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Introduction

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 more subtle aspects of white supremacy centring the interests of white people continue uninterrupted within systems and institutions. To add to this complexity, as the concept of race is designed to be internalized by all people, Black, Asian and Global Majority individuals can reproduce white supremacy with their actions and behaviours. Du Bois (1994) calls this double-consciousness, where Black and Global Majority people are taught about themselves from the perspective of the other. This makes developing an effective anti-racism framework with effective resource materials within ITE/T provision difficult. It is only by reviewing a global literature base on anti-racism in ITE that we can begin to achieve this ambitious, but fundamental aim.

**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 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.

Glossary

TRAINEE/QUALIFICATION SPECIFIC:
ITE/T – Initial Teacher Education/Training – these terms are used throughout the review as these are the terms used in England to describe a diversity of courses undertaken to become a teacher. We acknowledge that these terms are not used elsewhere.
NQT – Newly Qualified Teacher.
PGCE – Post Graduate Certificate in Education – a post-graduate academic teaching qualification offered in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.
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 reviewed.
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 understand the concepts of race and racism, which in turn allows 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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I) 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 Ahmed (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!’” (Ahmed, 2012 in Arday and Mirza, 2018 p. 183)

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 polices 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-Rasht 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”.

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 Dixson (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:

- 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-racism 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:

“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), Maylor (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:

“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 Maylor (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.
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 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:

“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
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 which whiteness operates within PETE: naturalisation, ex-nomination and universalisation. (Flintoff et al., 2014 p. 567)

Naturalisation places whiteness as the norm by which all other groups are othered as abnormal; ex-nomination allows white ITE tutors to ignore their racialised selves; and universalisation occurs where their experiences of whiteness are taken into their teaching practice, omitting the impact of racism on the lives of racialised others.

Similarly, Lachuk and Mosley (2012, p.312) advocate a three-dimensional narrative inquiry space with white pre-service teachers to explore race, racism, and anti-racism. A three-dimensional narrative inquiry space allows teacher educators and pre-service teachers to look forwards and backwards, and inward and outward at the narrative threads of their lives and experiences:

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

“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.” (Matis 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:
1) To encourage emotional expression within a CWS framework, Matias and Mackey (2015) selected emotional readings written by authors of colour and other marginalized groups (Aveling, 2006 does the same in Australia). They then asked student teachers how the texts made them feel.

2) They also held community trips to a predominantly Black area with high rates of deprivation, as well as an affluent, predominantly white area, asking how the different spaces made the students feel with knowledge about the racialised history that created such spaces. If tutors on the ITE/T course have not engaged with CRT or CWS, there is a danger, they will reinforce an ideology of the poor, inferior Black people and superior white people.

3) Bringing the teacher candidate into the role of teaching:

“After learning the social context, feeling the burden, and taking responsibility for their privilege, the teacher candidates learn how to apply these concepts to a more humanistic education.” (Matias and Mackey 2015, p. 37).

As identified by Leonardo (2013), how race and racism are taught is multifaceted and can be subtle, thus the resources used in an emotional based approach to CWS should be diverse—including social media, music and adverts, with space built in to reflect how white supremacist norms are reinforced and promoted. One of the more controversial yet truly enlightening aspects of Matias and Mackey’s (2015, p.38) CWS program was getting the student teachers to write the following statement on Facebook: ‘I’m taking a class on race, class, and gender, and can finally see why a woman of color may experience the U.S. differently from a white male’.

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-blindness; (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 individuals’ 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 preservice 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 Mackay (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) provides 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’s 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 EandD policies focus on), which serves to place BAME as the “study down” ‘other’ (Aveling, 2006 p. 263), 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/T. 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.

IX) Effective anti-racist pedagogies in practice

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 were 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 of 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’ (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 separate table 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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