picower (2009)** |
| **Bonilla-Silva (2014)** |
| **Lopez (2007)** |
| **Lander (2011)** |
| **Gillborn (2019)** |
| **Callender (2019)** |
| **Leonardo and Porter (2010)** |
| **Devine (2005)** |
| **Gillborn (2019)** |
| **Feagin (2001)** |
| **Cole and Stuart (2005)** |
| **McNamara and Basit (2004)** |
| **Poku (2018)** |
There is a clear need for anti-racist pedagogies to be embedded in all ITE provision

- ITE students confident and able to challenge all forms of racism and embed anti-racism in their teaching practice
- Counteracting the tools of whiteness – denial, avoidance, silence, deflection, colourblind ideology
- Preventing assimilation to white supremacist norms
- Improve racial literacy of ITE students and tutors
- ITE tutors have the knowledge and institutional support to teach anti-racism
- Improvement in recruitment and retention of BAGM ITE students
- Wider impact of embedded anti-racism teaching in ITE:
  - Decrease the attainment gap of BAGM pupils
  - Improvement in how racism is challenged in schools
  - A teacher workforce that is more reflective of the population
  - Newly qualified teachers are better placed to support all pupils and prepare them to work and live in racially diverse communities
- Decolonised curriculum
- Inclusive school policies

**Global Literature Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Centre for Education Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansouri and Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest et al 2014 in Forrest, Lean and Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhopal and Ramie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arday and Mirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maylor 2014, 2016 and 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin et al (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crozier and Davies (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minier (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Lander (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhopal and Ramie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintoff et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arday and Mirza (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph-Salisbury (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villegas and Lucas (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whigham and Hobson (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaught and Caustagno (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavy (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Kraehe (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon et al (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieto (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield and Jean-Marie (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias et al (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heng (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazeley and Dunne (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock at al (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaine (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias and Zembylas (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global Literature Review**

- ANTI-RACISM FRAMEWORK
- GLOBAL LITERATURE REVIEW
- GLOBAL LITERATURE CHART
- SURVEY ANALYSIS
There are examples of excellent anti-racist pedagogies in ITE programs, but they are dependent on specific ITE tutors who have knowledge of Critical Race Theory (CRT), Critical White Studies (CWS) and passion to push the agenda.

The institution where ITE provision takes place must support embedding anti-racist pedagogies.

Global examples of anti-racist pedagogies in ITE are available and can be adopted into a wider anti-racist framework for ITE.

If the ITE tutors who have developed anti-racist pedagogies leave the institution, the work can fall to the side.

Whiteness as the norm is critically investigated allowing student teachers to develop understanding about how race and racism manifests and operates as a structural system within a white supremacist framework as opposed to an individual approach.

Denial, resistance and avoidance by student teachers to anti-racism is reduced, supporting critical analysis regarding race producing change in how race and racism is recognised in teaching.

Examples of anti-racist pedagogies, all use a CRT framework:

- The white ally approach
- Critical reflection of whiteness (CWS) – including how the concept of whiteness is internalised by BAGM ITE students
- Counter storytelling to encourage critical self-reflection
- Emotional based approach - using the work of BAGM authors/ speakers/conference leaders and documentaries especially intimate technology via social media

Examples of excellent anti-racist pedagogies in ITE programs include:

- **Smith** (2014) - Emotional responses to documentary viewing and the potential for transformative teaching
- **Matias and Mackey** (2015) - Breakin’ down whiteness in antiracist teaching: Introducing critical whiteness pedagogy
- **Lachuk and Mosely** (2012) - Us and Them? Entering a three dimensional narrative inquiry space with white pre-service teachers to explore race, racism, and anti-racism
- **Aveling** (2004) - Hacking at our very roots’: rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education
- **Puchner and Markowitz** (2014) - Using an adult development model to help explain pre-service teacher resistance to learning about race
- **Riley and Solic** (2017) - “Change Happens Beyond the Comfort Zone.”
- **Picower** (2012) – Teacher activism: Enacting a vision for social justice
- **Campbell and Valauri** (2019) - “Our Voices Matter: Using Video-Cued Ethnography to Facilitate a Conversation about Race between Parents of Color and Preservice Teachers.”
- **Ladson – Billings** (2019) - Teacher Education in a Racialized Society: An Interview with Gloria Ladson-Billings
- Video Cue Ethnography between parents of colour and preservice teachers
- Kegan’s constructive developmental model – for ITE tutors to understand resistance and denial
- Centering the Black imagination
- ITE tutors being part of, and having connections with teacher activist networks
- Neo abolitionist pedagogies – to reflect and dismantle whiteness
- Teaching the contribution/sacrifice of BAGM to society – Ladson-Billings the debt we owe as opposed to the lack of the ‘other’
- Fanonian theory of safety in race dialogue - Risk and discomfort should be embraced by ITE tutors as part of the anti-racist dialogue.
- Privilege Education program - Adoption of an intersectional approach in anti-racist pedagogies – changing behaviours is a more useful undertaking than changing attitudes. Under this, constructs such as identity, gender, class and race are discussed before moving to activities such as, Walking through white privilege and review of the documentary, A girl like me

Leonardo and Porter (2010) - Pedagogy of fear: toward a Fanonian theory of ‘safety’ in race dialogue
Jones and McNamara (2004) - The possibilities and constraints of multimedia as a basis for critical reflection
Harris (2012) - ‘Purpose’ as a way of helping white trainee history teachers engage with diversity issues.
Daniel (2009) - Conversations on race in teacher education cohorts
• Centering purpose as a way of helping white trainee history teachers engage with diversity issues - Change is more likely to occur in a teacher’s ideas and actions if they appreciate the need for change and that change is more likely to occur where it is closely linked to a teacher’s sense of identity, which is often centered around their identity as a subject teacher [p. 221]

• Critical literacy workshops to explore historical creation of race and racism

• Everyday Antiracism for Educators (EAR) – Identified the following core tensions:
  What can I do? – 
  What can I do? –
  What can I do? –

• A three dimensional narrative inquiry with pre-service teachers and ITE tutors - –Lachuk and Mosley (2012)
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DEVELOPING AN ANTI-RACISM FRAMEWORK FOR INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION TO MITIGATE RACIAL INEQUITIES IN EDUCATION AND TO DEVELOP SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES FOR THE FUTURE

The survey front page was looked at 453 times (although not necessarily by that number of individuals). The survey was then opened 80 times but only 27 individuals submitted the survey (28 originally but one of them was blank). One of the 27 returns was submitted by a student and hence was also not considered in most of the analyses. There were therefore 26 usable survey returns.

SECTION 1: RESPONDENT/COURSE DETAILS

Course Type and details

BA Undergraduate: 10 (out of the 6 who gave details, all were primary and 2 included 3-11). All were 3 years except one which offered 4 years integrated Masters

PGCE Secondary: 13 (5 of the 11 details were 11-18/19, all the same length 9months/1 year)

Subjects listed from 11 who gave details

Art and Design, MFL, History, geography, Computer Science, English, maths, science,

Range of subjects offered: Science (Physics, Chemistry, Biology), Maths, English, Geography, History, Computer Science, PE, Design and Technology, MFL (French, Spanish, Mandarin), Latin with Classics, Business Studies, RE with Citizenship

English, science, MFL, history, dance, music, PE, mathematics. All students follow a common Professional Studies module

15 subject specialisms

German

subjects: English Geogphy History RE MFL Mathematics, Biology Chemistry Physics Physics with Maths Social Science

English, Maths, Science, MFL, Classics, History, Geography, Music, DT, Business Studies, RE, Psychology, Computing, Media, Drama

all

English PGCE

History with humanities and Geography with humanities

English, Maths, PE, Sciences, Science with Physics with maths
**PGCE Primary:** 11, all 1 year

Range of age groups taught:
- 3-7 and 5-11
- Primary including EYFS
- 4-11
- 2-7, 5-11
- 5-11
- 5-11
- 3-11

Range of subjects taught:
- PE, DT, RE, Primary
- We offer School Direct with PGCE
- 15 subject specialisms
- SEND/ EAL Inclusion enhancement for all students
- 3 general specialism pathways - EY & KS1, KS1 & KS2 and KS2.
- Subject specialisms in maths and primary languages.
- Primary and Secondary

**School Direct** [salaried or not]: 7 (all 1 year)

Range of age groups taught:
- 3-7, 5-11 and 11-16
- Primary and Secondary
- 11-16
- 2-7, 5-11
- 5-11
- Primary and Secondary

**SCITT:** 4 (all but one are both secondary and primary; one 4-11; all 1 academic year)

Subjects taught:
- Showing all 2 responses
- Most subjects except DT, PE and Classics
- We offer English, Maths, Science, Art and Design, PE, Geography and History and EY as specialisms

**Teach first:** 0

**Other:** 4 (one is 1 year long and the other 2 are 2-3 years long)

- BsC Maths with QTS
- MA English Language Teaching, Cambridge Delta
- Secondary

**Subjects taught:**
- Secondary maths
  - This is a qualification for teachers of English who teach new users of English
- Niche PhD provider

---

**Global Literature Chart**
Roles for those across multiple or single types of provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught several course types (Pr = primary; Sec = secondary; AD = School Direct)</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Taught only one course type (Pr = primary; Sec = secondary; AD = School Direct)</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Pr, PGCE, SD, SCITT</td>
<td>Acting head of department ITE</td>
<td>SCITT</td>
<td>Head of Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Pr</td>
<td>Course lead</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Subject co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE Sec and Pr + SD</td>
<td>ITE professional tutor with responsibilities including anti-racism</td>
<td>BA Pr</td>
<td>Programme lead for BEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE Pr and SCITT</td>
<td>Deputy director with EDI responsibilities</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Training school tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE Sec, SD</td>
<td>Head of Secondary – MA English language teaching</td>
<td>Course leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE Pr +SD Pr ISEND and EAL enhancement for all students</td>
<td>Head of Pr. Ed.</td>
<td>BA Pr</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCITT, PR, sec, and one course 14-19</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE Pr and SCITT</td>
<td>Course director</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Head of PGCE secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, PGCEs, SD</td>
<td>Head of ITE</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Head of PGCE sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, PGCE Pr</td>
<td>Head of Primary education</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Programme leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, PGCEs Pr and Sec</td>
<td>Lecturer leading equity provision</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Pr; SD Pr and Sec; other</td>
<td>Programme leader ‘niche’ PhD</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCEs Pr and Sec</td>
<td>Director of ITE</td>
<td>PGCE Sec</td>
<td>Lead teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Pr; PGCE Pr</td>
<td>Head of primary ITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 respondents were responding on behalf of more than one course type. Most of these respondents played a senior role in the courses, e.g. Head of course type, ITE, Primary or Secondary Education. Of the 2 who were not in a leadership role, they both had responsibilities for equity/anti-racism.

The pattern was more varied for those 13 who were responding on behalf of only one course, suggesting that these respondents may have taken individual responsibility to respond to the survey.

In terms of the respondents’ personal details (from question 18), the survey was taken by 5 men, 20 females and 1 Cis woman most of whom had been teaching in ITE/T for between 5 and 9 years:

- 0-4 years: 5 (19.2%)
- 5-9 years: 10 (13.8%)
- 10-15 years: 6 (21.3%)
- 15+ years: 5 (19.2%)

Out of the 25 respondents who chose to name their ethnicity (free text box):

- 2 respondents recorded mixed (1 mixed black African and white; 1 mixed black Caribbean and white)
- 1 respondent recorded Chinese
- 1 respondent recorded British Asian (Indian)

15 recorded white British and 6 recorded white = 21 white respondents.
Out of the 24 who responded giving their professional role, interestingly over 50% were senior lecturers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Professor</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>13 (54.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting academic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader (for School-based provision)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Mentor (for School-based provision)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (for School-based provision)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

This may reflect roles in ITE/T for colleagues beyond senior lecturer status, in that those above this level may have a reduced role to play in ITE/T.

In terms of where respondents taught, the overwhelming number of respondents work in London or the South-East:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>11 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>5 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>3 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>2 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2: AWARENESS OF AND NEED FOR ANTI-RACISM POLICIES IN ITE/T

There was a clear distinction between knowledge of anti-racism as part of equality policies at an institutional level, where 21/26 responded positively, and policies existing at other levels.
Yes the policy at this level does refer to anti-racism: 21 (80.8%)
No the policy at this level does not refer to anti-racism: 2 (7.7%)
I am unsure about the policy at this level: 3 (11.5%)
Not applicable: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

At other levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes the policy at this level does refer to anti-racism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No the policy at this level does not refer to anti-racism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure about the policy at this level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the number of respondents who said that the course policies do not refer to anti-racism and those who were unsure at faculty level.
For those working in schools as school-based providers, there was an interesting response number for not applicable, but this may be skewed somewhat by more respondents answering this question than expected:

### Showing all 26 responses (as submitted)

Teachers are pivotal in society and need to be anti-racist and promote anti-racism.

Because unless we interrupt racism in classrooms, we stand no chance of having a just society.

ITE should be future-focused and so it is important for trainees to be aware of strategies and principles for tackling racism, especially as the terrors of populism take hold across the country.

It is part of our aims and vision to develop teachers who promote social justice and anti-racism. Trainee teachers, as those new to the profession, as in the position to make changes from the ground up. Teachers are in a position to influence the lives of children and, as such, should be championing anti-racist practices in a system which is systemically racist. We believe it is important for trainee teachers to be aware of this and how it can affect students and groups of students and to actively work against this.

Because there is significant evidence of the impact of racism on educational outcomes, so student teachers need to know how to mitigate this. They are also responsible for promoting anti-racism and can have an impact on and tackle to causes and impact of racism.

We are training public professionals and it is essential that they are aware of both racism and anti-racism.

Racism leads to discrimination (and worse). This is immoral and illegal. Teachers can challenge racism.

Teachers need to be confident to recognise and deal with all forms of inequality. They need to recognise the structural barriers in place for certain groups.

It is vital to take an anti-racist stance because racism still exists. Education systems are institutionally racist and need to be dismantled. New anti-racist frameworks need to be put in place.

Teachers need to be aware of racism and how to prevent it if it is going to go away in future generations and society.

Most of our students are from BAME backgrounds. They and their families have experienced racism in society and in education.

Because it’s the right thing to do and also to fulfil equality act and PSED responsibilities.

---

### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

**4.4.a (for school-based providers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes the policy at this level does refer to anti-racism</td>
<td>21 (80.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No the policy at this level does not refer to anti-racism</td>
<td>2 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure about the policy at this level</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those answering the survey were unequivocal however, in their support for anti-racism appearing as an aspect of ITE/T provision, which suggests that those who responded were committed to anti-racism in ITE/T:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Global Literature Chart**
To ensure that a matter of such importance has a high profile
Because we can’t expect teachers to be anti-racist if we haven’t taught them how to do this; how to be racially literate and given them the confidence to discuss racism directly.
Training teachers need to learn and understand about anti racism in order to challenge racist stereotyping within school approaches, systems and curricula. This is essential for developing racial equality in education.
To ensure a fully inclusive environment
The acknowledgement of white privilege is the only sensible starting point for an institution and individuals to start when addressing the curriculum frameworks provided for ITE that are colour blind in the way they are written.
Schools can change pupils’ lives which is why it is important to have an inclusive and supportive approach. Education is crucial to challenge the normalisation of many forms of racism. A culture of open discussion around race and racism is needed in order that staff and young people can find solutions to the issue together. In a predominantly white area of the UK, this becomes even more important where inequalities and oppressive racial norms need to be openly challenged.
For representation. For inclusion.
I believe that it should be embedded in our curriculum
This fits with the expectations for teaching as a profession and the need for teachers to be fit for practice. It is fundamental that we have respectful and empathetic/ tolerant teachers.
Our teacher population is made of of 85% white practitioners, our student population does not mirror this and reflects our diverse society. It is essential that we address issues of institutional racism, white privilege and colour blindness to ensure that we disrupt the prejudice and discrimination that BAME pupils experience during their time in education
It is important to be addressing social justice issues
It helps equip trainees with the right/best way of dealing with or talking about racism and anti-racism, as well as setting a clear standard of behaviour of what is expected of them as professionals and role models.
Teaching is a profession predicated on securing equality of opportunity for all pupils and on allowing all pupils to fulfil individual potential. This cannot be done if discriminatory practices are operating at training, school or individual level. Learning at degree level is also an opportunity to step away from schools and be able to identify, and know how to challenge, systemic racism which is inbuilt in society and educational institutions.
As racism is prevalent within society and education

Respondents’ reasons for the inclusion of anti-racism echoed those identified in the global Literature Review.

• The role of teachers is paramount in promoting anti-racism to develop a racially equitable society.

One respondent wrote, “Education is crucial to challenge the normalisation of many forms of racism”, another wrote, “Teaching is a profession predicated on securing equality of opportunity for all pupils and on allowing all pupils to fulfil their potential.”

The importance of teachers and therefore teacher training, was reflected consistently throughout the Literature Review:


“As a consequence, teacher education remains impelled to educate all pre-service teachers to unconditionally provide their future learners with equitable and high-quality education so that they may become critical and productive members of their societies” (le Roux, 2016 p. 1 in Literature Review, p.35).

One respondent in the survey wrote about the influence teachers have in the lives of pupils and the importance of teachers knowing how systematic racism impacts the lives of students to effectively work against it, “Training teachers need to learn and understand anti-racism in order to challenge
racist stereotyping within school approaches, systems and curricula” (Survey response).

On page 29 of the Literature Review, data from the YMCA (2020) ‘Young and Black’ report and ‘Race and Racism in Secondary schools’ report, described the negative impact of systematic racism within schools embedded by school policies. The survey respondent recognised how anti-racist teaching within ITE/T can counteract/challenge systematic racism.

One survey respondent identified impact of racism on educational outcomes, “There is significant evidence of the impact of racism on educational outcomes”. This was also highlighted in the Literature Review on page 30:

“There remains continued differential patterns of education access and outcomes for pupils from BAGM heritage, as revealed in the UK government’s Race Disparity Audit 2017” and in DfE statistics - Statistics at DfE - Department for Education - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).

The need for anti-racism in ITE/T identified in the Literature Review, was highlighted in the survey responses to question 5:

“We can’t expect teachers to be anti-racist if we haven’t taught them how to do this, how to be racially literate and give them the confidence to discuss racism directly.”

“Teachers need to be confident to recognise and deal with all forms of inequality.”

An inquiry into teacher education led by Brown and Kraehe (2010), noted the expansive literature about the complexity of preparing teacher candidates to work with diverse pupils:

“Literature in the teacher education field abounds with reports about the difficulty that university teachers have in helping teacher education candidates develop [a] the requisite background and sociocultural knowledge and [b] personal beliefs, dispositions, and habits needed to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population” (Brown and Kraehe 2010, p.92 in Literature Review, p.34)

These difficulties highlight the responsibility of ITE providers to work with student teachers to recognise the role sociocultural influences have on schooling and teaching and the need to embed anti-racist pedagogies in ITE.

**Importance of anti-racist pedagogies and Critical Race Theory (CRT), Critical White Studies (CWS) in ITE/T**

Responses from the survey attest to the need for CRT and CWS in anti-racist pedagogies and the need for ITE/T tutors to have knowledge and confidence to apply these in their anti-racist teaching.

E.g., survey responses:

“The acknowledgement of white privilege is the only sensible starting point for an institution”.

“It is essential that we address institutional racism, white privilege and colour blindness to ensure that we disrupt the prejudice and discrimination BAME pupils experience during their time in education.”

Developing racial literacy in ITE/T tutors and student teachers as part of a CRT framework requires embedding CWS as an anti-racist pedagogy. There is not one set definition of racial literacy, which adds to the complexity and potential avoidance of it. When applied to ITE/T, Lander’s (2011) definition of the need for racial literacy as part of an anti-racist framework is useful, “To educate student teachers to use...
appropriate language to refer to a child’s ethnicity and to develop their awareness of race issues in a predominantly White area is a function of ITE/T. We need to be aware that educating student teachers in a predominantly White area poses additional challenges in terms of their starting points regarding race and need to educate some of them to develop a positive disposition to the presence of pupils from BME backgrounds, or those for whom English is an additional language and not to perceive them as a problem to tackle or ignore” (Lander, 2011 p. 358 in Literature Review, p.36).

Bree Picower’s (2009) ‘tools of whiteness’ – denial, defensiveness, evasion and colour blindness was frequently referenced in the Literature Review, as a block to anti-racism in ITE/T, along with work produced by Haney-Lopez, 2007; Lander, 2011; Smith, 2013; Wells, 2014; Gillborn, 2019.

All the effective anti-racist pedagogies identified in the Literature Review incorporated CRT and CWS.

**Institutional racism is prevalent in society including in education systems**

One respondent wrote, “Education systems are institutionally racist and need to be dismantled.”

Another wrote, “As racism is prevalent within society and education.” The Literature Review noted the importance of education in reproducing structural racism via a variety of methods; a Eurocentric curriculum, lack of Black, Asian and Global majority teaching staff, high dropout rates of BAQM student teachers and racist behaviour going unchallenged on placement and in some cases endorsed by staff in schools.

In his review of anti-racism in PGDE programmes in Ireland, O’Brien (2009) found a majority of those interviewed felt that there are some aspects of the Irish post-primary education system that are institutionally racist. His findings regarding institutional racism in education were reflected in work by Olsson et al (2010), Warner (2018), Mirza (2018) and Marom (2019). In the Literature Review, Olsson et al, noted that student teachers made two specific recommendations: more university sessions addressing diversity, race, and racism, ‘not just one or two’ and that “incidences of racism, especially among student teachers, be unequivocally dealt with” (Olsson et al, 2020 in Literature Review, p.42).

Recognition of the majority white teaching population not reflecting the growth in racial diversity among school pupils in England leading to a need to ensure anti-racism via racial literacy is taught to student teachers.

Responses in the survey acknowledged dissonance between the ethnic make-up of the vast majority of teacher educators/teachers and school pupils.

“‘Our teaching population is 85% white practitioners; our student population does not mirror this and reflects our diverse society.”

Lack pf representation was also mentioned in response to barriers to anti-racism practice (see survey question 17a).

Note: Data used in the review regarding racial make-up of teachers in the UK, was from the DfE, 2018 which noted that 92% of teachers in England state funded schools were white.

Only one respondent in the free text response to question 5, noted that anti-racism in ITE/T was important to fulfil the Equality Act. The Literature Review found that the Equality Act in the UK served to diminish reality of racism by placing it under one umbrella with all other protected characteristics. Like the term BAME, grouping
historically oppressed people as one, facing the same challenges is unhelpful and ineffective in combatting racism.

The Literature Review revealed the importance of the lack of representation of Black Asian Global Majority (BAGM) teaching staff and student teachers (Flintoff et al. (2015), Riley & Solic, (2017), Warner, (2018), Marom, (2019), Salisbury, (2020). In the UK, figures for BAME student teachers between 2015 and 2018 has been consistently 4%; 5% lower than for white students (Olssen et al, 2020). An improvement in retention in 2018-2019 was followed by a disappointing decline in 2019-2020. A semi-structured discussion with secondary BAGM student teachers revealed micro aggressions and overt racism from white peers and stereotyping whilst on placement. (Literature Review page 29)

SECTION 3: RESPONDENTS’ VIEWS ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE ANTI-RACIST PEDAGOGY IN ITE/T

Survey question 6: Please rate the importance of the following options in line with your understanding of what effective anti-racist pedagogy should involve:

1. Knowledge of the equality act and their responsibilities as a teacher as reflected in the National Curriculum and the Teachers’ Standards.

2. Being able to deal with incidents of racism or racial harassment in school.

3. Understanding the ways racism is manifested in interpersonal interactions including for example, racial microaggressions.

4. Understanding the ways in which school systems can act to discriminate against pupils from BAME communities.

5. Developing knowledge of critical theories, pedagogies and anti-racism approaches in education.

6. Drawing on knowledge of these theories, pedagogies and approaches to ensure better outcomes for all pupils, especially those from BAME heritage.

7. Developing knowledge of ways to provide BAME representation in the curriculum to include achievements and experiences – decolonising the curriculum.

8. Knowledge of acronym ‘EAL’ and being able to identify pupils and their languages

9. Developing inclusive teaching practices for pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) to promote better outcomes.

10. Developing inclusive teaching practices in understanding the needs of pupils who have refugee/asylum seeker experiences.

11. Developing inclusive teaching practices for pupils who are Roma

12. Developing inclusive teaching practices for Traveller pupils.

13. Raising awareness of ‘unconscious’ teacher bias; for example, in understanding societal stereotyping of pupils from BAME communities and how this affects deficit assumptions and the lowering of teacher expectations and disparities in exclusion rates.

All respondents answered this question.
Out of the 26 respondents, 17 (65%) rated each of the areas listed as very important (the highest rating). 2 of the respondents rated only one statement differently (raising awareness of ‘unconscious’ teacher bias) as important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Raising awareness of ‘unconscious’ teacher bias; for example, in understanding societal stereotyping of pupils from BAME communities and how this affects deficit assumptions and the lowering of teacher expectations and disparities in exclusion rates. (1 not important).

**SECTION 4: INFORMATION ABOUT RESPONDENTS’ OWN PRACTICES**

Survey question 7: Do the respondents feel they adopt an anti-racist pedagogy in their own teaching when teaching student teachers, in order to model what this looks like in practice?

- Yes: 18 (69.2%)
- No: 1 (3.8%)
- Not sure: 7 (26.9%)

2 respondents who said they didn’t do this or were unsure, provided extra information:

- As a team, we are unsure about what exactly anti-racist pedagogy looks like. The type of content we cover doesn’t have opportunity to refer specifically to anti-racism practices.
17/25 (68%) respondents said that they did teach their student teachers to become anti-racist pedagogues in their classrooms (survey question 8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>2  (8%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of those who said they did not or weren’t sure about teaching their student teachers to become anti-racist pedagogues, the following reasons were given:

- Showing all 3 responses
  - I believe in positivity and inclusion for all. Through literature and my sessions, I aim to include a range of marginalised individuals and how we can best communicate this to our students. My concern is that the role becomes a political tool for some lecturers.
  - We need to develop a shared understanding of this and embed it into the programme so that it is a core element and integral to what we do.
  - We don’t explicitly cover being an anti-racist teacher. However, using equal and inclusive practices are strongly encouraged and embedded within our particular projects/tasks. As facilitators, we also aim to model this with our own behaviour.

These few responses correspond to data in the Literature Review where ITE/T tutors stated they did not teach explicit anti-racist pedagogies in favour of more generalised equality and diversity training.

The Literature Review found in England, directives from the state placed emphasis on equality and diversity, not anti-racism:

Race equality issues are rarely addressed directly, being more commonly subsumed into broader ‘equality of opportunity’ and ‘diversity’ issues, whilst racism as a phenomenon is virtually ignored. The Ofsted guidance for inspection is particularly deficient in this respect.

What emerges from this study is a significant gap between government rhetoric on race equality and the policy enactment of government agencies involved in ITE. Although outcomes are given attention, the emphasis is still largely on policy awareness and procedural compliance, where good intentions are seen as being as important, if not more so, than good practice. (Wilkins, C, 2013 in Literature Review, page 33).

In the Literature Review, one tutor stated that they were concerned if they were explicit about anti-racism that this could be seen as ‘favouritism’ towards one equality strand, to the detriment of other strands. In the Literature Review, evidence showed that a focus on producing and being aware of equality and diversity policies within the institution served to diminish the reality of racism.

For those that do model anti-racism practices and do aim to develop anti-racist pedagogies, the following methods were recorded:
From this we can see a variety of practices, but the aspects of provision which the highest number of respondents agreed were included in their practice were:

An embedded approach (17 respondents = 77.3%)

As part of a series of lectures addressing a range of equality issues (16 respondents = 72.7%)

Provision of key readings (14 = 63.6%)

Taught by members of staff with relevant knowledge (12 = 54.5%)

Seminar activities (11 = 50%)

These identified anti-racist pedagogies are assessed against the effective/ineffective anti-racist pedagogies identified in the global Literature Review.

From this we can see a variety of practices, but the aspects of provision which the highest number of respondents agreed were included in their practice were:

An embedded approach (17 respondents = 77.3%)

As part of a series of lectures addressing a range of equality issues (16 respondents = 72.7%)

Provision of key readings (14 = 63.6%)

Taught by members of staff with relevant knowledge (12 = 54.5%)

Seminar activities (11 = 50%)

These identified anti-racist pedagogies are assessed against the effective/ineffective anti-racist pedagogies identified in the global Literature Review.
As part of a series of lectures addressing a range of equality issues (16 respondents = 72.7%).

The Literature Review found that some ITE/T course held a series of lectures as part of their anti-racist pedagogies however, effective anti-racist pedagogies need to be explicitly anti-racist and not diminished under the wider equality banner and importantly they should not be ‘one off’s. Anti-racist ITE/T tutors like Aveling (2006), Lachuk & Mosely (2012) and Matias and Mackey (2016) ensured enough time was built into the course to allow for appropriate critical reflection and discussion after each lecture. Structured questions in small groups, following larger anti-racist lectures were used to support story telling critically.

Provision of key readings (14 = 63.6%)

Key readings or providing texts written by Black, Asian and Global Majority authors was identified in the Literature Review as an aspect of effective anti-racist pedagogies. Key reading must be combined with other elements and time needs to be built in for critical reflection as a wider group, smaller groups and with the tutor. The term critical race counter narratives was not used in any of the survey comments regarding the anti-racist pedagogies the ITE/T courses were providing; or described in the comments section of the survey, yet key readings can be critical race counternarratives if enough time is built in to critically reflect.

Aronson et al (2020) reviewed the impact of critical race counternarratives over 2 years with 57 preservice teachers. The researchers wanted to understand how student teachers managed any conflict when taught counternarratives of history which challenged the dominant, or master narratives they entered the course with. Under a CRT framework, student teachers were presented with revisionist history texts in critical literacy workshops.

Taught by members of staff with relevant knowledge (12 = 54.5%)

Key words being relevant knowledge, survey respondents identified that anti-racist teaching on their ITE/T courses was connected to staff with specialist knowledge. This reflects findings in the Literature Review which showed that institutions which taught anti-racist pedagogies in ITE/T had staff which had a particular interest and passion for the subject.

The Literature Review found that regarding anti-racist pedagogies, “race, racism and anti-racism are not given consistent attention or seen as a priority within ITE/T policy; instead, anti-racism is side-lined as a specialism—not a fundamental aspect of teaching (Whigham & Hobson 2018 in Arday & Mirza, 2018). Some tutors of student teachers like Aveling (2006), Milner (2007) Smith (2014), Lander (2011) and Matias and Mackey (2016) embed anti-racist pedagogies by devoting themselves to a consistent and coherent anti-racist program, combining CRT with CWS “ Literature Review, p.51).

The Literature Review identified that the ITE/T tutors who embedded anti-racist teaching, worked to develop their understanding of effective anti-racist pedagogies, despite student resistance evidenced
via evaluations. The recommendation was that anti-racism needs to be embedded right across the institution, for ITE/T this includes within placement schools and school-based mentors. “It is important that support to embed anti-racist pedagogies also comes from the wider institutions producing ITE programs, with an understanding that the ‘tools of whiteness’ will be used in critique of anti-racist teaching by pre-service teachers, leading to difficulties particularly for BAGM ITE/T teachers. (…) It is also notable that in Milner’s (2007) study on emotional counter storytelling, he was acutely aware that his skin colour (black), may work against him in his anti-racist pedagogies if white students chose to raise a complaint with the dean of the institution. Aveling (2006), also had concerns about her job security based on negative student evaluations of her anti-racist pedagogies” (Literature Review, p.51)

Seminar activities (11 = 50%)

A range of anti-racist seminar activities were identified in the effective anti-racist pedagogies studied as part of the global Literature Review on anti-racism in ITE/T. Some of these activities were creative and innovative adopting a CRT framework (see Global Literature Chart, p.77-79).

SECTION 5: RESPONDENTS’ COURSE-AND-SELF EVALUATIONS

The evaluation of anti-racist practice was variable.

In terms of conducting evaluations with student teachers on the course other than responses collected in the NQT survey (survey question 9.1), the majority of survey respondents (52.2%) said they did not conduct an evaluation with student teachers about the teaching of anti-racism on the course.

Yes 10 (43.5%)
No 12 (52.2%)
Not sure 1 (4.3%)

The Literature Review (e.g. Aveling (2006), Campbell and Valurai (2019) and Aronson et al (2020)) revealed that course evaluations of anti-racism practice are imperative for identifying ‘shifts’ in students’ thinking and behaviour. Evaluations also help identify barriers to anti-racist teaching, (e.g. Picower (2009) and Leonardo (2010)), which is useful in planning anti-racist pedagogy and tutor reflections. The importance of evaluations (and responding to those evaluations) on anti-racist pedagogies within ITE/T is reflected in the additional survey comments.

Additional survey responses:

“We use any information from incidents as part of programme improvement.”

“As a result of evaluations of student experience of anti-racist approaches to education and an overall module focussing on equality and diversity, we have adapted our practice in response to student feedback. Student and tutor feedback has also led us to undertake research into how we can improve both tutor confidence in teaching about anti-racist approaches to education and student preparedness to embed anti-racist pedagogy in their practice.”

“An annual review of our modules have (sic) anti-racism as a focus question to make sure our modules are addressing this issue throughout and we question to what extent and try to improve.”
“The single question in the end of year survey prompted a greater focus on the activities on inclusion.”

“100% of our trainees evaluate our course as promoting equal opportunities. Results are monitored and any report of this not being the case would be sensitively explored and acted upon.”

This final additional response is not specific to anti-racism but wider equal opportunities. As already noted in this analysis, conflating the terms anti-racism and equal opportunities is problematic and diminishes the reality of racism. Effective anti-racist teaching needs to be explicit, as do corresponding course evaluations.

In terms of conducting an appraisal of, or formally reflecting on their own or other colleagues’ experiences of teaching anti-racism on the course, the majority of survey respondents did not conduct an appraisal/formal reflection with colleagues. This is unfortunate given other survey responses which show that thinking with colleagues supports informal training which was highly valued.

Additional survey responses:

“Not an appraisal as such, but we have held team meetings to audit our curriculum in light of decolonising the curriculum and discussed how this connects to anti-racism. As a result, we agreed actions to review materials and content of sessions.”

“We feel strongly the responsibility for importance of tackling racism and providing anti-racism within education provision and our regular reflections help us to improve our own provision every year. Student evaluations and responses to the tasks and directed activities are positive in this respect and we are seeing an increase in positive reactions in the light of recent high-profile public movements such as BLM and the increased pressure to decolonise the curriculum. Our students appreciate the efforts we make in including this as part of their provision, discussions and consideration, with, we hope, positive impact on their own practice as teachers. We still, however, have a lot of work to do in this regard.”

The above responses are encouraging provided that anti-racism is embedded in the ITE/T course. To demonstrate that anti-racism is embedded, anti-racist pedagogies should be holistically and consistently reviewed, not just a focus on decolonising the curriculum which is only an aspect of anti-racist pedagogies.

In terms of conducting a specific appraisal of the experiences of student teachers of BAME heritage about the teaching of anti-racism on the course, the majority of survey respondents did not do this.

Additional survey response:

“We review trainee’s evaluations weekly and act upon suggestions and feedback where appropriate. We have surveyed all trainees with...
regards to race specifically in order to use this information to improve upon this aspect of our provision going forward. We don’t currently record these experiences; however, this is something we wish to do going forward, particularly in terms of identifying placement schools.”

Other additional survey responses to question 9 spoke about assessing suitable placement schools specifically for Black, Asian and Global Majority student teachers. E.g. additional survey comment: “Deselection of one placement school”

Finally, survey question 10 asked if they recorded any student experiences/ witnessing of racism during the course (including on placement).

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(42.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of survey respondents did not record student experiences or witnessing of anti-racism on the course or on placement.

Additional survey responses:

“Question 9 has made me aware of a gap in our practice – thank you. We only informally record incidents of racism – this is another area we wish to improve on. Also, I personally think we need to think more carefully about where we place some of our BAME students.”

“Haven’t had any such experiences to record. We do have a student equality placement policy which is monitored across the Partnership.”

The above survey responses confirm what the Literature Review found from work by Lander (2001), Maylor (2015) and reflected too in the the NQT survey; student teachers felt unprepared to teach pupils from BAGM and did not know how to challenge racism. This will not improve if they do not witness this being done on their ITE/T course combined with anti-racist teaching. Poor reporting and recording of racism on the course and placement may contribute to non-recognition of racism and higher non-completion rates of BAGM student teachers. Teacher educators must be aware that many people choose not to report racist incidents so as not to relive racial trauma or add to that trauma by having to prove racism against them. This is also relevant to all placements and not just ‘equality’ placements.

“Research has shown that teachers are not well prepared to teach diverse students whose cultural values are different from their own, (Bhopal & Ramie 2014 pp 310).

In response to the recording of racist incidents on the course and on placement, the literature review found that racism experienced on school placements was a significant problem as well as racialised micro aggressions on the ITE course evidenced by research conducted by: Wilkins and Lall (2010), Marom 2019, Warner (2019) and Olsson at al (2020). Olsson et al (2020) consider the testimonies of BAME students to be essential in ITE/T course design:

“The students made two specific recommendations: more university sessions addressing diversity, race and racism, ‘not just one or two’ (Doran, 2019, p. 3) and that incidences of racism, especially among student teachers, be unequivocally dealt with” (Olsson et al, 2020 in Garratt, 2021 pp. 23). The importance of listening and responding to the experiences of BAGM students was reflected in the following additional survey comments.
Additional survey responses:

"Students told us that they were unhappy with the term BAME as it lumped together diversity."

"We are using the ‘Break the Cycle’ recruitment document to support with recruitment and retention practices. We are currently conducting an external review of the experience of undertaking BA / PGCE course with a specific focus on the experience of BAME students."

SECTION 6: RESPONDENTS’ AND COLLEAGUES’ LEVEL OF EXPERTISE AND TRAINING AND PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO ANTI-RACISM IN ITE/T.

As one may have suspected, the person completing the survey reported more knowledge and confidence to teach anti-racism than they claimed for their colleagues:

Interestingly, and rather alarmingly, more respondents reported feeling confident than knowledgeable!

In terms of training in anti-racism, there was a mix of formal and informal training.

Multi answer: Percentage of selections across all answer options (adding up to 100% across all options)
The free text comments about training from 14 respondents showed a variety of types of formal training and ways of informal training and also varying responses to the impact of this training. This can be summarised as:

In terms of perceived barriers to teaching anti-racism in ITE/T, respondents ticked any of the statements which they believed was a barrier to teaching anti-racism in ITE/T.

The options for barriers were:

- Lack of time
- Lack of course colleagues’ expertise
- Lack of school-based mentors’ expertise
- Lack of importance on course
- Lack of importance in schools
- Lack of importance on teachers’ standards
- Lack of importance on CCF

As the chart shows, two items were chosen by most respondents (18):

- Lack of school-based mentors’ expertise
- Lack of importance in teachers’ standards

Closely followed by:

- Lack of importance in CCF (17)
- Lack of time (16)
- Lack of colleagues’ confidence in teaching anti-racism (16)

Respondents were also asked to rate the barriers by indicating which was the biggest, 2nd and 3rd biggest barrier for them.
When asked to rank the barriers, most respondents named the lack of course colleagues’ expertise as the biggest barrier (7), whereas the lack of school-based mentors’ expertise was rated most often as the 2nd and 3rd biggest barrier (4 and 4). A lack of time was rated the next biggest barrier (3). Other interesting features included the fact that 50% of those who found student cohort demography as a barrier, rated this as the 2nd highest barrier (3/6). Finally, the lack of importance of anti-racism in the CCF was rated as the 3rd biggest barrier by 4 respondents, the highest number along with 4 respondents naming lack of time and lack of school-based mentors’ expertise.

Additional free text comments included the following perceived barriers:

- “Confidence levels and levels of comfortability of staff to deliver anti-racist content, for example with white members of staff who don’t feel as though they are able to deliver this content. Lack of diversity on staff team.”

- “Confidence in schools”

- “Not convinced that all colleagues share same view of its importance. Lack of diversity within ITE staff.”

The Literature Review identified barriers including lack of time, fear, lack of knowledge as possible reasons why anti-racism is not embedded in some ITE/T courses. The Literature Review also discussed at length the importance of developing racial literacy, to increase the confidence of teachers so they can discuss/teach anti-racism, “By their own admission, many teachers are ill prepared to teach in ways that promote anti-racism, and this can include BME teachers. Racial literacy therefore needs to be placed at the centre of teachers’ role and teacher training. It is important that all teachers take responsibility for teaching in ways that promote anti-racism.” (Salisbury, R, 2020 page 30 of Literature Review)
The Literature Review also revealed that “the curriculum review on diversity and citizenship found that teachers lack confidence and knowledge about these issues and often sidestep them” (DCSF, 2007 in Bhopal and Rhamie 2014, p. 3 on page 37 of Literature Review).

The latter section of the Literature Review focused on effective anti-racist pedagogies which understand these barriers and how to dismantle them. They were identified as effective for the shifts they produced in student teachers attitudes and behaviour, yet long term effectiveness had not been studied.

Another survey respondent added:

“Quite an antagonistic govt approach in DfE and certain libertarian groups which have questioned these approaches as confounding government policy, breaking education act 1986, and taking a very centralised control of course content through the CCF.”

The CCF is the latest in a line of state directives which focus attention away from racism as revealed on page 33 of the Literature Review:

The lack of clear anti-racist directives in Ofsted trickles down to a lack of anti-racist teaching in ITE. As Gillborn, (2005) argues, “Regardless of the political persuasion of the incumbent political party, therefore, race equity has constantly to fight for legitimacy as a significant topic for education policy-makers. This is a key part of the way in which education policy is implicated in white supremacy” (Gillborn, 2005 p. 493).

**SECTION 7: RESPONDENTS’ EXPERTISE CAPTURED IN PUBLICATIONS AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS AROUND ANTI-RACISM IN ITE/T.**

The final questions asked about whether respondents had ever published any academic or practice-type guides for anti-racism in ITE/T:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 4 who have published shared their publications with us, but of these, only 3 gave consent to contact them and agree what would be shared. In brief, however, the publication content was related to:

- **Representation in children’s literature**
- **Preparation of teachers**
- **Supporting asylum-seekers.**

Only 1 respondent out of 16 reported having published a practice guide, and this was for Multiverse.

Although 10 respondents agreed to share examples of anti-racism practice, e.g. handbooks, teaching resources, student tasks, etc with the research team as anonymised exemplification of practice for the research report, only 8 gave us their email addresses.

11 respondents agreed to share examples of their practice, e.g., handbooks, teaching resources, student tasks etc more widely as exemplars of practice to accompany an anti-racism framework as publicly shared material for ITE/T providers, 7 of whom shared their email address with us for further contact.