

THE MEANING OF MATTERING: A
STUDY OF THE *EVERY CHILD
MATTERS* INITIATIVE IN FOUR
SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

AMANDA IRENE ANGELA JAKES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements of the University of
Brighton for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

May 2012

The University of Brighton

Abstract

The government initiative *Every Child Matters* was introduced in 2003 in the wake of a number of high profile cases of the abuse and deaths of children. *Every Child Matters* was identified as an educational responsibility and its philosophy represented the convergence of a number of developments that are explored in the opening chapters of this study. The central concern here is the delivery of *Every Child Matters* and this is examined through the processes of legitimation, formulation, adaptation and mediation. Particular reference is made to the role played by teachers of religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education.

The initial fieldwork was conducted by structured interview and in the subsequent phase an unstructured mode was employed in a sample of four schools. A distinctive characteristic of the method practised was the voice given to the participants. Social constructionism is the theoretical tradition within which the data were interpreted. This tradition has been practised by Robert Jackson within religious studies and was the method adopted within this study.

There emerged five significant themes, identified in the thesis as Incorporation, Invisible matter, Inclusion, The mentor's role and The climate of the classroom.

It was found that the prevailing concept of *Every Child Matters*, mediated by teachers had undergone a character change since 2003; it is recognisable but not attributable to the original vision. It is an irony that a measure to make children safe claims little security for itself. The emergent implications include the need to protect initiatives within schools, the hazards of transient fashions and vocabulary, the benefit of teachers' instincts to adapt initiatives and introduce new ideas and the need to address student well-being in initial and in-service training.

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements	6
Declaration	6
List of abbreviations	7
1 Foundations	8
1.1 Introduction: the devolution of Every Child Matters	8
1.2 The history of citizenship	12
1.3 The history of religious studies	19
1.4 The history of personal, social, health and economic education	28
1.5 The history of the Every Child Matters agenda	44
2 Mattering	52
2.1 The theology of mattering	52
2.2 The meaning of mattering	55
3 Methods	68
3.1 The journey to Every Child Matters and mattering	68
3.2 The choice of method	69
3.3 Constructing realities	73
3.4 Asking questions – Phase 1 The development of the methodology	81
3.5 Asking questions – Phase 2 The use of the methodology	90
3.6 Populations and politics	91
3.7 Seeking the consent of participants	96
3.8 Seeking access from the schools	101
3.9 The role and impact of gatekeepers on behalf of student participants	102
3.10 Accessing information – the entitlement of the teacher versus the researcher	104
3.11 Conflicts of the teacher-researcher	105
3.12 Leaving the field	109
3.13 Limitations of the findings	111
3.14 From teacher to researcher	114

4	Analysis	118
4.1	Coding and constructing	118
4.2	Incorporation	126
4.3	Invisible matter	134
4.4	Inclusion	142
4.5	The mentor's role	150
4.6	The climate of the classroom	156
5	Review	163
5.1	In retrospect	163
5.1.1	Reflecting on some limitations of the study	168
5.1.2	Mediating mattering	170
5.2	In prospect	173
5.2.1	A partial eclipse of mattering.	173
5.2.2	Preparation to teach	179
5.2.3	Indicators of mattering	184
5.3	Perspectives for further research	189
5.3.1	Voice	189
5.3.2	Two professional cultures	193
5.3.3	Honouring mattering	196
	Postscript rioters voice	202
	Bibliography	206
Appendix 1	The participants	238
Appendix 2	Pilot interview questions	239
Appendix 3	Letter to prospective teacher participants	241
Appendix 4	Teacher Participant Information Sheet	242
Appendix 5	Teacher Participant Consent Form	243
Appendix 6	Student Participant Information Sheet	244
Appendix 7	Student Participant Consent Form	245

Appendix 8	Parent Information Letter	246
Appendix 9	Example of line by line coding by the researcher	247
Appendix 10	Example of participant interview transcript	248
Diagram 1	Linear approach to the data	258
Diagram 2	Comparison and contrast between Teacher G and Teacher M	259
Diagram 3	Listening to Teacher M – Every Child Matters	260
Diagram 4	Listening to Teacher G – Religious studies	261

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my parents for being my rock, especially since I embarked on my research. Without their love, encouragement, patience and support I would not have gotten through the difficult times.

I am eternally grateful to my supervisor, Professor Roger Homan whose belief in me never wavered and for walking this journey with me from its conception. I am forever appreciative to my supervisor, Dr Dave Simpson at the University of Brighton for his encouragement and for talking 'grounded theory' and to Dr Philip Barnes at King's College London for his contributions to the history of religious studies section.

I would like to acknowledge the support of St Gabriel's Trust. I am blessed by your kindness and the faith you have shown in me once again. Thank you for enabling my dream to become a reality.

Finally I would like to acknowledge the helpful support given by Leon Robinson at the University of Glasgow and Lorraine Harrison at the University of Brighton.

Note for reader

I wish to record my gratitude to my Principal and to those who have participated in this study they know who they are and I believe they will recognise themselves by their first names or initials (see Appendix 1).

Declaration

I declare that the research contained in this thesis, unless otherwise formally indicated within the text, is the original work of the author. The thesis has not been previously submitted to this or any other university for a degree, and does not incorporate any material already submitted for a degree.

Signed

Dated

List of abbreviations

DCSF – Department for Children, Schools and Families

DES – Department of Education and Science

DfE – Department for Education

DfEE – Department for Education and Employment

DfES – Department for Education and Skills

DoE – Department of Employment

DoH – Department of Health

NCC – National Curriculum Council

Ofsted – Office for Standards in Education

QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

QCDA – Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency

RCBDD(UK) – Royal Commission on the Blind, Deaf and Dumb of the United Kingdom

TDA – Training and Development Agency for Schools

1 Foundations

The inclusion of subjects within the curriculum can often be taken for granted and it is the foundation of three subjects citizenship education, religious studies and personal, social, health and economic education from ancient Greece to their presence within secondary school education that is the focus of this chapter. The rationale and formulation of the government's *Every Child Matters* initiative introduces and concludes this chapter.

1.1 Introduction: the devolution of *Every Child Matters*

Every Child Matters was published as a single document with coherent aims (DfES 2004c) and as it evolves so it devolves. This has been made apparent not only within the literature but during the researcher's fieldwork.

The failures in our recent history to protect children have served as a catalyst to initiate change (this is amplified in section 1.5). Perhaps the most ambitious change to the safeguarding and well-being of our children to date has been the creation and introduction of the *Every Child Matters* initiative. The circumstances surrounding the case of Victoria Climbié which initiated the inquiry undertaken by Lord Laming served as the driving factor behind this initiative. Lord Laming's inquiry sought

to find out why this once happy, smiling, enthusiastic little girl – brought to this country by a relative for 'a better life' – ended her days the victim of almost unimaginable cruelty (2003:1).

The death of Victoria Climbié in 2000, aged 8, at the hands of those who were meant to look after her and the failure of those agencies that were meant to protect her provided the legitimation that led to the subsequent formulation of the *Every Child Matters* initiative (DfES 2003, DfES 2004b, DfES 2004c, DoH 2003 and Laming 2003). Victoria Climbié 'died a slow, lonely death – abandoned, unheard and unnoticed' (Laming 2003:2). The protection of children, ensuring every child meets his or her potential and providing a means whereby children can be seen and heard became a Government focus.

Lord Laming's report and recommendations along with the Government's report *Keeping Children Safe* (DoH 2003) gave rise to *Every Child Matters* as a Green Paper. In order to improve children's lives the Green Paper aimed

to reduce the numbers of children who experience educational failure, engage in offending or anti-social behaviour, suffer from ill health, or become teenage parents (DfES 2003:5).

To achieve these aims five outcomes were identified which would enable well-being: Being healthy; Staying safe; Enjoying and achieving; Making a positive contribution and Economic well-being. *Every Child Matters: Next Steps* (DfES 2004b) reported on the consultation process surrounding the Green Paper (DfES 2003) which paved the way for the Children Act 2004 (HMSO 2004) and provided the legislative foundation to implement *Every Child Matters*. The national framework for local change was set out in *Every Child Matters: Change for Children* (DfES 2004c) and subsequent documentation followed to maintain momentum and focus (see sections 1.5 and 5.2.1).

The implementation of the *Every Child Matters* initiative was decided by individual schools and this dictated the methodology as the researcher wanted to look at the way *Every Child Matters* had been nationally prescribed and locally constructed. A number of initiatives marked the transmission of *Every Child Matters* from central government to school practice.

- National conferences and training courses aimed at the senior leadership team/governors could be attended for a whole school approach to *Every Child Matters* as well as subject specific conferences and training courses for subject leaders.
- Specific members of staff were internally appointed or externally recruited to provide the support and services necessary to achieve the aims and outcomes of *Every Child Matters* as well as manage and monitor the initiative within school.

- Key subjects were identified to lead and deliver *Every Child Matters*, most notably personal, social, health and economic education, citizenship education and religious studies (see Best 2007, Cheminais 2006, Council for Subject Associations 2008, Crow 2008, DfES 2003, Knowles 2009, Roche and Tucker 2007 and Weare 2007).
- Subject specific textbooks were published which purported to fulfil the five well-being outcomes and support subject leaders in the delivery of *Every Child Matters* objectives within the classroom.
- Assembly resources were produced for use in schools to fulfil *Every Child Matters* intentions.
- The format for school improvement plans, department development plans, lesson plans, schemes of work and individual pupil portraits adopted by schools included amongst other things a space to signify the satisfaction of *Every Child Matters*.
- The inclusion of *Every Child Matters* as an agenda item during in-service day (Inset) training, whole school meetings, middle leader forums and department meetings.

The *Every Child Matters* initiative sought to develop child protection and improve multi-agency collaboration within schools, advocating

the case for moving away from a narrowly conceived child protection agenda...[as the] development of a more preventative and educationally based focus on safeguarding work potentially brings with it the opportunity to change working relationships and practices (Roche and Tucker 2007:216).

In order to prevent 'fragmented services, [and] a failure to effectively 'join up' provision' (Roche and Tucker 2007:215) schools were identified as being 'well positioned' (Harris 2006:6) to lead on this change. In response there is a visible presence from a variety of agencies within schools which include

health visitors; GPs; social workers; education welfare officers; youth and community workers; Connexions personal advisers; education psychologists; children's mental health professionals; speech and language therapists; staff allied to other health professionals; community care workers; young people's substance misuse workers; learning mentors; school support staff; teachers;

school nurses; home visitors (volunteers and mentors); statutory and voluntary homelessness agencies; the police; and various LEA officers and advisers (Reid 2005:18).

Schools were inspected on their adherence to the aims and the five outcomes of *Every Child Matters* via the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted 2009b). The inspection of *Every Child Matters* within schools had the potential to divert attention away from its intentions which resulted, at times, to it becoming evidence driven (Roche and Tucker 2007). *Every Child Matters* could also be affectively interpreted rather than collectively understood. The concept and the intention behind an initiative stating every child matters could be misunderstood by those charged with honouring it where it became associated or limited to child protection and/or multi-agency collaboration rather than the academic and pastoral well-being of the whole child and for every child (see sections 2.2 and 5.1.2).

This research evolved from a focus on a government initiative to the concept of mattering contained within the intention that every child is to matter. How this is honoured within schools and expressed by individuals and what is experienced and felt by the student sat at the centre of this study.

What remains sociologically essential is the recognition that all symbolic universes and all legitimations are human products; their existence has its base in the lives of concrete individuals, and has no empirical status apart from these lives (Berger and Luckmann 1966:146).

In the process of the fieldwork it became apparent that schools were reading *Every Child Matters* in their own way and embedding their own selection of *Every Child Matters* intentions. The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the *Every Child Matters* initiative in secondary schools across three curriculum areas religious studies, citizenship education and personal, social, health and economic education in order to capture the experiences of those who are to honour *Every Child Matters* as well as those who are to feel its effects through the voice of the participants. It also aims to illuminate what it means to matter.

1.2 The history of citizenship

Foundations

A citizen is a person furnished with knowledge of public affairs, instilled with attitudes of civic virtue and equipped with skills to participate in the political arena. The acquisition and enhancement of these attributes is in truth a lifelong undertaking (Heater 1990:336).

This idea is not a new one and has, in fact, an ancient foundation. This section will explore the origins and aims of the citizen and citizenship as well as the evolution of citizenship education.

Citizenship was first recognisable in the Greek city-state where the idea and practice of citizenship was explored. According to Plato, the status of citizenship was bestowed on an individual by birth. As a consequence of people fulfilling their birth right, order was promoted in Greek society. Citizenship was at the very core of Greek life as citizens were involved in judicial processes and public debates which were undertaken prior to policy being formed and political decisions being made. The status of citizenship was clearly associated with the performing of a person's political service or duty.

The Greeks expected a number of skills from their citizens and the citizen class needed to be educated for these duties by the state because

by allowing families to educate their sons as they wished in civic duties, the state fatally failed to provide for itself the necessary underpinning of a citizenry conscientiously committed to Athenian civic values (Heater 1990:6).

The state provision of education would ensure that these values were shared and understood and, for Plato, education was central in the 'training of its members for their appropriate role in the Republic' (Davies et. al. 2002:153).

Plato outlined his vision for the ideal society in the *Republic* and divided members of society into three groups: the Guardians who were sub-divided into two further

groups, the auxiliaries whose role it was to defend and the Philosopher-kings who were to rule society and the remainder of society which made up the third and largest group. Members of each group outlined in the *Republic* were to be educated in a manner appropriate to those individuals in that group as 'it is unjust to treat un-equals equally' (Barrow 1976:28). Therefore a person's status was decided through parentage rather than fulfilling one's nature or potential. According to Plato, the Philosopher-kings must be

capable of abstract reasoning about end, capable of seeing affective means to ends, capable of clinging to reason in the face of temptation to do otherwise, capable of avoiding fallacious reasoning, are concerned for truth [and are] of benevolent disposition (Barrow 1976:18).

Education 'produces a keen desire to become a perfect citizen who knows how to rule and be ruled as justice demands' (Plato, translated by Saunders 1970:73) because virtue was essential for selfless, cooperative civic life.

Aristotle, like Plato before him, defined a citizen as a man who 'becomes entitled to participate in authority, deliberative or judicial' (Aristotle, translated by Sinclair 1962:103). Political participation was central to Aristotle's understanding. For Aristotle a good citizen is 'to know well how to rule and be ruled' (Aristotle, translated by Sinclair 1962:109). Aristotle, like Plato, thought that education in such matters should be the responsibility of the state. Both Plato and Aristotle sought to educate citizens to respond in a 'just, responsible and selfless manner to public issues' (Heater 1990:6). The rise of the Roman Empire ended the luxury of idleness, which vanished along with the idea of political duty to the state. The emphasis of the Roman concept of citizenship was not on political service which was stressed by the Greeks, but military service.

The Romans changed the concept of citizenship from the original ideas of the Greeks. In Roman times, citizenship could be granted rather than being a birth right and it was 'conferred in recognition of [military] services' (Heater 1990:4). The status of citizenship in Roman times gave citizens complete equality before the law and this was a crucial tool for the Romans who were expanding their empire and conquering

land. They needed loyalty and compliancy which the status of citizenship provided in order to maintain the empire. Both the Greek and later the Roman idea of citizenship required loyalty to the state either through political service by the Greeks or through military service by the Romans. Later, in medieval times, there was a sense of divided loyalties as citizenship required allegiance to both the church (affording salvation) and the throne (expecting obedience to the law).

Very early in its history, the term citizenship contained a

cluster of meanings related to a defined legal or social status, a means of political identity, a focus of loyalty, a requirement of duties, an expectation of rights and a yardstick of good social behaviour (Heater 1990:163).

Such qualification for citizenship was, for Plato and Aristotle, a status a person was born into. Within schools today there are assessments and examinations in citizenship education which include levels of ability in Key Stage 3 and accreditation in Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5. Within society today a person who is not a citizen by birth may apply to be tested to become a British citizen. In order to take the test, the applicant needs to meet the required standard of English (ESOL Entry 3) and a series of twenty-four questions must be answered based on a handbook entitled *Life in the United Kingdom: A Journey to Citizenship* priced £9.99. Knowledge, either through schooling or a citizenship test, forms the basis of what it means to understand or achieve citizenship in the early twenty-first century. Having briefly outlined the origins of citizenship, it is to the evolution of political education and citizenship education in the twentieth century that our attention must now turn.

Evolution

Then do you know that the most important part of every task is the beginning of it, especially when we are dealing with anything young and tender? For then it can be most easily moulded, and whatever impression any one cares to stamp upon it sinks in (Plato, translated by Lindsay 1935:57-58).

It has been stated that,

Citizenship has a tendency to mutate from being an agent of segregation to an agent of association. Within the state, it began as a means of differentiating between inhabitants; it is now a means of equalising their status. Internationally, citizenship has become a device for distinguishing the members of one nation-state from another; world citizenship could become a device for recognising the homogeneity of mankind. The education of young people for their social and political functions has reflected these trends (Heater 1990:246).

It has been suggested that until recently England has failed to establish a tradition of citizenship education (see for example Davies et. al. 1999 and Kerr 1999). Heater (2001) on the other hand has said that political education and citizenship education has been interwoven during the twentieth century which although has been limited, has still existed.

The founding of the Association for Education in Citizenship in 1934 was to promote the democratic way of life in England that was perceived to be under threat by the rise of totalitarianism after the Nazi accession to power. The purpose of the Association for Education in Citizenship was to 'use schools as a means to strengthening liberal democracy' (Heater 2001:106). The activity begun by the Association for Education in Citizenship in the 1930s was to prove brief as 'the prevailing attitude for decades became the belief that political matters were beyond the comprehension of school children' (Heater 1990:110). Although some secondary schools did include civics education in the 1930s and beyond, the concentration on examination based subjects meant there was little time for citizenship activities.

It was not until the late 1960s and early 1970s that citizenship had its revival which has continued into the twenty-first century when the idea of using schools as a way to strengthen values that were considered desirable evolved.

But of all the safeguards that we hear spoken of as helping to maintain constitutional continuity the most important, but most neglected today, is education, that is educating citizens for the way of living that belongs to the constitution in each case. It is useless to have the most beneficial rules of society fully agreed upon by all who are members of the *politeia*, if individuals are not going to be trained and have their habits formed for that *politeia*, that is to live democratically (Aristotle, translated by Sinclair 1962:215-216).

Whilst the right constitutional temper has changed, the use of schools and teaching to promote these changes has not.

There were a number of issues in the 1960s and 1970s that revived a discussion of political education in schools. For example the immigration of people into Britain saw a rise in racism. Education for tolerance and empathy became a priority as research revealed that 'fundamental political attitudes are formulated at an early age and then remain basically unaltered' (Heater 1990:223). In 1969, the Politics Association was created. The Hansard Society for Parliamentary Government in association with the Politics Association sought to enhance political literacy through the Programme for Political Education which was launched in 1974. This aimed to provide

the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to make a man or woman informed about politics; able to participate in public life and groups of all kinds...and to recognise and tolerate diversities of political and social values (Crick and Porter 1978:1).

The decline in membership of the main political parties along with increased support for extremist parties, the raising of the school leaving age from fifteen to sixteen and lowering the voting age to eighteen created a need for a social and preparatory curriculum for young people (Clarke 2007). The aims of political education in the 1970s were to promote

discussions about issues, attempts to develop learners' potential for action and a commitment to what were described as 'procedural values' such as respect for truth and reasoning rather than simply giving pupils the 'right' answer (Davies et. al. 2002:122).

Political education sought to engage rather than instruct learners. Further research however, has suggested that political education increases a person's knowledge but does not alter people's attitudes (Morris et. al. 2003).

In the 1980s and 1990s, concerns over a lack of political engagement, problems with behaviour displayed among the young and the changing nature of society including the tensions of multiculturalism, reignited the need for citizenship education in schools (see for example Morris et. al. 2003 and Osler and Starkey 2005). Citizenship

education was recognised as ‘a means of addressing both unity and diversity’ (Osler and Starkey 2005:iv). Frazer commented that ‘the history of political education looks very much like the history of a wave of moral panics’ (1999:6). The subject of citizenship education in the 1990s and into the twenty-first century resulted from a move away from political education as it was in the earlier part of the twentieth century to the notion of ‘duty, obligation and responsibility’ (Heater 2001:109) which found favour with the government.

The Education Reform Act in 1988 saw the introduction of the National Curriculum. Students were to study ten subjects that were common to all primary and secondary state schools in England and Wales. The National Curriculum was divided into three core subjects, English, maths and science and seven foundation subjects, geography, history, technology, art, music, physical education and in secondary schools a foreign language (Welsh for students in Wales). The introduction of a common examination for all pupils aged sixteen replaced the General Certificate of Education ‘O’ levels and Certificate of Secondary Education examinations (CSEs) which measured pupils against the performance of each other. In its place the new General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) measured pupils against absolute standards of knowledge, understanding and skills.

The teaching of citizenship education and political education was strengthened by New Labour’s Excellence in Schools White Paper in 1997 and David Blunkett’s Advisory Group on Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools (Kerr 1999). One of the main recommendations of the Advisory Group, stated

the teaching of citizenship and democracy is so important for schools and the life of the nation that citizenship education should be a statutory entitlement (Kerr 1999:277).

The review of the National Curriculum in 1999 introduced compulsory lessons in citizenship.

Citizenship is more than a statutory subject. If taught well and tailored to local needs, its skills and values will enhance democratic life for us all, both rights

and responsibilities, beginning in school, and radiating out (DfEE and QCA 1999a:13).

In September 2002, citizenship was included as a National Curriculum foundation subject for all students in each year group in Key Stage 3 (11-14 years) and Key Stage 4 (14-16 years). Student attainment was demonstrated by measuring students against end of Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 descriptors and in September 2002, a short course GCSE, equivalent to half a full course GCSE in citizenship education was introduced.

Current orthodoxy

A new National Curriculum was introduced in September 2008 and citizenship education was firmly embedded as a statutory subject. Citizenship was to 'develop social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy' (QCA 2007:27). Three key concepts and three key processes were identified (QCA 2007:28-31) and through the key concepts and using the key skills the content of the curriculum is delivered. To bring citizenship education in line with other statutory subjects within the National Curriculum, eight level descriptors were introduced to assess students in the study of citizenship education in Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4. Advanced A' levels in citizenship education began in 2008 and a full course GCSE became available from 2009.

Citizenship has evolved from a subject in the 1930s-1950s that students were taught and learnt about, to one in the 1960s and 1970s that aimed for students to be informed about political issues. Since the creation of the National Curriculum it would appear that citizenship education is still very much taught to students with the added expectation of participation in order to adopt and accept the concepts, skills, knowledge and values deemed necessary by the government. The aims of the National Curriculum for citizenship education are challenging. With curriculum time at a premium and the pressure associated with league tables and results, more schools are introducing a citizenship examination. A review of the National Curriculum was undertaken in 2011 and the panel recommended that citizenship education become

part of the Basic Curriculum (DfE 2011a) the outcome of which remains to be seen at the time of writing.

1.3 The history of religious studies

Foundations

Religious educators have tried, not always successfully, to adapt their subject to make it relevant to contemporary society. On occasions they may unwittingly have adapted RE [Religious Education] into something else entirely, like Social Studies or Personal and Social Education...All these escape routes from teaching religion seem to be based on the premise that teaching religion itself is either intellectually suspect or socially unacceptable (Copley 1997:9).

In order to discuss the current position of religious studies, a brief overview of the development of schooling is necessary to inform and explain the presence and development of religious studies in British schools.

As far back as prehistory, the imitation of others for example the making of tools or producing pictures on cave walls along with 'initiation ceremonies by which young people are inducted into manhood or womanhood' (Boyd and King 1975:1) would have been taught by the family. The family 'predates [formal] schooling' (Aldrich 1982:9). It is not until the 'limitations of family education were recognised' (Aldrich 1982:9) with the invention of writing which was a task 'so highly specialised that the home...could not accomplish it' (Boyd and King 1975:2) that formal education during the time of the ancient Greeks is first recognisable in Europe.

Later, with the fall of the Greek Empire and the rise of the Roman Empire, the Romans 'made it their deliberate policy to introduce their institutions and culture among their subject peoples' (Boyd and King 1975:75) and 'Romanising through schools' (Boyd and King 1975:75) went on until the Roman Empire fell in the fifth century. During the Dark Ages, the desire for education had largely died but the Church became concerned and involved itself with education due to the need to provide education for its clergy and adherents. There

grew a system of schools which by the end of the Dark Ages was almost as complete and as comprehensive as that which had passed away with the Roman Empire (Boyd and King 1975:99).

The

clerical monopoly of education established in the age of transition from the ancient world to the modern lasted for more than a thousand years (Boyd and King 1975:101).

This echoes the view expressed by Hull that 'the British education systems have never been secular' (1984:27).

The involvement of the Church in schooling has been documented (see for example Commission on Religious Education 1970 and Schools Council 1971). In 1698 charity schools were established in England by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge but the demands of the Industrial Revolution lead to their decline. This however enabled later nineteenth-century developments as 'economic, sociological and political developments...pointed to the need for more extensive educational provision' (Commission on Religious Education 1970:3). The British and Foreign School Society founded in 1808 and The National Society for the Education of the Children of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church in 1811 provided inexpensive elementary education for large numbers of children. The next major developments in education happened with the 1870 Education Act.

As the Church founded the first schools, it is perhaps unsurprising that religious education was taught in schools. Board schools were created in 1870 which later became county schools in 1944 as an alternative to church schools. Religious education continued as part of a child's education in both church and board schools. Although religious instruction had no legal status in schools at this time, the 1870 Education Act provided a withdrawal clause from religious instruction. The aim behind the clause was to protect Christian children who attended a school of a different denomination (Copley 1997). The Cowper-Temple clause stated that 'no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular

denomination shall be taught in school' (Lawson and Silver 1973:317). The 1870 Act 'had not made RI [Religious Instruction] universally compulsory' (Copley 1997:30) because its standing as part of the curriculum at the time was considered secure. With attendance at school in England and Wales compulsory by law in 1880, all pupils were exposed to religious instruction.

During the last century, religious studies evolved and this is clearly evident by the changing name of the subject. Students have been taught Religious Observance (Hull 1998) then in Acts of Parliament from 1870-1944 Religious Instruction emerged (HMSO 1944 and Hull 1998). Since then, 'Religious Instruction, Divinity, Religious Knowledge and Scripture, give way to Religious Education or Religious Studies on the exercise-book covers' (Copley 1997:9).

RE [Religious Education] was effectively created by teachers and other educators during the period between 1944 and 1988, and it was legally recognised and given its current name by the 1988 Education Reform Act (Rudge 2008:11).

Religious education gained its legal status in the 1944 Education Act. It is to the development of that Act and the evolution of religious education that our attention now turns.

Evolution

The subject is both compulsory but optional and local but national (Rudge 2008:9).

As previously noted, religious education was being taught in schools but it had no legal status until the twentieth century. In 1943, a White Paper Discussion stated that

religious education should be given a more defined place in the life and work of the schools springing from the desire to revive the spiritual and personal values in our society and in our national tradition (Copley 1997:24).

The desire to give religious education a more defined place was so that pupils would be able to 'challenge any future threats from 'distorted religion' such as Nazism and

build their capacity for making moral judgement' (Religious Education Council 2007:2). Butler who was president of the Board of Education in the 1940s later acknowledged that

towards the end of the war, the feeling was widespread among many sections of the community that in any future measure of educational reform religious instruction – and in the normal case Christian instruction – should play a larger part in the education of a child...My general aim...was to recognise formally this special place of religion in education (Butler cited in Copley 1997:19).

What followed was the 1944 Education Act which stated 'religious instruction shall be given in every county school [formally board schools] and in every voluntary school [formally church schools]' (HMSO 1944:25(2)). Within the same Act

the parent of any pupil in attendance at any county school or any voluntary school [may] request that he be wholly or partly excused from attendance at religious worship...religious instruction...or both (HMSO 1944:25(4)).

The Cowper-Temple clause of 1870 which was upheld in the 1944 Education Act, meant that

RI [Religious Instruction] was simultaneously the only compulsory subject (the law said it must be provided) and the only optional subject (parents could withdraw their children) (Copley 1997:35).

Whilst agreed syllabuses were already popular in the 1920s and 1930s, the 1944 Education Act 'ratified and clarified' (Hull 1998:107) their use and made them 'mandatory' (Hull 1998:107). Agreed syllabuses were considered 'extremely successful' (Copley 1997:31) because of their undenominational nature and avoidance of creedal formularies. A great deal of developmental work resulted from the 1944 Education Act and religious education began to develop as a subject not just as a compulsory part of the 1944 Act which will now be discussed.

Britain was changing in the 1950s as the stereotypical image of fifties family life was competing with changing realities (see Copley 1997). In schools, religious knowledge replaced religious instruction and the purpose of religious education was to induct pupils into the religious heritage of the nation, namely Christianity. 'The 1944 Act

sought, implicitly, to nurture children into Christianity, though not into any specific Christian denomination' (Rudge 2008:19). A confessional approach to religious education became common place and included

teaching which was intended to produce, or which assumed as the norm, a particular view of life (usually Christian) and whose whole purpose was to increase or produce commitment on the part of the child (Copley 1997:101).

During this decade Britain was also emerging as a multi-faith and multi-ethnic society. The docking of the Empire Windrush in 1948 was seen by many as the start of the post-war migration to Britain (Cashmore 1989) with

the arrival of immigrants from different cultures and countries, some of them different Christianities such as Caribbean, others from different religions altogether, notably Indians and Muslims from Pakistan and Eastern Bengal (Copley 1997:48).

In response to the changes in British society in the 1960s, 'God disappeared from many syllabuses' (Copley 1997:11) as the idea of themes such as sacred writing and places of worship was introduced. During the same decade a great deal of research into how religious education should be taught was taking place. Loukes and Goldman for example recognised that religious education needed to become more relevant to the pupils it was aimed at and the subject needed to address some of the wider issues it faced. Goldman focused on the failure of Bible-centred teaching and found that what was taught was age inappropriate 'as the symbolic nature of many events was beyond them [the students]' (Kay 2012:57). His proposal for a neo-confessional approach was later discussed and criticised (see Schools Council 1971). Loukes suggested that religious education be taught in a way that fulfilled the role of the subject rather than the role Christians had for it. His implicit approach asked the teacher to 'set children thinking and searching for meaning' (Schools Council 1971:35) and he recommended teaching religious education through a problem-centred approach. Madge focused on a child-centred approach to learning although this was later rejected by Thatcher who preferred the learning of facts rather than 'imaginative engagement' (Thatcher 1993:590). Acland's research suggested that a literal approach to teaching the Bible was a problem for pupils and if such an

approach continued, Christianity would be rejected as science was considered true and the literal teaching approach of the Bible in religious education compromised. Difficulties faced by religious education teachers during this time was summarised by May and Johnston

the difficulty for the Religious Knowledge teacher...[is] the way in which children bow to the superior knowledge of the maths or history teacher but are quick to accuse the teacher of religion of dogmatism (1968:73).

The 1970s were marked by a rise in unemployment and strike action. Most notably the Winter of Discontent and continued changes in Britain lead to further racism (see for example Cashmore 1987, Chevannes (ed) 1995 and Horowitz 1971). Some pupils were de-motivated and some schools saw a rise in truancy and disruption in the classroom (see Copley 1997). The place of religious education in schools was questioned in the 1960s and 1970s and it had to 'demonstrate that its existence could be defended on educational grounds rather than on grounds of religion or custom' (Kay 2001:2). The Fourth R report in 1970 made a number of recommendations and criticisms involving curriculum time, content and staffing but it was not as influential as Working Paper 36 which offered an alternative perspective.

Working Paper 36 argued that the aim of religious education was

the promotion of understanding. It uses the tools of scholarship to enter into an empathetic experience of the faith of individuals and groups. It does not seek to promote any one religious view point but it recognizes that the study of religion must transcend the purely informative (Schools Council 1971:21).

Working Paper 36 wanted religious education to facilitate the systematic study of other religions. As a result Smart's phenomenological approach to religious education appeared in schools. It claimed that by

emphasising what is common between the religions...pupils will learn tolerance, become less prejudice and realise the importance of making their own, autonomous choices in life (Backus 2008:63).

The introduction of a phenomenological approach to religious education has been heavily criticised (for example Barnes 2000, Barnes 2001a, Barnes 2001b, Barnes and Wright 2006, Barnes, Wright and Brandom (ed) 2008, Kay 1997, Kay and Smith 2000, Watson 1993 and Wright and Brandom (ed) 2000). The phenomenological approach to religious education was replaced by a multi-faith approach in the 1980s. This multi-faith approach was criticised by Hay in the 1990s who suggested an experiential or spiritual model for teaching religious education to overcome the factual approach of multi-faith religious education. More recently Wright (2004a) has proposed a religious literacy model.

The emergence of comprehensive schools in the 1980s provoked further debate on education and 'moves towards a national curriculum were part of the centralizing of control that was symptomatic of the Thatcher era' (Copley 1997:120). The Education Reform Act in 1988 saw the introduction of the National Curriculum which set out three core and seven foundation subjects. The National Curriculum eliminated variation in local curriculums and established a baseline for assessment in order to test and establish league tables. Religious education became part of the Basic National Curriculum and its title, religious education, was maintained in the subsequent National Curriculum (QCA 2007:262).

The 1988 Education Reform Act for religious education stated that

the curriculum...shall comprise a basic curriculum which includes provision for religious education for all registered pupils at the school' (HMSO 1988:2(1)).

Also that 'all pupils...shall on each school day take part in an act of collective worship' (Education Reform Act 1988:6(1)). All future agreed syllabuses

shall reflect the fact that the religious traditions in Great Britain are in the main Christian whilst taking account of the teaching and practices of the other principal religions represented in Great Britain (HMSO 1988 8(3)).

The withdrawal clause remained,

if the parent of any pupil in attendance...requests...he may be wholly or partly excused (a) from attendance at religious worship; (b) from receiving religious education...or (c) both...until the request is withdrawn (HMSO 1988 9(3)).

The Act also makes it clear that 'no teacher...shall be required to give religious education' (Education Reform Act 1988 84(14)).

With religious education excluded from the core and foundation subjects in the National Curriculum it was without

high finance, high media profile, and a high status position in the forthcoming national tests, and without national attainment targets, centralized syllabuses, free literature to parents, and well-publicized inspections (Copley 1997:147).

It lacked support and was deemed the 'Cinderella subject' (Copley 1997:185) because

the results of the examinations in these subjects [core and foundation] will be made public and will determine the standing of each school...religious education will simply not count (Hull 1998:99).

The National Curriculum subjects were funded by the government but as religious education was funded by the Local Education Authorities it was left 'moan[ing] from the parched deserts' (Hull 1998:100) and struggling for time and resources (Wright and Mohammed 2000). Whether religious education should be nationally rather than locally controlled continues to be discussed (see for example Hunt 2008). Religious education formed the basic curriculum as it was 'not subject to nationally prescribed attainment targets, programmes of study and assessment arrangements' (Ofsted 1994:1). In response to a lack of nationally agreed or common assessment arrangements, Exeter University School of Education created Forms of Assessment in Religious Education in 1990 and produced six attainment targets for religious education (see Watson 1993). This was followed by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) Model Syllabuses for Religious Education (1998) which provided end of Key Stage statement descriptions to support assessment. It was not

until the Non-Statutory Framework in Religious Education (QCA 2004) however, that parallel and common level descriptions were available in order to assess religious education alongside National Curriculum subjects. Dearing (1993 and 1994) made a number of recommendations in relation to the National Curriculum including the amount of curriculum time that religious education should occupy. He specified thirty-six hours per year at Key Stage 1, forty-five hours per year at Key Stage 2 and 3 and five per cent of available curriculum time at Key Stage 4 although Dearing's recommendations never became statutory.

Key concerns for religious education include a shortage of specialist teachers (Copley 1997 and Religious Education Council 2007), poor provision at Key Stage 5 (Ofsted 2007a and Religious Education Council 2007) fewer good and outstanding lessons and quality assessments when compared to core and foundation subjects (Ofsted 2007a and Religious Education Council 2007) and a lack of accredited courses for students aged fourteen to nineteen across the ability range (Ofsted 2007a). The introduction of a compulsory short course GCSE at Key Stage 4 within some schools has alleviated some of the issues surrounding status, position and the purpose of religious education although results remain static (Ofsted 2007a). Although the National Curriculum non-statutory programme of study (QCA 2007) presented and structured religious education in the same format as other subjects to facilitate links and cross curricular planning, it is questionable as to whether it alleviated any of the issues previously raised.

Current orthodoxy

Religious education has usually been nurture into the religious traditions and beliefs of the educating society...But if the society is not unanimous about its religion, then there are problems (Hull 1984:45).

Religious education has evolved from a subject in the nineteenth century taught by virtue of the church founding the first schools, into a subject in the twentieth century aimed at nurturing children into the Christian beliefs of society. Since the 1944 Education Act, religious education has transformed itself, moving away from a confessional approach and adapting to the needs of society through a multi-faith

approach. The transformation continues through the work of Barnes and Wright for example into how religious education should be taught and what should be taught.

After a number of reviews, a new National Curriculum was introduced in September 2008 and 'RE [Religious Education] is a statutory subject in the curriculum. All schools are legally obliged to teach it' (QCA 2007:263) and it remained part of the basic curriculum whereby it is taught to all students according to a local, rather than a national, agreed syllabus. Six key concepts and two separate skills were identified (QCA 2007:264-267). To bring religious education in line with the core and foundation subjects in the National Curriculum, eight level descriptors were provided to assess students under its two attainment targets AT1 (learning about religion) and AT2 (learning from religion) in the study of religious education at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4. The content of religious education is still governed by a locally agreed syllabus which every Local Education Authority produces in conjunction with a Standing Advisory Councils for Religious Education. Full and short course GCSEs and Advanced A' levels in religious education continue. A review of the National Curriculum was undertaken (DfE 2011a) but because religious education is not a National Curriculum subject it was not part of the review and its current status remains unchanged at the time of writing.

1.4 The history of personal, social, health and economic education

Foundations

Now what I want is Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else and root out everything else (Dickens, edited by Craig 1969:47).

This was the educational philosophy of the schoolmaster in the novel, who believed children's minds were akin to empty vessels waiting to be filled. There has been a great deal of discussion and debate surrounding the meaning of the term education (see for example Holley 1978, Scheffler 1973, Smith 1965, Thompson 2004 and White 1982) and the aim of education (see for example Beck and Earl (ed) 2000 and White 1982). It has been recognised that schooling goes beyond the acquisition of

facts and includes 'the socialisation of young people' (Brown 1990:40). It is to the broader aim of education beyond acquiring facts that our attention must now turn.

Personal, social and health education has been an aim of education since ancient times. Plato believed that education should aim to produce and foster good character and it should therefore go beyond the acquisition of knowledge. Plato divided members of society into three groups and of his guardians he wrote 'how shall we rear and educate these guardians?' (Plato, translated by Lindsay 1935:57). Plato was not only concerned with what his Guardians must learn but the manner in which their learning was to take place. Personal awareness and understanding were needed to inform decisions, attitudes and behaviour as 'gaining the mastery over himself...he moulds the many within him into one, temperate and harmonious' (Plato, translated by Lindsay 1935:133). Health education can similarly be traced back to ancient times (McBride 1983 cited in Burrage 1990:51). The relevance and need of personal, social and health education has been recognised since the foundation of society in ancient times and it is still present within the school curriculum in the twenty-first century to which economic education has been included.

Personal, social, health and economic education has previously been known by a number of different names including, Social Education (Brown 1986), Personal, Social and Moral Education (Wakeman 1984), Lifeskills (Hopson and Scally 1981), Preparation for Life (Brown 1990), Social Education (Macdonald 2009), Personal, Social, Health Education (DfEE and QCA 1999b), Social and Life Skills (Hargreaves et. al. 1988) and Design for Living (Hargreaves et. al. 1988). Her Majesty's Inspectorate called for a single name for the subject in 1988 (DES 1988a). In September 2008 Personal, Social, Health and Economic education was suggested as the subject title in secondary schools 'to trim back and secure both the growing title and the diversity of content within it' (Macdonald 2009:23). The need for transparency and consistency in the title was to remove any ambiguity and to support parents for example in their right to withdraw their child from sex and relationship education. There is, however, still much discussion surrounding the name (see Macdonald 2009) and the diversity of subject names continues within secondary schools.

Evolution

For historical, economic and political reasons, high status attaches to areas of learning and knowledge in schools that are academic, intellectual-cognitive, theoretical, easily examined and that lead to extensive quantities of written work or enumerated results on paper. New subjects seeking to establish themselves in the curriculum, it has been observed, must usually meet these criteria or perish (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:51).

High status was not afforded to personal, social and health education (see Hargreaves et. al. 1988) although it has maintained a place within the curriculum. Changes to the education system affected the development of personal, social, health and economic education which will now be briefly outlined.

The Education Act 1944 stated that schools must

afford for all pupils opportunities for education offering such variety of instruction and training as may be desirable in view of their different ages, abilities, and aptitudes (HMSO 1944 section 8).

Whilst the Act did not specify a tripartite system of education, grammar, secondary modern and secondary technical schools were formed although few secondary technical schools were ever founded. The Act provided free education for all pupils (HMSO 1944 section 35) and the school leaving age was raised to fifteen (HMSO 1944 section 61). With the introduction of the General Certificate of Education in 1951 which was aimed at the top twenty-five per cent of students, competition for grammar school places increased because these qualifications led to university places and professional careers. Therefore the traditional curriculum (see Aldrich 1982) was no longer relevant to every pupil under the tripartite system.

Twenty years later, a Circular from the government in 1965 recommended a system of comprehensive schooling to replace the existing tripartite system which was intended to provide courses to suit pupils of all abilities (DES 1965). The 1960s and 1970s saw the reform of grammar schools and secondary modern schools into comprehensive schools. The raising of the school leaving age in 1971 to sixteen

brought additional changes to the curriculum. A number of developments took place between the 1940s-1970s which affected the evolution of personal and social education, health education and careers education. The evolution of these subject areas into the form that exists in secondary schools in the twenty-first century will be discussed in turn.

Personal and social education

The more that education tries to live up to its broad promise of being an agent of personal development and social change rather than merely a process of practical training or intellectual mastery, the more controversial and contestable it becomes. For what is at stake is not just practical or intellectual competence, but the developing attitudes, values and social commitments of young people – the shape of society in the future (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:7).

With the creation of the tripartite system, a new curriculum was needed to replace the traditional curriculum. Many secondary modern schools adopted a similar curriculum to the grammar schools with the inclusion of social studies. Social studies, also called social science, with its combination of history, geography and/or sociology emerged in the 1950s and 1960s to fill the void in the curriculum. Aspects of personal and social education which had formed part of this new subject were eventually removed as social studies became ‘more academic, more subject based, and more examinable’ (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:32) and ‘it rarely sought to make connections between its subject matter and pupils’ experiences or opinions’ (Brown 1990:35).

The introduction of the comprehensive system in the 1960s and 1970s and the raising of the school leaving age in the early 1970s meant that traditional academic routes were not suitable for all pupils and new, non-examinable subjects were needed. Social studies remained but ROSLA (raising of the school leaving age) courses were developed. Due to high youth unemployment these ROSLA courses became examinable and testable (Brown 1990). A carousel of non-examinable subjects or topics such as ‘Health Education (mainly Sex Education and Drugs), Careers Education, [and] Leisure’ (Brown 1990:36) were developed to address these needs and personal and social education, mainly for the older pupils, became established.

The creation of the comprehensive system saw the introduction and development of tutor time (Power 1996). Teachers

were now allocated to activity which was definitely not to be 'teaching' of a subject and had aims related to the 'personal' (Brown 1990:36).

Some teachers 'feared the consequences for their own authority and discipline' (Brown 1990:36). The emergence of tutor time along with personal and social education meant teachers had to

take on responsibilities that are often more concerned with social welfare than with education. Why is that?...a pre-condition of successful teaching is that the learner have the pre-conditions for successful learning (Pring 1984:141).

Although tutor work to support personal and social education was created in the 1970s and 1980s it soon became part of the carousel of non-examinable topics.

Whilst personal and social education had initially emerged due to the raising of the school leaving age and the need for non-examinable courses for weaker students, in 1977 Her Majesty's Inspectorate suggested that all areas of the curriculum should be accessible to all pupils and that included personal and social education (DES 1977). Later health education and careers education were incorporated into personal and social education which is discussed later in this section. Prior to the Education Reform Act 1988 and the introduction of the National Curriculum, a broad curriculum was still being discussed which included personal and social education. In the government's discussion paper *A View of the Curriculum* it stated

all pupils have to be prepared to meet the basic intellectual and social demands of adult life, and helped to form an acceptable set of personal values...Personal and social development in this broad sense is a major charge on the curriculum (DES 1980b:2).

Another publication the same year recognised that in order for schools to prepare young people for adult life and to fulfil these aims the curriculum

requires many additions to the core subjects...in areas such as...health education, preparation for parenthood and an adult role in family life; careers

education and vocational guidance; and preparation for a participatory role in adult society (DES 1980a:8).

The following year it was acknowledged that education was 'to help pupils to acquire knowledge and skills relevant to adult life and employment in a fast-changing world' (DES 1981:3) and a broad education was also supported in a later publication *Better Schools* (DES 1985). Despite the implementation of personal and social education from the 1960s and into the early 1980s, there were a number of issues that were not resolved. A survey for Her Majesty's Inspectorate (DES 1988a) identified a number of concerns surrounding the planning, monitoring, assessment, evaluation, staffing and inset time linked to personal and social education. However these were not addressed in the National Curriculum or the documents that followed.

The Education Reform Act (1988) defined the curriculum in subject specific terms and personal and social education was not mentioned although the Act did state that schools must prepare pupils 'for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life' (1988 section 2). Guidance on the National Curriculum that followed stated the

whole curriculum for *all* pupils will certainly need to include at appropriate (and in some cases all) stages...other aspects of personal and social education (DES 1989:3.8).

In a following publication, personal and social education was termed a cross-curricular element or dimension (NCC 1990a:2). Although personal and social education 'has been given very little specific financial allocation for in-service development or experimental innovation' (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:8) it continued to grow in the 1980s even though no central agency was involved in the developing of a syllabus or content. It is perhaps no wonder personal and social education was seen as a 'rag-bag of topics' (Brown 1990:37) with its carousel of topics which included

health, careers and political education, legal, economic and world issues, personal relationships and responsibilities, moral and religious education, community and social studies (DES 1989:9).

It took a further ten years for a framework to be clearly outlined (DfEE and QCA 1999b). In spite of its status, lack of financial support or clarification on content, personal and social education was validated 'as an entity distinct from the rest of the curriculum and yet capable of fitting into existing school learning structures' (Brown 1990:36). During a similar period health education emerged and formed part of personal and social education.

Health education

Health education became a concern for schools initially because it affected a child's capacity to learn.

Education aims are frustrated if health is absent. Teachers cannot teach fractious children, poorly children, children with toothache, one whose hands and feet are cold because it is poorly clad and poorly nourished (Lewis 1993:161).

There is little in the way of health education in the literature in the early twentieth century and prior to the 1960s health education was concerned with instruction on matters such as personal hygiene. It was not until the publication of an official health education handbook from the Ministry of Education in 1957 that health education was transformed in schools. Government reports in the 1960s began to urge schools to 'recognise the changes in health behaviour taking place in society and to address these issues in the classroom' (Lewis 1993:164).

The Health Education Council which was established in the 1970s and later became the Health Education Authority was pivotal in the development of health education in schools. The Schools Council's Health Education Project produced curriculum materials and in-house training for a planned and comprehensive health education in the 1970s. By the late 1970s, health education was recognised as 'an integral part of the personal and social education of young people' (Stears et. al. 1995:169). Health education became part of a carousel of topics in personal and social education lessons in the 1970s due to the raising of the school leaving age and the need for a suitable curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils. In the 1980s many schools and

Local Education Authorities invested time, staff and resources into providing a good health education programme. The government's Grant for Education Support and Training for Preventive Health Education scheme in 1986 aimed at providing local authorities with the funding to appoint staff which included health education coordinators and drug education coordinators to develop health education within schools.

The introduction of the National Curriculum ought to have secured a place for health education as schools were required to prepare pupils for adult life (Education Reform Act 1988) and sexual development within the science curriculum had been specified. However health education was identified as a cross-curricular 'theme' (NCC 1990a:4) and personal and social education identified as a 'dimension' (NCC 1990a:13) within the curriculum documents that followed the Education Reform Act 1988. The

enormous demands placed on schools by the implementation of the National Curriculum, and the paraphernalia of testing associated with it, together with the non-statutory and non-examinable position of health education, conspired to marginalize its status in the curriculum (Stears et. al. 1995:170).

Despite the slimming down of the National Curriculum subjects to release teaching time in the Dearing review, there was no mention that this time should be given to cross-curricular themes. Progress in health education was made in spite of rather than because of the National Curriculum (Stears et. al. 1995).

Schools were to contribute in tackling health matters as schools were seen as places of 'social control' (Brown 1990:41). Previously health education had been defined as the transmission of 'medical 'facts' (where babies come from, why you need vitamins) [or]...social and behavioural prescription (don't smoke, do take exercise)' (Burrage 1990:52). It was soon realised that addressing sex education and drugs education by providing facts or telling young people what to do was not effective (Stears et. al. 1995). A government White Paper in 1992 set out five key health areas two of which were HIV/AIDS and sexual health. Schools were now required to provide sex education beyond the science curriculum (HMSO 1993) which became a focus of health education in schools. No guidance was provided on the content or method of

teaching sex education (DfE 1994) until the arrival of the non-statutory framework (DfEE and QCA 1999b) which combined personal, social and health education.

Concerns surrounding sex education (see DfEE 2000, Ofsted 2002 and QCA 2005) and drugs education (see DfES 2004a and Ofsted 2005a) have continued to dominate attention and raise the profile of health education in schools. The narrow focus on health education in terms of sex education and drugs education has had a lasting effect on health education in the curriculum as Ofsted have highlighted, stating the

PSHE [personal, social and health education] curriculum is often not broad enough. It needs to include important aspects such as mental health and well-being, parenting education...which are currently being neglected in many schools (2005b:1).

The content of personal, social and health education has since broadened to include careers education. The development of careers education and its location within personal, social, health and economic education now follows.

Careers education

Within the 2007 National Curriculum (QCA 2007), careers education was located within the non-statutory personal, social and health education Economic Wellbeing and Financial Capability strand. A discussion of the evolution of careers education as part of personal, social and health education is therefore deemed pertinent.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, schooling was not free beyond the elementary stage and many working class pupils left school as early as twelve or thirteen to start work to contribute to the family income (see Lawson and Silver 1973). During this time, youth unemployment was high and the Labour Exchanges Act of 1909 established a bureaux to assist people with finding a job, with a separate section within the bureaux for young people. Some people felt that the bureaux was too concerned with filling vacancies rather than responding to the needs or skills of the young people. Under the Choices of Employment Act in 1910, schools became more

involved as Local Education Authorities had the authority to provide young people with vocational guidance and the bureaux was charged with placing young people in work. The tension between the role of the school, the government and the needs of the economy regarding careers education was set to continue for the next one hundred years.

Due to the state of the labour market in the 1920s and 1930s, young people simply had to fill the vacancies that were available. This changed in the 1940s and 1950s as economic growth and an improved labour market meant that young people were able to choose a job rather than accept any job that was offered. Change continued into the 1960s as the economy continued to grow and new occupations were emerging. Education was seen as essential in order to provide skilled workers. With more choice for young people available, careers education was needed to provide pupils with skills for life and skills around choices. The introduction of comprehensive schooling aimed to foster a pupil centred approach rather than subject led approach to teaching. Comprehensive education set out to remedy the inequality of the tripartite system where pupils were more often segregated by class rather than ability (see Power 1996) and aimed to prevent 'wastage' (Harris 1999:39) in terms of ability and talent. This vision was not fully realised though as a tripartite system of education existed under one comprehensive roof in terms of streaming or banding pupils as high, middle or low achievers. The 1970s resulted in significant changes for teachers, the raising of the school leaving age meant pupils had to stay at school for an additional year and it was soon realised that a suitable curriculum was needed for these pupils.

'Curriculum relevance' (Harris 1999:54) to the world of work became an issue. The 1970s saw an economic recession and this

crisis was effectively transposed from the economy to the schools with the latter identified as being a major cause of economic decline (Harris 1999:55).

Further debate on education was sparked in the *Black Paper* (Cox and Boyson 1975) but the vision for education in the late 1970s and into the 1980s was outlined by

James Callaghan in his speech at Ruskin College where the foundation for a National Curriculum was set,

Let me repeat some of the fields that need study because they cause concern. There are the methods and aims of informal instruction, the strong case for the so-called 'core curriculum' of basic knowledge; next, what is the proper way of monitoring the use of resources in order to maintain a proper national standard of performance; then there is the role of the inspectorate in relation to national standards; and there is the need to improve relations between industry and education (Callaghan 1976).

What resulted was

more central control of the school curriculum, greater teacher accountability and the more direct subordination of secondary education to the perceived needs of the economy (Chitty 1998:320).

Within schools, careers education had been deemed most appropriate for pupils who were considered academic failures. The Newsom Report stated that education for average and below average pupils should be 'deliberately outgoing – an initiation into the adult world of work and leisure' (Central Advisory Council for Education 1963:xv11). Newsom and ROSLA courses were founded in secondary modern schools and in lower streams of comprehensive schools but they did not improve the attainment of average and below average pupils or better prepare children for the future. ROSLA courses included activities such as car maintenance and community service. Newsom courses were provided although they were regarded by pupils as courses which 'provided no qualifications' (Burgess 1984a:183) and did not involve 'proper teaching' (Burgess 1984a:183). Newsom lessons amounted to

little more than sessions where pupils played table-tennis, lay across – and fall asleep on – their desks, and indulged in protracted routines for buying, preparing and drinking coffee (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:31).

Under the comprehensive system in the 1970s, vocational initiatives were introduced for all pupils because 'pupils needed sufficient preparation in school for their transition to the world outside' (Harris 1999:56). During the same period the Schools Council Careers Education and Guidance Project (1971-1977) were tasked to provide

teaching materials for teachers which related to the transition from school to work and in doing so launch careers education.

In the 1980s Technical and Vocational Education was founded by the government and launched across all Local Education Authorities with the aim of making education more relevant to adult working life. The need for careers education stemmed from the needs of industry and employers. Careers education gained support in the 1980s with the publication of *Working Together* (DoE 1986) which stated the importance of careers education. The government's document *Careers Education and Guidance from 5-16*, was 'intended as a contribution to the deliberations of the National Curriculum Council and its working groups' (DES 1988b:preface) on the need for careers education and guidance in Years 9-11. Whilst the Education Reform Act (1988) did not include careers education, the publication *National Curriculum from Policy to Practise*, clearly identified careers education as a cross-curricular theme (DES 1989) which could be delivered through other subjects although such an approach was already known to be difficult (Harris 1999). Although careers education was later identified as being important for all pupils from Year 7 (NCC 1990b) the low status of careers education was felt (see Harris 1999).

The 1990s saw a range of post-sixteen routes develop and the need to skill young people for multiple career changes was evident. There were also a number of students dropping out of Advanced A' level courses at college and careers education and guidance was 'identified as having an important role in reducing the cost of such wastage through high quality guidance' (Harris 1999:107). In 1997 careers education and guidance became statutory in Years 9-11 'all registered pupils...must be provided, during the relevant [14-16years] phase of their education, with a programme of careers education' (HMSO 1997 section 43). The Education Act 1997 later amended in 2004 made careers education statutory in Years 7-11 (Connexions 2007). In 2004 work-related learning in Key Stage 4 became statutory and recognised that 'direct experience of the world of work should be at the heart of work-related provision' (QCA 2003:3). In 2004 the Department for Education and Skills published a non-statutory framework for careers education for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 which was updated in 2010 to support more recent legislation. A non-

statutory framework for work-related learning for Key Stage 4 was also produced. The government introduced the September Guarantee which guaranteed a place in learning for all sixteen year olds from 2007 and all sixteen to seventeen year olds from 2008 to address and reduce those pupils who had previously been identified as NEET (not in education, employment or training). To support young people with their decision making, the Education and Skills Act 2008 stated the need for impartial information and advice. The government raised the participation age where young people are expected to stay in education or training until seventeen from 2013 and until eighteen from 2015 making careers education even more important to the pupils, the parents and the school.

Current orthodoxy

PSHE [personal, social and health education] is often seen as the area that can be endlessly manoeuvred to meet other people's needs. On the one hand it is perceived as a subject where students can be removed from lessons to undertake other activities that are deemed more important; and on the other hand it is expected to be able to undertake the delivery of new initiatives in an otherwise inflexible curriculum. In short, PSHE [personal, social and health education] is both valued and tolerated, expectations are both high and minimal (Buck 2003:223).

A new National Curriculum was introduced in September 2008. Personal, social, health and economic education was set out within the National Curriculum using the same structure as all other subjects. Personal, social, health and economic education was divided into two separate strands: Economic Wellbeing and Financial Capability which aimed to 'equip pupils with the knowledge, skills and attributes to make the most of changing opportunities in learning and work' (QCA 2007:227). Whilst Personal Wellbeing aimed to help young people 'embrace change, feel positive about who they are and enjoy healthy, safe, responsible and fulfilled lives' (QCA 2007:243). Although economic education has been part of personal, social and health education for a number of years (DES 1989) it had not been prominent in lessons (Ofsted 2005b and Ofsted 2010b). For Economic well-being four key processes and four key skills have been identified (QCA 2007) and for Personal well-being five key concepts and three key skills were identified (QCA 2007).

Through the key concepts and using the key skills the content of the curriculum is delivered in Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4. Unlike all other subjects in the National Curriculum no level descriptors were provided to assess students in the study of personal, social, health and economic education in Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 but end of Key Stage statements have been available since 2005. Ofsted found that most secondary schools 'have not yet implemented the new 2008 programmes of study effectively, which include economic well-being and financial capability' (2010b:5).

The biggest area of weakness for personal, social and health education has been assessment (see Ofsted 2002, Ofsted 2005a, Ofsted 2005b, Ofsted 2007b and Ofsted 2010b). The issue has surrounded what is to be assessed or tested,

it is certainly possible...to test knowledge about physiology or the physiological effects of given substances and behaviour, but it is less easy – and, many would feel, professionally very questionable – to test publicly individual's attitudes to, say, drugs, mental illness or contraception (Burrage 1990:62).

A recent consultation document revealed that eighty-six per cent of respondents thought personal, social and health education should be excluded from having any attainment targets (QCDA 2009). A weakness of personal, social and health education is a 'lack rigour and challenge' (Brown 1990:38) due to the issues surrounding assessment. Therefore it can often be 'taught by any teacher without much planning or training' (Brown 1990:38) with 'gaps in their timetables' (Hargreaves et. al. 1988:19). To address this some schools have created their own assessments or introduced external assessments such as the Certificate of Personal Effectiveness, Trident Gold Award or the Certificate in Enterprise and Employability. There are currently no full course GCSEs or advanced (A') level qualifications for personal, social, health and economic education. Recently Ofsted have commented that 'PSHE [personal, social and health education] was seen too often as a subject where pupils were to gain subject knowledge and understanding' (Ofsted 2005b:1). Ofsted are no longer asking schools about the provision of personal, social and health education but the achievement in personal, social and health education 'as related to

their pupils' attitudes, values and personal development' (Ofsted 2005b:1) and its 'impact' (Ofsted 2007b:2).

It has been proposed that personal, social and health education is delivered through a cross curricular approach (NCC 1990a and DES 1989), through other subjects (Burrage 1990), through pastoral care within schools (Hargreaves et. al. 1988) or through extra-curricular provision (Hargreaves et. al. 1988) but these methods have been far from successful. More recently the delivery of personal, social, health and economic education by specialist departments, class tutors, drop-down days and integration with citizenship education or religious studies have been evaluated (see Macdonald 2009). The most effective delivery is by a specialist department with specialist teachers (Macdonald 2009 and Ofsted 2005b). Tutors were not as effective (DfES 2004a, Macdonald 2009, Ofsted 2002, Ofsted 2005a and Ofsted 2010b) and drop-down days were the least effective (Macdonald 2009 and Ofsted 2010b). When personal, social and health education is combined with other subjects for example citizenship education or religious studies, 'curriculum overload' (Ofsted 2005b:15) is a concern as time is not increased to take into account the additional content (Ofsted 2007b and Ofsted 2010b). Discreet personal, social and health education lessons with specialist teachers seem to be the optimum model of delivery (Ofsted 2010b).

Despite Ofsted reporting that 'too much time and effort have been spent in discussing whether Personal, Social and Health education should be a statutory subject' (2007b:22), in October 2008 the government announced its intention to make personal, social and health education statutory. In September 2011, personal, social, health and economic education was to become a statutory foundation subject and part of the National Curriculum at primary and secondary school level for all young people for the first time (DCSF 2009b). To support this change, Macdonald (2009) in his review recommended the non-statutory framework as a basis for consultation and entitlement, all Initial Teacher Training courses to include a focus on personal, social, health and economic education, the creation of a route for Initial Teacher Training and specialist personal, social, health and economic education teachers and that personal, social, health and economic education is excluded from the requirement of statutory levels of attainment. The government also intended on bringing forward

legislation to lower the age of parental withdrawal from nineteen to fifteen for sex and relationships education to ensure at least one year of teaching.

Personal, social, health and economic education has secured a place within the curriculum due to a number of reports, initiatives and guidance documents. Government concerns around sex education and drugs education and the role of schools in addressing these health education concerns have already been discussed in this section. Personal, social, health and economic education delivered by specialist teachers is the most beneficial approach to health education within schools. The implementation of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) initiative through personal, social, health and economic education has raised and strengthened the profile of the subject within the curriculum (Macdonald 2009 and Ofsted 2010b) along with the introduction of the National Health Schools Programme for schools to be awarded National Healthy Schools Status (DoH and DfES 2002:7, Ofsted 2007b and Ofsted 2010b). Personal, social, health and economic education fulfils much of the *Every Child Matters* agenda and the provision by Ofsted of well-being indicators to inform inspections of the *Every Child Matters* outcomes confirms it has a significant contribution to make to this initiative (Ofsted 2007b).

Personal, social, health and economic education has evolved from personal and social education in the early part of the twentieth century which included aspects of health related issues, to a carousel of topics in the 1960s and 1970s. The carousel sought to prepare students for adult life and provide a relevant curriculum to support the philosophy of comprehensive education and the additional year at school due to the raising of the school leaving age. Since the creation of the National Curriculum it would appear that the need for personal, social, health and economic education increased due to the changing nature of schools and the implementation of initiatives and policies in schools. It is perhaps the subject where schools 'hang a range of what can seem quite disparate and competing initiatives' (Inman et. al. 2003:17).

With the change of government in May 2010, personal, social, health and economic education was not made statutory and legislation to lower the age of parental withdrawal from sex and relationship education was not introduced. A review of the

National Curriculum was undertaken (DfE 2011a) although as personal, social, health and economic education is a non-statutory subject it was not included in the review and at the time of writing its provision and status remains unchanged.

1.5 The history of the Every Child Matters agenda

Foundations

Victoria [Climbié] spent much of her last days, in the winter of 1999–2000, living and sleeping in a bath in an unheated bathroom, bound hand and foot inside a bin bag, lying in her own urine and faeces. It is not surprising then that towards the end of her short life, Victoria was stooped like an old lady and could walk only with great difficulty. When Victoria was admitted to the North Middlesex Hospital on the evening of 24 February 2000, she was desperately ill. She was bruised, deformed and malnourished. Her temperature was so low it could not be recorded on the hospital's standard thermometer... she died a few hours later, on the afternoon of 25 February 2000 (Lord Laming 2003:1.4-1.6).

The death of Victoria Climbié raised the issue of child protection once again and Lord Laming's inquiry into her death supported the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda. There were a number of tragedies which preceded the death of Victoria Climbié and the creation of *Every Child Matters*. It is to these preceding events that our attention must first turn.

The first Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act also known as the Children's Charter was passed in 1889 and it came as a result of children's organisations lobbying parliament. For the first time the law was able to intervene in matters between parents and children, warrants could be obtained to enter the home of a child thought to be in danger and anyone found ill-treating a child could be arrested. By the end of the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century a number of changes occurred to protect children. Children were allowed to give evidence in court, juvenile courts were established, foster parents had to be registered, supervision orders for children who were at risk were put in place, mental cruelty to children was recognised and sexual abuse became an issue for the law rather than the clergy. Despite

increased protection under the law, the failure to protect children has continued to serve as a catalyst for change.

The death of Dennis O'Neill on 9th January 1945, aged 12, from a heart attack caused by a 'brutal beating' (Hopkins 2007) from his foster father triggered the Monckton inquiry. The failures which were identified by the inquiry were addressed in the Children Act 1948 which advocated that wherever possible, children should be kept with their birth mother. It was soon realised however, that there was also a need to protect children from their own families.

The inquiry into the death of Maria Colwell in 1973 (Doward et. al. 2008), aged 7, and Jasmine Beckford in 1984 (ITV 1985), aged 4, at the hands of their family led to the Children Act 1989. Underpinning the Act was the right to protect children from abuse and it recognised 'the principle of closer collaboration between agencies in order to enhance the quality of provision for children' (Straker and Foster 2009:120). That same year the United Nations agreed a human rights treaty for children and young people which set out over forty rights and was agreed by the government in 1991. Despite the legislation in the Children Act 1989 and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, cruelty to children continued.

The death of Lauren Wright in 2000 (BBC 2001), aged 6, and Ainlee Walker in 2002 (BBC 2002), aged 2, again highlighted the failings of agencies and services to protect children. The

common threads which led in each case [Maria Colwell, Jasmine Beckford, Lauren Wright and Ainlee Walker] to a failure to intervene early enough were poor co-ordination; a failure to share information; the absence of anyone with a strong sense of accountability; and frontline workers trying to cope with staff vacancies, poor management and a lack of effective training (DfES 2003:5).

The need to protect children within and beyond the family surfaced as an area that also needed to be addressed. The deaths of Jessica Chapman and Holly Wells in 2002 revealed that 'current checks on staff working in schools were insufficient to protect children' (Roche and Tucker 2007:214). Although there have been improvements and progress in a number of areas related to children (see for example

DfES 2003 and Reid 2005), there are however issues that still affect a child's well-being which need to be addressed (see for example Barker (ed) 2009, DfES 2003, DoH 2003 and Reid 2005). As the deaths of Lauren Wright, Ainlee Walker and Victoria Climbié demonstrated, the Children Act 1989 did not go far enough to protect children. Following Lord Laming's report (2003) into the death of Victoria Climbié and the Government's report *Keeping Children Safe* (DoH 2003) the *Every Child Matters* agenda was conceived.

Evolution

Victoria Adjo Climbié was born in the Ivory Coast on 2nd November 1991 to Francis and Berthe Climbié, the fifth of seven children and she was intelligent and articulate at school. Her great aunt, Marie-Therese Kouao during a visit from France in 1998 offered to take Victoria back to France to be educated. Francis and Berthe Climbié as well as Victoria agreed. Victoria and Marie-Therese Kouao spent six months in France before moving to England in March 1999. During the eleven months that Victoria was in London she had an allocated social worker for seven months as there had been a child protection referral. The social workers

single responsibility to Victoria throughout this period was to safeguard and promote her welfare in accordance with the Children Act 1989 (Laming 2003:109).

During Victoria's ten month stay in London, 'on twelve occasions...chances to save Victoria's life were not taken. Social services, the police and the NHS failed' (DfES 2003:5) and she died on 25th February 2000. Lord Laming made

108 recommendations for changes to services to children at a national and local level, and within and between the different agencies and professions (Barker 2009:9).

These recommendations by Lord Laming were influential in the development of the *Every Child Matters* agenda. In his report, Lord Laming concluded that

Not one of the agencies empowered by Parliament to protect children in positions similar to Victoria's – funded from the public purse – emerge from this Inquiry with much credit. The suffering and death of Victoria was a gross failure of the system and was inexcusable. It is clear to me that the agencies with responsibility for Victoria gave a low priority to the task of protecting children. They were underfunded, inadequately staffed and poorly led. Even so, there was plenty of evidence to show that scarce resources were not being put to good use (Laming 2003:1.18).

The government published *Every Child Matters* as a Green Paper where the policies outlined were 'designed both to protect children and maximise their potential' (DfES 2003:5) from birth to nineteen for all children and teenagers living in England. The Green Paper aimed

to reduce the numbers of children who experience educational failure, engage in offending or anti-social behaviour, suffer from ill health, or become teenage parents (DfES 2003:5).

Achieving these aims would enable 'well-being' (Knowles 2009:1). Well-being was broken down into five outcomes:

- Being healthy
- Staying safe
- Enjoying and achieving
- Making a positive contribution
- Economic well-being.

These five outcomes for well-being are now the goals of the *Every Child Matters* agenda and all services that are concerned for the education and welfare of children and young people are bound to ensure these outcomes are achieved (Knowles 2009:1).

The publication of *Every Child Matters: Next Steps* emphasised the need to 'build the strongest possible coalition around a shared programme of change' (DfES 2004b:4). It reported on the consultation process surrounding the Green Paper (DfES 2003) and paved the way for the Children Act 2004 (HMSO 2004) which provided the 'legal framework' (Harris 2006:5) for *Every Child Matters*. The aim of the Act was to

legislate for changes at local and national levels to transform children's services and thereby optimize the well-being, life chances and potential for all children and young people, particularly those belonging to socially disadvantaged communities (Harris 2006:5).

Whilst the implications of the Children Act 2004 for schools is explored in more detail by Reid (2005), the

introduction of ECM [Every Child Matters] and the legislation to support its implementation should be viewed as a staging post for a government that is on a significant journey of reform for child-related policy and practice (Roche and Tucker 2007:215).

Behind this proactive measure sat a conviction that children matter and underpinned all *Every Child Matters* publications. It has been suggested that *Every Child Matters* took the government's focus away from achievement (Andrews 2008) but the circumstances surrounding the death of Victoria Climbié could not be ignored. To rectify the previous failings as identified in Lord Laming's report (2003), *Keeping Children Safe* (DoH 2003) and drawn from the Every Child Matters Green Paper (DfES 2003), were four key areas of legislation:

- (1) Integrated services which required local authorities to develop 'integrated, coherent and targeted services for children and young people based on cooperation between relevant agencies and professional workers' (Harris 2006:5). As well as a Common Assessment Framework 'to identify the needs of children and young people' (Harris 2006:6) was also to be developed.
- (2) Safeguarding where local authorities establish 'Local Safeguarding Children Boards...to safeguard and promote the welfare of vulnerable children and young people, especially those at risk of abuse or neglect' (Harris 2006:6).
- (3) Information Sharing to 'facilitate legislation that will support information sharing between professionals' (Harris 2006:6).
- (4) Workforce Reform to 'ensure sufficient, suitably trained staff' (Harris 2006:6) and the development of Children's Trusts.

To manage the vision of *Every Child Matters*, the government published *Every Child Matters: Change for Children* which set out 'the national framework for local change

programmes to build services around the needs of children and young people' (DfES 2004c:2). It was essential that

child protection services are not separate from support for families, but are part of the spectrum of services provided to help and support children and families (DoH 2003:4).

These changes sought to rectify the problems with the previous structure that had 'left different professions in charge of delivering different outcomes' (Straker and Foster 2009:119) which was both 'detrimental [and] inefficient' (Straker and Foster 2009:119).

With the policies and plans for *Every Child Matters* in place, the death of Baby P in August 2007 raised a number of concerns related to practice rather than policy surrounding child protection and the effect of *Every Child Matters*. In response to the death of Baby P, Lord Laming was asked to,

report on the progress being made across the country to implement effective arrangements for safeguarding children...[and] to evaluate the good practice that has been developed since the publication of the report of the Independent Statutory Inquiry following the death of Victoria Climbié, to identify the barriers that are now preventing good practice becoming standard practice, and recommend actions to be taken to make systematic improvements in safeguarding children across the country (Laming 2009:3).

Lord Laming (2009) made fifty-eight further recommendations to greater protect and improve the lives of children and young people.

Current orthodoxy until 2010

It was anticipated that it would take ten years for *Every Child Matters* to be fully realised (Laming 2009 and Reid 2005). Many agencies were identified as having an important role in the implementation of the new legislation which included schools (see Broadhead and Martin 2009). There were a number of challenges that needed to be overcome and some of the challenges specifically faced by schools will be discussed.

The 'heritage' (Broadhead and Martin 2009:45) of the 1988 Education Reform Act along with the National Curriculum that was borne out of it raised the question as to whether the National Curriculum and the new *Every Child Matters* policy were both 'compatible' (Broadhead and Martin 2009:45). The former was consumed by standards and testing, the latter concerned with the whole child. *Every Child Matters* did not escape being tested in the form of Ofsted inspection frameworks and an Every Child Matters Standards Award was developed for schools (see Cheminais 2007).

The arena for considering the delivery of the ECM [Every Child Matters] agenda is transformed from what might be described as an aspirational framework to one where evidence is sought in relation to specific targets against each outcome...At the same time the agenda is far-reaching in that it covers the behaviour of children and young people both in and out of school...Perhaps what we are witnessing here is a fundamental shift in responsibility for the care and education of the young, where schools are judged against learner behaviours both in the specific institution and wider community (Roche and Tucker 2007:221).

As a continuation of the broader aims of *Every Child Matters*, the creation of *The Children's Plan* sought

a new role for schools as the centre of their communities, and more effective links between schools, the NHS and other children's services so that together they can engage parents and tackle all the barriers to the learning, health and happiness of every child (DCSF 2007:3).

The government announced that there would also be 'major reform to the school accountability system' (DCSF 2009:3) including 'new Pupil and Parent Guarantees' (DCSF 2009a:3) that will be set out in law. For schools to be successful in the implementation of *Every Child Matters*, initiatives must not be tackled in isolation. *Every Child Matters* would only be fully realised when schools were helped to

make links between ECM [Every Child Matters] and other activities with which they are starting to engage but with which they may not necessarily have made connections (Weare 2007:239).

The contribution of personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship education to the *Every Child Matters* agenda is extensive (see Best 2007, Cheminais 2006, Crow 2008, DfES 2003, Knowles 2009, Roche and Tucker 2007 and Weare 2007). Recognising the role of personal, social, health and economic education in this agenda will continue to be a challenge as its status remains non-statutory and no Initial Teacher Training routes are available to ensure a quality of training and provision.

Also central to the *Every Child Matters* agenda is the intention that schools work in partnership with parents and families. The challenges this poses have been raised (see Argent 2007). Pastoral care also has an important role to play in achieving the *Every Child Matters* agenda (see Best 2007) which is all too often hindered by the tension between the pastoral and the academic within schools (see Power 1996). This must be better understood and resolved to facilitate collaboration and cooperation especially as attainment (the academic) is interwoven with the pastoral (see Weare 2007).

Finally if every child is to matter there is the need for pupil voice in order to fulfil the intentions behind *Every Child Matters* (see Hopkins 2008). A number of issues in obtaining pupil voice and the nature of the voice that is sought have been raised (see Jakes 2010). These issues need to be realised and addressed to support and promote *Every Child Matters*.

2 Mattering

Mattering lends itself to such a wide variety of interpretations that the diversity in understanding and approach within and across various disciplines is perhaps to be expected. In relation to this study mattering means not only that the child has a voice but that it is heard. Not only is the child significant as a number on the school roll but as a dignified human person. Not only is the child seen but that he or she is regarded as significant and not only is the child's academic ability pursued but his or her whole being is nourished.

2.1 The theology of mattering

If a man has a hundred sheep and one of them wanders away, what will he do? Won't he leave the ninety-nine others on the hills and go out to search for the one that is lost? And if he finds it, I tell you the truth, he will rejoice over it more than over the ninety-nine that didn't wander away! (Matthew 18:12-14).

The idea of being found may be understood in terms of being significant. It is an idea which is evidenced within the scriptures time and again. The notion of mattering, the significance of the individual and the practice of being known, are all rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition. They are part of the relationship of the individual with God and this provides a tradition in which *Every Child Matters* may be said to belong.

God establishes a relationship between Himself and humanity, "So you will be my people, and I will be your God" (Jeremiah 30:22). This relationship is one in which His people matter, 'we are the people he cares for, the flock for which he provides' (Psalm 95:7). But it is not only humanity as a collective that is important to God as each individual is recognised above all things and is very special in His eyes.

When I consider your heavens,
the work of your fingers,
the moon and the stars,
which you have set in place,
what is man that you are mindful of him,
the son of man that you care for him? (Psalm 8:3-4).

The individual is special as a result of being known by God, 'You created my inmost self, knit me together in my mother's womb' (Psalm 139:13). Whilst in the gospel Jesus said 'Indeed, the very hairs of your head are all numbered' (Luke 12:7).

The relationship with God is strengthened through the expression of moral values, for example those contained in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7). Values that had become prominent in society were challenged by Jesus who taught that it was the righteous, the merciful and the pure in heart for example that mattered to God (Matthew 5:6-8). The scriptures also revealed that those who are marginalised within society are to be afforded dignity.

Hear this, you who trample the needy and do away with the poor of the land...skimping the measure, boosting the price and cheating with dishonest scales, buying the poor with silver and the needy for a pair of sandals (Amos 8:4-6).

And when a woman was brought before Jesus who had been caught in the act of adultery Jesus said,

'Has no-one condemned you?'

'No-one, sir,' she said.

'Then neither do I condemn you,' Jesus declared. 'Go now and leave your life of sin' (John 8:10-11).

Affording dignity to those who are marginalised is a concept which is reflected within the *Every Child Matters* agenda, where the needs of every child are identified and honoured.

The significance of the child evolved as previously in the scriptures the child mattered not as an individual human life but as a commodity which could be sacrificed to please God. Across the Abrahamic religions the sacrifice of Isaac is found within the Judeo-Christian tradition and the Qur'an.

When they reached the place God had told him about, Abraham built an altar there and arranged the wood on it. He bound his son Isaac and laid him on the altar, on top of the wood. Then he reached out his hand and took the knife to

slay his son. But the angel of the LORD called out to him from heaven, 'Abraham! Abraham!' 'Here I am,' he replied. 'Do not lay a hand on the boy,' he said. 'Do not do anything to him. Now I know that you fear God, because you have not withheld from me your son, your only son' (Genesis 22:9-12).

This is consistent with Ariès understanding of the evolution of childhood where children had been regarded as 'sacrificial offerings' (1962:39). It was not until the fourteenth century that the 'special nature' (Ariès 1962:129) of a child was recognised. The instrumental value of a child which was demonstrated by the practice of child sacrifice to God became obsolete. In its place a child's intrinsic value was revealed, for example when Jesus said

'And whoever welcomes a little child like this in my name welcomes me. But if anyone causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a large millstone hung around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea' (Matthew 18:5-6).

The principle to protect children from harm is echoed in the foundation of the *Every Child Matters* initiative (see section 1.1 and 1.5).

Through the actions of Jesus, children are shown to matter. Jesus welcomed opportunities to form relationships with children. In the gospels Jesus said "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them" (Matthew 19:14, Mark 10:14 and Luke 18:15). Jesus also responded to the individual needs of children. For example healing a boy possessed by an evil spirit,

'You deaf and mute spirit,' he said, 'I command you, come out of him and never enter him again.' The spirit shrieked, convulsed him violently and came out. The boy looked so much like a corpse that many said, 'He's dead.' But Jesus took him by the hand and lifted him to his feet, and he stood up (Mark 9:25-27).

The significance of the individual, the importance of relationships and the value of a child as a whole being not a commodity is evident throughout the scriptures. The theology of the Judeo-Christian approach to mattering is echoed within the values underpinned by *Every Child Matters*. It is to an understanding of the meaning of

matter within an educational framework that our attention must now turn and how this meaning can be utilised within schools.

2.2 The meaning of mattering

Macmurray distinguished between societies and communities and stated the difference between the two groups is that 'the intention involved in society lies beyond the nexus of relation which it establishes. In community it does not' (1968:58). Following this distinction, societies are defined as 'groups of people who are together for some external purpose...[and] treat each other as means to an end' (Stern 2007:284) and communities are defined as 'groups of people who are together for themselves...and treat each other as 'whole people'' (Stern 2007:284). In this respect schools function as societies because schools exist for an external purpose, for example the provision of qualifications and the training of young people for work. In order to foster a sense of community 'a network of wider social policies that desire to increase social cohesion and a sense of community' (Adams 2007:228) were introduced within schools. Community Cohesion is an example of one such policy (Ofsted 2008). Although the intention was to facilitate a sense of community, Community Cohesion became externally inspected and judged against fixed criteria. The practice of implementing policies and their subsequent inspection leaves one to consider whether it is the evidencing itself or the students whom it should benefit that matter.

When a student is treated as a whole person the student's intrinsic value and not only his or her instrumental value is recognised. Even when schools provide wider curriculum opportunities or enrichment activities such as extra-curricular clubs, trips, drop-down days and personal and social development, such opportunities are

set against the overwhelming burden of meeting stringent and exacting targets such provision fails to adequately foreground an ethic of care (Adams 2007:228).

The whole child ceases to matter because of the societal nature of schools. The practice of student voice and the concept of inclusion in schools are two means by

which students could matter as whole people, but current practice suggests that students are not treated as whole people who matter. Student voice and inclusion will now be discussed in turn.

Student voice has been defined as

a legitimate perspective and opinion, being present and taking part, and/or having an active role in decisions about and implementation of educational policies and practice (Holdsworth 2000:355).

The principal of student voice became prominent in schools in the 1990s (Cook-Sather 2006) although there are antecedents in the 1960s which demonstrate students being given a voice (see Neill 1962) or actively seeking a voice. For example the lack of student involvement within higher education establishments led to a number of students seeking a voice at the Hornsey College of Art (Nairn 2008 and Wright 2008) and at the London School of Economics in 1968. Similar experiences can be found across Europe in the same decade (Libcom 2006). In the wake of the student movement of the late 1960s a model for democracy within schools was provided by McPhail et. al. (1972). They said

some consider that the inalienable rights and freedom of the child are trampled on if pupils are not given a full voice in the running of the school (McPhail et. al. 1972:179).

The intention behind student voice is to enable students to play a role within the school, but intention does not necessarily equate to practice and student voice provides an example of how students can be treated as a means to an end. Schools are expected to hear the voice of the student (see for example Ofsted 2009a and 2009b). However, the transition from the more traditional teacher/student relationship to one where students have a voice has not been without issue (see for example Fielding and Rudduck 2002, Homan 2009, Jakes 2010 and Lumby 2011). Also it seems that 'increasingly institutional 'monitoring' is conflated with student voice as 'voice' is now interwoven with inspection requirements' (Jakes 2010). The student's voice matters to fulfil a purpose beyond its intention. When students have expressed their voice on issues that have not been initiated by the school (see for example BBC

2006 and Couchman 2006) it was reported as a protest rather than student voice with its positive associations. Where student voice is not used to inform decision making, decision making is then left to the teachers. Students are unable to take an active role within the school and the opinions of the students go unheard and do not matter.

In relation to *Every Child Matters*, obtaining student voice would support policy and practice within schools and 'there is no question that evidence of meeting each of the five outcomes would be significant' (Stern 2007:289). Without obtaining student voice in relation to *Every Child Matters*, mattering would be reduced to the accumulation of evidence based on the conceptualisation and interpretation by the school on what it means to matter under these five outcomes. When student voice is not heard or when it is not sought on matters that are important to the students but deemed important to the school, students are treated as 'less than their teachers' (Stern 2007:286). A school remains a society and cannot become a community as the student is not treated as a whole person whose opinion is equal to everyone else's.

The concept and practice of inclusion within schools is another example of how students may not be treated as whole people who matter. Although the notion of inclusion can be traced back to ancient Greek and ancient Roman times (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009) it is to the development of inclusion since the late nineteenth century that is pertinent to this study. Forster's Education Act of 1870 and Mundela's Education Act of 1880 resulted in children with various needs attending school the outcome of which was that

educationalists and society...came to the same conclusion that children with SEN [Special Educational Needs]...were limiting the educational progress of other 'normal' pupils (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009:59).

These Acts led to a Commission which observed

there are a great many backward children in our Elementary schools who require a different treatment to that of the ordinary children (RCBDD 1889:104).

It was therefore recommended that

feeble-minded children should be separated from ordinary scholars in public elementary schools in order that they may receive special instruction (RCBDD 1889:106).

However there was no distinction between those children who had a physical or a mental impairment or those with a disability. Children were subsequently categorised as either 'ordinary and normal' (Copeland 2003:45) or 'abnormal or subnormal' (Copeland 2003:45) and educated separately.

The 1944 Education Act introduced national intelligence quotient (IQ) testing and intelligence or ability was deemed to be something that was testable and fixed. During the time that followed the 1944 Act, children

were labelled, categorised and dispatched to special school placements with many never having the opportunity to discover if they could make progress in ordinary schools (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009:65).

Up until 1970 some students were considered 'ineducable' (Black-Hawkins et. al. 2007:8) and state education provision was not made for them. It was not until the 1970 Education Act which gave all children, regardless of their ability, the right to be educated that all children were afforded dignity and mattered. Whilst the intention was education for all, the segregation for children with learning difficulties continued. Towards the end of the 1960s and 1970s the ideology changed and it was thought that the

mainstreaming or integration of children with SEN [Special Educational Needs] into mainstream schools would facilitate their access to and participation in society, both as children and adults (Frederickson and Cline 2002:68).

This ideology was supported by the Warnock Report in 1978. It criticised the orthodoxy of segregation and recommended that a concept of special educational needs is introduced which should be met and delivered in mainstream schools.

Special Educational Needs acquired legal status in the 1981 Education Act but segregation continued and integration was subject to a 'postcode lottery' (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009:69). The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act in 2001

underpinned the rights of children with special educational needs to be educated within mainstream schools. Educational institutions

were not able to refuse children access to mainstream placements based upon the contention that they could not meet their individual needs (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009:75).

In the twenty-first century, inclusion includes students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) which has been defined and legalised. Inclusion also incorporates children with special needs or additional educational needs and includes children who are entitled to free school meals, those who are looked after children, those from an ethnic minority, those who have English as an additional language, gifted and talented children, a child's socio-economic status and traveller children (see for example Soan (ed) 2004).

The practice of inclusion can be honoured within the intentions behind *Every Child Matters* which 'even in its name, demands that educational inclusion and achievements are rights for all, not privileges for some' (Black-Hawkins 2007:12). However a tension has arisen,

the problem facing those committed to developing inclusive schools has been about mediating the tension between the demands for excellence in academic achievements with the principle of equity (Black-Hawkins 2007:20).

The demand for excellence in schools has developed because teachers have become

subject to a growing performance model of practice, which seeks to govern not only the inputs and processes but also the outputs of education (Osborn 2006:252).

The conflict has stemmed from

the drive for greater efficiency and increased accountability [which], transforms learning into 'performing'...for it describes a unidirectional, transmission-based relationship between teacher action and pupil learning (Adams 2007:228).

The 'marketisation of education' (Hartley 2009:428) rather than an education system centred on the well-being of the whole child has emerged.

This tension has led to a change of focus as schools must now demonstrate the progress and attainment of various groups of students (Ofsted 2012). Whilst the achievement of all students should matter, the academic achievement of some students matters more to the school than others. This is perhaps because the achievements of some groups of students benefits the school in terms of league tables and additional funding, which reduces the student to a commodity rather than treating him or her as a whole person. The importance of mattering for the individual beyond the benefit to the school will now be discussed.

Mattering to significant others

The importance of mattering for psychological well-being has been documented (Coopersmith 1967, Rosenberg and McCullough 1981 and Rosenberg 1985) and its distinction from self-esteem identified. Self-esteem is the 'degree of liking or satisfaction with the self' (Marshall 2001:486) whereas mattering is '*the psychological tendency to evaluate the self as significant to specific other people*' (Marshall 2001:474). It is the tendency in people to evaluate whether or not they are significant to others and therefore matter that is pertinent to this study. Evaluating the self as significant or mattering to specific others has the potential to inform an individual of the extent to which he or she matters and therefore belongs. This sense of belonging is important as it reduces the feeling of being peripheral to the social context of the group and increases the individual's sense of well-being.

There is a distinction between belonging to a group which is not sufficient to elicit feelings of mattering and evaluating the self as significant or mattering within a group. Although unification and identity have been created within schools, for example through an awareness of common values or practices, the wearing of a school uniform, singing the school song or the presence of an ethos statement or a school motto, these can lead to a superficial sense of belonging and leave the student feeling as though he or she does not matter. To elicit feelings of mattering a person's

presence in a group must be acknowledged; he or she must feel important to the group and he or she must feel that they make significant contributions to that group (France and Finney 2009). When an individual perceives that they matter it also provides a 'sense of meaning for existence' (Marshall 2001:474) which is important to well-being.

The concept of mattering has three broad components, attention or awareness; an individual matters because others realise the individual exists, importance; an individual matters because others are concerned about that individual and dependence or reliance; an individual matters when others rely on that individual (France and Finney 2009). There are a number of ways a person can evaluate the self as significant or mattering to other people. How an individual perceives they matter is based on their interpretation of the quality and quantity of behaviours from significant others (Luria 1973). This is achieved in a variety of ways. One way that behaviour is interpreted by an individual is by being aware of the behaviour from significant others and assigning a meaning to the behaviour. This acts as an indicator of mattering and is a process that is socially learned. Another way that behaviour is interpreted is through social comparison (Pettigrew 1967). An individual compares the attention a person gives to them to the attention the same person gives to someone else, which allows the individual to interpret the extent to which they matter. A third way that the behaviour of other people can be interpreted is through reflective cognitions (Rosenberg 1990). An individual compares past events of mattering to a specific person with current events and he or she then uses them to judge the extent to which they matter. It has also been suggested that mattering is a relational dimension of identity (Josselson 1994) which emerges from eye to eye validation from specific other people to inform an individual of their identity. Therefore interpersonal interaction develops a person's perception of mattering.

If an adolescent's perception of mattering is interpreted through the quality and quantity of behaviours from significant other people towards them, then the actions of the teacher as a significant other person is central. As the classroom is the place where a student spends the most amount of their time at school the teacher is therefore the person the student spends the most amount of time with. Teaching

involves an 'emotional labour' (Johnson et. al. 2005:105) on behalf of the teacher which is then experienced by the student. What takes place within the classroom needs to be known from both a teacher and a student perspective. Due to the fact that the teacher's behaviour is being interpreted and evaluated by the students, a teacher must not only be aware that such interpretations are taking place but recognise the potential implications of their behaviour. If a student perceives he or she does not matter it could affect his or her relationship with the teacher and the extent to which a student fulfils his or her potential.

This interpretation by students of the self in relation to significant other people within the school also raises important issues for pastoral care and the role of the tutor. The tutor is the only person who has contact with the student every day and is, therefore, ideally placed to know each student in his or her care and provide attention to reaffirm the student's existence as an individual who matters. This has become more difficult with the emphasis on standards which has had 'implications for their [teachers] pastoral role' (Hammersley-Fletcher and Qualter 2010:906). Osborn concluded

that in an effort to raise standards, there has been a re-focusing of the group tutor role to include more academic support and personal planning (2006:248).

The attention a tutee receives from their tutor may not always be positive if it is based on academic progress and performance rather than on issues relating to the whole child. A tutee may only have access to their tutor's time based on a predetermined appointment system, rendering the student invisible or interpreted by the student to mean that they do not matter to the tutor all the time. If attention is associated with mattering, students may behave negatively to gain attention in order to matter to their tutor, their teachers and pastoral staff. Finally, if an adolescent's perception of mattering is also achieved through social comparisons and reflective cognitions the dynamics within a classroom and the school itself take on a greater significance. For example the setting or streaming of students can be interpreted by the students to reveal whether they belong and matter. Fast-tracking gifted and talented students or placing them in a top or higher group, whilst limiting curriculum opportunities for those students in a lower or bottom group, treats the student as a means to an end rather

than a whole person when ability and performance are the criteria used to measure the extent to which an individual matters within a school.

The subjective perceptions and interpretations of individuals to significant other people led Marshall (2001) as well as France and Finney (2009) to empirically measure and evaluate mattering. Although measures of mattering have been constructed, one was not found that measured the extent to which secondary school students perceived they mattered to their teachers. Marshall (2001) developed a measure of mattering and undertook an empirical study of adolescents and their perceived sense of mattering to parents and friends. There were two findings to consider in relation to this research which will be discussed. The first was that male and female adolescents thought that they mattered more to their mother than their father. With teachers acting in loco parentis how do male teachers, particularly in secondary school, convey mattering to their students and do students perceive they matter more to female teachers rather than male teachers? The second is that the adolescents reported 'too much control' (Marshall 2001:486) by their parents left them 'feeling as though they matter less' (Marshall 2001:486), and this was negatively associated with mothers. In terms of schooling, controlling the class, usually referred to as behaviour management, is often the focus within the class rather than caring for students (Adams 2007) or fulfilling the student's pastoral needs via the teacher's tutor role (Osborn 2006). Rogers (1986) recommended that teachers let go of the more teacherly qualities in order to facilitate personal growth and learning. If students felt less controlled and more cared for how might a student's sense of self-worth and behaviour be affected?

Treating the child as a whole person within a community is central to eliciting a sense of mattering. As soon as a school becomes 'function-dominated' (Stern 2007:286) it ceases to be a community and an opportunity to establish relationships between students and between students and teachers may be lost. Adams remarked

the standards agenda cannot be said to engender an education that culminates in caring relationships, for the care it does promote between teacher and pupil centres on attributes external to both: quality, curriculum, tests (2007:228).

France and Finney warn that if other people's 'reliance on us is too great, it may lead to increased amounts of stress' (2009:106). Stress associated with teaching has been documented (Johnson et. al 2005, Chaplin 2008 and Moriarty et. al. 2001). With government policies seeking the 'endless re-trainable employee' (Furlong 2008:735) along with the 'crippling emphasis on examination targets' (Watson 2006:253) and the 'terrors of performativity' (Ball 2003:215), feelings of stress in teachers may be heightened. As a consequence there may be less attention for individual students, less time afforded to the whole person and an increase in treating the student as a commodity to meet school based and teacher based targets.

Lumby cited that 'an absence of enjoyment is one of the foundational reasons for young people failing to achieve their potential' (2011:248). Having recognised that students 'must enjoy in order to learn' (Lumby 2011:247) poor relationships with teachers was identified as a central reason why students did not enjoy school especially by 'disaffected and disengaged' (Lumby 2011:261) students. Research suggests that even the most vulnerable students who are at risk of exclusion can achieve academically within a relationship of mattering (Harris et. al. 2006). Within a school community which promotes an ethic of care (Adams 2007), students could succeed through the relationships which are established as a result of being significant to other people and mattering as a whole person.

The challenge is how to incorporate the purpose of schooling and academic success with the community needs of those within it. Establishing a sense of community and mattering poses a greater challenge with the volume and variety of staff within secondary schools. For example the presence of teachers who do not want to form or be part of a school community, as well as supply teachers who can only establish limited relationships and who may have been appointed to teach a subject rather than the students. Subsumed within interpersonal interaction are not only one's actions but one's words. How people speak to one another and the use of dialogue to inform mattering will now be considered.

Communicating mattering

Teaching is a 'relational and dialogical task' (Bartholo et. al. 2010:879). Having discussed the relational aspect, it is Buber's concept of dialogue which will be used to illustrate the dialogical task of teaching in relation to mattering. To engage in dialogue is to be present and the 'present arises only in virtue of the fact that the *Thou* becomes present' (Buber 1958:26).

Dialogue enables people to treat each other properly and Buber stressed the need for people to treat each other in 'I-thou' rather than 'I-it' relationships. He said

the separated *It* of institutions is an animated clod without soul, and the separated *I* of feelings an uneasily-fluttering soul-bird. Neither of them knows man: institutions know only the specimen, feeling only the 'object'; neither knows the person, or mutual life (Buber 1958:63).

Buber suggested that true dialogue can only occur when the full existence of another is recognised. Within secondary schools recognising the full existence of a student can be a challenge. Students are taught by specialist subject teachers who teach hundreds of students each week. Knowing the full existence of every child when the teacher may not know the name of each child presents a challenge. With thirty students in a class and bells indicating that something should be beginning or ending, a child's full existence may be set-aside and replaced by his or her superficial existence. For example labelling a student based on his or her behaviour or inclusion category which may include a special educational need.

For Buber the fundamental role of the educator is

to be the support of a trust-based dialogical relation, which works as a pact between two persons [and is] a necessary condition for the pupil *to learn to ask* (Bartholo et. al. 2010:871).

Within and beyond the classroom students have learnt to ask, but perhaps the issue is whether the teacher has learnt to listen. Responding to what a student says is one way a teacher indicates to the student whether he or she has been heard and

matters. The tone and/or content of the response by the teacher may reveal how far a student can extend his or her trust. The opportunity for a dialogical relationship is limited within schools as teaching and learning has become a 'transmission of knowledge' (Adams 2007:228).

Stern suggested that

perhaps those working in schools should ask whether their institutions are 'well ordered' and 'harmonious' but unable to know people as the schools are 'animated clods without a soul'. Such institutions are likely to be those in which outcomes matter but in which people do not matter for their own sake, but only for some external ends. In those institutions, it cannot be that every child really matters (2007:289).

This is rather naive as the fact remains that students and teachers are operating within a performance driven environment. The challenge therefore is to ensure each child matters *in spite* of the current educational climate.

Every Child Matters supports the whole child approach by focusing on the social, emotional, physical, mental and spiritual development of the child in conjunction with the academic. To facilitate the education and well-being of the whole child, the student's spiritual development should not be overlooked even if it is not explicitly stated as an outcome of *Every Child Matters*. Spirituality offers a balance to the focus on performance and standards which has

demonstrated an unbalanced emphasis on economic and utilitarian aims, leading to an over-emphasis on school as a competitive market where the child is unable to flourish and grow as a person, or to be listened to (Watson 2006:253).

What has emerged in this chapter is that mattering is honoured when the child is seen as a whole person and when a school operates as a community within which individuals can achieve. This provides a means by which teachers and students can communicate via 'I-thou' rather than 'I-it' relationships (Buber 1958). To create a community those within the school must feel a sense of belonging and to belong goes beyond being identified with a school through such means as a common uniform. To

belong to a school an individual must be acknowledged, feel important and be able to make significant contributions. The student also validates whether they matter through interpreting the behaviour of significant other people. A community is also established in the way people communicate with one another. Relationships based on care rather than commodity and dialogue based on recognising the full existence of another rather than teachers talking at students is crucial. Chapter three discusses how the concept of mattering might be studied within secondary schools through the voices of the teachers and the students.

3 Methods

One can elect to use a research method but honouring that method in the field can present a challenge. One needed to learn how to suspend the role of the teacher and the skills associated with teaching and inhabit the role of the researcher. This was learnt through practise and reflection and it is this journey that follows.

3.1 The journey to *Every Child Matters* and mattering

Since the researcher began her training to be a teacher in September 2000, she has continued to attend seminars and courses as well as receive in-service training (Inset) days on child protection. The focus has been on how to identify a potential child protection issue, how to keep oneself safe as a teacher when faced with a potential child protection issue and how to respond on behalf of the school to the student. During the researcher's first year of teaching at her current school in 2006, child protection training was provided as part of an Inset day under a heading called *Every Child Matters*. For the first time, the researcher heard some of the events surrounding the death of Victoria Climbié (see section 1.1 and 1.5) which were shared to highlight the necessity of child protection and the consequences of failing to protect children. For the researcher, *Every Child Matters* (DfES 2003) was a new initiative. However, during the remainder of that Inset day, no other references were made to this initiative and it appeared that the school and the staff could continue with the 'business of teaching and learning'. It seemed as though the role of the teacher was to teach whether that be an exam syllabus, Agreed syllabus or the National Curriculum and be mindful to report any child protection issues.

There seemed to be a tension between the aims of *Every Child Matters* and the aims of the school. Staff meetings, department time and staff development training along with the introduction in 2009 of tutor *mentoring* rather than tutor *time* centred on results and performance. Whereas the *Every Child Matters* Green paper aimed

to reduce the numbers of children who experience educational failure, engage in offending or anti-social behaviour, suffer from ill health, or become teenage parents (DfES 2003:5).

Achieving these aims would enable 'well-being' (Knowles 2009:1) and well-being was broken down into five outcomes: Being healthy, Staying safe, Enjoying and achieving, Making a positive contribution and Economic well-being. Schools have found a way to quantify well-being through measures, such as the introduction of these five outcomes as a heading on a lesson plan pro forma, a scheme of work pro forma and Individual Pupil Portraits for example. Whilst reward trips, celebration evenings, reward assemblies, Principal lunches, merits, letters or postcards home and gift vouchers are evidence of Enjoying and achieving for example. Increasingly, textbooks, exam syllabuses and external courses for teaching staff all purport how the *Every Child Matters* initiative will be fulfilled through, for example, a particular taught subject. But these claims cannot be measured and reveal a bureaucratisation of *Every Child Matters*. With this tension identified, an appropriate methodology was sought in order to conduct a study of the *Every Child Matters* initiative in secondary schools across three curriculum areas religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education.

3.2 The choice of method

There is no shortage of literature available to support a researcher in the decision making process of selecting a suitable methodology (Bell 2005, Bogdan and Biklen 2003, Burgess 1984b, Cohen et. al. 2007, Denzin and Lincoln (ed) 2005, Lankshear and Knobel 2004, Punch 2009 and Wilson (ed) 2009). In order to study the *Every Child Matters* initiative the researcher needed to access the experiences of those who were required to implement the initiative and the experiences of those who were to feel its effects. To this end a number of possible research methodologies were considered.

The use of questionnaires and surveys would have facilitated the acquisition of data from a large number of participants without geographical limitations. However there are a number of disadvantages to their use. It was thought that whilst a questionnaire or survey method would have produced a large amount of data, the researcher would have to interpret the data rather than listen to the participant (Denscombe 1998). Questionnaires and surveys can also be returned incomplete or not returned at all

perhaps because what is being asked of the participant cannot be clarified resulting in data collection degenerating into 'tick boxes'. Participants are often limited by the options or space provided which prevents any elaboration or clarification and it would therefore only be in response to predetermined, pre-sequenced and prescribed questions or statements that participants would be able to respond. Written data collection methods may also limit participation as some student participants may not engage as well with such a method for example students with special educational needs (Kormos et. al. 2009, Lennox et. al. 2005 and Ward and Simons 1998). Due to these concerns questionnaires and surveys were not pursued by the researcher.

Accessing documents in order to study the *Every Child Matters* initiative was considered. Such an approach would have been useful in order to reveal the intentions and the practice of the school(s). However knowing which documents to look at and being granted permission to access documents such as emails, reports, audits, behaviour logs, career professional development events, schemes of work or lesson plans, assemblies, tutor folders and the minutes of meetings in different schools would, due to data protection issues, be difficult (Hanafin et. al. 2010). Schools may also be reluctant to provide documentation for the purpose of their contents being checked and analysed in terms of whether the *Every Child Matters* initiative was supported. Documents were also unlikely to reveal the experience of the student participants who were to feel the effects of *Every Child Matters*. So much takes place within a school that is not written down that to limit this study to available or permissible documents was unlikely to provide an accurate account on which to draw conclusions. Consequently the use of documents was not pursued.

Participant observation would have allowed for interactions between staff, staff/teachers and students, students and students, students and parents and parents/students and teachers during formal settings (lessons, assemblies, parent evenings, detentions and meetings) as well as informal settings (break time, lunch time, movement between lessons, time in pastoral, students arriving/leaving school and clubs) to be captured. The advantage is that the method of collecting data would not be contrived but obtained in a typical setting or situation (Jarvie 2005). However there are a number of disadvantages to its use. Such a methodology might lead to

the teacher-researcher becoming an outsider as any interaction or observation could become 'data' and create a tension between the teacher-researcher role (Cohen et. al. 2007). As the teacher-researcher was in a position to observe a great deal of interaction, the boundaries between formal and informal data collection risked being blurred. Participant observation would also have entailed the researcher interpreting what she observed rather than providing the participants with an opportunity to share their experiences and hear their voice. Whilst such a methodology might have been possible within the researcher's own school it would not have been possible within the confines of this study to undertake participant observation in other schools and therefore it was not pursued.

Diarying and/or blogging might have been a solution to the logistical constraints of participant observation by the researcher (Bourque and Back 2005). Participants could be drawn from a wide geographical area and this approach could provide a large amount of data. Diaries and/or blogs offer the chance for the participant to record and share what they choose to in their own words allowing the researcher to hear their voice. However there are practical considerations with this method. The researcher could not assume that every participant would have access to the internet, especially student participants and the technical knowledge of safeguarding teacher participants and student participants in terms of E-policies would be beyond the skill of the researcher. Finding a way to ensure that teacher participants and student participants completed their diary entries or blogs may limit participation or result in entries being incomplete. Conversely a great number of entries may be submitted but the entries may not be focused on the study at hand. Written methods of data collection may not engage all student participants for example students with special educational needs and it could be regarded by some student participants as extra homework. There are also ethical considerations with this methodology. Diaries or blogs may not be kept confidential by the participants and identify the school, the staff or its students. Also a written method of data collection by the participants themselves which is given to the researcher is a permanent record of a potentially sensitive nature unlike for example an interview that is being recorded where the recorder can be turned off. Consequently diaries and blogs were not used because

there were practical issues and ethical issues which were insurmountable within the confines of this study.

A case study of the researcher's school would have provided ample access to potential participants. However there are a number of disadvantages (Stake 1995) to this approach. The findings would be limited to the experiences at one school. A case study would not have allowed for the experience of other colleagues in similar roles in different schools to be known and the wider influence of the *Every Child Matters* initiative to be understood. The possible tension between researchers and teachers has been documented (Bogdan and Biklen 2003, Burgess 1984b and Delamont 1992) and as a teacher-researcher there are further possible tensions to be considered (Burgess 1984b and Lofland et. al. 2006). Although tension can be valuable as it can illuminate findings, deliberately creating tension between the researcher and her participants was to be avoided by the researcher in order to maintain the relationships that she had established with her colleagues. Whilst the depth that could be afforded by a case study was desirable, its limitations meant it was not pursued. It was not desirable for one's own colleagues and friends to become one's participants or for the teacher-researcher to become an outsider within the institution where she works.

A structured interview would enable comparisons to be made between participants. It would also have practical advantages as a methodology. As the questions are prescribed, an interview could be conducted by more than one person and this would facilitate the recruitment of a larger number of participants removing any geographical limitations (Anderson 1998). However there is a number of disadvantages. A criticism of quantitative research methods is that they generate 'data...to test existing theories by logically deducing hypotheses from them' (Charmaz 2004:516). A structured interview would impose the preconceived agenda of the interviewer onto the interviewee, with limited interest on elaboration or deviation to the questions by the participant. Whilst the researcher must listen to the participant it is only in response to what the researcher wishes to hear about rather than what the participant wishes to say. In order to study the *Every Child Matters* initiative, the researcher's study needed to go beyond her understanding and experience. Prior to recruiting any

participants, the researcher spoke separately with six secondary school teachers who taught religious studies, citizenship and/or personal, social, health and economic education in four different secondary schools in one county during 2008-09 in a variety of formal and informal settings. It was apparent from the discussions with those teachers about the 2008 National Curriculum and the *Every Child Matters* initiative that more was revealed during the discussions than the researcher would have thought to ask.

The researcher decided that a less structured interview was the most appropriate methodology in terms of data collection. It had clear boundaries for the researcher and the participants as only information collected during an interview would be used for analysis. The purpose behind the researcher's interview approach was to listen to the teacher and the student participants rather than impose the researcher's assumptions and opinions to allow the experience of the participants to be heard.

3.3 Constructing realities

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the *Every Child Matters* initiative in secondary schools across three curriculum areas in order to capture the experiences of those who are to honour *Every Child Matters* as well as those who are to feel its effects through the voices of the teacher and student participants. It also seeks to illuminate what it means to matter. The researcher was initially drawn to a Grounded Theory approach (Charmaz 2004, Glaser 2012 and Strauss and Corbin 1990) and had thought that it would underpin the basis of her methodology. Grounded theory advocates that

One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge (Strauss and Corbin 1990:23).

Grounded theory is 'the discovery of theory from data' (Glaser and Strauss 1967:1). The publication of *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists* (Strauss 1987) and *Basics of Qualitative Research* (Strauss and Corbin 1990) has provided those wishing to adopt this methodology with a formulaic approach to grounded theory.

As a teacher-researcher responsible for the three curriculum areas of concern to this study within her own school and interviewing teacher and student participants whom she knew and was known, it led to a personal involvement within her research (this is amplified in sections 3.10, 3.11 and 3.12). She identified with the view that everyday life is

a world I share with others...I also know, of course, that the others have a perspective on this common world that is not identical with mine (Berger and Luckmann 1966:37).

Her initial instinct in view of her status within the school was to listen to and implement government prescriptions as far as they could be understood. In the course of the research however, this predisposition was found to change and the reciprocity of teacher and student voice and government initiative provided a tension which became the focus of the research and of which the researcher became a more neutral observer (see section 3.1, 3.4 and 5.1). Holding a position of trust and authority within her school and her unquestioning acceptance of 'they way things are done here' meant she did not have cause to look beyond her own institution. Undertaking this study provided an opportunity for the teacher-researcher to reflect and see beyond her own reality and to experience and to acknowledge the reality of others.

Interviewing teacher and student participants led to an awareness that there was no single reality and instead reality varied in each school and for each participant.

Reality is socially defined. But the definitions are always *embodied*, that is, concrete individuals and groups of individuals serve as definers of reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966:134).

A number of considerations came into play as the researcher became aware of the existence of several parallel realities rather than one. The researcher was persuaded that reality is dependent on social interaction. It was at this point the researcher recognised there were compelling features of an alternative methodology which were more appropriate although the use of line by line coding was retained (Charmaz

2004). It became apparent that her subjectivity as a researcher 'was inextricably linked with the conduct of the research and the construction of knowledge' (Duckett et. al. 2008:103). This is evident in the method she used which is the focus of this chapter as well as her analysis and subsequent findings (see Chapter 4).

Accordingly the theoretical foundation of this research is 'social constructionism'. Social constructionism acknowledges that 'reality is always an interpreted, perceived, and negotiated reality' (Bürigi et. al. 2005:19). It can be defined as a

theory of knowledge that considers how social phenomena develop in particular social contexts. A social construction (social construct) is a concept or practice that may appear to be natural and obvious to those who accept it, but is regarded by the sociologist as an invention or artefact of a particular culture or society (Gilbert 2008:514).

Constructionism and constructivism share 'fundamental assumptions' (Burr 2003:19) and have been used interchangeably within the literature (Burr 2003, Duckett et. al. 2008, Homan 2012 and Jackson 2009). As the theoretical foundation of this research is more akin to a sociological perspective and the seminal work of Berger and Luckmann rather than to a psychological tradition, the term constructionism rather than constructivism is used hereafter (Burr 2003).

The term 'social construction' was founded by sociologists who were working in the field of the sociology of knowledge and who were seeking to answer the question 'How does reality come to be?' Influential in this field were Max Scheler (1874-1928), Karl Mannheim (1893-1947) and Alfred Shultz (1899-1959). The notable contribution made by Berger and Luckmann in their work *The Social Construction of Reality* (1966) was their suggestion that reality was constructed through human interaction rather than as a product of human thought.

Berger and Luckmann argue that a person's subjectivity is objectively available. Consequently society is a human product of an objective reality and they believe all knowledge derives from and is maintained by social interaction. Berger and Luckmann's approach to knowledge

drew on, the idea that the structures of our knowledge are social in origin – that they are not either divinely inspired, inherent in our minds, or in a world external to us (Young 2008:5).

For Berger and Luckmann, everyday life presents itself as a reality which originates in people's thoughts and actions and is 'subjectively meaningful to them as a coherent world' (1966:33). Everyday life is expressed through language and an 'understanding of language is thus essential for any understanding of the reality of everyday life' (Berger and Luckmann 1966:51-52). The purpose of using a semi-structured interview within this study was to reveal everyday life through the language of the teacher and the student participants in order to construct a shared reality. Berger and Luckmann advocate 'a purely descriptive method [of analysis], and, as such, 'empirical' but not 'scientific' (1966:34).

According to Berger and Luckmann, society is then understood in terms of 'an ongoing dialectical process composed of...externalization, objectivation and internalization' (1966:149). Externalization is understood as our use of language that makes our personal experience available or accessible to other people. Our worlds become objectivations because they express and externalise our subjective meaning and enable a shared use that can be used in many places and at different times. Internalization refers to the process of these objectivations becoming part of the human consciousness and shared with others.

The extent to which it is possible to speak on behalf of others as a legitimate authority when listening to the voice of others (Alcoff 2009) and/or empathise with another person(s) experience especially within the realm of religion (Jackson 1997) has not been without discussion and it has been suggested that speaking for others is 'socially constructed' (Alcoff 2009:120).

Social constructionists have applied the ideas of Berger and Luckmann to a wide range of areas including medical ethics, religion, sexuality/identity, childhood and voice (see for example Burr 2003, Clark and Moss 2011, Duckett et. al. 2008, Jackson 1997, 2005 and 2009, Kitzinger 1987 and Lawlor 2010). For example

social constructionist methodologies are particularly prevalent in work conducted under the newer conceptualization of childhood in which children's voices and participation are sought (Duckett et. al. 2008:94).

A social construct methodology provided a means to 'understand the lived experience of being at school from the pupil's perspective' (Duckett et. al. 2008:94). This perspective has been embraced in recent literature on the sociology of children for example that of Alderson and Morrow 2004, Clark and Moss 2011, Greig et. al. 2007 and Percy-Smith and Thomas (ed) 2010. One must also be mindful that

teachers do not always agree, and that they speak in individualized and dissonant voices that have been shaped by immense variations in the contexts in which they teach (Atkinson and Rosiek 2009:177).

Social constructionism honours the voices of the individual rather than assumes a single voice of a profession.

Pertinent to this study is how social constructionism has been applied as a means of method and analysis within religion which is one of the subject areas in relation to this study. One of the leading thinkers in modern religious education, Robert Jackson, developed an interpretive approach to religious education theory both in terms of religious education which incorporated academic and curriculum aspects and religious nurture which included the transmission of religious culture often by the family. Within religious education, Jackson became 'aware of one's own self and personal and social understandings in interpreting the testimony of someone from another way of life' (1997:30) and this awareness enables the researcher to construct meaning alongside their participants. By

comparing and contrasting elements of one's own language and experience with that of insiders, as well as examining the interplay of the individual insider's experience and behaviour with the wider symbolic context of language, imagery and practice – provides a means to elucidate another's way of life (Jackson 1997:46).

Jackson's approach recognises the place for the researcher's personal response and presuppositions which are to be welcomed and put to use (Jackson 2009, 2005 and 1997).

To understand how the terms *Every Child Matters* and mattering are used and understood, and how they vary across different groups of people a social constructionist approach was chosen. The theoretical foundation of this research allows the researcher to challenge the notion that both mattering and each child matters are 'givens' to be accepted as objective reality. Rather, they can be regarded as 'constructed' by members of that world and which, although appearing to be objective, are intersubjective. Within this study the researcher sought to listen to the experiences of teacher participants and student participants to discover how the *Every Child Matters* initiative has been adapted and mediated from its original formulation within schools and how mattering is honoured and felt.

Social constructionism advocates that

learning is a social, participatory activity rather than a cognitive activity, emphasizing that the human agent's understanding resides, first and foremost, in the practices in which s/he is involved and that knowledge is not discovered but rather created (Petit and Huault 2008:78).

As both a teacher and a researcher she recognises her involvement in the study and her creation of knowledge in collaboration, comparison and contrast with her participants.

In the course of this study there were two groups of participants, teachers and students. In both cases the selection of the group was rational and opportunist: participants of course had to be both willing and available. The teachers, being of the same professional community as the researcher but in different schools, were approached provisionally and from a larger number eight teachers and one non-teaching member of staff were selected because it was clear that they represented a range of interpretations of *Every Child Matters* (see section 3.6). The student participants were chosen from a group who signified a willingness to participate within the researchers own school (see sections 3.6 and 3.7). There were two phases of student recruitment. Student participants were initially drawn from the Student Council or Teaching and Learning Student Leadership group. Reflecting on this

practice revealed that participation was low and the voice of the student experience was limited and therefore the researcher sought an increased number of participants and a more varied student voice (see section 3.7).

The following notes may clarify the roles of the participants without disclosing their identities (see Appendix 1). Teacher J was the head of personal, social, health and economic education and the head of citizenship education at an 11-18 mixed comprehensive school. Teacher N was the head of humanities, the head of religious education, the head of citizenship and the head of personal, social, health and economic education with responsibility for line managing the head of geography and the head of history at an 11-18 mixed comprehensive school. Teacher PA was the head of humanities which included leading religious education, citizenship, history and geography at an 11-16 mixed comprehensive school serving a large town. Teacher S was formerly the head of religious education although at the time of the interview due to internal restructuring was a teacher of religious education at an 11-16 mixed comprehensive school serving a large town. Teacher G was the head of religious studies in Key Stages 3 and 4 also the head of personal, social, health and economic education and the head of citizenship education at Key Stage 4 in an 11-16 mixed comprehensive school serving a large town. Teacher D was the assistant headteacher whose responsibilities included personal, social, health and economic education in an 11-16 mixed faith school with a wide catchment area which included a well-known deprived urban area receiving European funding for regeneration. Teacher P was the head of religious education in an 11-16 mixed faith school with a wide catchment area which included a well-known deprived urban area receiving European funding for regeneration. Teacher M was an assistant headteacher whose responsibilities included Every Child Matters in a recently established 11-16 mixed comprehensive school within a large city. Mr G was an environmental co-ordinator and a non-teaching member of staff who worked with students and had extensive experience listening and responding to student voice at an 11-18 mixed comprehensive school. Teacher PA and Teacher S worked at the same school, Teacher D and Teacher P worked at the same school and Teacher N and Mr G worked at the same school.

Student Angus was a Year 10 student who had been a Student Leader on the Teaching and Learning group for an academic year. Student Paige was a Year 9 student who had been a member of the Student Council for an academic year. Students Harry and Leon were Year 8 students. They were identified as challenging students as they were high profile in the school and had spent extensive amounts of time in Isolation and in Pastoral being seen by their pastoral manager. Students Rita and Amy were Year 10 students. They were identified as challenging as they had spent a significant amount of time in Isolation and in Pastoral being seen by their pastoral manager. They had recently become members of the Student Council. Students Jordan and Joe were Year 10 students. Student Joe was identified as a special educational needs student and they were both identified as challenging students as they had spent extensive amounts of time in Isolation and in Pastoral being seen by their pastoral manager. Students Ben and Brad were Year 9 students. They were identified as challenging and as special educational needs students. Both had spent extensive amounts of time in Isolation and in Pastoral being seen by their pastoral manager. Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily were Year 10 students. They were identified as gifted and talented students. The student participants attended an 11-18 mixed comprehensive school.

There were two phases with regards to interviewing participants during this study (this is amplified in sections 3.4 and 3.5). Although the researcher sought the voice of the teacher and student participants and created a semi-structured interview, her interview with Teacher J, Teacher N, Teacher PA and Teacher S during Phase 1 revealed a structured approach where the researcher collected information and imposed her own perspective onto her participants rather than facilitate listening to their experience. Phase 2 (see section 3.5) reveals how the researcher learnt how to conduct a less structured interview by preparing one initial question rather than having a prescribed list or sequence of questions with Teacher G, Teacher D, Teacher P, Teacher M and Mr G and Students Harry and Leon, Students Rita and Amy, Students Jordan and Joe, Students Ben and Brad and Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily. This allowed the researcher to listen to the experience of her participants in order to unlock their voice and reveal their reality rather than imposing her own reality.

3.4 Asking questions – Phase 1 The development of the methodology

In accordance with the practice of Powney and Watts who recognised that

several interviewers working on the same project do not automatically share the same perspectives and even if they did, their presentations or styles of interview will incur different perceptions and reactions from the people being interviewed (1987:37)

the researcher decided to conduct all her teacher participant and student participant interviews herself to ensure consistency.

The reliability of the data that was obtained was strengthened because there was only one interviewer. However she was mindful of the fact that the responses from the participants were what they wanted to reveal to the researcher during that interview. A researcher using another methodology may not have the same response or may not interpret the same response in the same way that she has (Cohen et. al. 2007, Corbin 2011 and Denscombe 1998).

In preparation for the teacher participant interviews, interview questions were prepared and piloted during a seminar at the University of Brighton in which the researcher was invited to present her study to date (see Appendix 2). To investigate the experience of colleagues in similar roles in other secondary schools it was considered necessary to know what initiatives teacher participants had to implement and whether *Every Child Matters* was one of them. It was thought that by identifying initiatives that were underway in school(s) a teacher participant's knowledge of an initiative equated to the initiative having an influence. Therefore in order to achieve this she planned to ask about initiatives and provide a list of them that teacher participants would be able to 'tick'. The purpose of asking about the initiatives was to illuminate whether or not the *Every Child Matters* agenda was a focus of the school. She also considered including some bogus initiatives within the list that was to be given to the teacher participants to monitor how honest they were being. The feedback from those present during the seminar was very critical of a testing

approach and this was not taken into the field by the researcher. It may have caused anxiety if teacher participants thought that there were initiatives they were unaware of which had been implemented in the researcher's school when in fact they were not real. To test or trick teacher participants would have been unethical and could have had serious consequences in terms of their participation or their colleagues participation in the research (Bogdan and Biklen 2003). Providing teacher participants with a list of initiatives was also considered too restricting and was not taken in to the field.

Reflection on the feedback from the seminar followed by discussions with her supervisor enabled the researcher to reduce the list of possible interview questions to four interview questions. The researcher was aware that she needed the participants to talk. The intention was for open-ended questions which would also act as a means of obtaining data that would facilitate analysis as it would be based around the questions asked (Anderson 1998). The four questions that were taken into the field for the first phase of teacher participant interviews were

1. What initiatives is everyone talking about in [name of school]?
2. My main interest is *Every Child Matters* – is *Every Child Matters* on your school agenda?
3. How far does your practice and department support *Every Child Matters*?
4. What is happening with your department and the new 2008 National Curriculum?

Three teacher participant interviews were conducted with Teacher J, Teacher N and Teacher PA within two weeks of each other in June 2009 using the four interview questions. At the end of the interview each teacher participant asked about the researcher's own school in relation to the questions she had asked. It was necessary and appropriate to share what was happening at the researcher's school because without being prepared to be open the researcher may not have had such frank and honest responses from the participants that were afforded to her (Lankshear and Knobel 2004). As the researcher's school was aware of the nature of her study and no restrictions were placed upon her, discussing initiatives and the National Curriculum at her own school did not break any confidences.

It became apparent that the researcher would need to do this. Anxiety was expressed by the teacher participants and a need to compare their answers with the practice at another school mirroring the interview itself where the teacher-researcher had compared her role with the teacher participant in other schools. One teacher participant said,

I'm very poor at this actually, you know I wish I did have a better system, if someone else has got a really good system of prioritising things I'd be quite keen.

Whilst the researcher welcomed the opportunity to stimulate reflection in the teacher participants, causing anxiety was not an intention and this needed to be resolved through the way in which the data was collected in the field. The researcher needed to 'learn to sense when you are gathering rich data, useful data that do not undermine or demean your respondent(s)' (Charmaz 2008:90).

The researcher had used the interview to compare her experience with that of other teachers rather than enable teachers to share their experience. Although a less structured interview was the selected method, it was apparent after the initial interviews that a structured interview had in fact been conducted as the researcher conveyed her own perspective to the exclusion of the participant. Although the researcher did seek clarification from the teacher participant it was clarification based on the questions that she posed, for example at the end of the third interview,

Interviewer *Thank you. I've covered everything I need unless there's anything you want to say either about initiatives or curriculum or subject based that has come to mind?*

Teacher PA *No not really I've just answered your questions really.*

The interview "covered" everything that the teacher-researcher considered to be important instead of covering what was important to the teacher participant and following what he had to say. Her method of interviewing evolved and was refined as she realised that she needed to unlock the experience of the teacher participant in terms of what was important to him or her and what the participant wanted to share, not limit the interview to questions posed by the researcher. The intention was for a

semi-structured interview (Denscombe 2007) to empower the teacher participants to share what was important to them. What had emerged was a structured interview as there was fixed questions that were asked in sequence to move the interview from one area of interest to the next as directed by the researcher.

Some interviews may last many hours (Dawson 2002) and participants can talk virtually uninterrupted as the participant's story 'tumbles out' (Charmaz 2008:90). The researcher sought knowledge from the inside from the point of view of the person experiencing it but limited interviews to thirty minutes for student participants and sixty minutes for teacher participants because of interviewee fatigue and the practical considerations of her study (Bell 2010, Cohen et. al. 2007 and Dawson 2002). All teacher participant interviews were recorded with the consent of the participants (Bell 2005). All participants were reassured that the recorder could be turned off if there was something they wanted to say which they did not want recorded. This was evident when a teacher participant said "leave your recorder on but we were actually told..." and another who did ask for the recorder to be turned off for a period of time. All teacher participant interviews were transcribed in full because

it is in the process of transcribing that you truly "hear" what the person has said, and, as such, this is a period in which analytic insights are most likely to occur (Lofland et. al. 2006:107).

The researcher transcribed all the teacher participant interviews in full herself and this enabled her to become very familiar with the data that she had obtained. Transcripts allowed the whole of the interview to be heard and subsequently seen which facilitated the coding of the data rather than the researcher recalling memorable parts of the interview or the parts that she thought were important at the time. Someone other than the researcher checked all teacher participant transcripts against the interview recordings for accuracy and a sample of the interviews and transcripts were also listened to by her supervisor. All interviews were transcribed as the participant and interviewer had spoken (Riley 1990). Written comments were added in brackets (Riley 1990) by the researcher as a reminder of what cannot be spoken for example actions or what cannot be captured for example the tone of what is said during the

interview. Brackets were also used to note any thoughts or reflections by the researcher that occurred during the interview or during transcription for example,

Teacher participant *I haven't seen the new one (laughs) scared.*

Teacher participant *That may be a weakness actually it might be something that we need to do, yeah (reflective yeah).*

Teacher participant *Yeah, yes I would but we would struggle I think to provide evidence without running around and that's something that maybe we need to do (think is it all about the evidence or the practice of??) to actually, yeah....*

The researcher recognised that

transcriptions inevitably lose data from the original encounter. This problem is compounded, for a transcription represents the translation from one set of rule systems (oral and interpersonal) to another very remote rule system (written language) (Cohen et. al. 2007:367).

During analysis, having the interviews transcribed allowed the data to be moved. This movement of the data enabled the researcher to verify whether the codes and theory that were beginning to emerge fitted the data. The three initial teacher participant interviews were transcribed once all three were conducted. Due to the locations of some of the interviews transcribing was a challenge as 'distinguishing some words is often made the more difficult by intrusive background noises' (Powney and Watts 1987:147). Interviews were subsequently transcribed within forty-eight hours to facilitate transcription and lessen the challenge of intrusive background noises.

At the same time as the first three teacher participant interviews two student participant interviews were conducted in July 2009 with Student Angus and Student Paige and they provided the researcher with a steep learning curve. All student participant interviews were recorded with the consent of the students. These first two student participant interviews were not transcribed because on listening to the recordings and on reflection after the interviews the researcher realised that she had in fact not asked the right questions (Morse (ed) 1994). The experience of the student participants was not unlocked and instead the researcher tested their knowledge of the changing National Curriculum as she expected student participants

to answer the questions that were asked rather than empower them to speak and share their experience. For example

Interviewer *Ok, so you're kind of comparing what you remember about Year 7 to now. If I had a Year 7 sat here next to you, do you think they have anything different, special, fairer, worse than you've had this year with your curriculum or you know if you think to your Year 7 and their Year 7 then, do you think there's any differences going on, has there been any changes or no changes?*

Student Angus *I assume there's been some changes.*

Interviewer *But do you know or you think there might be?*

Student Angus *I just think there is because there's normally it's four years ago, I think things change over time.*

The researcher considered recruiting siblings in different Year groups in order to compare the different curriculum provision but it was quickly apparent that it was not the curriculum provision that was at the centre of the experience of the students.

Opportunities to delve into the experience of the first two student participants were lost, for example when one student participant said “teachers don't bother with Year 10”. The researcher focused on the question she had previously asked and expected an answer to, rather than explore what the participant meant by the remark. The approach of the researcher towards the initial two student participants was not within keeping with her methodology. Whilst the intention was to listen to the student participant's experience, the reality was a semi-structured interview. It was clear that a deeper understanding of her methodology was needed and the researcher decided not to conduct any more student participant interviews until her methodology was established. The researcher recognised that in order to ‘facilitate the co-construction of meaning’ (Clark and Moss 2011:4) she needed to ‘listen to [the] children more rather than assume we already know the answer’ (Clark and Moss 2011:8).

The experience of the two student participant interviews and listening again to the recordings of the three teacher participant interviews revealed the testing nature of the questions and the extent that it was the relationship and rapport of the researcher with the participants that enabled data to be obtained despite the interview questions. It was apparent as the researcher transcribed and read the three teacher participant transcripts during this time that the interview questions needed revision. Although the

interview process evolved these interviews did yield data about the teacher participants experience but what was revealed was what the researcher asked about rather than what the participant wanted to say. Four questions were reduced to three, but more importantly there was an understanding that the experience of the teacher participant was central to the interview. The three interview questions that were taken into the field were

1. What initiatives is everyone talking about at [name of school]?
2. As you know *Every Child Matters* is my main focus, do you have any ideas how to implement it within the department that you could share?
3. With the new 2008 National Curriculum can you share what you/your department have done and any tips you can give me?

A fourth teacher participant interview was conducted in December 2009 with Teacher S and, whilst the initial questions were open-ended, the follow up questions became testing in nature again. The researcher sought out information based on professional curiosity on areas such as organisational structure and practice rather than to understand the experience of the teacher participant, for example

Interviewer *Are off timetable days part of [name of school] culture, or are they quite new and if so how, what has been the response of the students, parents and staff?*

Teacher S *They're very new like I said they only really started last September.*

Interviewer *So they never existed as in any other sort of format?*

Teacher S *Um, well this is my sixth year at [name of school] and I've never known off timetable days but I know teachers that have been here longer remember they're would be whole activity weeks and things like that in times gone by...*

Interviewer *And is there some evaluation in terms of the input and I'm talking about all sorts of things, the resources and the time is there or is there going to be an evaluation of the input versus the output gained?*

The researcher was also aware that at times she would ask particular supplementary questions that might inform her own practice and would justify asking them on the basis that she might afterwards find it relevant to the research. She deviated from conducting an interview into engaging in a dialogue with a fellow professional. For example supplementary questions on student/staff voice "So students weren't given a[n evaluation] sheet or staff?" or teacher professional development, "And can I also ask, just to see how it has worked whether there was, um what training..." Although

such questions illustrated the practice and procedure within other schools, it was not directly relevant to the interview. This was not listening to the experience of the teacher participant but professional curiosity of how 'other schools do it' and she needed to be more aware of this.

The tension between responding to a teacher participant or remaining quiet presented itself during the course of her interviews. The researcher decided it was more appropriate to break the 'rule' (Burgess 1984b:44) and offer a comment than keep quiet because it is not always possible to 'follow a set of rules' (Burgess 1984b:44) when undertaking research. When interviewing one teacher participant regarding the contribution of religious studies to the *Every Child Matters* initiative, the teacher participant initially stated,

I would say and this is being very truthful, I don't think we do anything in particular really with ECM [Every Child Matters].

A little further into the interview, the teacher participant amended her initial response by stating

ECM [Every Child Matters]...that stuff, that's well, it just ,yeah you know, that just goes on every day in you know 99% of the lessons.

The researcher asked for examples of how religious studies supported the *Every Child Matters* initiative and as the teacher participant went through the five outcomes of *Every Child Matters* it became apparent to the teacher participant that

some are definitely more natural than others...erm (pause) 'understanding of beliefs and teaching to perceive how economic activity can help or harm humanity, other species or the planet' that's almost more, I mean they might do that in Key Stage 3 citizenship actually but not so much in RE [religious education] erm...'Be healthy' erm I mean again this is sounding this is almost PSHE [personal, social and health education] isn't it, sort of 'confront ethical issues such as relationships, drugs, advertising, genetic research, violence' again that's Key Stage 4 (nervous laugh) this is actually quite interesting looking at this erm.

This was one such occasion where the researcher decided to break the rule (Burgess 1984b). The researcher decided that remaining silent implied that the teacher participant's practice or judgements were wrong and may have influenced the honesty with which the teacher participant responded to further questions (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). As the researcher had thought of an example from religious studies based on an earlier part of the interview and in connection to *Every Child Matters*, it was offered for consideration

Interviewer *That's sort of like a GCSE syllabus where you've got to look at poverty, charity...*

Teacher S *That's what I am thinking it's just the wealth and poverty stuff of the Key Stage 4 GCSE.*

Due to the testing nature of the questions it was sometimes necessary to reassure teacher participants. For example she offered the teacher participant a point to consider in relation to something they were trying to express, to which the teacher participant responded "That's what I am thinking". Although offering points to consider is perhaps inevitable within a discussion amongst colleagues, it is less desirable when wishing to hear the voice of the participants. The researcher also sought comparison with her own experience for example "How do you go about prioritising what you do and don't do? How do you figure that out?" rather than listening to the participant's experience. Interviews were also becoming longer as supplementary questions were being asked based on professional curiosity and comparison rather than the teacher participant's experience being central to the interview.

It was apparent that another approach to the teacher participant interviews was needed as her methodology was 'continually defined' (Burgess 1984b:31). As a teacher-researcher it was a challenge to adopt the role of a researcher and suspend the role of a teacher as the skills required of a teacher were not always desirable skills for a researcher. The researcher was still looking for responses based around these three predetermined questions by asking *about* rather than listening *to*. Her intention was to understand the experiences of colleagues in similar roles in other schools. However by not allowing teacher participants to talk about what was

relevant to them she imposed her questions and removed power from the teacher participants rather than listening to them.

3.5 Asking questions – Phase 2 The use of the methodology

The methodology changed from a prescribed and sequenced list of questions to understanding the experience of the teacher participants in their role within their institution. Five more teacher/staff participant interviews were conducted between February and June 2010 with Teacher G, Teacher D, Teacher P, Teacher M and Mr G. The only starting point for the interviews was “Can you talk to me about the priorities you have in your role?”; there were no other prescribed or predetermined follow up questions.

This approach was liberating as the researcher was not preoccupied with remembering prepared questions at the expense of listening to the participant’s experience. It was daunting as it required a great deal of concentration which was not always easy at the end of a working day or in a noisy location for the interview. This style of methodology allowed her to inhabit the role of the researcher and suspend the role of the teacher by not finishing off teacher participant’s sentences or thoughts, nor asking questions to satisfy professional curiosity. Instead she asked appropriate follow up questions to illuminate the experience of the teacher participant (Bogdan and Biklen 2003 and Charmaz 2004). By empowering the teacher participant and by being focused on the experience of the participant, the testing nature of the interview was removed and the integrity of the teacher participant was left intact. The outcome was that no teacher participants sought the researcher’s approval or reassurance during or at the end of an interview with this approach.

After the success of the teacher participant interviews the same method was applied to the student participant interviews. It was important to listen to the students as well as the teachers because

the constructivist researcher makes an effort to understand how the worlds of children operate by somehow entering those worlds, describing and analysing the contextualised social phenomena found there (Greig et. al. 2007:48).

The perspective and experience of the student participants were essential as their voice needed to be heard in order to study the *Every Child Matters* initiative. Unlike the teacher participants who were asked “Can you tell me what your priorities are in your role?” the student participants in the first paired interview, Student Harry and Leon were asked, “Can you tell me what it is like for you being at school?” A question was needed to unlock the experience of the student participants in the same way that the experience of the teacher participants was sought. The initial response to this question was “Boring” and it was apparent that it would not unlock the experiences of the students. The researcher decided to change the question for the student participants as she had thought that student participants would not comprehend the word priority that had been asked of the teacher participants, something which had been assumed without evidence or pilot testing. With this in mind, the students in the second paired interview, Students Rita and Amy, were asked the same question as the teacher participants, “Can you tell me what your priorities are at school?” This question stimulated more than a one word reply. It enabled the researcher to listen to the student participants’ priorities and experiences and it became the initial question that was used for all subsequent student participant interviews with Students Jordan and Joe, Students Ben and Brad and Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily. This unlocked the voice of the student participants.

Instead of control, constructivists want naturally occurring social behaviour, in place of isolated variables, they seek a contextualised holistic examination of participants’ perspectives, instead of measuring, correlating and predicting, constructivists describe and interpret (Hatch 1995:122).

3.6 Populations and politics

The focus of the study was the *Every Child Matters* initiative and had two underlying aims, the first was how the *Every Child Matters* agenda was supported by three specific curriculum areas, religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education and the second was how mattering was honoured from a student’s perspective. The most appropriate sampling strategy available for teacher participants was purposive sampling which allowed the researcher to ‘handpick’

(Cohen et. al. 2007:114) participants 'in order to access 'knowledgeable people' [to] acquire in-depth information from those who are in a position to give it' (Cohen et. al. 2007:115). Such participants have 'specialised knowledge or experience of the area of concern' (Cheetham 2001:168) and for this study, teacher participants were recruited before data collection commenced as it was their specialised experience that the researcher intended to unlock. It is to the recruitment of the teacher participants that our attention must now turn.

It was decided for two reasons that all teacher participants should have ownership for the curriculum area under investigation. The first was that such teachers, for example heads of department, were often required to attend additional training meetings within their school on forthcoming initiatives. They were also more likely to attend external courses or training on curriculum related issues and therefore have a greater awareness of initiatives. The second reason was that they were more likely to be expected to implement, monitor and evaluate change as they were responsible for that curriculum area.

Teacher participants were recruited via two means, personal, social, health and economic education teacher participants were recruited through the CfBT Education Trust Joint Action Consortium meetings for personal, social and health education. Citizenship teacher participants were recruited through the CfBT Education Trust Joint Action Consortium meetings for citizenship. These meetings were held for teachers in schools within the county. There was some crossover with personal, social and health education and citizenship attendees; the researcher herself was one such example. Religious studies teacher participants were recruited through various contacts associated with a university in the county. Personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship teachers who were attending the Joint Action Consortium meetings were receiving training and up to date information on initiatives related to their curriculum subjects. Attendees were also responsible for the curriculum area within their school. Religious studies teachers were expected to have received up to date training through being recently qualified themselves, the presence of a newly qualified teacher within the department, information received via the presence of a student teacher and/or attending external training courses.

Upon receipt of a signed Teacher Consent Form, the teacher participant was contacted via email or a Joint Action Consortium meeting to arrange a date, time and location that was mutually convenient for the interview outside of the researcher's teaching commitments. The choice of venue for the interview was based on convenience for the teacher participant but there were suitable features in widely contrasting locations although familiarity for the teacher participant was the central theme across all locations. All except one of the teacher participants were known to the researcher prior to the actual interview which facilitated rapport and as neither the interviewer nor interviewee were strangers there was a more relaxed atmosphere. As the intention was to unlock the experiences of the teacher participants there was limited opportunity for the researcher to express her opinion during an interview limiting the potential for participants to agree with what the researcher said in an attempt to please her (Bell 2010 and Denscombe 1998). Familiarity with the teacher participants facilitated genuine dialogue and preamble about the teacher participant's working day. Some teacher participants toured the researcher around their school site, introduced her to members of staff and/or showed the teaching rooms for the subject and she was welcomed into the school. The researcher was conscious that not only was she representing herself but that she was also representing the school where she worked. She was therefore mindful of how she conducted herself whilst interviewing teacher participants who were experienced colleagues and/or members of the senior leadership team especially if interviews took place at the teacher participant's school. All teacher participants were heads of department with some teacher participants in a more senior role or with more teaching experience than the researcher which minimised the issue of power within the interview.

The most appropriate sampling strategy available for student participants was convenience sampling. Such a sample is typical of 'captive audiences such as students' (Cohen et. al. 2007:113). The researcher is aware that this sampling strategy does not represent any group apart from itself although there are similarities between the students within the researcher's school and other comprehensive secondary schools in the county. The school is an 11-18 mixed comprehensive secondary school. At the time of the interviews there were approximately 1,500

students on role; seventy-five per cent of students were drawn from the local community (a four mile radius) which included two areas of social housing. Twenty-five per cent of students were drawn from outside the local catchment area. GCSE results in August 2010 were seventy-seven per cent five A*-C and fifty-four per cent A*-C including maths and English. Initially student participants were drawn from the Teaching and Learning Student Leader group and the Student Council members who consisted of approximately forty students. Subsequent student participants were recruited from the wider student population of approximately 1,500 students.

The student participants were recruited based on the groups the researcher defined. The researcher was mindful that students as early as Year 9 and up until the end of Year 11 would take a number of external module examinations in a range of different subject areas and was conscious of the disruption to teaching and learning that the interviews would bring. As most of the student participants were recruited in Term 1 during the academic year 2010-11, the researcher decided not to approach Year 7 students as they were new to the school. The researcher also decided not to recruit Year 11 students as they would be sitting external module exams as well as internal mock exams in Term 2 when interviews would take place. It is to the recruitment of the student participants that our attention must now turn.

Student participants were recruited from the researcher's current school in order for the researcher to manage the recruitment and subsequent interviews of the student participants. Understanding the 'language' (Burgess 1984b:93) of the students in the school allowed for more fluid student participant interviews. Interviewing students from the institution the researcher herself worked enabled a common understanding through insider knowledge (Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2011). It also allowed student participants to share their experience without the interviewer having to seek constant clarification for example,

Student Amy *we were cause for concern*

Student Harry *coz this morning, yeah, we was in AL*

Student Jordan *stuff at college*

Student Ben *I used to go to Phoenix*

As a teacher-researcher she knew that 'cause for concern' was a way to formally rate student behaviour and that when a student referred to 'AL' it was an abbreviation for an alternative learning programme that is accredited via the Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network (ASDAN). When a student participant talked about 'stuff at college' he was referring to the fact that he is an increased flexibility student and attends a separate college one day a week whilst 'Phoenix' is the designated facility for the school's most vulnerable students. This is insider rather than expert knowledge as the language is specific to the teacher-researcher's school rather than to the teaching profession.

The researcher decided to use her non-teaching periods to interview student participants. To interview student participants before or after school would have limited the participation of some students who travelled to school by bus as they could not arrive any earlier or stay after school any later. To interview students during break or lunch time was an additional cost to the student that the researcher decided was not appropriate. Also the time allocated for break and lunch time was twenty-five minutes and thirty minutes respectively and movement around the site did not allow sufficient time for interviews.

The first two student participant interviews with Student Angus and Student Paige in July 2009 took place in a small, rarely used classroom. It was possible to take some measure to diminish the power relationship between the interviewer as a teacher and the interviewee as a student. For example the classroom was chosen because it was not the teacher's own so that both the student and the researcher were on neutral ground. The intention was that the classroom would provide a quiet, neutral space although with its desks and chairs it was apparent that another venue for the interviews would be needed to achieve a more relaxed atmosphere. For all the other student participant interviews, the researcher arranged to meet students in Pastoral. Pastoral denotes the area of the school which is frequented by students who have access to a designated non-teaching pastoral manager throughout the day. This decision was undertaken in an attempt to alleviate the issue of formality from the previous venue and echo the theme of familiarity in the teacher participant interviews as the Pastoral area of the school is known by all the students.

After the two individual student participant interviews in July 2009, all other student participant interviews were conducted in pairs or groups (Burgess 1984b). This approach facilitated a more relaxed atmosphere than the two individual student participant interviews. As there were at least two student participants and one interviewer, the power dynamic changed as the interviewer was at times interrupted which is perhaps more unusual in a traditional student-teacher role and she was not the only one to ask the questions, for example

Interviewer *Have you got like Tracking or grades?*

Student Leon *I'm the best in my class in both subjects, so, coz, I'm a 6b in maths a 6c in art.*

Student Harry *What Target or grade?*

Student Leon *um grade.*

3.7 Seeking the consent of participants

Obtaining the consent of participants was undertaken in accordance with the University of Brighton's ethical guidelines and sources of literature (Bell 2005, Bogdan and Biklen 2003, Cohen et. al. 2007, Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, Homan 2001 and Lankshear and Knobel 2004).

According to the regulations, informed consent is consent which is *knowledgeable*, exercised in a situation of *voluntary* choice, made by individuals who are *competent* or able to choose freely (Thorne 2004:161).

The researcher sought informed consent from all her participants. In order to formally recruit teacher participants, a letter along with a Teacher Participant Information Sheet and Teacher Consent Form (see Appendix 3, Appendix 4 and Appendix 5) were sent with a stamped addressed envelope so that teacher participants could return their signed consent forms if they chose to participate. Teachers, by nature of their profession, were judged to be competent as they would be able to read and understand the Teacher Participant Information Sheet and Teacher Consent Form. Twelve teacher participants were invited to participate and nine consented to participate. Teacher participants who did not return the consent form were contacted in accordance with the Teacher Participant Information Sheet. One had left the

county and two did not reply to either of the follow up emails and were not contacted again. The researcher is unable to confirm why some teachers did not participate. It is possible that the teachers may have changed role or moved school, forgot to return the consent form, did not want to speak about the school within which they work, did not have the time to participate or chose not to participate.

Mindful of the fact that a participant may sign the consent form because the researcher held a position of power (e.g. student-teacher relationship), a different Participant Information Sheet and Participant Consent Form were provided for teacher participants and student participants. Such precautions by the researcher did not eradicate the role that power in the form of a student-teacher relationship brought to bear. For example one student participant explained the reason why he thought he had been chosen to be interviewed

doing stuff like this, you know like you wouldn't have asked me if I was like in Isolation everyday or I don't think you would have would you?

The student verified his role as a participant through that of his *tutor* and *teacher* rather than through that of a researcher.

In order to formally recruit student participants, six prospective student participants from the Teaching and Learning Student Leaders or Student Council members were individually taken out of their lesson by the researcher in July 2009 so that she could speak to each student about participating. Students were familiar with being removed from lessons; for example if they had to report to Pastoral or for a variety of activities which included Student Leader or Student Council meetings, reward lunches and student reception duty and whilst these held incentives, the researcher offered no incentives or rewards to participate in the interviews. Each student was given a Student Participant Information Sheet (see Appendix 6), a Student Participant Consent Form (see Appendix 7) and a Parent Information Letter (see Appendix 8) which the researcher read with them. This was to ensure the documents were read and not simply signed because a teacher had asked. They were also read so students could access the language as some prospective student participants had English as an additional language and some had special educational needs

associated with reading. It was important that student participants understood these documents, so the Student Participant Information Sheet and Student Participant Consent Form were written in age appropriate language.

The researcher explained what the prospective student participants needed to read and what they needed to sign if they chose to participate. The signed consent form was to be brought to the interview which had the date, time and location of the interview written on it. Interviews would take place during one of the researcher's non-teaching periods and was decided without consultation with the student participants and without receipt of the signed consent form first. When recruiting teacher participants such an assumption was never made. A provisional date, time and location were not assumed. Whilst the researcher certainly sought informed consent from the student participants, in contrast their consent was anticipated if not expected.

Having initially approached six students the assumption was that all the students would consent to participate when in fact only two students consented and arrived for the interview at the allotted date, time and location (see section 3.4). The researcher verbally asked each student participant if they would consent to an individual interview as these two interviews had been pre-booked at different times. Both student participants consented to an individual interview although the Student Participant Information Sheet stated interviews would be conducted with at least two students. The researcher is unable to confirm why the other four students did not participate. Students may have forgotten to attend the interview, chose not to be interviewed, chose not to miss their lesson, their parents preferred they did not participate or they did not have the consent form which they needed to bring with them on the day of their allotted interview. The researcher decided not to follow this up with the four students for two reasons. The first was that the students were deemed competent to give their consent to participate or not, and for whatever reason the student had taken the decision not to participate. The second reason was that there could have been an issue of power with students thinking that they were obliged to participate despite the researcher going to great lengths to explain that they were

under no such obligation on the Student Participant Consent Form (Cohen et. al. 2007).

The experience of recruiting student participants brought with it a number of changes. More students would need to be invited as it was unlikely all would consent to participate, how student participants were recruited needed to change and the breadth of students invited to participate needed to change as the experience of the students was not fully revealed (see section 3.4). When student participants from the wider school population were recruited in September-October 2010, the researcher again removed the students from their lesson to ask them about participating. This time, where possible, students were spoken to in possible interview pairs or groups. This raised a further issue of informed consent as there was an element of coercion from fellow students. For example one student spoke on behalf of both students by stating “we’ll do it”. The researcher reminded students that they had to decide for themselves if they would like to consent to participate. Fourteen were invited to participate and thirteen consented although one student later withdrew before the interview. The Student Participant Information Sheet, Parent Information Sheet and Student Consent Form were read by the researcher with the students. This time she explained that signed consent forms were to be returned to the researcher in person or to her pigeonhole via Reception. Students were reassured that the researcher would not ask them again to participate as it was their choice but if they lost their consent form and wanted to participate or had questions about the research then they could ask her.

The researcher waited until she received a signed Student Consent Form before arranging a date and time for the interview echoing the practice with teacher participants. Upon receipt of a signed consent form, student participants were excused from their lesson in their interview pairing or group so that an interview could be arranged. Student participants were able to take ownership of the day, date and time of their interview rather than the researcher imposing the most convenient day and time for her. Students were interviewed in pairs or groups in accordance with the Student Participant Information Sheet.

The researcher was mindful to read and elaborate on the Student Participant Information Sheet and the Student Consent Form with the students as the content was written in 2008. Ensuring informed consent entails ensuring information for participants is correct, which is an issue with conducting research that develops over time (Lofland et. al. 2006). One student participant who had consented later withdrew as he was anxious over the subject based nature of the interview. Although the researcher explained that the interview was about an understanding of school from the point of view of the student he no longer wanted to participate. His decision to withdraw was received in an email from the student participant's mother and read,

Thank you for inviting [name of child] to take part in the Every Child Matters research study however there is a problem with him being involved. Over the past two years he has missed all the PSICHE [personal, social, citizenship and health education] lessons due to him being fast-tracked for [name of subject] GCSE. Having discussed this issue further with [name of child] he now feels uncomfortable about representing the school in this research as he doesn't feel he will be able to speak with any authority on the subject and more importantly he believes he may 'spoil' the research findings as his is a very particular case. Obviously the study may be concentrating on current teaching and learning which would be a different matter. Please let us know your thoughts.

The researcher replied to the concerns that were raised but the student's decision to withdraw from the interview remained.

Homan (2009) has argued that Gillick competence can be applied to educational research in order to obtain student consent and this was the measure used by the researcher towards her potential student participants. The researcher provided all prospective student participants with a Parent Information Sheet so that parents were informed about the research and alerted to the fact that their son/daughter had been invited to participate. Students were encouraged to discuss their potential involvement with their parents but the researcher emphasised that as it was the student she wished to interview it was his or her consent that she sought rather than a parent consenting on behalf of their child. Whilst Gillick competence is used to establish whether a student is able to give his or her consent to participate in educational research, upon practice and reflection by the researcher she has argued that it should not be used by a teacher-researcher (Jakes 2010). This is because a

teacher occupies a position of trust, and students as well as parents assume teachers will cause no harm as they act in loco parentis.

Gillick competence was intended for use with children under sixteen so they might be able to consent to medical examination and treatment (DoH 2009) providing 'sufficient maturity and intelligence' were shown (Wheeler 2006:807). Within the medical field, the use of Gillick competence is very subjective because 'the law leaves the decision about whether a child is Gillick competent to the individual practitioner' (Hunter and Pierscionek 2007:659) although the aim is that the patient will *benefit* from the medical treatment. Unlike medical research, educational research is not inherently therapeutic and Gillick competence may be granted by the educational researcher for the *benefit* of the *research* (Hunter and Pierscionek 2007). The power relationship between teachers and students can be amplified by the reputation or status of the teacher within the school which can make refusing to participate difficult (see Homan 2001). Researchers need participants and teacher-researchers have a seemingly limitless supply of participants. One must remain mindful that the possession of a signed consent form could become a 'meaningless ritual' (Thorne 2004:160) when consent forms should improve the ethics of field research. The researcher would argue that teacher-researchers should not recruit their own student participants but a third party be charged with this role to check understanding of the research as well as the costs/benefits to the participating student(s).

3.8 Seeking access from the schools

A great deal has been written on access to research settings (Bell 2005, Bogdan and Biklen 2003, Burgess 1984b, Cohen et. al. 2007 and Lofland et. al. 2006). Access is often granted by a senior member of staff and this was true for the researcher. The researcher also sought informed consent from all participants to avoid consent being granted on behalf of the participants by an individual, for example the Principal (Burgess 1984b). To gain access to teacher participants in other schools, prospective teacher participants were asked to discuss their participation and share the Information Sheet and Consent Form with anyone they deemed necessary and appropriate. This was suggested because it was important that prospective teacher

participants within a research context understood that their responses would be analysed and written about.

In accordance with the reporting structure in the researcher's current school, she sought permission to conduct student participant interviews from her line manager, a deputy principal, during a formal line management meeting. The researcher was not required to attend any additional meetings which pertained to the conduct of student participant interviews or submit any further request in relation to her research. Permission from the deputy principal was granted during that meeting. The Principal was also aware that the researcher had commenced further study. Although the researcher was 'channelled' (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007:59) towards the Teaching and Learning Student Leader group and Student Council members, she was not restricted to recruiting only these students. Being a teacher-researcher was certainly an 'advantage' (Lofland et. al 2006:41) however, it was this familiarity and 'badge of membership' (Lofland et. al 2006:41) that resulted in the blurring of lines in terms of access to students in the form of gatekeepers, access to student information and the tension between the researcher's role as a teacher and her role as a researcher that will now be discussed.

3.9 The role and impact of gatekeepers on behalf of student participants

Although access was obtained from the deputy principal to interview student participants and consent was obtained from the individual student participants themselves, there was a degree of controlled gate-keeping by other members of staff. It became clear that in a large comprehensive secondary school divided into academic and pastoral responsibilities, knowing who had the role of the gatekeeper and who assumed the role of the gatekeeper was more complex than the researcher had anticipated. During the course of a student participant interview the researcher met with a self-appointed gatekeeper in Pastoral where the interviews were being conducted. The location of the student participant interviews was changed from a small, rarely used classroom to Pastoral because Pastoral would be a more familiar setting whilst affording a private space. The reality was that the space became public due to the actions of a gatekeeper. During a paired student participant interview a

member of staff and self-appointed gatekeeper came into the room to make a cup of tea. Clearly confidentiality was broken as the interview was no longer between the two student participants and the researcher but the two student participants, the researcher and a member of staff, who was an assistant principal. The researcher had to make a decision as to whether the interview should be terminated, suspended until the assistant principal left or continued.

The researcher decided to continue with the interview for a number of reasons. The first was that students did not look at the assistant principal during the interview and it was clear that they were focused on the conversation taking place. Secondly the assistant principal did not interrupt the interview in terms of talking to the student participants or the researcher. The assistant principal was an experienced member of staff who had been involved in pastoral work for many years and the researcher felt confident that anything that the students said, unless related to matters of child protection by which she herself would be bound, would remain confidential. The researcher had to make a judgement and interpret the meaning of confidentiality within this context and as she did not believe that there would be any negative consequence for the student participants based on what they said that was overheard by the assistant principal the interview continued.

To have stopped or suspended the interview may have prompted fears in the gatekeeper. As the researcher was confident in terms of the student participants' understanding of confidentiality, to have stopped or suspended the interview may have been interpreted as secretive. Although access had been obtained from the deputy principal who had overall responsibility for Pastoral, within a complex organisation like a secondary school the role of gatekeeper was devolved to the assistant principal who oversaw its day to day running. The assistant principal was concerned enough regarding the content of the interviews and any potentially negative consequences of granting the researcher access, to physically drop-in on one and there was perhaps a tension within the role undertaken by the gatekeeper which is pertinent to the *Every Child Matters* agenda. The assistant principal acted on the student's right to safety which overrode their entitlement to a voice and their ability to give or withhold their consent.

Another situation arose with the same gatekeeper when the researcher asked the pastoral managers for the names of their 'challenging' students. The assistant principal who was present challenged the researcher and wanted to know why the names were being sought and whether it was in relation to her research. When she confirmed that it was research related, the assistant principal informed the pastoral managers in the future to "watch her and ask why the names are needed". Whilst there was an element of humour in the gatekeeper's voice, it made the researcher realise that the line between the role of the teacher and the role of the researcher had been blurred. She had used her role as a teacher to facilitate her role as a researcher.

3.10 Accessing information - the entitlement of the teacher versus the researcher

Having realised that interviewing Teaching and Learning Student Leaders and Student Council members was not ideal, the researcher sought a way to hear the experiences of the wider student population. Interviewing over 1,500 students was not feasible so the researcher divided the student population into four groups from which she intended to hear the experience of some students within each group. The four groups she identified were challenging students, gifted and talented students, students with special or additional educational needs and students who did not fall into the groups already specified. It was thought that these groupings would incorporate the breadth of the student population. The researcher considered asking heads of department to identify challenging students but decided against this as they would only be aware of challenging students within their department. She would also have used her role as a teacher to benefit her role as a researcher. To have contacted every head of department would have been time consuming and the researcher did not want subject based challenging students. Also heads of departments may have expected the researcher to improve or intervene with the challenging students they identified which was not within the scope of her research. Instead pastoral managers were asked to identify challenging students in the presence of the gatekeeper.

A student was identified as challenging by the researcher based on the number of times he or she was sent to Isolation and was seen by a pastoral manager for behaviour related issues in the academic year 2009-10. The researcher decided that the pastoral managers were best placed to identify challenging students as tutors would only have information relating to their tutor group, whereas pastoral managers had the overview of the entire year group. It was later that day when the researcher was able to reflect on the comment from the gatekeeper reminding the pastoral managers to ask why the researcher had requested the information that she realised the line between teacher and researcher had once more become blurred. With pastoral managers, heads of departments and the student participants themselves in close proximity it was more difficult than with the teacher participants to leave behind the role of the teacher and become a researcher. There was a conflict of roles. As a teacher she had access to all manner of information (Homan 2001), for example the school's gifted and talented register, the Special Educational Needs register and class lists. As a researcher she was not entitled to the same data or information that was readily available to her as a teacher in order to recruit potential student participants.

3.11 Conflicts of the teacher-researcher

The main concern the researcher had prior to the student participant interviews was what the students might reveal in the interviews about other members of staff, how she might respond to the revelations and what the students might, as a teacher rather than a researcher, expect her to do. Students

may feel that they have a lot to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning but they are uncertain how to proceed and tend to remain silent – unless a visiting researcher provides a one-off outlet for comment (Rudduck and Fielding 2006:225).

Within her role as a researcher she was, at times, regarded as a confidante. Her methodology did not obviate the conflict of teacher-researcher and these conflicts were dealt with as they arose in student participant interviews. She considered

setting ground rules which students would be familiar with as part of their personal, social, health and economic education lessons but she decided not to take this idea into the field. To start student participant interviews with rules may inhibit the freedom with which the student participants wished to express their experiences of school (Cohen et. al. 2007) without preconceptions and it was important as a researcher and not a teacher to hear their experiences.

In the course of interviewing participants, the researcher was often mindful of the persistence of the role of teacher. It was not long before a situation presented itself and she had to decline to justify her own or her colleagues' practice. For example Student Angus during his interview commented "...it's fun like with [name of teacher] like we watch Simpson's quite a (pause) sometimes". As the head of department the researcher may have been inclined to explore this much further in an attempt to know the practice of a member of the department and reveal what goes on behind closed doors. This unintended aspect of her research was a feature throughout the student participant interviews as the students' revealed information about other teachers. It was a timely reminder that 'pupils' perspectives [may] be at odds with the 'facts' known by staff' (Duckett et. al. 2008:97). She needed to be mindful of her perspective as a teacher-researcher constructing theory from the reality of her participants which may be at odds with her own.

Whilst the experience of one student participant raised concerns about teaching and learning within the researcher's own department, the relationship between the student participant and that teacher was spoken about in a positive way. What caused the researcher anxiety were the student participant interviews where students revealed what the teacher-researcher considered to be professional misconduct because she was unable to act on the information obtained in her role as a researcher. The sense of responsibility to the students, the school and the profession and the information she obtained as a researcher created a tension.

The recordings and transcriptions of teacher participant and student participant interviews were kept secure and confidential. Whilst the expectation of the researcher was that the interviews would not be contentious at the time of giving the

assurance of confidentiality and anonymity to participants, the researcher did not truly appreciate the weight of this statement. In the course of a teacher participant interview, information was revealed that as a teacher the researcher would have had to act upon but as a researcher she was bound by the ethics of her research not to. She had not anticipated that the data she collected would make her uncomfortable and distance her from colleagues. The 'emotional response' (Duckett et. al. 2008:103) of the researcher to the reality that was shared by the student participants was not expected. There was a real sense of 'knowing too much and being able to do so little' that caused a tension between herself and her colleagues and created frustration at being powerless to act. There was no-one within the school setting she could confide in due to the confidential nature of the interview itself.

Listening to the experience of the student participants as a researcher rather than responding to them as a teacher was not a skill or response that came naturally. But one that was learnt. For example

Interviewer *Why is it funny to watch that?*

Student Ben *I dunno*

Student Brad *Coz their head goes red*

Student Ben *Coz they're just go really angry, it's just so funny, you'd think it'd make you listen and learn but when teachers shout at you you don't, you just find it funny*

Interviewer *Do you think teachers know that?*

Rather than ask "Do you think we know that?" she learnt to ask questions as a researcher rather than as a teacher during student participant interviews. Whilst the researcher had anticipated that student participants would talk about other members of staff, she had not anticipated that student participants would talk about her in an interview. Being a teacher-researcher often provides insight into the teacher's own practice (Strauss 1995) but the insight the researcher received was not via a moment of revelation or reflection but direct student voice. The researcher decided to respond within the role of a researcher whenever she was referred to during an interview.

The researcher was again taken by surprise when a student participant referred to the content of his interview during a lesson. During a Year 8 lesson some students in the

class lost their focus. When the teacher-researcher explained to the class that because of the behaviour of some students the activity would have to stop and a different activity would need to take place, the student participant, Student Harry, put up his hand and said that this was an example of what was talked about in the interview, referring to when he said

sometimes it's probably coz they're [teachers] stressed with some of the students, coz maybe they're not doing their work or nothing, if one person is bad in a group then everyone gets the punishment if you know what I mean?

This raises the question when conducting research whether data can only be collected when an individual is in the role of the researcher as consent was not established and confidentiality was, therefore compromised. The researcher decided that only data that was conducted during a teacher participant or student participant interview would be used otherwise overt data collection would descend into covert data collection which would have raised further ethical issues (Fontana and Frey 2005).

Teacher participant interviews were conducted at the end of the teaching day or during the weekend. There were no incentives offered by the researcher to the teacher to participate in the interviews. When the researcher conducted an interview at the teacher participant's school the researcher took biscuits for the participant and when the researcher conducted an interview during the weekend the interviewer bought the teacher participant a coffee. These were not incentives as the consent of the teacher participant had already been received prior to the interview and the teacher participant was unaware they would be brought biscuits or bought a drink. A packet of biscuits or a cup of coffee helped to set the tone of the interview (Morse (ed) 1994) and was in recognition by the researcher of the teacher participant's time and that this was valued and acknowledged as they would not necessarily benefit from taking part in the interview.

During the first two student participant interviews in July 2009 the researcher did not acknowledge the time that she was afforded by the student participants. This reflected the conflicting nature of the teacher-researcher with the expectation of a

teacher that the students would participate. The initial lack of participation by students reminded the researcher not to expect students to consent. As the role of the researcher was inhabited, acknowledging the time of student participants became more natural. With all subsequent student participant interviews, each student participant was given a bar of chocolate at the start of the interview by the researcher. The researcher decided to give the student participants the chocolate at the start of the interview rather than at the end so that they did not interpret the chocolate being for 'good' or 'correct' answers. She cannot however measure the impact of her actions as, whilst she did not want the gesture of appreciation in the form of a drink or biscuits/chocolate to be seen as a reward, it may have made participants more receptive to the interview process and subsequent questions.

3.12 Leaving the field

During the course of conducting teacher participant and student participant interviews, the researcher had not anticipated the journey that her fieldwork would take her on. Leaving the field provided the researcher with an opportunity to reflect on her fieldwork.

On many levels, the actual conduct of field research reveals a chronic tension between the demands of involvement and withdrawal, of participation and detachment (Pollner and Emerson 1983:235).

As there was no formal agreement between the school and the teacher-researcher regarding her dual role this created a tension between the demands of her research and the work within the school which she was paid to undertake. It was these tensions that contributed to the decision to leave the field. During this study there was a temptation for the researcher to become a whistleblower. The first two structured student participant interviews conducted in July 2009 meant that the researcher only heard what she chose to ask about rather than what the students chose to reveal. The emotional burden of listening to the experiences of the student participants in the subsequent interviews conducted from October to December 2010 became increasingly difficult. Initially listening to the student participants and their revelations about colleagues was tantalising; however it soon became all too clear

that the researcher was not only let into the experience of the student participants but the actions and attitudes of her colleagues. In some cases the actions and attitudes of her colleagues was inspirational but other revelations troubled the researcher and caused her to feel 'guilt, anger' (Lofland et. al. 2006:27). Guilt at hearing what was going on behind closed doors, and guilt at being unable to reveal what she knew as it had been acquired during her role as a researcher. Also anger at her colleagues for their conduct towards students, and anger at herself for not realising what was going on.

This emotional factor (Lofland et. al. 2006) had an influence on the researcher's professional role. The information revealed in her role as a researcher as opposed to her role as a teacher meant she remained silent. In contrast she envied colleagues in other schools where teacher participant interviews revealed that the students mattered. Within her role as a teacher there was no-one to confide in. When combined these revelations were the main reasons for the teacher-researcher distancing herself from her peers. It was an isolating experience as friends and colleagues were viewed with suspicion and the revelations within student participant interviews made her protective towards the students.

The researcher began identifying not only with the student participants but with the student population as a whole and to take the accounts of students at 'face value' (Lofland et. al. 2006:62). This came to a head when the researcher was on duty one day and she was asked by a pastoral manager to take a statement from a student. So keen was she to listen to the student and so strong was her desire for him to matter that his allegation against a member of staff went unquestioned. The researcher had become an advocate of the students, identifying herself as their 'voice' and she had lost her detachment. The honesty the student participants had shown in their interviews had been transferred to all the students within the school and despite the researcher having worked closely with the colleague against whom the allegation was made and who she respected, her guilt and anger at being 'fooled' by the conduct of some colleagues revealed during the student participant interviews was transferred onto this teacher. To continue to interview student participants could have descended into an exposé of the 'plight' of students and a means to identify the

practice and principles of the staff rather than revealing the experiences of the student participants. The 'conflicting goals and loyalties' (Lofland et. al. 2006:28) felt by the teacher-researcher, the impact and influence of them on her judgement and the risks associated with her continuing to interview student participants meant she felt ethically compelled to leave the field. The researcher needed to channel her energies into data analysis and gaining a suitable position in her current school to affect change to benefit the students and establish her own voice as a teacher informed by her study.

3.13 Limitations of the fieldwork

Obtaining informed consent from student participants, the categorisation of prospective student and teacher participants, the location and use of paired student participant interviews and the tension created by an absence of institutional feedback were limitations of the fieldwork which will now be discussed. Obtaining informed consent from student participants when research is conducted by a teacher-researcher creates a conflict between the need for student participants and deeming a student competent to give his or her informed consent. The concept of the teacher as a researcher especially for students with weak literacy skills, where most of the information to recruit students is presented via the written word, is more difficult. A student participant information sheet and student participant consent form may be given to the student and duly signed but not necessarily read or understood. Prospective student participants may misunderstand that research is different to student voice when it is collected in the same way; for example the use of questionnaires, surveys and interviews and conducted by the same person, the teacher. This is because unlike student voice which is usually compulsory and aims to benefit the student (see for example Cook-Sather 2006 and Hopkins 2008), academic research may have little or no benefit to the student and participation is voluntary. Teachers act in loco parentis and students may consent to participate in research because they trust their teacher rather than because they are informed. The recruitment of student participants should perhaps be undertaken by someone other than the teacher-researcher. This avoids the tension between the need for participants and subjectively judging a student to be competent to consent. This may

reduce the number of student participants but consent must be informed and not regarded as a 'meaningless ritual' (Thorne 2004:160) or made using Gillick competence when there is little or no benefit to the student participant (Jakes 2010).

The assumptions made by the researcher when she categorised the students and restricted the participation of some students limited the fieldwork (see section 3.6). Before student participants were recruited, students were categorised into groups with the intention that the student population would be represented and given a voice within the research. Students were categorised as challenging, gifted and talented students, students with special or additional educational needs and the rest of the student population. Although the categorisation of students made recruitment manageable they reduced the students as a means to an end (see section 2.2) and the diversity of the student population was not recognised. Whilst it was the voice of the student participants that the researcher sought, some students were prevented from participating in the study. For example Year 11 students were excluded from the research by the *teacher* due to their forthcoming exams because it would be disruptive to their learning. A *teacher-researcher* would instead have invited Year 11 students to participate and allowed the students to decide for themselves if an interview would be disruptive to their learning. If younger students were deemed competent to give informed consent, Year 11 students should have been afforded the same consideration. Similarly, the *teacher* decided to exclude Year 7 students from the study because they were new to the school. A *teacher-researcher* would have appreciated the contribution Year 7 students may have afforded the study.

Similarly, teachers were categorised into groups based on their status or role and the subject(s) that they taught as only teachers who taught religious studies, citizenship and/or personal, social, health and economic education were invited to participate (see section 3.6). The researcher assumed the status of the teacher and the subject that was taught rather than the teaching of children was more important to this study. Whilst limiting the research to three subject areas made the recruitment of teacher participants more manageable, it limited recruitment and restricted the voice of teachers. Another study which recruited teachers regardless of their status or the subject(s) taught would be beneficial as teachers can often have more than one role

or area of responsibility and teach more than one subject so the voice of a wider range of teachers would be heard.

During Phase 1 of this study (see section 3.4) student participants were not afforded the same consideration as teacher participants to select a location for their interview that was familiar to them. It was during Phase 2 (see section 3.5) that the importance of a familiar place for student participant interviews was realised and Pastoral was used for all future student participant interviews. Compared to the location of the interviews in a small, rarely used classroom during Phase 1, in Pastoral there was constant noise and activity in this busy part of the school. Issues surrounding confidentiality due to the interruptions from a self-appointed gatekeeper also surfaced (see section 3.9). However the familiarity of Pastoral to the student participants made it a more suitable location. Although student participant interviews were confined to the school site, student participants could have nominated a location for their interview echoing the consideration given to teacher participants. There were few familiar locations for student participant interviews but one without the interruptions of Pastoral would have supported the fieldwork.

Not only where but how student participants were interviewed limited the fieldwork. Interviewing student participants in groups inhibited the voice of some participants for two reasons. The first reason was that when students were interviewed in a group situation, some students dominated the conversation which restricted the participation of others. Whilst it is the role of the teacher to encourage the participation of every student during a class discussion, it is not the role of the researcher to coerce or control participation during an interview. The voice of a student participant can therefore be lost. The second reason was the cohesion of the students within the group interview inhibited the voice of some participants. Students spoke in front of peers and for a student to be comfortable or feel as though they matter their presence must be acknowledged, they must feel important and feel that they can make significant contributions to the group (France and Finney 2009). Dialogue may be restricted if students are grouped together based on teacher-researcher categories rather than relationships between student participants. Paired student participant interviews reduce the number of participants who may dominate the conversation and

increase participation leading to fewer peers for the participant to be conscious of (Bell 2005).

As a teacher-researcher a tension was created when student participants revealed what took place behind closed classroom doors. This was because there was no expectation or opportunity for the teacher-researcher to provide feedback to the school based on her research. Teacher-researchers and researchers undertaking fieldwork within school(s) might perhaps be required to provide feedback to the governors or senior team as part of the research process. Discoveries made in the course of a research project could lead to recommendations and may benefit the students and the school. Such a tension may be reduced within a national study because the researcher is outside of the institution(s) within which he or she is studying and does not have a relationship with the participants.

3.14 From teacher to researcher

Under the strains of being a teacher-researcher her role, relationships and identity were found to evolve (in addition see sections 3.11 and 3.12). At the end of the interviews it was possible to reflect on some of the researcher's habits and predispositions that changed during the course of the fieldwork. The researcher's relatively closed mind became a relatively open one as she came to appreciate that there were alternative perspectives to her own. Her rigid approach to completing paperwork and 'ticking boxes' which purported to fulfil aims, outcomes and initiatives softened as she became more receptive to new ideas within and beyond her own school. Her tendency to suppose that the student's perspective might need to be corrected rather than validated gradually diminished. She came to interview her students as a teacher within their school and therefore inevitably from a position of authority and knowledge. In the event of the interview she was the seeker of knowledge and the students became her informants. This reversal of the epistemological relationship between teacher (now researcher) and student participants was a revelation to the researcher and in the end a salutary experience. There was a rise in the validation of student voice as her assumption that she could speak for students gave way to listening. An ability to see a student as an individual

rather than in terms of his or her class, reputation or a label emerged. Also as a teacher she recognised she had the capacity and the responsibility to develop her own professional practice which led to a change of role within her school and a change of attitude within her classroom.

The death of Victoria Climbié in 2000 and Baby P in 2007 continued to highlight the necessity to protect children (amplified in sections 1.1, 1.5, 5.1.2 and 5.2.1). The researcher was attuned to the practice of identifying and reporting child abuse and neglect along with the importance of safeguarding children (see section 3.1). But what the researcher began to realise through her fieldwork was that there existed a concept of mattering beyond child protection, beyond the aims of the *Every Child Matters* initiative (DfES 2003) and beyond the five well-being outcomes: Being healthy; Staying safe; Enjoying and achieving; Making a positive contribution and Economic well-being. What emerged in the course of this study, by unlocking the voice of her participants, was the importance of enabling the students to become visible and audible (see Chapter 4 and Jakes 2010).

The researcher knew eight of the nine teacher/staff participants prior to the fieldwork and she also knew or was known to all the student participants (see section 3.6). Whilst knowing prospective participants can facilitate recruitment, once the interviews commenced she recognised the necessity to make the familiar strange. When conducting fieldwork, a researcher may be drawn into the community that is the focus of their research and risks 'going native' (Burgess 1984b and Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). Within this study the teacher-researcher was already a 'native'. She needed to detach herself from the community so that she might be receptive to other voices and perspectives that were different to her own. In her dual role as both a teacher and a researcher there were a number of means that she adopted to signal movement between these two roles and to facilitate the separation of her combined roles in order to establish the interviews within the context of a researcher. Distancing herself from her participants and inhabiting the role of a researcher rather than a teacher did not come naturally but she was able to learn from prior interviews (see section 3.4).

All interviews were recorded with the consent of the participants (see section 3.4) and the researcher also made notes during the interviews. Recording the interviews and taking notes signalled to the participants that an interview was taking place because dialogue with colleagues and/or with students is not recorded. It also helped to instil a sense of importance and indicated to the participants that their words and their time were valued. Prior to the recorder being turned on, participants were thanked by the researcher for agreeing to be interviewed as part of her study. Turning the recorder on/off signalled the start and end of the interview and thanking the participants for consenting to an interview served as a visual and audible cue.

The researcher also realised that the participants mattered. In particular she moved from a teacher led approach to the student participant interviews where their participation was expected if not anticipated, their time was not valued or acknowledged and they were questioned rather than listened to (see sections 3.7 and 3.11) to a new approach to the recruitment of student participants, acknowledging the time they afforded by being interviewed and hearing what they had to say. Within the interview setting student participants spoke about teaching and non-teaching staff who were colleagues and/or friends. Within her role as a teacher, students are typically prevented and/or actively discouraged from expressing their opinions about other staff and may even be silenced. By distancing herself from her role as a teacher and signalling to the student participants that an interview was taking place, the researcher set aside her own convictions and the voice of the student could be heard.

Staff and student voice is often collected within schools although typically a person's choice to withhold or withdraw his or her voice is not offered, his or her permission is not sought and participation is usually considered to be compulsory. Interviews with teacher and student participants were arranged upon receipt of a signed consent form. Whilst the researcher's consent form served one purpose, its function in defining the nature of an interview became an additional one. The formality of the information sheets and consent form (see Appendix 3-8) alongside the structure of arranging a date, time and location for an interview facilitated the separation of her dual roles and distanced the researcher from her participants.

This study evolved from a focus on the *Every Child Matters* initiative that by its very title suggested its implementation by those on behalf of children and students would honour the concept that every child is to matter, to a concept of mattering that was expressed by the participants. Without making the familiar strange during the fieldwork, the theory of mattering may not have emerged. It was unlikely the researcher would have anticipated or hypothesised what was revealed in her data (see section 3.2). The use of a semi-structured interview meant that she did not know what her participants would share in advance nor was she looking for her participants to substantiate any pre-conceived opinions. The meaning of mattering was constructed with teacher and student participants through their voice and this is discussed in Chapter 4 below.

With the methodology and limitations discussed, it is to the analysis of the data and the construction of the theory that our attention must now turn.

4 Analysis

In the early stages of the fieldwork and analysis the researcher was attracted in principal to Grounded Theory (see section 3.3) and she adopted some of its characteristics for example line by line coding. However, in the course of time there was a greater exercise of the researcher's own interpretative habits and as the research settled so it became apparent that the method and analysis were much closer to the tradition of social constructionism. What follows describes this process in practice.

In total eight teacher participants and fourteen student participants were interviewed (see Appendix 1) although the researcher coded only those interviews where her methodology had been established to construct the theory (see section 3.5) with prior interviews used to support the findings. Interviews with four secondary school teachers located in three separate schools in one county were coded; Teacher P was the head of religious education in a mixed gender faith based school, Teacher G was the head of religious studies and the head of Key Stage 4 personal, social and health education and Key Stage 4 citizenship education in a mixed gender comprehensive school, Teacher D was an assistant headteacher whose responsibilities included personal, social and health education in a mixed gender faith based school and Teacher M was an assistant headteacher whose responsibilities included *Every Child Matters* in a mixed gender comprehensive school. Interviews with ten secondary school students located in one school in the same county as the teacher participants were also coded. There were three paired interviews, Students Rita and Amy in Year 10, Students Jordan and Joe in Year 10 and Students Ben and Brad in Year 9. There was also a group interview with Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily who were in Year 10. The student participants have been allocated names they can recognise to maintain their anonymity whilst enabling the reader to distinguish their voice.

4.1 Coding and constructing

Although the researcher had learnt to unlock the voice of the participants during her interviews (see section 3.5) the initial temptation was to interpret their voice according

to four predetermined stakeholder groups. The four groups the researcher thought were pertinent to *Every Child Matters* were the school, the students, the Local Education Authority and the parents. The researcher intended to use these four groups as headings to approach her data. These groups had no basis in her data and did not emerge from the teacher participant or the student participant interviews. A reading of Charmaz (2004), Glaser and Strauss (1967), Miles and Huberman (1994) and Strauss and Corbin (1990) made the researcher realise her approach was not line by line coding of the data and it was apparent that the researcher would need to be mindful of subjecting her data to preconceived ideas.

To that end she recognised the needed to immerse herself in the data and listen to the participant's voice. The researcher began with one interview transcript, that of Teacher M. Line by line coding of the data (Charmaz 2004 and Miles and Huberman 1994) revealed a number of themes and these were label, organisational, practicalities, clarifying, cooperation, role/responsibility, power/status, explanation versus innovation, language, delegation and curriculum versus pastoral (see Appendix 9). From these initial themes seven codes emerged and these were Influences, Power, Pastoral intervention, Academic intervention, Innovation, Compliance and Enforcing. Teacher M's transcript was cut and a physical poster of the data was produced using these codes. This allowed the researcher not only to see the codes but see the interview in its entirety and as it was not sequential it enabled the researcher to move beyond the story of the interview (Charmaz 2004). A second interview transcript belonging to Teacher G was coded line by line and the seven codes emerged once again. The transcript was also cut and placed onto the poster.

The researcher's conviction felt by the emerging codes was replaced with trepidation as she was unsure how to proceed. It was then that the researcher decided to embark on 'diagramming' to aid analysis and she proceeded with Teacher M and Teacher G's interview. Diagramming initially led to the researcher looking at her data in a linear way (see Diagram 1). The researcher anticipated that the teacher participant's values and approach to their professional role was based on various Influences. These influences affected the teacher participant in terms of the Power

that was afforded by their actual title or role and how they interpreted and understood their title or role. This created Tension which led to Action to Resolve the tension. The researcher could not 'fit' Pastoral intervention and Academic intervention into her diagram and it was apparent that the researcher had taken the codes and had attempted to explain them with little reference to her data or any literature. Diagram 1 provided an opportunity for the researcher to reflect and it produced a moment of clarity. She had found in her teacher participants what she herself experienced within her role in her own school and therefore she read her data accordingly. It is perhaps unsurprising that within an institution structured in a hierarchical fashion such as a school, there would be limitations on a teacher's power and/or authority creating tension leading to action to temporarily or permanently resolve it. The researcher had imposed her own reality onto her data and sought confirmation within the voice of her participants.

It was at this point that the researcher realised she had created a clear and logical diagram (Diagram 1) rather than respond to the data as it presented itself. It also revealed that the researcher had preconceived ideas as to how she would work with the data. Returning to the original analysis poster containing the seven codes, the researcher realised that Influences and Power were present because the researcher sought clarification of the teacher participant's role during the interview before she asked about the teacher participant's priorities. She therefore decided to remove Influences and Power as codes during her analysis as they were misleading. Enforcement was also removed as a code as her developing understanding of Compliance negated its inclusion. Four codes emerged from the interviews with Teacher M and Teacher G and they were Academic, Pastoral, Innovation and Compliance.

The researcher then coded Teacher D and Teacher P's transcripts as additional data would confirm or challenge the four codes that had emerged (Charmaz 2004, Glaser and Strauss 1967, Miles and Huberman 1994 and Strauss and Corbin 1990). The additional data confirmed the codes. The researcher then coded the interview with Student Rita and Student Amy and the student participant data also confirmed these four codes. A workshop with fellow research students proved valuable in affirming

the decisions the researcher had made. The coded transcripts from the four teacher participant interviews and the student participant interview were cut and placed into clear plastic wallets based on the four codes that had emerged Academic, Pastoral, Innovation and Compliance. This allowed the data for each code to be 'seen' together and to be physically moved during further analysis. The data from the remaining three student participant interviews Students Jordan and Joe, Students Ben and Brad and Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily were coded line by line and the four codes were again identified although the transcripts were not physically cut.

The data that had been placed in each of the clear plastic wallets needed further analysis and explanation to illuminate how the participants had constructed their reality. The pieces of transcript in each of the clear plastic wallets were grouped or placed under additional sub-headings (Charmaz 2004 and Miles and Hubermann 1994). For example the Pastoral poster was titled with the voice of a teacher participant and her phrase "it's just knowing the children that you've got in the school". Under this phrase the first sub-heading was well-being which was further broken down into three further headings: emotional well-being, clubs and faith/reflection. The second sub-heading was barriers to learning which was further broken down into four further headings: emotional barriers, special educational needs (SEN), parents and reputation.

The Academic poster was also titled with the voice of a teacher participant who said her priority was to "enable young people to achieve their potential". Under this phrase the first sub-heading was climate of the classroom. The second sub-heading was student voice and this was further broken down into the status of religious studies. The third sub-heading was the religious studies curriculum and this was further broken down into influences on religious studies. The fourth sub-heading was personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship education and this was further broken down into influences on personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship education. The fifth sub-heading was tracking and this was broken down into three further headings which were school intervention followed by

school results, department intervention followed by department results and finally student intervention followed by student results.

Similarly the Innovation poster was titled with the voice of a teacher participant and his phrase “I think when you do anything new or radical...it makes me even feel a bit twitchy”. Under this phrase were three sub-headings which were community, well-being and curriculum and curriculum included enjoying, relevant and accessible. Finally the Compliance poster was titled with the voice of a teacher participant and her phrase “ensuring that people are doing their job”. Under this phrase were five sub-headings which were superficial, conflict/go through the motions, self, others comply and school.

In order to move from a descriptive response to the data and construct theory and to alleviate further preconceptions (see Diagram 1), the researcher decided to go back to Teacher M and Teacher G’s transcript and diagrammed with the data (see Diagram 2, Diagram 3 and Diagram 4). This promoted familiarisation with the data and revealed similarities, challenges and tensions between the two teacher participant interviews. Using the language of the participants within the diagrams meant it was the teacher participant’s voices that were at the forefront of her mind and her analysis rather than her own. The researcher began by constructing Diagram 2 from the data coded on the Compliance poster. The voice of the teacher participants alongside the researcher’s codes (see Diagram 2) began to reveal a difference although Teacher M and Teacher G had used a similar phrase which was “just like a tick sheet” and “tick the boxes” respectively. The researcher identified this as a telling rather than a typical moment in the teacher participant’s interview and returned to their transcripts to locate other sources of compliance that was expected of them or they expected in others (Charmaz 2004 and Miles and Huberman 1994). Teacher G expressed compliance in relation to her new Key Stage 4 citizenship role, her acquisition of the personal, social, health and economic education curriculum at Key Stage 4 and the schools expectation to achieve good GCSE exam results within religious education. Teacher M expressed compliance in relation to the provision of evidence on two new but related *Every Child Matters* initiatives, Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) and Community Cohesion.

Whilst Teacher G appeared reassured by ticking the boxes, Teacher M expressed a conflict not only in her words but in her tone (see Diagram 2). Conformity exists in many spheres and teaching is no exception for example following a dress code, attendance at parent evenings and Performance Management. Whether teacher participants were expressing compliance which was typical within their role or if there was a tension caused through their compliance and if or how this notion resonated with the student participants needed further exploration through additional participant transcripts (Charmaz 2004 and Strauss and Corbin 1990). Elements of conformity via society's use of rules and boundaries forms part of our day to day life and therefore compliance would not capture the reality participants were expressing. Incorporation began to emerge as the researcher moved beyond a descriptive response to the data as a result of coding to constructing theory.

Teacher M was responsible for *Every Child Matters* within her school which provided a unique opportunity to explore actual practice related to this initiative and diagramming was used to aid this (see Diagram 3). Once again the voice of the teacher participant alongside the researcher's codes suggested the comprehensive nature of *Every Child Matters* within one school. For Teacher M, *Every Child Matters* at its most basic was expressed via the school's ethos and the commitment of the staff to the whole child in terms of what was provided for and felt by the students within and beyond the classroom. The difficulty associated with implementing new initiatives was expressed by Teacher M and was also echoed by Teacher J, Teacher PA and Teacher S during Phase 1 of the interviews. Whether the needs of every child and the whole child were recognised and met in order to honour the inclusive nature of *Every Child Matters* as expressed by the teacher participants and felt by students would need further exploration in the data (Charmaz 2004 and Strauss and Corbin 1990). By moving beyond a descriptive response to the data to constructing theory, inclusion and mattering within and beyond the classroom became prominent.

Religious studies has been termed the 'Cinderella subject' (Copley 1997:185) and during Teacher G's interview she candidly expressed the need to "sell our subject" which resonated with the researcher. Concern regarding the status and time afforded

to religious studies had similarly been expressed by Teacher S during Phase 1 of the interviews. The researcher was keen to explore religious studies using the voice of Teacher G and to that end a diagram was constructed (see Diagram 4). The voice of the teacher participant alongside the researcher's codes (see Diagram 4) revealed a tension had emerged. There was innovation to make religious studies more appealing and relevant within the school by absorbing other subjects namely personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship education in Key Stage 4 to ensure its status and position within the curriculum. Teacher G also desired to achieve the best results that were possible via a curriculum that was not only relevant and meaningful to the students but appropriate to their needs and academic potential. However Teacher G's interview also revealed that her intentions were not always felt by her students within the classroom. Further exploration of the intentions and actions of the teacher participants and what was experienced by the students was deemed worthy of investigation within the transcripts (Charmaz 2004 and Strauss and Corbin 1990). Moving beyond a descriptive response to the data to constructing theory meant the climate of the classroom once again became prominent alongside the inaudible voice of some students.

The researcher was mindful not to attempt to explain her data in a linear fashion (see Diagram 1) by focusing on a single poster with the aim of creating a theory for each of the four headings Academic, Pastoral, Innovation and Compliance at the exclusion of the other headings. She was aware that she needed to look at her data critically and analytically in order to gain

perspectival knowledge based on the lived experience of the participants is the goal. The expected product is no longer a truth but an acceptable rendering of what had been produced in the moments of the inquiry (O'Connor et. al. 2008:30).

With the data coded and Diagrams 2, 3 and 4 revealing areas of interest, the construction of the theory could begin.

Further analysis of the data revealed five elements of the process of construction by participants to be entitled Incorporation (section 4.2), Invisible Matter (section 4.3),

Inclusion (section 4.4), The mentor's role (section 4.5) and The climate of the classroom (section 4.6). Reading the interview transcripts that had been coded Innovation and Compliance led to the emergence of Incorporation. This was beginning to emerge in Diagram 2 although it was not until the remaining participant transcripts were coded that Incorporation was confirmed to be significant. The voice of the teacher and the student participants revealed innovative ideas to develop the school, a subject, a department or an initiative although their voices were not always heard along with an expectation to comply within the boundaries of their respective role, subject or current initiative. The conditions under which it was possible for the same teacher participants and student participants to be both innovative and compliant and the tensions that ensued emerged as significant.

The extent to which a person considers themselves to be significant to specific others and is regarded as a whole person can inform an individual of the extent to which he or she matters (see section 2.2). During the teacher participant interviews the "invisible child" and "knowing the child" were particularly pertinent within the data and resonated with the concept of mattering. On examination of the interview transcripts that had been coded Academic and Pastoral the researcher heard how a student could become invisible and inaudible within a classroom or school and led to the emergence of what is here called 'Invisible matter'. An alternative reality expressed mainly by the teacher participants was ways to 'know' and 'see' the students. How a student was included and what constituted inclusion from a school and teacher perspective as well as a student perspective was pursued specifically the categorisation of students. Inclusion therefore emerged as a significant finding. Invisible matter and Inclusion were beginning to emerge in Diagram 3 although it was not until all the participant transcripts were coded that the significance of them was confirmed.

Whilst perusing the interview transcripts that had been coded Pastoral, it was apparent that there was a tension between the teacher participant interviews concerning the role of the mentor or tutor and the purpose of tutor time and its absence during the student participant interviews. The perspective of the teacher participants and the associated literature on the role of the tutor and tutor time was

not a reality expressed by the student participants and by its absence the role of the mentor or tutor emerged as significant. Finally a reading of the interview transcripts that had been coded Academic, indicated that the classroom as it was experienced by the teacher participants and experienced by the student participants revealed a contrast. This was beginning to emerge in Diagram 4 where the perspective of the teacher participant was at odds with what she revealed her students experienced in the classroom. The classroom climate was also a sub-heading within the Academic poster produced from the sections of the transcripts. The reality that was expressed by the teacher participants within their interviews was of teachers within classrooms adhering to the ethos of the school whereas the reality that was expressed by the student participants with regards to a 'good' lesson or a 'good' teacher was what it felt like to be in that classroom. Both verbal and non-verbal communication is used as an indicator of mattering (see section 2.2). The climate of the classroom as experienced by the student participants expressed through the words and actions of their teachers emerged and became significant.

There were commonalities and contrasts expressed by the teacher and student participants when coding the data. The task was to make sense of their realities (Berger and Luckmann 1966) which were revealed during the participant interviews and it is to a discussion of these five elements constructed with the voice of the participants that follows.

4.2 Incorporation

Within the context of this section, incorporation is defined as being included in or conforming to a shared vision. Teachers and students have often sought to incorporate themselves within the school for example teachers supporting students' listening in lessons (Crosskey and Vance 2011), the implementation of policies related to teaching and learning (Glover and Law 2001 and Moriarty et. al. 2001) and the role of the school manager (Ball 2003). The researcher's data reveals the occurrence and importance of teacher participants and student participants conforming to pre-assigned roles by the school. For example during an interview a teacher participant explained how student voice within her school had in the past

“upset a lot of staff” as it was “badly handled” which had led to a “formal complaint to the Head” on behalf of the staff as a staff governor. Since then another member of staff who had been put in charge of student voice was thought to be “impressive” as his approach was that “the students and staff together work on building a school”. The interpretation offered here is that the vision and rationale regarding student voice had been shared and the teacher participant felt included and its purpose was less threatening. Incorporation is significant because the increased expectation placed on teachers and students to conform illustrated a number of tensions when a challenge presented itself and the use of student voice is one such example.

It has been suggested that within the classroom students are not equal (Fielding 2004) and matter less than their teachers (Stern 2007). When opportunities for students to express their voice within the school present themselves it places the student in an active role as a consultant rather than a passive role, as he or she can collaborate with staff on issues that matter and influence subsequent change. This was apparent during a teacher participant interview. Teacher P said

I could be quite cynical and say right we've ticked the pupil voice box that's not where I'm coming from um it's it's genuinely useful um cos they're they're very honest.

Teacher P regarded student voice as

a different perspective that's sometimes you know spot on that we miss so I think it's it's essential and it's it's useful.

The interpretation offered here is that Teacher P was led by the response of his students to influence teaching and learning within the department. This was in contrast to another teacher participant. She likened her students to “guinea pigs” as student voice was conducted to evaluate a teacher imposed curriculum designed to meet external policy requirements.

Students can also express their voice via Student Council. Students on the School Council are privy to information other students are not aware of. For instance, future school plans are explained and discussed with them and they become part of the

vision. During a student participant interview Student Rita revealed that she joined the Student Council because

we used to like get out our word across and be all mouthy but it's, nice to be able to get our word across to people who listen, so then like they take our opinions on board and we are not getting in trouble for it.

Student Rita revealed that during the previous academic year “we were constantly getting told off [by teachers]” but at the time of the interview she was experiencing something new “they [teachers] praise us”. Student Rita and Student Amy had “learnt” that they had to conform to the expected role of student if the teacher was to listen and their opinion was to matter. A tension revealed itself in the data where these students had not previously conformed and incorporation was recognised. Student participants were listened to when their voice was expressed in the way prescribed and approved by the school. Outside these formal or permissible collection points the same opinions were “mouthy” and the students would find themselves in “trouble” for expressing them. The interpretation offered here is that these student participants had experienced positive and negative incorporation when expressing their voice. The rewards for positive incorporation for example being “listen[ed]” to and receiving “praise” were “nice” and became preferable which led to a change in the student participant.

Incorporation was also evident during discussions on behaviour. The data revealed that the cause(s) of disruptive classroom behaviour were not resolved and the needs of the students were not known or met. Two student participants spoke about their behaviour the previous academic year and both students reported they use to “mess around”. During the last three months of the previous academic year one student participant said she spent “a whole month in Isolation” and during the interview she suggested a “cooling room” as a better alternative to the Isolation room because

if you look on that the log book thing of the Isolation, generally it is the same people over and over again it doesn't teach anyone a lesson.

Isolation reinforced negative incorporation and this was expressed by the student participants who had been sent there who felt “angry” and likened it to being a

“prisoner”. The voice of the students who had been sent to Isolation did not seem to matter to the school. These students had not yet “learnt” to behave and therefore they were not heard as one student participant remarked,

you can never turn round and have like a civilized conversation with a teacher that you've just argued, with I think that would help coz then you could get your problems resolved.

Communication between the teacher and the student participant(s) did not occur and the classroom experiences and/or views of the students who frequented Isolation were not sought. In contrast, teacher participants revealed that listening to the voice of the students as a means of resolution was in place. For example Teacher M said

if children are sent out of class then the idea is at the end of the day they go back and they have a conversation with the teacher where they look at what went wrong and how the teacher can support them and you know maybe things that could change within the classroom, and equally what they need to do next.

The interpretation offered here is that Isolation incorporated the student into a negative view of the school and an absence of mattering was demonstrated by a student's repeated attendance. The absence of communication with students or between teachers and students indicated that it was the punishment itself that mattered more than the effectiveness of the punishment.

Other student participants revealed that they were already positively incorporated into the school, for example “if you chat and you get a warning you know to stop otherwise you may be sent to Isolation”. Research suggests that from a student perspective fairness and consistency are important qualities in a teacher. When ‘disproportionate attention’ (Lumby 2011:255) is given to students who misbehave or to students who do not achieve, it can lead to students feeling a ‘sense of injustice’ (Lumby 2011:255). A tension emerged in the data when the student participants reported on other students who did not behave likewise albeit positively or negatively.

There needs to be with warnings there needs to always be a sanction at the end...if you carry on just giving warnings they'll know that nothing's going to

happen and they'll keep on doing it but if there's a sanction at the end after a warning they'll go ok next time I'll be sent out I'll stop now but if it's warning after warning after warning they'll just go oh I'll carry on they're not doing anything about it.

Without a “sanction” a warning was “like a threat really that doesn't kind of sink in”. Student Emily seemed resigned to the fact that

you are always going to have a few people that are disruptive...some teachers are good at with students like that like taking care of them...like send them out.

The inconsistency in the response of teachers towards disruptive students in the classroom was anticipated if not expected by some student participants. The interpretation offered here is that the inaction of those teachers suggests they are not positively incorporated into the school. Further research might consider why fairness and consistency are not present in every classroom. Perhaps the use of sanctions is viewed negatively by the school or perceived as a weakness in the eyes of the teacher and a reflection on his or her teaching ability. Teachers may also adopt a more lenient approach anticipating it is preferred by students.

The curriculum provision contributed to classroom disruption and the extent to which students felt incorporated within the school. Concerns regarding curriculum provision have been expressed in the literature. The National Curriculum is thought to hinder the personalisation of learning (Hartley 2009) and its

narrowness...is detrimental to the production of the kind of flexible, problem solving lifelong learners needed for the future workforce of a leading economy (Hammersley-Fletcher and Qualter 2010:905).

The limitations of the curriculum were echoed during the interviews when the student participants spoke about Key Stage 3 and specifically Year 9. Student participants observed other students would “disrupt” lessons in the subjects they did not enjoy. Research has identified that Year 7 and Year 11 are the “twin peaks” in student engagement’ (Demetriou et. al. 2000:428) with Year 8 and Year 9 the ‘times when students can easily lose commitment to school’ (Demetriou et. al. 2000:428). For example one student participant admitted that during

the last three-ish months of school, in [name of subject] we would we'd literally stand on tables stand on chairs, like just walk out.

Towards the end of Key Stage 3 student participants knew which subjects they would be studying in Key Stage 4 and this knowledge alongside an intention to “be good next year [Year 10]” due to the onset of examinations brought with it a change in the student participant.

We realise like how difficult it is to get a job now and you do need the grades...so like every I don't know everyone's sort of buckled down...no Isolation no warnings no names on board don't do things like that anymore um my grades have gone up.

The Key Stage 3 curriculum presents additional challenges and tensions as there are limited incentives that can be traded for a student's compliance and positive incorporation that have desirable internal or external value for him or her. With each year of secondary school “fenced off” (Demetriou et. al. 2000:429) the students have no ‘clear understanding of the continuities of learning’ (Demetriou et. al. 2000:429) and can become complacent and disengaged.

Regardless of the Key Stage, the absence of the subject teacher altered the behaviour of the student participants. Disruptive behaviour was prevalent when there was a cover teacher and so was the tension that was created within the classroom. One student participant regarded cover teachers to be “pushovers” because “they don't really know all the rules and that so you can kind of do whatever you want”. Student James explained how “students use talking noise to overpower them, you know so the class has control whereas the cover doesn't”. The tension that was shown by the student participants was whether or not to join in with the disruptive behaviour,

sometimes you know, people do go along with it you know, because, you don't want to be seen as the goody goody or anything because then you'll be picked upon, so you join in.

This was supported by Student Will who said

I mean you can see the fun side of it but then if you think about it we're in the year where we are doing our, starting our GCSEs, then you think, I shouldn't really be doing this.

The interpretation offered here is that the “goody goody” students were expected to be disruptive when circumstances and peer pressure dictated it should occur. The “goody goody” students who had previously desired sanctions for disruptive students had themselves become disruptive. They were incorporated into the vision shared by the other students in the class at the time rather than that of the cover teacher or the school. The data reveals the tension conforming creates in students not only in terms of their behaviour but in being heard.

Teacher participant interviews also revealed challenges and tensions to incorporation. The role the school assigned to Teacher G was one of “ticking the boxes” and her willingness to incorporate herself into the school made her successful as she was continually promoted despite the fact she had not

really had any (laughs) training or er knowledge about [her increasing curriculum areas] other than we [the school] need someone to do it (laughs) um you seem to be the person who could do it.

Teacher G gained additional status and responsibility but was unable to set the agenda. What was important to the school with the “threat of Ofsted” was compliance to and evidence of policies being adhered to. This was a quality identified in Teacher G who made sure her “paper work is correct”, that “everything matches up” and that “we do everything when we're supposed to”. Indeed she proceeded with her most recent promotion by

mapping the curriculum seeing where they fit together looking at the guidelines, you know trying to find the guidelines (exasperated) on citizenship has been really hard.

‘Teachers are concerned that what they do will not be captured by or valued within the metrics of accountability’ (Ball 2003:223) and this was experienced by Teacher G. Teacher G was less successful when she deviated from her assigned role of “ticking

the boxes” to meet the needs of the students as she found “things that I want to do have been just flat out refused”.

During another teacher participant interview, Teacher M considered a similar approach to that of Teacher G, namely ticking boxes. Teacher M’s decision was in relation to the implementation of two new initiatives. Teacher M said

actually I’m just at the point where I’m thinking what I need to do is I just need to do something really simple like, have five questions on SEAL [Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning] five questions on Community Cohesion and say, when you are planning, just like a tick sheet almost, have you done this, this, this and this but I mean obviously that’s quite superficial it’s not, it is quite superficial and if you take something like, it is quite superficial.

A “tick sheet” for staff would have provided a quick solution to the implementation and monitoring of these initiatives. However in contrast to Teacher G, it was not the “superficial” implementation of the initiatives as a paper task that was important to Teacher M. The ethos of the school was one in which staff “share practice and develop practice” and a “simple” and “superficial” approach did not support the “powerful...whole school ethos”. The use of a tick sheet as a solution was subsequently rejected.

In order to support incorporation, further consideration might be given as to how to break the cycle of disruptive classroom behaviour so that every teacher and every student feels included and matters and teachers and students can not only share in but shape the future vision of the school. How the voice of the students and the staff can be better heard to promote incorporation and a sense of belonging needs to be addressed. Future research into curriculum provision at Key Stage 3 and the relationship between content and behaviour along with the perceived and actual value of what is being learnt to meet the needs of the students and the wider society may shed light on this.

4.3 Invisible matter

The notion of the invisible child has appeared elsewhere in respect of teaching Mathematics in secondary school (Nardi and Steward 2000), support for siblings of disabled children (Naylor and Prescott 2004), gender differentiation in nursery schools (Morgan and Dunn 1988) and students with special educational needs (Lovey 1995). The invisible child has been defined as one who displays 'quiet disaffection' (Nardi and Steward 2000:61) towards learning or children who 'seem capable of hiding like chameleons among the desks, and who are almost unknown' (Morgan and Dunn 1988:4). Conversely visible children are regarded as those who

present a high profile (positive or negative) in the classroom...and in all parts of school life. They are the children that everyone on the staff has encountered, or heard about (Morgan and Dunn 1988:6).

What has been suggested by the researcher's study is whether a student matters more or less when they are located in a separate space be it physical, social or emotional and rendered thereby invisible or inaudible to the subject teacher. Visibility and audibility are prerequisites of mattering and student participant interviews revealed invisibility could be created by teachers which went beyond previous definitions of disengaged or quiet children. It is how the invisible child is understood from the perspective of student participants and teacher participants in relation to mattering that is discussed here.

Harris et. al. (2006) found that excluding a student from a lesson(s) or a school matters to the child who has been excluded. This was reflected in the researcher's study when the student is internally excluded (Isolation) and becomes invisible. Remaining in a lesson and being in the presence of the teacher conveyed to the student that he or she mattered. A 'good' lesson was identified as a lesson in which "no-one's actually been sent out...yet". This was echoed by another student participant whose physical presence in the class was more important than her actual learning

in the lesson me and [name of subject teacher] he's a good teacher but I don't understand the way he taught it...and when I go through it with my [name of subject] tutor I just understand everything.

Even though the student did not understand the content of the lesson and undertakes extra work with a private tutor she considered the teacher to be “good”. The student participant felt she mattered to the subject teacher as she remained part of the class rather than being separated from it.

Student participants revealed that they could become invisible to the subject teacher through being sent out of the lesson. Student participants were physically separated by being told to “go to Isolation” or being removed from a lesson by another member of staff “every lesson she'd [the teacher] get a senior management in to to get Joe out”. An adolescent's perception of mattering develops through ‘interpersonal interaction’ (Marshall 2001:475) with significant others. Within school the teacher becomes a significant other and a student judges the extent to which he or she matters to the teacher by comparing the actions and attention of the teacher towards them in comparison to other students and in comparison to previous lessons/encounters. Remaining in the lesson with the other students revealed the student mattered to the teacher equally. Being removed or a teacher indicating that the student was going to be removed left the student feeling that he or she did not matter in comparison to the other students,

they're [teachers] like do you want to go to Isolation and start making fun out of you and all that and make you embarrassed and all that.

Once removed from a lesson and sent to Isolation the student could continue to be invisible and inaudible depending on the member of staff in Isolation. For example one student participant said

we was in Isolation with [name of cover supervisor] or someone he let us throw paper aeroplanes around the room but then if you have someone like [name of pastoral manager] she makes you sit there and face the wall.

This was echoed by another student participant who felt “treated like a prisoner just sitting against a wall”. If no member of staff was present

we just used to sit there [Isolation] there wouldn't be in a teacher in there ever coz it would be on a Friday and they don't have teacher up there like on a Friday.

On Friday's these students were not only invisible to the subject teacher but to the school.

An adolescent's perception of 'low paternal mattering was statistically significantly associated with depression, anxiety, and hostility' (Marshall 2001:474) and this finding is pertinent to the researcher's study. Teachers act in loco parentis and similar feelings were expressed by student participants when a student perceived they did not matter and therefore became invisible to his or her teacher. For example students who were permanently removed from a lesson became invisible to the subject teacher and no longer mattered. For example one student participant said

I got kicked out of [name of lesson] last week, and I walked into this lesson where I didn't, where I only knew one person in it and...everyone was like oh look it's a new kid, it's a new kid and I'm like I'm not I've been here since the beginning.

The anxiety of only knowing one other student and being perceived as the "new kid" was apparent. Although the link between friendship groups and academic performance has been researched (see for example Demetriou et. al. 2000) there was no resolution between the student and the teacher and the student's invisibility (removal) was permanent. The permanent removal from a subject was echoed by two other student participants who recalled being told by one of their teachers "I know you hate me and I hate you" and in another lesson the same teacher said "I don't like you, and you don't like me". Both students were then "removed out of her class". Not only did the student participants reveal hostility towards the teacher by "hold[ing] a grudge" but hostility was also felt by the teacher towards the student participants and suggests a desire on behalf of the teacher for the students to remain invisible. At the start of the following academic year one student participant said "I've walked to the door [of that teacher's classroom] I was literally a metre out and I heard go away (shout)". Similarly the other student participant said

I bumped into her like the first week we of coming back and she was like get out now and shut the door (shout).

The temporary (Isolation) or permanent (changing of class) removal of a student from a lesson rendered the student invisible to the subject teacher and there was a different perspective between the students and the classroom teacher regarding what mattered. For the teacher what mattered was the temporary or permanent removal of the student whereas what mattered to the student who was removed was to “be allowed back in lessons or to talk to the teacher”. Some student participants were resigned to the belief that it was “never going to happen”. The students who were sent to Isolation were the “same people over and over again” and Isolation for some students and some teachers had become a habit. ‘Not to change, modify, experiment is to be stuck in the rut of habit’ (Mason 2002:7). A reflective practitioner is an ‘expert who is awake to, and aware of, their practice, not just immersed in it’ (Mason 2002:15). Consideration perhaps needs to be given to find ways to recognise habitual behaviour and find alternatives.

When students were physically removed by the teacher they sought a place where they did matter. Pastoral was a place where students were visible and audible. For example one student participant said “I always think Pastoral are automatically the most understanding people in the whole school”. This sentiment was echoed by other student participants “one day I’d had enough and come here [Pastoral]”, “we always used to just come to Pastoral” and

say, you’ve done something, like wrong, you get called to Pastoral and then you can get it put right, really, just talk about it.

Empirical work in an elementary school found that teachers may avoid communicating with students individually which makes it hard for some students ‘to have a meaningful school life’ (Bartholo et. al. 2010:874) as rather than talk ‘to the student’ the teacher talks ‘*about* the student’ (Bartholo et. al. 2010:872). Pastoral staff are trained to be understanding, neutral and detached and do not allow loyalty to

teaching colleagues to compromise their relationship with students. Pastoral listened and conveyed to the students they mattered as individuals.

Anyone caring for people...needs to find a quiet calm place from which to shelter from any tide of emotional energy and from which to act dispassionately, that is, to develop a part of themselves which remains separate from the emotions of the moment, what has been called an inner witness (Mason 2002:19).

Whilst some students were invisible to the classroom teacher, teacher participant interviews revealed how their school had sought to ensure all students mattered in order to prevent 'unknown' (Morgan and Dunn 1988:4) students. For example Teacher D said

we track every child's involvement...as pastoral leaders we pull up the children that have never had a chance to be involved in anything, and therefore our action then is to try and get them into something appropriate that they would value and see because it's kind of developing the whole child.

All students were visible through their enjoyment of and participation in activities beyond their timetable. The physical tracking of participation by the school prevented the invisible child because participation was monitored and the interests and needs of individual students were met. This process of tracking participation within the school identified an ethnic group who were not involved in an activity. The conversation that then ensued with those students revealed that "culturally you don't put yourself forward". These invisible students became visible to the pastoral leaders and the school and their needs were met in a culturally sensitive way because they mattered.

Schools have sought to ensure students' affective needs are not invisible. Teacher D reflected on knowing individual students through a pastoral book, the

pastoral, book system...it actually gives you a very close and very instant record of of the children...so if there's any concerns you might have someone seems a bit lethargic if someone says they haven't had breakfast if someone seems a bit down you know it's it's not ignored...you need to know the children that you teach and if they're if they're displaying behaviour which, is different to their normal behaviour then it must be recorded...it might be so and so just doesn't seem themself at the moment or you know I noticed someone crying in

the corridor they didn't want to speak to me but I wanted to let someone know about it, so I think it is constantly constantly knowing the children in your care, is what helps you actually understand the whole person.

Similarly, Teacher M spoke of belonging to a team within the school which acted as “gatekeepers” to provide pastoral and/or academic intervention to meet the needs of all vulnerable children. A student became vulnerable when a “concern” had been identified in relation to that child for example

a really bright, very successful child [whose] struggling because they are expected to get As across the board, and they're currently you know feeling stressed.

The child had become “emotionally vulnerable”. Whilst teachers were innovative within their school and adapted to meet the needs of the “whole child” as discussed by Teacher D and Teacher M what was clear from the data was such innovation and change must translate into classroom practice which would prevent the invisible and the inaudible child.

As well as being invisible, students could also become inaudible to the subject teacher. Teacher talk can be confused with dialogue. Students can become inaudible when they are not invited to speak or participate in a lesson. Teacher talk is defined as engagement in ‘organising, explaining, summarising, reformulating, and redirecting what has been said both by themselves and by students’ (Blanchette 2009:391). Dialogue is defined as the ‘exploration of one’s own ideas; discovery of the ideas of another human being; and examination of the subject’ (Schihalejev 2009:3). For example one student participant said

if I put my hand up saying Miss, Miss and like she doesn't answer me and she goes to a different student, that's like I've been calling you since the beginning of the lesson and they've only just put their hand up so why can't you go to me?

Another student participant revealed a similar experience “you’ve got your hand up for ages they say like ask everyone else”. The interpretation offered here is that the students felt what they had to say did not matter to the subject teacher. When

students were allowed or invited to speak in a lesson they mattered and they knew that they were being listened to when “they [teachers] answer you back”. This demonstrated to the students that what they said was “not going in one ear and out the other”.

In an effort to ensure students are not inaudible, schools have introduced such measures as Student Councils, tutor representatives, student interview panels for prospective teachers and student voice (see for example Cook-Sather 2006, Fielding 2001, Richardson 2011, Rudduck and Fielding 2006 and Smyth 2006). The researcher’s study revealed that such initiatives do not guarantee students are listened to or what they say matters. As we have heard, one student participant spoke of joining the Student Council

it’s, nice to be able to get our word across to people who listen, so then like they take our opinions on board.

It was important to the student that she was heard and sought the appropriate manner for which to do so within the school. Her optimism for being listened to and being able to initiate change was not matched by the teacher participants. For example Teacher J revealed that in terms of Student Council within her school they were

trying to make it [Student Council] more democratic with more kids involved and they don’t see action happening and they are put off and nothing they suggest seems to happen.

Similarly Teacher N said “the Student Council’s a bit moribund really doesn’t really do anything really”.

At times the teacher participants themselves were invisible and their attempts to improve student engagement, student welfare and student achievement did not matter to the senior team and/or governing body. For example Teacher G wanted to enrich the curriculum through the filming of Channel 4’s Sex Education Show in an effort to reduce pregnancy within the school. Her request was “flat out refused” by the governors due to the potential “controversy” it may have caused in the

community. The perception of the school within the community mattered more than the voice of the teacher participant or the potential benefit to the students. Teacher P was also seeking to change the curriculum as a direct result of “pupil voice” so students could be “more switched on”. However changing the curriculum would be “radical” as “there isn’t a single school in the diocese that that isn’t doing that [teaching a Gospel]” and this was something the governors felt “very very strongly on is that a Gospel should be taught”. The voice of the teacher participants and the students was inaudible.

Instances of teachers reacting rather than responding to students were revealed in student participant interviews and a different perspective towards mattering was once again revealed.

Instead of responding sensitively to situations, we [teachers] frequently react according to established patterns. We may even find ourselves quickly classifying people and situations in which we are involved and then reacting to those stereotypes before we realise what has happened. So we continue to believe we act freshly all the time, when in fact much of the time we react rather than respond (Mason 2002:8).

What mattered to teachers was the behaviour of the students in the past whereas what mattered to the students was a new beginning. Student participants spoke about how they were classified by teachers for example one student participant said

with like [name of teacher] was like oh I’m gonna have you at the front and I’d been I hadn’t like done anything and they’d say about it and it’s just they’ve seen your name.

Another student participant had a similar experience

my [name of subject] teacher said to me she didn’t er don’t know whether with [name of a student], coz we always messed around last year she said, we don’t know whether to keep you two apart this year or if you’re gonna start anew again.

Two other student participants revealed similar experiences during their interview. They said that when one of their teachers left during the academic year they found

out she had “writ something on the register about us two and it’s bad” for the new teacher and consequently they had “been blacklisted”. This was also true for another student participant who said “they [teachers] don’t give you like another chance” and this is echoed further by another student participant who stated

if you’re bad last year then like if something like, someone like makes a noise in the class they look straight at you and think it’s you.

The interpretation offered is that when students are judged by their previous actions they felt they mattered less and became inaudible to the subject teacher.

In order to prevent the student from becoming invisible and inaudible the following might be considered. The importance of a ‘fresh start’ (Harris et. al. 2006:30) and ‘feeling special and valued’ (Harris et. al. 2006:31) were reflected in the student participant interviews. Teachers who gave “everyone a chance...like a clean slate no matter what you’d done” and who “welcomed” students each lesson indicated that the student mattered to the teacher. Greeting students as they enter the classroom for example may make students feel welcomed.

Each act of teaching, of caring, of supporting, is also an act of learning: learning about the students, learning about the situation, and learning about oneself (Mason 2002:7).

The subject teacher needs to respond to the student without a ‘tide of emotion’ (Mason 2002:19) and talk to the student who has been removed rather than talk about the student to another member of staff for example a pastoral manager. This could help to resolve classroom issues and lead to a fresh start every lesson.

4.4 Inclusion

School systems have long segregated students on the basis of measures of ability and since 1944 children aged eleven were tested in order to allocate the child to either a grammar school, secondary modern school or technical school which ‘aimed to treat children of the same measured ability in the same way’ (West and Pennell 2003:29). Whilst the placing of students in different types of schools facilitated the

planning and organisation for these students' futures it meant those students who went to secondary modern schools mattered less than those students who went to grammar schools. This was because students at a grammar school could undertake Advanced (A') levels and progress to university which led to a professional career whereas students at a secondary modern school were not able to attain such qualifications or positions. The tripartite system relegated a student's significance as 'parity of esteem was never created between these different types of school' (West and Pennell 2003:29). The belief that a child's intelligence was fixed and was easy to assess and that through the process of categorisation a child would learn best in a school which reflected these differences was later challenged (Black-Hawkins et. al. 2008).

From the 1960s, the Labour Government sought to establish a comprehensive educational system that was not founded on ability or selection and by the 1980s comprehensive schools were universal. Since the creation of comprehensive schools, a number of Education Acts have embedded the philosophy of education for all (see section 2.2). More recently the organisation of students has taken account of a wider range of measures. This has created a tension between striving for equity and academic performance and consequently to an understanding of how students matter within schools.

Schools have become more inclusive (see for example Frederickson and Cline 2002, Hodkinson and Vickerman 2009 and Soan (ed) 2004) and this was evident in teacher participant interviews. Teacher participants in their respective schools revealed inclusive education included students who were "looked after children", students who were identified as "vulnerable", students who were from "black and minority ethnic groups", students who start school "below level 3", "children who are at school action children who are at school action plus children who have a statement", "children on the special needs register", "children with disabilities", "EAL [English as an additional language] children", students with "emotional and behaviour and social difficulties", students at risk of being "excluded" and students with "low self-esteem or lacking confidence". To matter has been defined as feeling 'cared for by others' (France and

Finney 2009:105) and teacher participants discussed innovative ways for these students to matter within their school. For example one teacher participant said

we've organised, where the EAL [English as an additional language] children do lunch time clubs they teach the other children their language and, bring in their food for them to try and play games with them.

The process of identifying the increasing diversity and inclusive nature of students within a school was not without its difficulties as Teacher D revealed,

it was assumed we had a very very naughty Polish boy and um I think you know for the first couple of months we probably failed him because, we got very little information on him the parents can't speak a word of English, er he was disrupting lots of lessons, um and it was only until we got another parent to come in as like an interpreter...that we actually found out he was coming with specific needs special needs, he was very unhappy we changed, transformed his whole timetable we've got college release course for him we've got, all sorts of different systems set up.

The interpretation offered is that a student who is perceived to be “naughty” and “disrupting” the learning of others matters less than a student with an identified “need”. When a label or need is allocated to a particular student the student mattered more as the perception of the school and the staff changed towards the student and he or she was bestowed support. Those students without an identified need or label are expected to learn without any additional support.

This was highlighted during a student participant interview. The student was acutely aware of his needs “I can't really read that well...I ain't dyslexic but I can't really read and write that well”. The student participant explained the difficulties he experienced during lessons

your hand hurts like ow and then you get in trouble for not writing and then you get in trouble coz you can't learn as quick as some of the others.

As he is unable to complete the work as fast as the other students in the class and feels he “can't learn” his behaviour deteriorates and he gets his “name on the board or get sent to Isolation”. Despite the student participant being aware of his learning

difficulty, without an accepted label, for example “dyslexic”, his needs were not met and he did not matter. Instead he was considered “bad” and subsequently “blacklisted” by his teacher.

“Naughty” and “bad” behaviour by student(s) who “can’t learn” is noticed by teachers.

Every practitioner, in what ever domain they work, wants to be awake to possibilities, to be sensitive to the situation and to respond appropriately. What is considered appropriate depends on what is valued, which in turn affects what is noticed. Thus every act of caring and supporting depends on noticing (Mason 2002:7).

Student participants recognised when they were noticed by their teacher and mattered for example one student participant said “she knows how much to help us...how to teach us”. For other student participants there was an absence of care and support within the school

well I've got a [name of subject] tutor now...coz I know now if I worry that I can't do it in class I just have my [name of subject] tutor to rely on to help me.

The class teacher failed to notice the student “can’t do it in class” and therefore could not be “rel[ied] on” by the student to support her learning. As the student participant was not disruptive in the lesson, the interpretation offered here is that what was valued and noticed by the teacher was good behaviour whilst an absence of academic understanding went unnoticed.

It has been suggested that an education system which is inclusive of students who have been identified with particular needs ‘disrupts not only their education, but also the education of others’ (Harris et. al. 2006:28). One student participant recalled how

this year I've gone down a set in [name of subject] and the people from top set to the second set it is a completely different experience, one hundred percent you'll get people who actually don't do any work at all, yet they stay in the lesson, every lesson.

In an effort to address the disruption in lessons, teacher participants and student participants revealed how some students were treated differently to their peers based

on their ability or learning status. Students were placed in “sets” or “stream[s]” which at times reduced their curriculum provision and/or the qualifications they could attain. Whilst the intention behind the actions of the teachers was to ensure each student mattered this was not always felt by the students. For example Teacher G said

students who don't get a level 5 at the end of Year 9 in their religious studies, they will do short course [religious studies] um OCR and the Certificate of Personal Effectiveness because then we can go at a pace that is a lot more suited to them whereas everybody else will not (emphasis) do the Certificate of Personal Effectiveness but concentrate on the [full course] GCSE so they'll be kind of the vast majority still doing GCSE but with maybe one or two classes smaller classes working with kids who need more support with their literacy or just more time to take and learn things.

Students who were in these “smaller classes” were aware they were being treated differently as Teacher G revealed

the behaviour in those classes can be really tough, the kids who've got low self-esteem haven't been particularly successful in school and so are kinda trying it on a bit.

The interpretation offered here is that students are relegated. Students with “low self-esteem” and who “haven't been particularly successful” were put in the same class together and were not afforded the same academic opportunity in terms of curriculum provision or potential qualifications as the students in the other classes. Whilst the intention behind Teacher G's actions was to enable the students to learn at a “pace that is a lot more suited” to them in “smaller classes” with “more support with their literacy”, the students did not interpret her actions in the same way and did not feel as though they mattered which they expressed through their “tough” behaviour and by “trying it on a bit”. Harris et. al. advise that teachers need ‘to develop more inclusive learning environments’ (2006:28). When schools or departments restrict provision on behalf of their students, the students interpret this to mean they do not matter.

The introduction of the National Curriculum and national testing where the content and pace of student learning has been fixed to meet expected outcomes (Hartley 2009) rests on the premise that all students are the same. This leads to a tension when alternative provision to personalise learning to meet the needs of individual

students is provided by schools or individual departments. Research has shown that certain students are more likely to underachieve at Key Stage 4 (Black-Hawkins et. al. 2007) and schools are keen to identify these students in order to improve their progress and performance. Different attainment by some students is pertinent to the researcher's study as interviews with teacher participants suggested a tension between personalisation for learning and student performance.

Schools have introduced tracking to monitor the progress and performance of their students. The introduction of measures of progression and school league tables have meant that student attainment has become a priority as underachievement reflects badly on the teacher, the department and the school. Tracking occurs at prescribed times during a school year and is the process of formally recording and reporting current student attainment against his or her target level or grade. Teacher participants revealed the purpose of tracking is to "identify underachievers" in order to ensure students are "not falling short of all they're capable of and potential of doing". Although every student is tracked, there is a greater emphasis placed on some groups of students as Teacher M revealed,

teachers track all children according as individuals but also according to groups, so for example they're looking you know if you're a science teacher you're tracking your class you track individuals but you also then have within that, children who are at school action children who are at school action plus school children who have a statement, children who have free school meals children who are black and minority, all of those things.

To ensure students make progress they are tracked across a variety of criteria as Teacher D explained

so every six weeks teachers will, either plus or minus a child's achievement on the targets that have been set...so you could actually minus a child on something like attendance for example you could minus them on er, you know poor homeworks or poor class work but you can also minus them on behaviour and focus.

To support progress in the classroom, teachers are expected to personalise learning (Furlong 2008, Hartley 2009 and Ofsted 2012) especially for students with particular needs. Personalisation of learning has been defined as "tailoring" pedagogy to the

pupils' needs' (Hartley 2009:429). It has been suggested that personalisation 'intends that every child will be enabled to meet his or her potential. Every child matters' (Hartley 2009:430). The government expects that personalisation will entail

matching high quality teaching to the different and developing abilities of pupils, focused on breaking down barriers to learning and progress and underpinned by high expectations...so that there is a relentless focus on pupils 'keeping up' (Hartley 2009:428).

Here there is a subtle but distinct difference. The different abilities of the students are deemed to be barriers and once these barriers are identified, students are expected to keep up and achieve the same standards and outcomes as every other student. The interpretation offered here is that support with learning has been replaced with intervention and caring about students has become tracking. There seems to be confusion between personalised learning which is grounded in personalism and one which is bureaucratic and market-driven. The contribution of personalism to personalised learning is that it underpins *Every Child Matters* as it recognises that mattering is a 'deeply personal issue' (Stern 2007:284) and teaching and learning is a 'personal exchange' (Stern 2007:284) which goes beyond performance and acknowledges the whole child.

The process of tracking reduces the student to a commodity where the student is relegated to an economic unit. During the researcher's study, student participants revealed their priorities in economic terms "to get a good job" and "get like good grades...to get a job". This was echoed in teacher participant interviews and teachers revealed their priorities to be "school results", "tracking of the academic progress" and "to make sure that they [students] are not underachieving" and schools were likened to "exam factories". *Every Child Matters* challenges the student being seen in purely economic terms and instead recognises the whole person.

Every Child Matters (ECM) sends the very clear message that in order for children and young people to thrive in contemporary society, their holistic development should be prioritized, and in this endeavour schools have an extremely important role to play (Adams 2007:225-226).

This is pertinent to the researcher's data. Despite the constraints of the curriculum and the pressures associated with performance, teacher participants sought to meet the wider social and emotional needs of their students to address their holistic development. For example Teacher G said

[personal, social and health education is] not just about exam results it is about kids making an informed decision and having good knowledge about things, and again we try and look at the curriculum each year and think about what's most relevant to those kids we also let them choose topics from a selection that they want to know about.

Similarly Teacher D said

in terms of the PSHE [personal, social and health education]...one thing that came up a few years back is stress and anxiety and mental health issues, that I don't think we probably did enough on as a school so now we've got units on emotional health and how to deal with anxiety.

Students want to matter to their teachers and student participants relished being "praised", being sent "postcards home" and knowing their behaviour was considered to be "excellent". The issue is how to marry the intentions of the teachers with the perceptions of the students so that the actions of the teachers to honour mattering are felt by all students. Teachers are expected

to bring more students than ever before to higher levels of achievement than ever before on a broader range of skills and knowledge than ever before (Levin 2010:740).

How the need for student performance and progress can be combined with care and support for the student as an individual needs further study. The signals that students picked up as to whether they were relegated or included were not always structural or formal in nature but were verbal and non-verbal interactions with their teachers and other adults. From a student participant perspective it was not the provision that mattered to the student but the personal style and approach of the teacher that made the student feel included. Whether students are aware of the labels or identities that are attached to them by schools, whether students respond positively to a label and

whether students and teachers regard those students as mattering more could be an area of further study.

4.5 The mentor's role

The 'House System' that has been adopted by many schools since the changes in education after 1944 developed as a way of 'enabling the pupil in a large school to feel at home, known and valued' (Marland 2002:5). Within the house system were Form Teachers but they had few responsibilities and their work was compounded by the fact that the students within a form were designated to different houses limiting the relationship between the student and the form teacher. Consequently progress in the 'pastoral aspect appeared thin throughout the fifties' (Marland 2002:4). Benn and Chitty found a number of reasons why the house system lost its popularity in the 1960s

it was often left to the Head of House or senior house staff to deal with all the many day-to-day difficulties faced by pupils...and these were pressures that were simply too onerous for many conscientious teachers (1996:230).

The creation of management positions within a pastoral framework similar to academic positions within schools 'meant that for the first time school resources, ie time and money, were put into pastoral work' (Griffiths and Sherman 1991:6). As a result the roles of head of year and form tutors developed which resulted in the role of the form tutor requiring 'a far higher degree of commitment than the traditional 'form teacher' of earlier times' (Davis 1993:79). The role of the tutor was further strengthened by the 1988 Education Reform Act and during that decade 'the establishment of the role of the tutor and a Tutorial Programme in most schools was fairly advanced' (Marland 2002:10).

A significant finding in the researcher's data was the lack of reference made to the tutor or mentor. Of the fourteen student participants that were interviewed in total, only one mentioned the role of the tutor, "if I do have any problems to make sure that they're sorted out...speak to my tutor". Contrary to Marland and Rogers who said

if there were no tutors in a school there would be no 'home' for a pupil to go to when he or she needed it (2004:3),

the data revealed student participants sought alternative pastoral care from someone other than their tutor. A number of student participants spoke about the role of Pastoral as the place where they mattered. For example if a student had "done something, like wrong", was involved in a "fight", behaved in a way that was deemed unacceptable to the class teacher such as "scribbled" in an exercise book or needed support "one day I'd had enough", the students said they "came", were "called" or teachers "bring you into Pastoral" as Pastoral, rather than their tutor, was the place a student could "get it put right" and "just talk about it". This was echoed by a teacher participant who said

we've got a fantastic student welfare team and I think they have been relied on a bit too much oh kid's crying go to Welfare.

Marland and Rogers wrote that in 'most secondary schools the students report that they are more likely to turn to their tutor' (2004:3) but the voice of the student participants in this study did not support their findings and it was not their tutor that the students recognised they mattered to. Although the role of the tutor has remained as part of a school's structure, student participants sought out an individual who displayed sensitivity and conveyed the student mattered to them rather than the person with the assigned role of tutor. As we have heard from one student participant who voiced

I wouldn't just go to any teacher I'd have come I'd probably I would come go to Pastoral coz I always think Pastoral are automatically the most understanding people in the whole school really.

Increasingly the social and emotional needs of students are met by non-teaching staff employed by schools in a pastoral role and this raises a number of questions that will now be considered. The first is how and why the role of the tutor changed, the second is what is the purpose of tutor time and the third is does tutor time support the needs of the whole child? The role of the tutor changed with the implementation of the National Curriculum, which brought with it national testing at Key Stages, explicit

targets and expectations of achievement and the establishment of Ofsted. Secondary school teachers expressed concern that their affective role was

undermined by the pressure for performance, to become “expert technicians” in transmitting externally pre-defined knowledge and skills to their pupils (Osborn 2006:243).

A teacher’s role as a ‘subject specialist’ (Osborn 2006:248) combined with an additional role as a tutor to support the personal and social lives of students led to a ‘tension and separation’ (Osborn 2006:248) between the two roles. The government’s promise to ‘diversify staffing structures within schools thereby freeing up teachers to focus on their core tasks of teaching and learning’ (Furlong 2008:731) was echoed by one teacher participant who said

she’s [the acting head] been um actually really very good (emphasis) this year on calling all the heads of department in, and going through what the school priorities are, um which as usual is results led.

Teaching and learning culminating in academic performance is what matters and consequently tutors can have ‘their minds on the challenge of their day’s subject teaching’ (Marland and Rogers 2004:39) rather than focused on their tutees or tutor time.

Marland and Rogers wrote that ‘a Tutor is a teacher whose subject is the pupil herself’ (1997:iii) but data from the teacher participants revealed that this was no longer accurate and that the ‘subject’ was not the ‘pupil’ as the purpose of tutor time had changed. With teachers in their dual role as tutors and the focus on teaching and learning, tutor time had become an extension of the academic rather than affective in nature. For example Teacher G said

I wanted to know what tutors were doing in tutor times as well as just in the subject [citizenship], so much scope for voting student um council school councils.

And Teacher N said

so Wednesday period five would be what we called Year Form Time YFT and gloom would descend on the college, every form tutor was with their form, in year groups and doing PSHE [personal social and health education].

Teacher G and Teacher N discussed how tutor time was used to deliver curriculum subjects which was also echoed by Teacher J who said

I do impact on tutor time where necessary for example anti-bullying week I write stuff for them [tutees] to do, anti-smoking day I write tutor stuff and option choices I have done some supporting and training, I have organised that.

Where tutor time is used for teaching a subject(s) there is less opportunity to get to know the tutees as individuals and whole people (Stern 2007) and as the teacher participant data revealed it affects how a tutor approaches tutor time and the tasks within it. Teacher N spoke of “gloom” and Teacher J said “tutor delivery is ad hoc and not delivered well” which can affect how tutees interpret the importance of tutor time, what is delivered and the extent to which they matter to their tutor.

Teacher M and Teacher D spoke extensively about pastoral care throughout their interview. In relation to the role of the tutor specifically, Teacher D said

it's not always easy to know everyone in the school so, it's having really really good um support for form tutors.

That way each tutee is known and matters to their tutor. Whilst Teacher M said

the notion behind it [mentoring] is that you have I think a much more mentoring role a kind of closer relationship with those individuals and you mentor them through, academically and kind of pastorally.

Teacher M added that the mentor is the person “we would encourage them [students] to go to because those are the people that they see most often”. Although Teacher D and Teacher M as assistant headteachers spoke about the importance of the role of the tutor or mentor, as neither of them were tutors or mentors a future consideration that might be explored is how effectively a policy or initiative is transmitted, understood and undertaken in practice by those charged with its delivery.

The change in the purpose of tutoring changed the emphasis on meeting the needs of the student which became performance driven. Marland and Roger said people need to

be wary of those who say the tutor's task is 'getting to know his pupils'. That is a means and not an end. The purpose of that knowledge is to help the tutee help himself be a better student (2004:17).

This reduces the student to a commodity (see section 2.2). Knowing the student does not matter as much as making them 'better' which is performance based. Osborn found

that in an effort to raise standards, there has been a re-focusing of the group tutor role to include more academic support and personal planning. Tutors were being required to monitor the progress of pupils using computer data in order to set targets, which would then be discussed with individual pupils (2006:248).

This was reflected in the teacher participant data "you mentor them through, academically". Another teacher participant echoed this and said

they [senior management] are going to change quite radically the tutorial system in the 6th form and they want to bring it into an academic coaching rather than a mentoring set up and I am a Year 12 tutor so it affects me but weirdly, and I don't understand this, they are going to suggest that you coach A' level students that you don't know who don't do your A' level so in other words it's a kind of it's meant to be negative or bland or something I don't know if that's the right word but you haven't got any bias it seems to be completely illogical but that's what they are talking about.

A "bland" or "negative" approach seemed "illogical" and created a tension as the teacher participant recognised the importance of knowing and having a relationship with the tutee that was to be coached. With the needs of the whole child not being met due to the emphasis on raising academic performance within tutor time or during mentoring, students are finding alternative people to meet their affective needs.

The size of secondary schools can make students anonymous, something which increases the importance of the tutor's role to ensure students matter.

Tutors are usually the only people in school who have daily contact with a group of students over an extended period of time, in some cases over five, six or even seven years (Carnell and Lodge 2002:13).

The relationship that can be formed and the potential to know the whole child must be understood and utilised for the benefit of every child. Osborn spoke of a shift in education from 'a "professional covenant" model of teaching' (2006:251) based on the personal to a 'contractual and performance based model' (2006:251) with prescribed inputs, processes and outcomes. The divide between the academic and the pastoral within schools hinders a sense of community and inhibits communication which does not support the whole person (Stern 2007). If

the tutor is the heart of the school, the specialist whose specialism is bringing everything together, whose subject is the pupil herself, who struggles for the tutee's entitlement, and who enables the pupil to make the best use of the school and develop her person (Marland and Rogers 2004:17)

and if every child is to matter the following recommendations are made in terms of the tutor's or mentor's role.

There needs to be a balance of meeting time between the academic (department) and the affective (pastoral/tutor) to signify the importance of the dual role of teachers. The 'pressure of time and a demand to plan, assess and reach ever increasing, externally defined targets' (Osborn 2006:246) in an environment in which for teachers and students the 'affective or social and personal domain had been reduced in preference to the academic' (Osborn 2006:246) can undermine the purpose of tutor time and the role of the tutor. As standards for teachers are monitored, similarly the role of the tutor should be formally and informally monitored to raise awareness of its importance. The position of tutor time within the school day, its duration and purpose needs to be reviewed.

For example, placing tutor time at the end of the school day would enable the tutor to address any issues that have arisen. Tutor time could then focus on the needs of the whole child. Staff should be expected and encouraged to inform the tutor of pastoral and academic issues that have arisen during the day, as the tutor is better placed to

support thirty students rather than a pastoral manager or a head of year who oversees an entire year group or house. When the role of the teacher is combined with the role of the tutor, for example via the delivery of the curriculum such as citizenship or personal, social, health and economic education and/or mentoring it too can undermine the purpose of tutor time and the role of the tutor. With education in a constant state of flux, the purpose of tutor time and the role of the tutor needs to be reviewed and understood.

4.6 The climate of the classroom

The climate of the classroom has been defined as

the collective perceptions by students of what it feels like, in intellectual, motivational and emotional terms, to be a student in any particular teacher's classroom, where those perceptions influence every student's motivation to learn and perform to the best of his or her ability (Bethel-Fox and O'Connor 2000:2).

This is separate from the ethos of the school which is defined as the 'subjective values and principles underpinning policy and practice' (Glover and Coleman 2005:16). Thus the climate of a classroom is what is perceived by students whereas its ethos is the intentions of its providers. The discussion that follows illustrates the discontinuity between what is intended and what is realised.

Although a measure of student perception with regards to the climate of the classroom has been developed (Rowe et. al. 2010), Bethel-Fox and O'Connor (2000) found that the teachers in their study did not understand the climate that existed within their classrooms nor the link between classroom climate and student academic progress. The government's standards agenda has created 'frightened organisations' (Watkins 1999:74) where the teacher's 'fear of failure leads to teacher-centred, didactic, content-driven classroom practices' (Harris et. al. 2006:33) which has created a 'competitive neurosis' (Andrews 2001:150) within schools. Despite research finding that

an ethic of caring is at the heart of teaching and learning, providing a foundation upon which effective learning and success can be built (Cefai 2008:55)

and the launch of initiatives such as Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL), measures of classroom climate 'are seldom used either to assess the current classroom environment, or to help teachers improve their pedagogic practices' (Bethel-Fox and O'Connor 2000:3) within English schools. Therefore the climate of the classroom is either overlooked or it is understood from an adult rather than a student perspective.

Student participants identified the style of the lesson, the attitude of the teacher and the behaviour management style that was adopted as a way to measure the climate of the classroom and the extent to which they mattered to the teacher. With regards to the style of the lesson, student participants identified 'bad' lessons as ones which were "boring", involved "writing the whole lesson", where the teacher "gives us a textbook", where students are told to "get on with this and do that" and extended periods of "sitting down". Other indicators included teachers "literally just like reading from a...script" or "a teacher talking at you for a whole hour" also "working on for the whole hour the same thing" and was reflected in the literature (see for example Harris et. al. 2006, Hopkins 2008 and Nardi and Steward 2000).

Students identified that they mattered to the teacher when variety and creativity were incorporated into the lessons. The researcher's findings are supported by other studies that found students 'complain of a curriculum which...leaves them passive and uninvolved' (Cefai 2008:84). To what extent a student participates or is engaged in a lesson may be associated with 'what it feels like...to be a student in [that]...teacher's classroom' (Bethel-Fox and O'Connor 2000:2). Whilst judgements are made on student engagement or participation by heads of department, members of the senior team or external advisers or inspectors, finding the cause of student disengagement or lack of participation is the step which is often missed once the judgement has been made and may need to be rectified.

Teacher participants recognised the importance of the style of the lesson in order to create a better classroom climate. For example Teacher G said

PSHE [personal, social and health education]...was taught as a discreet subject but by teachers who basically had extra time on their timetable so you're an hour under so you can teach the PSHE [personal, social and health education]...and some of the lessons that I was hearing about from the kids I just thought oh that's not good.

Teacher G secured the personal, social and health education curriculum time to develop a team of teachers for the benefit of the students because their learning and experience mattered to her. However this contrasted with the experience of Teacher J and Teacher S who had an external consultant offer advice on lesson style and were told of the importance of

making it clear what the objectives are, are you telling students what they should have achieved at the end of the lesson

so students are able to “tick off oh we’ve done X Y Z”. Teacher G recognised the climate of the classroom in relation to teacher style and student learning although the data indicated that some advisers saw lesson style as “telling” students what to achieve so learning can be ticked off.

There have been academic initiatives within schools such as Assessment for Learning (AfL) and Assessing Pupil Progress (APP) to support lesson style and structure and through the use of formative written and oral comments, the student can take greater ownership of their learning and progress alongside communication with their teacher. The use of Assessment for Learning as part of the lesson style is indicative that the students and their learning matters to the teacher, although because not all teacher participants were familiar with such initiatives an opportunity to enhance the climate of the classroom and learning was lost. For example Teacher PA said

I wouldn't be able to really explain to you clearly what AfL [Assessment for Learning] was or give you any real examples of what it is in practice...these are

initiatives that we've fallen behind on hence Gaining Ground the last couple of years...and we're getting all these things shoved down our our throat now.

From the perspective of the student participants, the attitude of the teacher affected the climate of the classroom and revealed whether or not the student mattered. For example student participants spoke of teachers who were “moody”, “stressy” or “shout” and

it's like they [teachers] don't get enough sleep and they just come to school and are like just do this like they don't really care.

If the teacher “don't really care” it makes it harder for the student to care and engage with the lesson. With up to six lessons per day, fluctuating attitudes from teachers would affect learning as the student is unsure whether he or she mattered to the teacher. If a teacher is “rude” then tries “to get your attention...that just makes you not want to give 'em it” and if a student is consciously not giving the teacher their attention, learning cannot take place. The way students are spoken to reveals the teacher's ‘emotional literacy’ (Tew 2007:11) and informs the student of the extent to which they matter and emphasises how mindful teachers must be in the way they communicate with students if a classroom climate conducive to learning is to be created.

Students knew they mattered when teachers were “calm”, when students felt “they [teachers] treat you with respect”, when the teacher “talks to us” rather than shouted, when the teacher's tone of voice was “interesting” and the teacher was “happy to teach”, “enthusiastic”, and in a “good mood”. Student participants also spoke about being made to “feel...welcomed” for example when a teacher “ask[ed] how your day was” made them feel as though they mattered. The student knew they mattered and interpreted the attitude of the teacher who displayed this attitude as wanting to be with the student and/or the class.

The importance of the teacher's attitude in the classroom to its climate and to student learning was expressed by Teacher M who said

nobody ever says oh I don't want that person in my class I've never...heard those kind of conversations that you, certainly historically and I imagine you still hear in other places.

A school can inform students, staff and parents of its ethos but for that ethos to be lived, it must be part of the daily experience not just the formal experience of the students because

collegiality, collaboration, engagement and shared values and beliefs contribute to a sense of belonging among the staff. This feeds back into the processes occurring at both school and classroom levels, as staff become more likely to share the school's values, vision and objectives (Cefai 2008:44).

This was emphasised by Teacher M who said in relation to the teaching staff

I think everybody that comes in here [to teach], if they stick around they have to kind of buy into that positivity.

And that positivity meant that every student matters.

Finally the behaviour management employed by the teacher was interpreted by the students with regards to whether they mattered. Student participants said that "getting shouted at...you'd think it'd make you listen and learn but when teachers shout at you you don't". Again learning cannot take place in a climate of shouting, especially as students consciously stop listening and learning as a consequence. When behaviour management is not followed through the inaction of the teacher can be interpreted by a student to mean his or her learning does not matter. For example as we have previously heard from one student participant

there needs to be with warnings there needs to always be a sanction at the end of it coz it's like with parents and children...if you carry on just giving warnings they'll know that nothing's going to happen and they'll keep on doing it.

Otherwise "it's like a threat really that doesn't kind of sink". Rules and structure liberates as they allow students to feel safe and thereby supports their learning (Harris et. al. 2006 and Tew 2007). Clear behaviour systems which enable the

student to communicate with the teacher supports both their learning and the classroom climate as illustrated by Teacher M who has previously said

if children are sent out of class then the idea is at the end of the day they go back and they have a conversation with the teacher.

Within the data there was some crossover between ethos and climate for example Teacher M said

the climate that you create in your classroom for example...you have a responsibility to teach lessons which are accessible first of all, enjoyable that's an interesting one in itself, um but also to address those issues about um, mental health I suppose and safety which is just about creating a safe environment...it's about classroom ethos classroom ethos and responses and things and whole school policies as well.

Also Teacher D said

monitoring is a massive (emphasis) part of my job so every every day there's, time for monitoring going around classes checking children are on task that they're not disrupting the learning or behaviour of others and that they're not, being isolated.

Teacher M and Teacher D had discussed the ethos of their respective schools rather than the classroom climate.

Whilst imposing a classroom climate may not be as effective because 'change must...come from within the classroom itself, rather than imposed from above or outside' (Cefai 2008:140), the first step towards change is that teachers must be taught how to create a good classroom climate for the personal growth of each student to improve learning. Receiving feedback on the climate that teachers create in their classrooms is rare (Bethel-Fox and O'Connor 2000) as feedback is often focused on student academic performance. Formal as well as informal observations of lessons must take account of the climate and as a guide to good practice, teachers should welcome students into the classroom, ensure every student starts with a "clean slate", that behaviour strategies are applied consistently and fairly and no lessons are taught solely from a textbook. The voice of the students must be

regularly collected on the climate of the classroom to reveal what takes place behind closed doors when heads of department, the senior team and external advisers or inspectors are not watching. Student voice must not be collected at the end of the year as it is too late to make any necessary changes and all students must be invited to be heard. During Initial Teacher Training (ITT) courses and Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) training, there is often space for reflection on lessons that are taught on university or school documentation and/or during seminars or meetings but reflective practice is not so readily encouraged or expected once Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) is reached and the focus becomes performance driven. The

narrow focus on performance has led many teachers, against their better judgement, to reduce the amount of attention they pay to pupils' social and emotional needs and to classroom relationships (Cefai 2008:55).

Perhaps this is because results rather than relationships have become a key focus. Teachers should be encouraged to reflect more on what takes place in the classroom.

Further research needs to be undertaken as to whether there is a gender difference between the ideal classroom climate created by male and female secondary school teachers which is desirable from a student perspective as most research to date is primary school based. The majority of student participants in this study were drawn from a cohort identified as challenging and/or special or additional educational needs. One might consider if the ideal classroom climate is the same for all students or whether there are differences between students and if so why. Finally the approach to staffing and timetabling needs further investigation. To what extent are lower sets allocated non-specialist teachers as a school policy because higher sets need specialist teacher expertise to ensure or maintain results. What impact might such policies have on staff and students in terms of the climate that is created as a result? With non-examined subjects like personal, social, health and economic education taught by teachers who are under target, what affect does this have on the climate that is created as exam classes are timetabled as a priority.

5 Review

This final chapter reflects on the journey of *Every Child Matters*. Education is in a constant state of flux and the place of *Every Child Matters* not only as a government policy that emerged and evolved but as a creedal concept within future practice is considered. The personal journey of the researcher is also discussed amid the tensions that arose not only as a teacher-researcher but in her professional practice as a teacher.

5.1 In retrospect

During this study the professional expectations that were adopted as a teacher inhibited her effectiveness as a researcher. As a teacher she is a voice of authority and knowledge, the leader of a curriculum that matters and someone who listens to and acts upon the decisions made by the Principal and the governors. These expectations are reinforced for example during staff briefings, middle leader forums, performance management meetings, communications with the senior team and departmental monitoring. Rewards for conforming to these expectations are received in the form of praise, opportunities to train others to do likewise and even promotion. It was apparent that these professional expectations permeated the teacher participant and the student participant interviews which made it difficult for her to inhabit the role of a researcher.

As a teacher who was conducting academic research, professional curiosity and professional comparisons could be heard during teacher participant interviews. She delved into the practice of the school or department which went beyond the intention of the interview for example by asking

What's going to be happening with the student voice...is it going to be expanded or is something different now going to happen in the rest of the school?

And

Can I ask how that goes in terms of what is provided for you as a department or a school in terms of time or resources?

At times teacher participant interviews were used in an attempt to resolve the personal conflicts she faced as a teacher and became cathartic. For example “Do you think if you worked more hours you would ever be on top of things?” and “How do you go about prioritising what you do and don’t do...what’s your system?” or “How do you organise your time to do everything you need to do?” Interviews were teacher-researcher rather than teacher participant led. This was evident when she inquired “And can I also ask, just to see how it has worked...” or “I’m intrigued...” The role of a teacher and that of a researcher was further blurred due to the relationship she had with the teacher participants and the cooperation and collaboration that ensued.

There was a sense of familiarity between the researcher and the teacher participants, many of whom were known to the researcher prior to their interview. The foundation for this relationship between colleagues was established during regular meetings and training courses that were based on common curricula subjects where habits that were not desirable as a researcher were formed. Within her role as a researcher she had to learn to be quiet, a skill not usually required in a teacher. By becoming quiet she learnt to listen more, recognise it was the voice of the teacher participants that mattered and she learnt to follow their lead during interviews rather than her own agenda as a teacher. It proved to be more of a challenge to maintain this approach and respect the voice of the student participants in the same way.

Although the voices of the teacher participants were keenly sought by the researcher, in contrast she debated the merit of obtaining the voice of the students and questioned whether it would illuminate the study. In her professional opinion as a teacher rather than as a researcher, honouring *Every Child Matters* was undertaken by teachers for their students. It therefore seemed most relevant to interview other teachers who were in a similar position to the researcher. Such assumptions permeated the first two student participant interviews in July 2009 and led to the researcher concluding that student participants were unable to engage with and contribute to the research. This conclusion was reached because unlike teacher participants who were initially asked structured interview questions, student

participants were unable to answer knowledge-based questions about the provision of the five outcomes of *Every Child Matters* within the school. The perspective of the teacher was thought more pertinent than the perception of the student. It was only on reflection that she realised she had failed to recognise the value of the student's voice.

Furthermore the contribution of members of staff other than teachers to facilitate mattering was not anticipated. Due to the fact that teachers have the most contact with students, it was assumed that they would have the most significant role to play in fulfilling *Every Child Matters*. Student participants revealed that it was not those who had the most contact with students who made them feel they mattered but those to whom the students felt were the most able to listen for example pastoral managers who would "talk" to the students. The assumption which lies behind *Every Child Matters* is that we know how to listen to young people. From the perspective of the student participants at least, it was a quality that not every member of staff within a school possessed and this is perhaps reflective of what happens in a classroom.

The majority of the dialogue that takes place between a teacher and a student occurs within the classroom and is based around the subject that is being taught. With notably few exceptions, opportunities for secondary school students to engage in dialogue with teachers about issues that matter to them are infrequent. The nature of the subjects that are taught by the researcher led her to believe that she listened to students about issues that mattered to them within and beyond the classroom. During the course of this study she has come to realise that this belief was unfounded. In her own teaching practice time was not made to listen. This is because issues that mattered and questions that were raised by students especially during lessons were at times dismissed.

For example when a student questioned why they were taught religious studies the assumption she made as a teacher was that the student was being difficult, was attempting to waste learning time and/or was being disruptive. Rather than engage in a dialogue on the provision of religious studies, the student was instead told that they had to study it and her focus could then return to the task at hand, namely to teach

the lesson. As the head of department she was the one who decided what students needed to learn and therefore what ought to matter to them. An opportunity to listen was missed. She perceived the student's question as a challenge to her authority and as a result classroom discipline could be at risk. No thought was given to the climate of the classroom from the student perspective. The teacher is bestowed the authority to stop students from speaking which includes asking or answering questions. This authority can be exercised without explanation and students can be punished for failing to comply. Undertaking this research highlighted that as a teacher she did not know how to listen to what students had to say until very recently. Through her research she has been able to reflect on and amend her own teaching practice.

The greatest obstacle in putting the student first was her mindset as a teacher. In the course of the fieldwork the expectations inherent in the role of the teacher gradually gave way to that of a researcher. The transmission of subject knowledge by the teacher to the students was replaced by listening, interacting with large classes of students was replaced by speaking to students in pairs or small groups and what was deemed worthy of discussion by the teacher-researcher was replaced with what mattered from the perspective of the student.

The change to her mindset during the course of the fieldwork allowed for a student concept of mattering to emerge. Once she was able to listen to the voice of the student participants she began to hear more than she had anticipated she would about colleagues. The researcher attempted to become an advocate for the students within the school. She took it upon herself to try to explain the perspective of the student and justify their actions to members of staff. For example acts of defiance or wrong doing were seen from the student's point of view with the belief that if members of staff listened to and understood the situation from the student's perception these misunderstandings could be resolved. The value of the voice of the student participants was transferred and afforded to all students and she expected the same value to be held by her colleagues without explanation. Having learnt how to become a researcher she needed to learn when to shed that role.

In retrospect listening to the student and assuming that the student is telling the truth are two different notions and should not be confused. The researcher's initial assumption that students had little to contribute that would be of value to this study was later replaced with the assumption that all students in all circumstances were telling the truth and must be heard. This led to a misplaced sense of judgement. Colleagues became a source of suspicion and she became a lot more conscious of teacher-talk based on classroom practice. If a colleague within the same faculty as the researcher could tell students "I hate you" unbeknown to the researcher, it made her question what else might be taking place behind classroom doors. The researcher became very protective of students and she found herself undertaking additional duties within the school in an attempt to watch-over them.

When faced with two opposing accounts of an incident, the researcher sided with the student and ignored the reputation of the teacher and the student for that matter. An example of this occurred one day when she was on duty and was asked to take a witness statement from a student who alleged he was hit by a member of staff. She shielded the student from the gaze of the member of staff, listened intently to the account the student shared with her and refused to enter into any dialogue with her colleague who wanted to explain the incident. The voice or perspective of the student was mistaken for fact. It was during a conversation with the student's pastoral manager where the evidence presented by other students in the class and the member of staff involved revealed no such incident had happened and a moment of clarity presented itself. Her role as a researcher had influenced her role as a teacher.

When undertaking academic research there are parameters set by the university and ethics board. Those same parameters and expectations were applied to situations outside of the research context although no-one else was aware of or operating by them. This had potentially devastating consequences to others as well as her. Student participant data collection ceased soon after this incident. One needs to be mindful of drawing conclusions and making assumptions without due thought.

5.1.1 Reflecting on some limitations of the study

A number of issues have emerged during this research project which impinge on the findings. How far these issues can be resolved and how much can be inferred from the data that has been collected are the focus of this section.

From the outset it was assumed that the concept of mattering was commonly understood and apparent to all. If confirmation was needed, the *Every Child Matters* (DfES 2003) Green Paper does not define what it means to matter, instead it identifies how mattering is to take place and how it can be evidenced. The researcher assumed she knew what it meant to matter and that it held the same meaning for everyone. Such assumptions inhibited her initial work as opportunities to recognise let alone engage with a student perception of mattering were lost (see section 3.4). The extent to which the initial teacher participant and student participant interviews could be used during data analysis was therefore limited to support emerging theory rather than generate theory.

When recruiting participants the decision was taken to focus on teachers from three curricula areas religious studies, personal, social, health and economic education and citizenship education. It was thought that the *Every Child Matters* agenda and the five outcomes associated with it: Being healthy; Staying safe; Enjoying and achieving; Making a positive contribution and Economic well-being, would have most relevance to these subject areas. Therefore those subject teachers were identified as the most suitable participants. In reality teacher participants occupied more than one role within the school for example one teacher participant said

So I am now Head of Humanities, so I line manage the subject leader for history, geography, RE [Religious Education] although I am actually the Head of RE this year but next year I won't be as we appointed someone and I am in charge of citizenship and in charge of PSHE [personal, social and health education].

When recruiting student participants the decision was taken to recruit students from one school. Although teacher participants were confined to specific curriculum areas and students participants to a particular school, the findings may be generalised

beyond the participants in the sample. As all teacher participants are part of the same profession and as all student participants are part of a generational peer group the concept of the indicative fact is applied to the findings of this study. This is because whilst there will undoubtedly be regional differences and differences between various types of schools for example rural and urban schools, the discoveries made within this research project are likely to be found and expressed elsewhere.

The researcher underestimated the subtleties of various exchanges and occurrences that were brought to bear on the interview dynamic. Initially the researcher was looking for a solution to the application of *Every Child Matters* within her curricula subjects. This made the teacher participant interviews more consultative in nature. Having probed the teacher participant with this structured interview approach, there was an expectation after the recorder had been switched off to answer the same questions about the researcher's own school. Once the researcher had learnt how to unlock the voice of the teacher participants the need for a trade off of information diminished.

A limitation of any interview is that the response is based on what the participant chooses to reveal on that particular day and at that particular time. It is possible that the content of the teacher participant interviews would change if participants were interviewed today or for a second time. Different educational policies and government legislation along with new initiatives would most likely be expressed by teacher participants as education continues to evolve. All studies have limitations of scale and this study was no exception. Eight teacher participant and fourteen student participant interviews were conducted in total. Because this study was time bound there was a limit on the length of time that was available for data collection and data analysis.

This research was conceived out of personal interest rather than being contracted. The advantage of this is that one is not confined by someone else's agenda and the researcher was able to exercise a greater degree of autonomy. However had this research have had the investment of a sponsor, her findings would have been

followed more closely potentially having a wider reaching audience and more immediate academic interest. In order to disseminate her findings, the researcher has to date presented a paper at a research conference at the University of Brighton (June 2011), published an article in R.Ed (July 2010) and co-taught a methodology seminar focusing on grounded theory to postgraduate students at the University of Brighton (Spring 2011). The researcher has been approached about sharing her research and working with other schools in the future. Further opportunities to present her work in academic institutions and to write articles will also be pursued.

5.1.2 Mediating mattering

Although *Every Child Matters* continued to evolve (see section 5.2.1 below) teacher participants revealed contrasting accounts of its role and status in their schools. Within one school a teacher participant said “it [Every Child Matters] doesn’t really impact on me in any in any significant way”. This was echoed by a different teacher participant at the same school who said “I would say and this is being very truthful I don’t think we do anything in particular really with ECM [Every Child Matters]”. Within other schools, *Every Child Matters* had a higher profile. “I personally think it underlines everything that we do” similarly another teacher participant said “I would say that ECM [Every Child Matters] is at the heart of the school”. The diverse interpretation of *Every Child Matters* which existed between schools within a few miles of each other and located within the same local education authority provided an illuminating insight.

Although there were national conferences which focused on *Every Child Matters*, there was an absence of local as well as individual school guidance which contributed to the diverse approach within participating schools. For one teacher participant, initiatives including *Every Child Matters* had not been implemented,

we’re getting all these things [initiatives] shoved down our our throat now because we didn’t keep up to speed in the first place.

For other teacher participants there was a sense of newer initiatives competing with *Every Child Matters*,

it's [Every Child Matters] been on the SIP [School Improvement Plan] for the last couple of years and it is the first year it is not on.

And

the most difficult thing about my job is there's lots of initiatives coming your way...I find time and again I'm blowing in the wind...I can think well I need to do that I need to do that I need to do that I need to do that.

Whereas for some teacher participants, emerging initiatives sat alongside *Every Child Matters*,

I think, what else is there that happens in school that doesn't fit in to the Every Child Matters outcomes I can't see...you've got the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning and then you've got, now you've got Community Cohesion as well.

The original intention which sat behind *Every Child Matters* was multi-agency collaboration to safeguard children. The presence of multi-agency staff either employed directly by schools or working alongside them was evident during teacher participant interviews. Reference was made for example to “social workers”, “counsellors”, “the Youth Offending Team”, “the Substance Misuse Team”, “Care for the Carers”, “Connexions”, “inclusion support workers” and “a youth worker”.

The decision to create a well-being indicator (Ofsted 2009b) to measure *Every Child Matters* changed the emphasis in schools from multi-agency collaboration to a focus on the five outcomes: Being healthy; Staying safe; Enjoying and achieving; Making a positive contribution and Economic well-being. To support with the provision of these outcomes, various curriculum based textbooks as well as assembly packs were written which purported to deliver on these outcomes and therefore schools could evidence them. This change in focus led to a wider interpretation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda which was heard in the teacher participant interviews surrounding curricula subjects and classroom behaviour,

'Make a positive contribution' I would say that you know that happens nearly every lesson...we do a lot of small group and stuff like that so hopefully you know children feel that they can talk even if it is not in front of the whole class in small groups.

the 'Economic' bit, um I would say comes through really through the PSHE [personal social and health education] and the Head of PSHE looking at that part of it.

positive behaviour management it's very much about, um giving children an opportunity to learn, um where they kind of went wrong and where they can do better...it's fantastic Every Child Matters because it's about treating people with respect.

The diverse approaches that were taken towards *Every Child Matters* revealed the importance of the mediator. At times the mediators were the students themselves as one teacher participant said "we've got the crusades now we we we never did the crusades that came from the pupils". Mediators listened to students and acted on their voice or provided ways for students to matter. For example, as an outcome of student voice a teacher participant was considering changing the Key Stage 4 curriculum to

move away from the Gospel...I know there isn't a single school in the diocese that that isn't doing that so that's that's a big decision.

The change that was permitted was not always for the benefit of the students. Some of the changes that were authorised were procedural and took place as they were for the benefit of the school. As we have heard for example teacher participants revealed that although a student council had been created, student voice did not matter, "they don't see action happening and they are put off and nothing they suggest seems to happen". Similarly a teacher participant at another school said "the student council a bit moribund really doesn't really do anything really".

A teacher participant, as we have heard, revealed that students raised concerns about the delivery of personal social and health education "some of the lessons that I was hearing about from the kids I just thought oh that's not good" which were taught by teachers who were "an hour under...rather than [by] teachers wanting to". When

an opportunity presented itself for students to matter through a visit from Channel 4's Sex Education Show what a teacher participant considered to be

the best experts in the country coming in to work with Year 9 10 and 11 big groups small groups work targeting kids who are maybe at risk

the teacher participant was "refused" because "it might cause controversy". Despite the fact that reducing teenage pregnancy was a founding aim of *Every Child Matters*.

What was taking place within participating schools went beyond the original and subsequent intentions of *Every Child Matters*. Although the government produced documents outlining how to honour the concept of mattering, it was not the documentation that successfully led to every child mattering. Success lay in the position of the mediator. It was the role and status of the mediator within the school that determined the extent to which he or she could initiate change. His or her role and status also determined the purpose and avenues that were created to gather student voice within the school.

5.2 In prospect

Every Child Matters was introduced as a major educational initiative, prompted by a concern for child protection. That young people mattered and their voices needed to be heard were set out as creedal statements for educationists and social workers. However, both at the level of further government directives and through the practice in schools it has gradually yielded to other priorities. The need to be heard and considered was apparent in the urban riots of August 2011. This section documents and interprets the partial eclipse of *Every Child Matters* and suggests ways in which its intentions could be addressed anew.

5.2.1 A partial eclipse of mattering

At its conception, *Every Child Matters* aimed to protect children from abuse and neglect and provide practical support for the most vulnerable families and their children. Through the protection and support of children, it aimed to facilitate the

academic success of all students but especially those who were the most likely to underachieve. Since 2003 *Every Child Matters* continued to evolve and adapt through a number of child centred initiatives. For example *Keeping Children Safe* (DoH 2003), *Every Child Matters: Next Steps* (DfES 2004b), *Higher standards, better schools for all* (DfES 2005), *The common assessment framework for children and young people: supporting tools* (DfES 2006), *The Children's Plan Building Brighter Futures* (DCSF 2007), *Every Child Matters Outcomes Framework* (DCFS 2008) and *Your child, your schools, our future: building a 21st century schools system* (DCFS 2009).

Since 2010 there was a change in focus within education. A new term 'help children achieve more' was introduced in place of *Every Child Matters* (Puffett 2010). However, as there were no publications and no literature available from the Department for Education on either term, *Every Child Matters* began to wither. It left in its wake confusion over its status and application within schools. A

flaw in the way governments approach education policy has to do with the lack of attention to implementation...When an issue is dealt with through an announcement or policy, attention shifts to the next demands, often in a completely different policy area (Levin 2010:741).

As government support for *Every Child Matters* was withdrawn, a new vision for schools emerged. The Schools White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching* (DfE 2010) signalled a return to a cognitive approach to education which focused on standards not only in Britain, but in comparison with the rest of world. The key changes in education included the launch of a National Curriculum review, increased qualifications in order to train to teach and an emphasis on the quality of teaching and student behaviour in the classroom. The 'quality of teaching and learning, backed by excellent leadership and management, and good discipline and behaviour' (Ofsted 2011:4) became the focus of the 2012 Ofsted inspection framework with well-being and community cohesion removed (Ofsted 2011). This was apparent at the launch of the 2012 Health Related Behaviour Survey (Balding 2012) by the Schools Health Education Unit. The *Every Child Matters* objectives which were present in the 2007 launch had given way to safeguarding ones in compliance with Ofsted's (2011)

inspection framework. The reasons behind the changes to education were outlined by David Cameron and Nick Clegg

What really matters is how we're doing compared with our international competitors. That is what will define our economic growth and our country's future. The truth is, at the moment we are standing still while others race past (DfE 2010:3)

Although interviews with the teacher participants challenges the view that schools are standing still. They revealed their priorities were “results led”, ensuring “students [are] making progress against their own target grades” and making sure all students “are not underachieving they're not falling short of all they're capable of and potential of doing”.

The National Curriculum

One reason why Britain was standing still and had sunk in international league tables was, as Michael Gove explained, because the National Curriculum was ‘substandard’ (DfE 2011c). The solution was a review of the National Curriculum in 2011 for delivery of an amended National Curriculum in September 2014, the outcome of which remains to be seen. However as teacher participants revealed, curriculum change does not always provide the solution. Interviews with teacher participants illustrated a wide range of responses to the implementation of the 2008 National Curriculum at a whole school and at a department level. One teacher participant said “we've actually been told not to really change schemes of work...so almost sit tight don't don't waste your time”. Other schools were more proactive. For example one school had begun “links with different subjects” and introduced “six curriculum enrichment days throughout the year”. At another school a teacher participant spoke about how her school had

made an enormous change in the curriculum area at [name of school] with this new two year Key Stage 3 which is to do with personalised learning, different pathways and choice.

Implementation within departments varied too. One teacher participant said “what I’ve suggested...to the teachers of the various subjects is that they actually don’t do anything yet”. Another teacher participant said

The new curriculum for PSHE [personal, social and health education] has made me focus a lot more on the financial side because although I knew it was part of my responsibility I was not used to doing it and that is something I am working on.

Not all curriculum areas were subject to review in 2011. Citizenship education as a statutory subject was reviewed and will become part of the Basic Curriculum in 2014. However the basic status of religious studies and the non-statutory status of personal, social, health and economic education meant they were not included in the review. Religious studies is to continue as part of the broad and balanced wider curriculum. Personal, social, health and economic education is to undergo an internal review to determine how schools could be supported in its delivery. Although the outcome of the review is currently unknown, it is likely to remain within the school curriculum.

Not only was the curriculum considered ‘substandard’ but Tim Oates, Chair of the review panel, thought the 2008 National Curriculum had ‘led teachers to move with undue pace through material and encouraged a ‘tick list’ approach to teaching’ (DfE 2011c). The relationship between the National Curriculum and improved standards and performance is more ambiguous as there are no external measures with the abolition of Standard Attainment Tests (SATs) at Key Stage 3. With the 2014 National Curriculum not externally assessed and its use more prevalent at Key Stage 3, it may be less of a priority within schools. As one teacher participant said

I presume that the exam boards have written those specifications based on the Key Stage 4 National Curriculum or that sounds sensible to me but really, to be perfectly honest in a results game as we are I’ve looked at the specifications rather than the National Curriculum, and just assumed that the specifications follow that Key Stage 4 National Curriculum because what I’ve got to do is get kids through their exams so I look at specifications rather than the curriculum because that’s what they are going to be examined on.

The focus in education on academic performance has meant that a subject’s value is determined by whether or not it is accredited. With more subjects offering

accreditation to retain this perceived value, students have an increasing number of examinations to undertake. This led one teacher participant to refer to schools as “exam factories”, as results and league tables had become the priority and there lacked a balance within schools beyond the acquisition of the maximum number of GCSEs possible. The undue pace and tick list approach to teaching is not in fact due to a non-examined National Curriculum but due to the demands on Key Stage 4 curriculum time and a subject’s value embodied in accreditation which can lead to teaching to the exam.

The performance of the ‘poor’

Another reason why Britain was standing still was situated in the academic performance of the ‘poor’ where it was thought improvements could be made. In *The Importance of Teaching*, Michael Gove wrote

It is only through reforming education that we can allow every child the chance to take their full and equal share in citizenship, shaping their own destiny, and becoming masters of their own fate...That is why it matters so much that access to educational opportunities is spread so inequitably in England. The gulf between the opportunities available to the wealthy and the chances given to the poor, is one of the widest...Our schools should be engines of social mobility, helping children to overcome the accidents of birth and background to achieve much more than they may ever have imagined (DfE 2010:6).

Gove suggested that enabling students to overcome the accidents of birth and background was through educational opportunity. Since 2010 educational opportunity has changed and academic achievement redefined. Alternative pathways for example BTECs (Business and Technology Education Council) and Diplomas which provided equivalent vocational qualifications to GCSEs lost favour. The measure of success is shifting towards the EBacc which consists of an A*-C GCSE grade in English, maths, science, a language and History or Geography. The importance of academic performance was clearly understood by student participants. During their interviews, their priority was to “get good levels really in my classes”, to “try a lot harder to...get the grades”, “working hard at getting more grades” because “if you don’t do the work then no job, no qualifications”. Unlike *Every Child Matters* which focused on all students but raised awareness of those who were most at risk of

underachieving, the label 'poor' does not. It loses the breadth of awareness created under *Every Child Matters* and fails to recognise that barriers to learning go beyond family finances. Whilst access to educational opportunities for all was reminiscent of *Every Child Matters*, where *The Importance of Teaching* differed was the affective needs of students which supported attainment were unavailable.

What remained from the initial formulation of *Every Child Matters* was an emphasis on child protection. Previous reviews and reform into child protection took place in the midst of a high profile death of a child, heightened emotion and the benefit of hindsight. The review undertaken by Professor Munro did not. Commenting on previous inquiries Munro said

when it is concluded that human error is a significant causal factor, the customary, and understandable, solution has been to find ways of controlling people so that they do not make these mistakes...This has been the repeated response in child protection (DfE 2011b:1.16).

The implication was that the *Every Child Matters* agenda was formulated on a belief that increasing control would prevent mistakes and promote change. This belief was unfounded as the death of Baby P in 2007 demonstrated. Munro concluded that the reforms and initiatives that had taken place over the years on both a national and local level 'led to the heavily bureaucratised system' (DfE 2011b:1.16). Instead of an emotional and reactionary review of child protection, Munro was able to adopt a different approach. The significance of her report for statutory guidance on child protection is being discussed at the time of writing. Although support for *Every Child Matters* was withdrawn, it is considered unlikely that the good practice put in place by schools to protect children, provide practical support and facilitate their academic success will cease. The reduction and withdrawal of services and support within schools has, however, meant continuing with the established good practice will be more challenging.

Munro stated that

supporting children so that they get the very best education is only possible when they are safe and well cared for (DfE 2011b:5.37).

If students are to get the most out of their education, the task faced by schools is to ensure all students are safe and well cared for within and beyond the classroom. The importance of being safe and well cared for within school, must then be understood from the student rather than the school perspective. Student participant interviews revealed the opportunity to express their voice on issues that mattered to them was restricted and there was a discrepancy between school assumption and student need. For example one student participant said that his teacher “hardly ever, well like once, she’d listen to me”. Aspects of the riots of August 2011 may be interpreted in the light of this study. The riots were widely regarded to be about the need to have a voice, the absence of a sense of community and the extent to which young people felt they mattered. With *Every Child Matters* withering, these problems that the riots exposed were central to the aims of *Every Child Matters*. Young people need an opportunity to have their voice heard on issues that matter to them. Without listening to the views of everyone, a community cannot be created if a group of people remain invisible as it is indicative that they do not matter. Therefore it is to an agenda of mattering that we must return. Relationships between teachers and students and the climate of the classroom emerged as two issues that mattered most to the students. If standards are to improve, if young people are to be heard and if communities are to be created, these must be addressed. A way to address these for those who are training to teach and those who are already teaching will now be discussed.

5.2.2 Preparation to teach

The findings have suggested that conveying to students the feeling that they matter is an important quality for teachers to possess. During the student participant interviews some students were told that they did not matter by their teacher for example “I don’t like you” or “I hate you” whilst others were made to feel that they were not valued based on the actions of their teachers “[he] gives us a textbook and just sits down” or

I put my hand up saying Miss Miss and like she doesn’t answer me and she goes to a different student.

Prospective teachers cannot be taught how to convey to a student that the student matters. It is not a skill one can simply learn, or a checklist of phrases or actions which are to be included within a lesson, because students can identify when they genuinely matter and when they do not. It is instead about the kind of person the teacher becomes. Such qualities may be acquired by teachers through experiences that are afforded during a teacher training programme.

Traditionally teacher training programmes focus on the academic aims of teaching (TDA 2007). For example the importance of subject knowledge, lesson planning and differentiation, marking and assessment, recording and reporting and providing evidence that meets the Qualified Teacher Standards to become a teacher. The focus in education on standards and academic performance has resulted in teachers training to become instructors. This was revealed during interviews with student participants. As an instructor, a teacher's knowledge was not to be questioned. If a teacher was challenged by a student

she'd [the teacher] say something and then we'd tell her the correct answer...and she went mental at us and was like oh do you want to teach?

If teachers are trained only to see students in a performance driven context, it is not surprising that a gulf between the cognitive and the affective exists within schools. If teachers are trained to focus on and relate to students in terms of the cognitive rather than the affective, it was inevitable that a teacher's pastoral role as a tutor became an academic one with tutees mentored to improve their academic performance.

Prospective teachers are also taught about behaviour management during teacher training programmes in order to facilitate learning in the classroom. Traditionally the emphasis is on the control of student behaviour and the implementation of the school's behaviour policy within the classroom. Attempting to control the behaviour of a student or a class of students and establishing a relationship with a student or a class are two different concepts. This study suggests that better relationships would lead to better behaviour. For example the same student participants who towards one teacher said they were "cocky", "rebel[led]" against and "annoy[ed]" her and would "get up and walk out of lessons" said about another teacher "I just didn't want

to mess around or anything because I didn't want her to think bad of me". The difference with the second teacher was in the relationship the student participants had with her. They both felt "welcomed" and "there was always a fresh start" suggesting that better relationships led to better behaviour which improved the climate in the classroom and facilitated teaching and learning.

Stress caused by 'disruptive pupils' (Chaplin 2008:204) was cited alongside workload as the main reason for trainee teachers never teaching or those recently trained leaving the profession. With teaching identified as one of the most stressful occupations (Johnson et. al. 2005), traditional approaches to classroom behaviour do not seem to be working because coping with disruptive students does not improve during teacher training (Chaplain 2008). The suggestion offered here is to provide all those who are training to teach with an opportunity to interact with individuals and young people outside of the classroom in a non-school placement. The benefit of a non-school placement to the trainee teacher is that through engaging with individuals and forming positive relationships with them outside the classroom could then translate inside the classroom. This could improve behaviour thereby lessen teacher stress caused by disruption and facilitate learning. It would enable prospective teachers to discover or refine the qualities needed to communicate with and relate to others, especially young people which are central to change. This would not only support the retention of teachers but improve standards as more people would be attracted to teaching and remain in teaching if one of the main stressors, discipline and poor behaviour, is removed.

A placement of this sort is of considerable benefit to the intentions behind *Every Child Matters*. The non-school placement can cultivate and develop in individuals a sense of the integrity of the person, how the least matter and affection for those who are the most marginal. A non-school placement alongside the school placement for those training to teach has been practiced in different institutions and for different reasons. An example of this practice is to be found at the University of Glasgow. In the second year of the Masters Degree in Religious and Philosophical Education, those who are on the degree course spend time in a variety of placements. These settings include charitable organisations, places of worship, hospitals, prisons, day centres, hospices,

asylum centres, voluntary organisations and youth clubs for example. The model at the University of Glasgow promotes the industrial non-school placement as an opportunity to explore the practical application of ethics and beliefs in the workplace which have arisen as part of the course being studied.

A complementary non-school placement is also undertaken by the students in the third year of their four year BA Education (QTS) degree at the University of Brighton. Students spend time in a variety of settings which can include for example parallel professional services such as pupil referral units and special educational needs settings as well as non-school based learning settings for example theatre and drama groups, outreach educational placements, residential care institutions for children, foreign placements and sports coaching. The model at the University of Brighton came as a result of a Teacher Development Agency Change Management Project in 2005 which coincided with a publication on how to manage change for Initial Teacher Education institutions and *Every Child Matters* gaining prominence. The change in focus on multi-agency collaboration as a result of *Every Child Matters* and the engagement of teachers beyond their own school experience prompted the initiative at the University of Brighton. The complementary non-school placement was

developed to reinforce interprofessional collaborative working in recognition of the changing role and context in which teachers are placed. These changes are driven by workforce reform for all who work with children and young people led by the *Every Child Matters: Change for Children* (Loveless and Colwell 2009:2).

Support for the model at the University of Brighton has been acknowledged by the Teacher Development Agency (Zwozdiak-Myers et. al. 2010).

There are of course a number of considerations in relation to providing a non-school placement. The practicalities in terms of time and resources are not dealt with here although aspects of the nature of the experience are. Compelling someone to undertake a non-school placement may limit their engagement with the experience. To overcome this, the trainee teachers must be able to select their own placement location so that it incorporates an aspect of practice that is of interest to them. The opportunity to get the most out of the experience is therefore afforded to them. A

compulsory non-school placement could also result in some trainee teachers opting for a placement based on the convenience of its location or the convenience of having a contact within a potential placement. This, however, does not negate the experience in terms of the intended aims or any additional benefits which result because of it.

Whether the intention behind the examples of the non-school placement provided here was to explore the practical application of ethics and beliefs in the workplace or the changing context of multi-agency collaboration, there is support that the benefit of a non-school placement goes beyond the intended aims and can lead to inner transformation in those who undertake the experience. This inner transformation helps to form the kind of person the teacher becomes. The external examiner for the University of Glasgow reported that

there was a growing awareness of the complementarity of voluntary agencies and a changing sense of how human beings matter (External examiner 2011).

Similarly, the University of Brighton's review of the complementary non-school placement noted 'changes [that] were a reflection of understandings of learning which were more focused on the wider welfare of the children' (Loveless and Colwell 2009:17).

Although achievement will most likely always form a significant part of the role of the teacher, it does not have to embody the whole role or be at the expense of relating to the student in the classroom. The experiences gained during a non-school placement could serve to remind the teacher during their teaching career of the need to have a greater awareness of wider issues which may affect a student academically or pastorally within and beyond the classroom. Such an awareness or understanding supports and extends the relationship between the teacher and the student. Integrity and humanity is developed. In short, the experience would serve as an opportunity to gain an insight into people as a whole person. It is an opportunity for the prospective teacher to align himself or herself with others and translate these skills into the classroom. Engaging with the wider needs of those who would be met during a non-school placement may enable the prospective teacher to put into context the

academic and behavioural focus of the teacher training programme and school placement(s).

The experience could enable the teacher to reflect and see each student beyond the data that has been accumulated and therefore prevent students from being invisible. There is no denying that teaching is about the accumulation of knowledge by students via the medium of the teacher which is then converted into skills to pass accredited courses. But this is not the sum total of being a teacher. What it means to be a teacher can be forgotten if experiences are not afforded to engage with the whole person. Teachers and students choose how to interact with one another. The issue is the context in which that engagement takes place and the climate that results in the classroom.

5.2.3 Indicators of mattering

The importance of the climate that is created inside and outside of the classroom by teaching and non-teaching members of staff was raised by student participants. For example one student participant revealed that one of his teachers

said um, in his lesson, that we're not allowed to have fun...and I'm laughing yeah and I said what am I not allowed to laugh? And he goes, no, not in my lessons...if you're not allowed to laugh in a lesson, that's that's really bad.

Students typically interact with teachers within a classroom. Students will also interact with non-teaching members of staff for example pastoral staff, lunchtime supervisors, school caterers and learning support staff. How relationships are perceived by students and how they can be improved within schools for existing members of staff is the focus of this section.

Student participants revealed that a positive climate was created inside the classroom when a teacher was “calm”, “talk[ed]” rather than shouted at the class or individuals within it, made the students “feel...welcomed”, was in a “good mood” and was “happy to teach”. A positive climate was created with non-teaching members of staff when the student felt they could “talk” to that person. As we have previously heard, one

student participant said “I always think Pastoral are automatically the most understanding people in the whole school really”. A positive climate was created when student participants mattered which was revealed through the relationships with the teaching and the non-teaching members of staff.

Student participants revealed that a negative classroom climate was created if the teacher appeared “like they don’t really care” and when the teacher was “moody”, “stressy”, “rude” or “shout[ed]” also if the teacher “made fun” out of a student or “embarrassed” a student. Outside of the classroom, negative relationships were created when a student felt humiliated or was threatened. For example a student participant recounted being told “do you want to go to Isolation?” and another student participant revealed he and his friend were “shouted at” for doing something “no-one has actually ever told us that [you’re not allowed to] do”. This led to the student participants feeling as though they did not matter.

A positive classroom climate built on good teacher and student relationships facilitated learning. For example one student participant explained that because of her teacher “I never wanted to learn a sub a subject so much”. A negative classroom climate prevented learning. As we have previously heard, one student participant said “getting shouted at...you’d think it’d make you listen and learn but when teachers shout at you you don’t”. Being shouted at had the opposite effect. The action of his teacher was interpreted by the student participant to mean that he did not matter to that teacher so the student did not listen and therefore did not learn. This suggests it is the climate in the classroom rather than the subject itself that facilitates learning. In a positive climate with an engaging curriculum which meets the needs of the students, children are able to learn because they feel they matter to their teacher.

It was apparent that some teachers found it more difficult than others to form positive relationships with students within and beyond the classroom. As one student participant has already said “if you think how many people repeat going to Isolation...generally it is the same people over and over again”. Student behaviour will not change unless the cause of the behaviour is changed. How to establish

positive relationships in the classroom which can lead to positive behaviour and facilitate learning needs further consideration.

For change to be implemented and sustained other distractions need to be reduced. During the interviews with teacher participants, they revealed that there can be “so many” initiatives imposed by “management” within schools. The issue, as explained by one teacher participant becomes that

you hear them [initiatives] and you go oh that is really really good but the reality is that you go back to your classroom you know you've got other things to deal with and and to actually you know are are the colleagues going away and implementing it who knows.

The challenge is to reduce the “other things”. For example schools focusing on one or two initiatives rather than “many” to facilitate change. To improve relationships, staff training and practical opportunities are needed.

During the school year there are many opportunities for staff training and development. For example departmental meetings, pastoral meetings, career professional development training and middle leader forums. However these meetings are led by staff who may not necessarily be the most appropriate member of staff to train others about forming positive relationships with students. Also these meetings often split staff into different groups or teams which include teaching and non-teaching staff, the subject taught, Key Stages, Year groups or Houses. Inset days are therefore preferable. Inset days occur throughout the year so the focus and momentum can be maintained. The importance of the training would be explicit as whole staff meeting time had been set aside for it. Every member of staff is able to attend Inset training so teaching and non-teaching members of staff can be together. Everyone would therefore be exposed to the same information and training can be led by the most suitable person(s).

Staff training would include sharing the research on forming relationships with students to create a positive climate. This will provide the rationale behind the change. Sharing good practice and identifying bad practice will enable staff to see

and hear what to aspire to and what to avoid. Watching footage from lessons, tutor time and interactions with students beyond the classroom from other schools would provide a neutral environment to begin the staff training. Providing some useful tips to support a positive climate which are phrased in positive language would support staff. For example greet students around the school site, welcome students in and out of the classroom, be on time for lessons, speak in a calm way, look at the person who is speaking and use the student's name. The next step in training would be encouraging teachers at the end of a lesson that they thought had a positive or negative climate to reflect on why. These reflections would be fed back and used during follow up Inset day training to maintain momentum and encourage further change which was centred on the individual needs of the school.

With the emphasis in education on standards, classrooms have become more open in terms of monitoring teaching and learning through performance management, senior team duties and head of department monitoring. Student voice is also used more widely to inform on curriculum provision. A similar open door approach and monitoring of expectations is needed towards the training in creating a positive classroom climate. The next step in this process might be informal lesson drop-ins or tutor time drop-ins. An opportunity to share a positive classroom climate or seek support and advice where the classroom climate was not positive would facilitate change through the feedback and discussion that would result. Ultimately watching footage from lessons, tutor time and interactions with students beyond the classroom within the actual school setting would form the next stage of staff training. Using feedback from student voice is the most important step as it is their perspective on relationships with teachers and the climate in the classroom in relation to learning that matters the most.

The issue as to how many opportunities there are for students to interact with teachers, non-teaching members of staff and other students to form relationships is also raised. The majority of opportunities within schools have an academic focus, for example homework clubs, revision sessions, detentions and 'catch-up' sessions. As one student participant revealed "if you haven't done it [homework] twice you have an after school detention for an hour". In these environments a different climate is

created which is not centred on relationships but can be silent and punitive. Alongside staff training must sit opportunities for relationships to form outside of the classroom. These relationships will then help to support the climate inside the classroom. All members of staff, especially teachers who have the most contact with students, need to be encouraged to set up clubs or activities beyond the classroom. Any student should be able to attend and mixed year groups, gender and abilities should be encouraged. Every student should be encouraged to attend at least one club or activity regularly which would facilitate relationships between staff and students as well as between students. These can take place at break or lunch time as well as before or after school. The clubs or activities need to meet the interests of the students and be non-academic based, otherwise the purpose and the environment would change. The aim is to get to know the students so popular activities may consider limiting places. Staff should be encouraged to collaborate. Those members of staff who are more skilled at forming relationships with students could coach and support those who are not as skilled. The aim is for relationships formed with students during these clubs or activities to translate into the classroom.

Interviews with teacher participants revealed that some schools changed their Year 7 or Key Stage 3 curriculum provision to improve the learning skills of their students. For example a programme to deliver Personalised Learning and Thinking Skills (PLTS) was introduced. Two teacher participants during their interview discussed the consequence of this change. One teacher participant said “we [the Religious Studies department] obviously have no contact with them in year 7”. Similarly another teacher participant said “they might get rid of RE [Religious Education] and Citizenship in Year 7”. A programme which is focused on teaching skills to improve learning is useful but this is also short sighted. Due to the curriculum time and the pressure of academic performance in Key Stage 4, these Personalised Learning and Thinking Skills programmes do not usually go beyond Key Stage 3. This approach also has the potential to devalue the status of those subjects that are removed or where contact time is reduced. This study indicates that behaviour and learning is improved through positive relationships with members of staff and a positive classroom climate. Rather than focus on change for a year group or Key Stage, staff training on relationships and developing relationships which can translate into the

classroom and improve the climate is more beneficial as it is for every member of staff and for every student.

5.3 Perspectives for further research

During this study, the meaning of mattering was illuminated by listening to the voice of the teacher and the student participants. What emerged was that the operationalising of policy and practice within schools led to a situation where in principle the child mattered but this did not necessarily equate with the interpretations and feelings expressed by the students. Students often remained silent and were increasingly fragmented by school imposed structures that were adopted for the benefit of the school rather than for the child. Where the student did matter was within the school curriculum although there were a number of tensions that needed to be overcome. In light of what has emerged, consideration will now be given to three perspectives for further research.

5.3.1 Voice

This study has revealed that from a student perspective, mattering is synonymous with feeling significant and in order for a student to feel significant their voice needs to be heard. Voice has been defined as

having presence, power, and agency...having the opportunity to speak one's mind, be heard and counted by others, and, perhaps, to have an influence on outcomes (Cook-Sather 2006:363).

Within the researcher's own study, as we have previously heard, a student participant revealed their voice was listened to only when they became incorporated, for example by joining the Student Council (see section 4.2),

we used to...be all mouthy but it's, nice to be able to get our word across to people who listen, so then like they take our opinions on board and we are not getting in trouble for it.

In contrast with the only time the student felt they could express their voice and be heard, the teacher participants revealed that the Student Council was “moribund really doesn’t really do anything really” and “nothing they [students] suggest seems to happen”. Whilst those students who are part of Student Council may feel as though they matter, the intentions behind student voice, for example to have an influence on outcomes and create change, are not realised.

Without being part of the Student Council there was no avenue for the same student, as we have heard, to express her voice and this was a view that was often expressed by other student participants (see section 4.2).

Do you know what I really think though I just don't think Isolation you may think oh yeah it's a punishment but, if you think how many people repeat going to Isolation it doesn't teach you anything sitting staring at a wall makes you more angry, like I think it would be better to have like a cooling room.

Student voice fosters a feeling of significance through its proclaimed intentions. Within schools it promotes mattering as student voice can provide a means towards improvement in terms of effective pedagogy and personalised learning (Hopkins 2008) for example Assessment for Learning (Rudduck and Fielding 2006). It is used to inform judgments made about a school (Ofsted 2011) ensuring the voice of the student matters. Student voice alters ‘authoritarian pedagogy’ (Smyth 2006:295) and ‘power imbalances between adults and young people’ (Cook-Sather 2006:366) by no longer ‘keeping students in the role of recipient or victim of teachers’ (and administrators’ and policymakers’) decision-making processes’ (Cook-Sather 2006:366). Instead it ‘insists that if students speak, adults must listen’ (Cook-Sather 2006:367). Their voice matters and the students are to be a part of the schools decision-making process through student forums for example. Student voice has also been cited to fulfil the Enjoy and achieve strand (Hopkins 2008) as well as the Make a positive contribution strand (DfES 2006) of the *Every Child Matters* agenda.

However, these intentions have not been realised as student voice has become largely operationalised within schools,

there are no spaces, physical or metaphorical, where staff and students meet one another as equals, as genuine partners in the shared understanding of making meaning of their work together (Fielding 2004:309).

Traditionally student voice was subsumed within Student Councils although more recently other forums such as student questionnaires and focus groups have become more prominent within schools. Student voice has become 'tokenistic' (Fielding 2001:103) and used to 'control both teachers and students' (Cook-Sather 2006:369). It has become 'mandated by the government [via] the inspection process of the Office for Standards in Education' (Cook-Sather 2006:369) and the consequence is that schools 'feel obliged to be seen to be 'doing it'' (Rudduck and Fielding 2006:228). Schools are more concerned in the collection of student voice than listening to what the students say and restrict what students talk about for example avoiding matters related to teaching and learning (Fielding 2001).

The current practice of student voice is not meeting its intended aims. Student Councils typically attract students who are 'self-assured and articulate' (Rudduck and Fielding 2006:228) and its members are unrepresentative of the whole student population (Fielding 2001) as it is often dominated by the 'middle class' (Cook-Sather 2006:363). The belief that there is 'a single student voice' (Cook-Sather 2006:367) that can legitimately speak on behalf of others (Fielding 2001) ignores the diversity of students within a school. Whilst Council members are elected, these elections usually occur at the start of the academic year limiting opportunities for other students to represent the tutor group, Year group or House. Meetings are typically held once a term therefore students incur a delay in any response or subsequent action.

The increasing use of student focus groups and student questionnaires to obtain student voice has a number of benefits. Small student focus groups facilitate discussion whilst questionnaires provide the opportunity for large numbers of students to be heard. However, there are a number of limitations with these two approaches, for example student focus groups and questionnaires are 'about matters that concern teachers, governments and almost anyone other than students themselves' (Fielding 2001:103). The voice of some students can be constantly sought by individual teachers, departments or those students who make up the Council. The student is

expected to participate therefore 'denying the potential power of silence and resistance' (Cook-Sather 2006:369). In contrast the voice of other students can remain silent. Finally focus groups and questionnaires usually take place at the end of a topic, the end of a term or an academic year and are therefore of little benefit to those students who participated.

The researcher's interviews with teacher participants and student participants and evidence within the literature has revealed that many of the mechanisms put in place to listen to students do not convince the student that they matter. What needs to be researched in the future is whether there is a better way of conveying a sense of mattering to students by listening to their voice in a different way. Two questions which can be addressed in a future research project are 'Where does student voice work well?' and 'Why does student voice work well?'

Within the researcher's own fieldwork an opportunity presented itself to interview a non-teaching member of staff who led a large group of students within a school and whose voice mattered to him. The most noticeable difference between Mr G's use of student voice and student voice conducted by teaching members of staff was that the students were able to speak to him at any time, "there's an open door here I mean the kids come in all the time". Another difference was that when the students identified a problem "something happens" and when they asked if they could pursue an idea they were told "of course you can". This facilitated "ownership" and made them "feel very special". Unlike "in education [where] they often take the best teacher and keep them furthest away from the kids which is cruel" he established a relationship where the students mattered by being accessible, supporting the students to lead change and empowering the students.

To reveal where student voice works well, all the good practice that is taking place needs to be identified. Consideration needs to be afforded to the setting itself including primary schools, independent schools, faith schools and single sex schools. Are there certain types of setting that are more or less conducive to listening to the voice of the student? To identify the variables that are needed within these settings to enable the voice of the student to be heard, relationships between teachers and

students, classroom pedagogy, the size of the institution, school ethos, the role and place of pastoral care and various avenues for obtaining voice might be considered including non-teaching members of staff.

5.3.2 Two professional cultures

The student has become fragmented into their affective and their cognitive self as a result of the emergence of two professional cultures within schools. This study has revealed a tension between the teaching and non-teaching professional cultures which teachers are particularly sensitive to. Traditionally pastoral care sat firmly with teaching staff through the role of the tutor and the head of year and has been defined as 'the structures, practices and approaches to support the welfare, well-being and development of children and young people' (Calvert 2009:267). Pastoral responsibilities were a central part of a teacher's role (Revell 2002) and as such the student mattered. It was the tutor who knew the child and provided 'individual support...to give them the help they needed' (Calvert 2009:271). Pastoral care has also been cited to support the five outcomes of the *Every Child Matters* agenda (Calvert 2009 and Jones 2006).

As a consequence of the national agreement (Andrews 2006), the introduction of teaching and learning responsibilities (Andrews 2006) and changes within education (Calvert 2009 and Jones 2006), non-teaching members of staff are increasingly taking on pastoral roles that were traditionally held by teaching members of staff (Calvert 2009). The outcome is that two professional cultures have developed within schools; that of the teacher has primarily become concerned with the cognitive and that of the pastoral manager with the affective. The child must divide himself or herself between different members of staff.

There are a number of benefits to the introduction of non-teaching pastoral managers within schools for example one headteacher said

non-teaching staff have a greater opportunity to establish meaningful relationships as they do not have as many other agendas as teaching staff to deal with (Clay 2009).

Parents, students and teaching staff also benefit by having quicker access to pastoral managers when previously tutors or heads of year could be teaching (Andrews 2006).

As one teacher summarised

teachers are freed to teach while pastoral managers focus solely on the pupils and their needs (Clay 2009).

It is precisely the focus by the pastoral managers on the students and their needs that has facilitated teachers abdicating their role in pastoral care and their responsibility to meet the affective as well as the cognitive needs of their students. A headteacher in support of non-teaching pastoral managers said

teachers are engaged in so much curriculum change and innovation and I want them to be focused on their classroom responsibilities (Revell 2002).

Pastoral responsibilities are subsumed within a teacher's responsibilities both within and beyond the classroom. The expectation on teachers 'to become "expert technicians" in transmitting externally pre-defined knowledge and skills to their pupils' (Osborn 2006:243) means opportunities for teachers to form relationships with students are missed which negatively affects learning (see section 4.6). This fails the whole child as boundaries are drawn regarding what it is that matters about the child and to whom it matters. As one commentator said

you are splitting off and distorting teachers' professional responsibility for their classes even further...but in fact it will mean they feel out of touch and disconnected with their pupils (Clay 2009).

Within this study teacher participants revealed how tutor time had become focused on academic attainment and moved away from the affective. For example one teacher said "you mentor them through, academically and kind of pastorally".

This was echoed by another teacher

they [senior management] are going to change quite radically the tutorial system in the 6th form and they want to bring it into an academic coaching.

Tutor time was also used to deliver the curriculum for example one teacher participant said “every form tutor was with their form, in Year groups and doing PSHE [personal, social and health education]”. Another said “with the Citizenship I wanted to know what tutors were doing in tutor times”.

The student participants revealed that their affective needs were met by those other than their teachers (see section 4.4), summarised by one student who said “I would come go to Pastoral”.

Not only has the advent of non-teaching pastoral staff subtracted from the role of the tutor but it has encroached on classroom behaviour management which begs the question do teachers matter? For example one student participant said

I don't want to go to Isolation but they [teachers] are making me want to, that's why I've got a time-out card, so...I can just use that.

This was echoed by another student participant who said

Well I don't go to Isolation...I go to Pastoral...I usually get sent out sometimes at the end of the day and I just have time-out.

With pastoral managers issuing students with time-out cards, the classroom teacher is unable to manage the student's behaviour and enforce discipline. There may be a legitimate reason but as students and parents speak directly to pastoral managers, they are often the gatekeepers and dictate if, when and what information about the student is communicated to teachers. This can leave teachers feeling frustrated and undermined.

The creation of a pastoral professionalism is having the effect of dividing the child. Although the importance of developing the whole child is apparent within educational philosophy, structures within schools hinder such a philosophy. The notion of specialisms and the division of labour in order to monitor and manage the performance of individual members of staff benefits the school rather than its

students. The question that needs to be addressed in a future research project is at what cost have schools let in a pastoral profession and if there is a better way of meeting the needs of the whole child that avoids the division of roles and the fragmentation of the child. To reveal the cost of the pastoral profession on teacher's professional self-esteem a comparison could be conducted between those schools who employ non-teaching pastoral professionals and those who do not. Variables that could be considered might include staff absence, perceived job satisfaction, student attainment, the use of sanctions and student behaviour.

In schools where teachers are expected to relate to their students only in terms of attainment and to elicit a performance rather than relate to students as individuals negates the need to form relationships with the students. It was these very relationships which student participants said indicated they mattered. Teacher participants spoke of the importance of relating to the whole child, "knowing the children in your care, is what helps you actually understand the whole person" and facilitated learning. If students are seen only in terms of their instrumental value and as an economic unit used to obtain funding or status for the school they do not matter.

5.3.3 Honouring mattering

Whilst a partial eclipse of *Every Child Matters* has surfaced during this study (see section 5.2.1), an informal survey of the contents and pedagogy of religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education gives support to the hope that *Every Child Matters* will be recognisable and remain within the school curriculum. This is because despite a review of the National Curriculum (DfE 2011a) it is not the totality of a student's schooling or a school's curriculum. Although officially the focus has moved away from *Every Child Matters* and some of its ideals have been forgotten, this research has suggested three curricula areas where *Every Child Matters* will be remembered and will continue. Religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education will be the saviour of the practice of every child mattering.

The foundation and evolution of citizenship education within schools has been discussed (see section 1.2). The intention of citizenship education in the twenty-first century was to ‘develop social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy’ (QCA 2007:27). Teacher participants experienced a tension between educating the whole child and delivering the content of the curriculum,

we want kids to do well and we want them to enjoy their learning really if possible...we got praised by a recent Ofsted for community links, um not particularly the citizenship that I do in the classroom but just general stuff going on in the school, er we're quite good at making a positive contribution to the community a lot of kids do that.

Another teacher participant said,

there's a lot of good stuff going on here...by lots of different people [but]...one of my issues is that how do you get it all in...my way round this is going to be to use these curriculum enrichment days a lot more, and actually put a lot of the citizenship I think maybe in there and actually level it and have instead of having a nice day where you do something and go home, actually get them to do some of the advocacy stuff and have people mark it.

The approach to citizenship education adopted by schools has impinged on its aims and potential,

structural aspects of delivery may not necessarily guarantee the success of citizenship education. Indeed, they could prove counter to the current push to widen schools' understandings of citizenship and the role it can play (Kerr et. al. 2007:10).

The number of students entered for the GCSE examination has increased (Ofsted 2010a:9) as ‘status and identity’ (Ofsted 2010a:13) has become equated with accreditation. The status afforded by accreditation has made it ‘more difficult to introduce varied and interactive teaching and learning approaches’ (Kerr et. al 2007:13) and it is a source of tension between teachers teaching about citizenship and students realising its aims. It was apparent in teacher participant interviews that despite the tension the student mattered as teachers sought innovative ways to not only deliver the curriculum but to provide opportunities to educate the whole child.

The foundation and evolution of personal, social, health and economic education within schools has been discussed (see section 1.4). The two strands within personal, social, health and economic education aim to ‘equip pupils with the knowledge, skills and attributes to make the most of changing opportunities in learning and work’ (QCA 2007:227) and help students ‘embrace change, feel positive about who they are and enjoy healthy, safe, responsible and fulfilled lives’ (QCA 2007:243). It is the subject where students mattered and this was summarised by one teacher participant who said “so I mean it is ECM [Every Child Matters] PSHE [personal, social and health education]”. Personal, social, health and economic education has also been cited to fulfil the aims of *Every Child Matters* (Brown et. al. 2011 and Crow 2008).

Teacher participants experienced a tension between achieving the aims of the curriculum and the means that were available to them. Delivering the curriculum was a challenge “when you haven’t got a specialist department” and teaching staff were selected “who basically had extra time on their timetable so you’re an hour under so you can teach the PSHE [personal social and health education]”. The method of delivery and the staff used to teach personal, social, health and economic education have been an ongoing concern (Brown 1990, Hargreaves et. al 1988, Ofsted 2010b, Ofsted 2005a, Ofsted 2005b and Macdonald 2009). School structures limit the extent to which the child matters. In spite of this tension, the practice of the teacher participants revealed the student mattered through the provision of a curriculum which delivered relevant and appropriate content to meet the needs of the students by listening to their voice. As we have previously heard from one teacher participant who said

we try and look at the [personal, social and health education] curriculum each year and think about what’s most relevant to those kids we also let them choose topics from a selection that they want to know about.

The foundation and evolution of religious studies within schools has been discussed (see section 1.3). Initially the presence of religious studies in the curriculum was founded on its instrumental value and based on the involvement of the church in establishing the first schools. Since then, religious studies has established its intrinsic

value (see for example Wright 2004b) and it has also been cited to fulfil the five outcomes of *Every Child Matters* (Council for Subject Associations 2008). However a tension remains between the private and public perception of religious studies. Some suggest religious studies should have no place in a school's curriculum as it is nothing more than 'irrelevant clutter, a private hobby' (Cooling 2012:91). To secure its place in the curriculum religious studies has been offered as a 'problem solver' (Cocker 2010:44) with the suggestion that it adopts and fulfils new initiatives.

We will weave ourselves so intricately into the fabric of the 'box ticking' world that our importance and place in the school would be immeasurable' (Cocker 2010:44).

Such an approach ignores the significance of religious studies although the need for security within the curriculum especially due to the changes at Key Stage 3 was expressed by teacher participants. The introduction of humanities at one participating school for example left religious studies "watered down". New subjects were also being introduced and one teacher participant said,

we're worried that RE's just gonna get a bit kind of sidelined more and more...they're doing this new Learning to Learn that started in Year 7...there was rumours perhaps of that you know they might get rid of RE.

Similarly a teacher participant at another school said

we have Opening Minds delivering the religious studies er requirement for Year 7 and that is taught as er not discrete subjects.

As a consequence one teacher expressed the need to "sell our subject" to the students because "they [the students] have they do flat out and say well, we've never done RE before or RS before". What has been identified is the

tension between 'covering' a set curriculum and preparing pupils for external assessments on one hand, and...at the same time trying to 'sell' the subject (McIntyre 2003:98).

The integration of religious studies within other subjects (Ofsted 2010c) and the effect of introducing new curriculum subjects on religious studies (Baumfield et. al. 2012

and Ofsted 2010c) have raised concern. Despite these concerns teacher participants expressed their students mattered as they aimed to provide a curriculum that was “relevant and interesting”, “open”, “meaningful”, that students “enjoy” and one that provided “a healthy sense of intellectual, competition” where students were able to “learn about their faith”. Religious studies aims to ‘encourage questioning and critical thinking, whilst recognising the affective as well as cognitive dimension to belief’ (Baumfield 2012:13) and in that respect the whole child matters. Religious studies also supports ‘the personal development’ (Ubani 2012:44) of the student and their ‘search for meaning’ (Ubani 2012:45).

Every Child Matters aimed to protect children from abuse and neglect and facilitate the academic success of all students. In practice the child was divided and measured against criteria (Cheminais 2007 and Ofsted 2009b). Stern reminds us that people ‘who work in school know that children matter’ (2007:292). The present study suggests that this is indeed true but the child often mattered for reasons that were external to themselves and that there was a tension between their instrumental and their intrinsic worth. Within schools a sense of community and the use of dialogue rather than talk are suggested as key components of mattering (Stern 2007). One must now locate these components.

What needs to be considered in a future research project is where the whole child can be found to matter in the curriculum. Within this study there is growing evidence that suggests the whole child mattered within religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education. An audit of public and school based syllabi for these three curriculum areas against the discrete outcomes of *Every Child Matters* would reveal whether *Every Child Matters* objectives are intrinsic to these subjects. An audit would be useful because this study has revealed that conveying to students they matter is imperative beyond any initiative or policy. The audit would consider opportunities for mattering beyond the content and classroom tasks or activities for example the chance for students to express their opinion (Felderhof 2005) would be taken into account. An audit of these three curricula areas could be compared with other humanities subjects for example geography, history and sociology to discover if

the *Every Child Matters* objectives are intrinsic in other subjects or exclusive to religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education.

The audit might be accompanied by interviewing teachers about their pedagogical practice. The question that might usefully be asked is whether religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education teachers in comparison to other subject teachers are more positively inclined towards honouring the *Every Child Matters* objectives and recognising the value of the whole child. Teachers of religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education do not claim to have absolute authority to the truth or to one clearly defined worldview not even within faith schools (Baumfield et. al. 2012:17). These curricula subjects underpin a student's social, moral, spiritual and cultural education (Diocese of Chichester 2006, Freathy 2008 and Macdonald 2009) and the teacher supports the student on their journey to establish their own truth, beliefs and attitudes (Ubani 2012 and Watson 2006). It is this journey that the teacher takes alongside their students which is perhaps unique to religious studies, citizenship and personal, social, health and economic education and makes the *Every Child Matters* objectives intrinsic. Research into the pedagogic practice of religious studies teachers has begun (van der Zee 2012) but it is in its infancy and therefore a possible area of future research is suggested.

Postscript rioters' voices

Rioting is the only voice we have that people will listen to (rioter).

We have noted that the *Every Child Matters* initiative has fallen into disuse (see section 5.2.1) and that the key words listening, voice and mattering are becoming more infrequent. In August 2011 it was these intentions that were being registered during the urban riots by the young people and those who spoke on their behalf. Although young people spoke of the possibility of riots breaking out in the weeks preceding these events with the closing down of youth clubs and the lack of services available to them cited as contributing reasons, their voices were not heard. This was acknowledged during the riots,

if you looked at young blacks and young whites with a discerning eye and a careful hearing they have been telling us and we would not listen (Darcus Howe BBC News 9.8.11).

Subsequently there has been a call for politicians to 'get into the young people's minds' (Adam Deacon BBC News 15.8.11).

A range of explanations for the riots have been put forward for example education, youth unemployment, 'criminality' (David Cameron on BBC Newsnight 9.8.11), race 'the whites have become black' (David Starkey BBC Newsnight 12.8.11), budget cuts, cuts to youth services and the 'abolition of the education maintenance allowance' (Dianne Abbott The Independent on Sunday 8.8.11). A number of commentators also made reference to gangs and 'gang culture' (David Cameron on BBC news 15.8.11).

Immediately outside the gates of most inner-city schools there exists a thriving gang culture, eager to gobble up those who need a sense of belonging (Phil Beadle The Guardian 29.8.11).

The kids at street level did say that the gangs who normally would be fighting each other united in these circumstances to fight what they perceived were the wrongs of government and the police (Camilla Batmanghelidjh BBC Newsnight 11.8.11).

It is not the purpose of this thesis to uncover the cause(s) of the riots but a number of reasons that have emerged have *Every Child Matters* principles running through them. Since *Every Child Matters* has been allowed to wither (see section 5.2.1) a revival of mattering is now urged.

The sense of not being listened to was frequently voice by young people.

We just wanna get heard (rioter).

No one's getting their voice heard (young person).

This was echoed by those who spoke on behalf of young people.

There is a sense that young people feel they're not being listened to (Harriet Harperson BBC Newsnight 8.8.11).

Listen to what the young people are saying because they need a voice (Adam Deacon BBC News 15.8.11).

They wanted what they haven't got, a voice (reporter after he interviewed rioters for Sky News August 2011).

Whether we like it or not there are large numbers of exceptionally disenfranchised and disengaged individuals living in the ghettos of Britain, they haven't had a voice, the whole dynamic of the interactions politically, has been dominated by people who have a voice, and a media who can express things the way they want to, these people haven't had a chance to say it, it doesn't justify them rioting but they haven't had the chance to say many things and we mustn't dismiss them, this is an opportunity to listen to them (Camilla Batmanghelidjh BBC Newsnight 11.8.11).

The sense of not mattering was also frequently voice by young people.

They [the government] don't care for us (rioter).

The youth have nothing to look forward to (young person interviewed by Sky News 9.8.11).

To be treated fairly (rioter recorded on BBC Newsnight 9.8.11).

This was echoed by those who spoke on behalf of young people.

Parts of the community seem to have been a tinder box waiting to explode (Diane Abbott The Independent on Sunday 8.8.11).

It is not just about toxic areas, toxic estates, toxic families; these are individuals (Diane Abbott 11.8.11).

A generation are growing up completely uncertain about their future, they are not certain they can get a home they are not certain they can get a job, they see politicians who do not engage with them (Ken Livingstone BBC Newsnight 8.8.11).

Some of these young people feel they have no stake in society (Rev Nims Obunge BBC Newsnight 8.8.11).

If we want to live in a society where people feel included, we must include them, where they feel represented, we must represent them and where they feel love and compassion for their communities then we, the members of that community, must find love and compassion for them (Russell Brand The Guardian 11.8.11).

It has been estimated that between thirteen and fifteen thousand people were actively involved in the riots, that over five thousand crimes were committed and of those arrested or identified seventy-five per cent were under twenty-four years old (Singh 2012). Whilst blame can be apportioned and causes can be discussed we have noted that the young people themselves are seeking to be heard within and beyond the school gates. During the riots, young people expressed that they did not have a voice and that they did not matter. *Every Child Matters* called for the voice of young people to be listened to and it sought to create a sense that everybody mattered. The revival of the intentions of *Every Child Matters* could go some way to provide the opportunity and focus for young people to be heard, their perspective to matter and to instil a sense of belonging and avoid a repeat of the events in August 2011 from reoccurring.

As we sweep away the mistakes made in the selfish, nocturnal darkness we must ensure that, amidst the broken glass and sadness, we don't sweep away the youth lost amongst the shards in the shadows cast by the new dawn (Russell Brand The Guardian 11.8.11).

The response to the voices that have been recorded above would indicate that a revival of the intentions of *Every Child Matters* is required. The Riots Communities and Victims Panel have not made that response. The work of the Riots Communities and Victims Panel heard the voices of the affected communities and victims although the voice of the rioters themselves was marginalised. Despite the Panel concluding that 'there was no single cause of the riots and no single group was responsible' (Riots Panel 2012:4), in the final report (Singh 2012) the riots were attributed to poor parenting, criminal elements, an absence of personal resilience, a lack of employment opportunities, consumerism, poor relationships with the police and a lack of respect within communities. A number of recommendations were made by the Panel in conjunction with the communities and the victims on behalf of the rioters. The Panel did not hear the voices the researcher recorded and these voices continue to go unheard.

Bibliography

ADAMS, P. (2007) 'Learning and caring in the age of the five outcomes' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 225-237.

AHIER, J. and ROSS, A. (ed) (1995) *The social subjects within the curriculum: children's social learning in the national curriculum* London: Falmer Press.

ALCOFF, L. (2009) 'The problem of speaking for others' in JACKSON, A. and MAZZEI, L. (2009): 117-135.

ALDERSON, P. and MORROW, V. (2004) *Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people* Ilford: Barnardo's.

ALDRICH, R. (1982) *An introduction to the history of education* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

ANDERSON, G. (1998) *Fundamentals of educational research* London: Falmer.

ANDREWS, D. (2006) 'Non-teachers' moving into roles traditionally undertaken by teachers: benefits and challenges – for whom?' *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development* 24, 3: 28-31.

ANDREWS, K. (2001) *Extra learning: new opportunities for the out of school hours* London: Kogan Page.

ANDREWS, R. (2008) 'Ten years of strategies' *Changing English* 15, 1: 77-85.

ARGENT, K. (2007) 'Every child matters: change for parents/carers and families? Can schools work with families to promote knowledge and understanding of government expectations?' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 295-303.

ARIÈS, P. (1962) *Centuries of childhood* London: Cape.

- ATKINSON, B. and ROSIEK, J. (2009) '*Researching and representing teacher voice(s): a reader response approach*' in JACKSON, A. and MAZZEI, L. (2009) :175-196.
- BACKUS, J. (2008) 'Developing programmes of study' in BARNES, P.L., WRIGHT, A. and BRANDOM, A-M (ed) (2008):49-70.
- BALDING, A. (2012) Schools health education unit. Health related behaviour survey launch Cavendish Hotel, Eastbourne (1 March).
- BALL, S. (2003) 'The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity' *Journal of Educational Policy* 18, 2: 215-228.
- BROADHEAD, P. and MARTIN, D. (2009) 'Education and every child matters' in BARKER, R. (ed) (2009):45-58.
- BARKER, R. (2009) 'Beginning to understand every child matters' in BARKER, R. (ed) (2009):5-27.
- BARKER, R. (ed) (2009) *Making sense of every child matters: multi-professional practice guidance* Bristol: Policy.
- BARNES, P.L. (2000) 'Ninian Smart and the phenomenological approach to religious education' *Religion* 30, 4: 315-332.
- BARNES, P.L. (2001a) 'What is wrong with the phenomenological approach to religious education?' *Religious Education* 96, 4: 445-461.
- BARNES, P.L. (2001b) 'Ideology, the phenomenological approach, and hermeneutics: a response to Professor Lovat' *Religious Education* 96, 4: 572-581.
- BARNES, P.L. and WRIGHT, A. (2006) 'Romanticism, representations of religion and critical religious education' *British Journal of Religious Education* 28, 1: 65- 77.
- BARNES, P.L., WRIGHT, A. and BRANDOM, A-M (ed) (2008) *Learning to teach*

religious education in the secondary school London: Routledge.

BARNES, P.L. (ed) (2012) *Debates in religious education* London: Routledge.

BARROW, R. (1976) *Plato and education* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BARTHOLO, R., TUNES, E. and TACCA, M. (2010) 'Vygotsky's and Buber's pedagogical perspectives: some affinities' *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 42, 8: 867-880.

BAUMFIELD, V. (2012) 'Understanding the wider context: meaning and purpose in religious education' *British Journal of Religious Education* 34, 1: 1-4.

BAUMFIELD, V. M., Conroy, J. C., Davis, R. A. and Lundie, D. C. (2012) 'The delphi method: gathering expert opinion in religious education' *British Journal of Religious Education* 34, 1: 5-19.

BBC (2001) 'Lauren inquiry demanded' (1 October). Available at [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/1573910.stm>] (accessed 1.5.2010).

BBC (2002) 'Parent guilty of killing daughter' (20 September). Available at [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/2270974.stm>] (accessed 1.5.2010).

BBC (2006) 'Pupils walk out over short lunch' (25 April). Available at [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/norfolk/4941974.stm>] (accessed 5.4.12).

BECK, J. and EARL, M. (ed) (2000) *Key issues in secondary education* London: Cassell.

BELL, J. (2005) *Doing your research project. A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science* Buckingham: Open University Press.

BELL, J. (2010) *Your research project. A guide for first-time researchers in*

education, health and social science Buckingham: Open University Press.

BENN, C. and CHITTY, C. (1996) *Thirty years on, is comprehensive education alive and well or struggling to survive?* London: David Fulton.

BERGER, P. and LUCKMANN, T. (1966) *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

BEST, R. (2007) 'The whole child matters: the challenge of every child matters for pastoral care' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 249-259.

BETHEL-FOX, C. and O'CONNOR, F. (2000) *The primary and secondary school classroom climate questionnaires: psychometric properties, links to teacher behaviours & student outcomes, and potential applications* London: Hay Group.

BIBLE (1994) *New international version* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

BLACK-HAWKINS, K., FLORIAN, L. and ROUSE, M. (2007) *Achievement and inclusion in schools* Abingdon: Routledge.

BLANCHETTE, J. (2009) 'Characteristics of teacher talk and learner talk in the online learning environment' *Language and Education* 23, 5: 391-407.

BOGDAN, R. and BIKLEN, S.K. (2003) *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

BOSMA, H. A., GRAAFSMA, T. L. G. and LEVITA, D. J. de (ed) (1994) *Identity and development: an interdisciplinary approach* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

BOURQUE, L.B. and BACK, K.W. (2005) 'Time sampling as a field technique' in Burgess (2005):91-97.

BOYD, W. and KING, E. (1975) *The history of western education* London: Adam and

Charles Black.

BROWN, C. (1986) '*Social education in secondary schools: principles and practice*' in BROWN, C., HARBER, C. and STRIVENS, J. (ed) (1986):3-20.

BROWN, C. (1990) '*Personal and social education: Timetable ghetto or whole-school practice?*' in Dufor (1990):34-50.

BROWN, C., HARBER, C. and STRIVENS, J. (ed) (1986) *Social education: principles and practice* London: Falmer.

BROWN, J., BUSFIELD, A., O'SHEA, A. and SIBTHORPE, J. (2011) 'School ethos and personal, social, health education' *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development* 29, 2: 117-131.

BUBER, M. (1958) *I and thou* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

BUCK, M. (2003) 'Leadership and management of pshe to support a whole school approach in INMAN, S., BUCK, M. and TANDY, M. (ed) (2003):217-233.

BURGESS, R.G. (1984a) '*It's not a proper subject: it's just newsom*' in GOODSON, I.F. and BALL, S.J. (1984):181-201.

BURGESS, R.G. (1984b) *In the field. An introduction to field research* London: Routledge.

BURGESS, R.G. (ed) (2005) *Field research: a sourcebook and field manual* London: Routledge.

BÜRGI, P., JACOBS, C. and ROOS, J. (2005) 'From metaphor to practice: in the crafting of strategy' *Journal of Management Inquiry* 14, 1: 78-94.

BURR, V. (2003) *Social constructionism* London: Routledge.

BURRAGE, H. (1990) 'Health education: education for health?' in DUFOR, B. (ed) (1990):51-68.

CALLAGHAN, J. (1976) 'Towards a national debate' (15 October 2001). Available at [<http://education.guardian.co.uk/thegreatdebate/story/0,9860,574645,00.html>] accessed 27.4.2012.

CALVERT, M. (2009) 'From 'pastoral care' to 'care': meanings and practices' *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development* 27, 4: 267-277.

CARNELL, E. and LODGE, C. (2002) 'Support for students' learning: what the form tutor can do' *Pastoral Care in Education* 20, 4: 12-20.

CASHMORE, E. (1987) *The logic of racism* London: Allen and Unwin.

CASHMORE, E. (1989) *United Kingdom?: class, race and gender since the war* London: Unwin Hyman.

CEFAI, C. (2008) *Promoting resilience in the classroom: a guide to developing pupils' emotional and cognitive skills* London: Jessica Kingsley.

CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL for EDUCATION (1963) *Half our future: a report of the central advisory council for education (England)* London: HMSO.

CHAPLAIN, R. (2008) 'Stress and psychological distress among trainee secondary teachers in England' *Educational Psychology* 28, 2: 195-209.

CHARMAZ, K. (2004) 'Grounded theory' in HESSE-BIBER, S. N. and LEAVY, P. (2004): 496-521.

CHARMAZ, K. (2008) 'Grounded Theory', in SMITH, J.A. (2008):81-110.

- CHEETHAM, R. (2001) 'How on earth do we find out what is going on in collective worship? An account of a grounded theory approach' *British Journal of Religious Education* 23, 3: 165-176.
- CHEMINAIS, R. (2006) *Every child matters: a practical guide for teachers* London: David Fulton.
- CHEMINAIS, R. (2007) *How to achieve the every child matters standards: a practical guide* London: Paul Chapman.
- CHEVANNES, B. (ed) (1995) *Rastafari and other African-Caribbean worldviews* London: Macmillan.
- CHITTY, C. (1998) 'The 'moment' of 1976' *British Journal of Educational Studies* 46, 3: 318-323.
- CLARK, A. and MOSS, P. (2011) *Listening to young children: the mosaic approach* London: National Children's Bureau.
- CLARKE, S. (2007) 'The trajectory of 'political education' in English schools: the rise and fall of two initiatives' *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 3, 1: 3-16.
- CLAY, D. (2009) 'Lean on me' *Times Educational Supplement* (4 April).
- COCKER, M. (2010) 'RE as a problem solver: ticking all the right boxes', *REtoday* Summer 27, 3: 44-45.
- COHEN, L., MANION, L. and MORRISON, K. (2007) *Research methods in education* London: Routledge.
- COMMISSION ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN SCHOOL (1970) *The Fourth R: the report on the commission on religious education in schools, appointed in 1967 under*

the chairmanship of the Bishop of Durham London: S.P.C.K.

CONNEXIONS (2007) *Quick guide: national requirements and guidance for schools (spring 2007)* London: DfES.

COOK-SATHER, A. (2006) 'Sound, presence, and power: "student voice" in educational research and reform' *Curriculum Inquiry* 36, 4: 359-390.

COOLING, T. (2012) 'Faith, religious education and whole school issues' in BARNES, P.L. (2012):88-97.

COOPERSMITH, S. (1967) *The antecedents of self-esteem* San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

COPELAND, I. (2003) 'Integration versus segregation: the early struggle', in NIND, M., RIX, J., SHEEHY, K. and SIMMONS, K. (ed) (2003):43-56.

COPLEY, T. (1997) *Teaching religion: fifty years of religious education in England and Wales* Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

CORBIN, J. (2011) 'Grounded theory' in SOMEKH, B. and LEWEN, C. (2011):113-120.

COUCHMAN, H. (2006) 'Give us our voice in class' (23 October). Available at [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/oct/23/comment.schools>] (accessed 5.4.12).

COUNCIL FOR SUBJECT ASSOCIATIONS (2008) 'Religious education making every child matter' *Primary Subjects* 1, 1-4.

COX, C. and BOYSON, R. (1975) *Black paper 1975: the fight for education* London: Dent.

CRAIG, D. (ed) (1969) *Hard times: for these times* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

CRICK, B. and PORTER, A. (1978) *Political education and political literacy: the report and papers of, and the evidence submitted to, the Working Party of the Hansard Society's 'Programme for political education'* London: Longman.

CROSSKEY, L. and VANCE, M. (2011) 'Training teachers to support pupils' listening in class: an evaluation using pupil questionnaires' *Child Language Teaching and Therapy* 27, 2: 165-182.

CROW, F. (2008) 'Learning for well-being: personal, social and health education and a changing curriculum' *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development* 26, 1: 43-51.

DAVIES, I., GREGORY, I. and RILEY, S. (1999) *Good citizenship and educational provision* London: Falmer.

DAVIES, I., GREGORY, I. and MCGUINN, N. (2002) *Key debates in education* London: Continuum.

DAVIS, L. (1993) *Pastoral care: caring for secondary school pupils* London: Janus.

DAWSON, C. (2002) *Practical research methods. A user-friendly guide to mastering research techniques and projects* Oxford: How to Books.

DCSF (2007) *The children's plan: building brighter futures* Norwich: HMSO.

DCSF (2008) 'Every child matters outcomes framework'. Available at [\[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100406141748/publications.everychildmatters.gov.uk/eorderingdownload/dcsf-00331-2008.pdf\]](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100406141748/publications.everychildmatters.gov.uk/eorderingdownload/dcsf-00331-2008.pdf) (accessed 24.4.2012).

DCSF (2009a) *Your child, your schools, our future: building a 21st century schools system* Norwich: TSO.

DCSF (2009b) *Press notice on personal, social, health and economic education* (5 November) DCSF. Available at [\[http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/pns/DisplayPN.cgi?pn_id =2009_0208\]](http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/pns/DisplayPN.cgi?pn_id =2009_0208) (accessed 26.12.2009).

DEARING, R. (1993) *The national curriculum and its assessment: interim report* London: National Curriculum Council.

DEARING, R. (1994) *The national curriculum and its assessment: final report* London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority.

DELAMONT, S. (1992) *Fieldwork in educational settings: methods, pitfalls and perspectives* London: Falmer Press.

DEMETRIOU, H., GOALEN, P. and RUDDUCK, J. (2000) 'Academic performance, transfer, transition and friendship: listening to the student voice' *International Journal of Educational Research* 33, 4: 425-441.

DENSCOMBE, M. (1998) *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects* Buckingham: Open University Press.

DENSCOMBE, M. (2007) *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects* Berkshire: Open University Press.

DENZIN, N. and LINCOLN, Y. (ed) (1994) *Handbook of qualitative research* London: Sage.

DENZIN, N. and LINCOLN, Y. (ed) (2000) *Handbook of qualitative research* London: Sage.

DENZIN, N. and LINCOLN, Y. (ed) (2005) *The sage handbook of qualitative research* London: SAGE.

DES (1965) *The organisation of secondary education (circular 10/65)* London: HMSO.

DES (1977) *Curriculum 11-16: working papers by HM inspectorate: a contribution to current debate* London: DES.

DES (1980a) *A framework for the school curriculum: proposals for consultation* London: DES.

DES (1980b) *A view of the curriculum* London: HMSO.

DES (1981) *The school curriculum* London: HMSO.

DES (1985) *Better schools* London: HMSO.

DES (1988a) *A survey of personal and social education courses in some secondary schools: a report by HM inspectorate* London: HMSO.

DES (1988b) *Careers education and guidance from 5 to 16* London: HMSO.

DES (1989) *Personal and social education from 5 to 16* London: HMSO.

DfE (1994) *Education act 1993: sex education in schools* London: DfE.

DfE (2010) *The Importance of Teaching. The schools white paper 2010* Norwich: TSO.

DfE (2011a) *The framework for the national curriculum. A report by the expert panel for the national curriculum review* London: DfE.

DfE (2011b) *The Munro review of child protection: final report. A child-centred system* Norwich: TSO.

DfE (2011c) 'National curriculum review launched' press notice (20 January). Available at [<http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0073149/national-curriculum-review-launched>] (accessed 1.2.2012).

DfEE (2000) *Sex and relationship education guidance* Nottingham: DfEE.

DfEE and QCA (1999a) *Citizenship the national curriculum for England: citizenship* London: DfEE and QCA.

DfEE and QCA (1999b) *The national curriculum: handbook for secondary teachers in England key stages 3 and 4* London: Stationary Office for DfEE and QCA.

DfES (2003) *Every child matters* Norwich: TSO.

DfES (2004a) *Drugs: guidance for schools* Nottingham: DfES.

DfES (2004b) *Every child matters: next steps* Nottingham: DfES.

DfES (2004c) *Every child matters: change for children* Nottingham: DfES.

DfES (2005) *Higher standards, better schools for all* Norwich: The Stationary Office.

DfES (2006) *The common assessment framework for children and young people: supporting tools*. Available at [<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/CAF-SUPPORT-TOOLS>] (accessed 24.4.2012).

DIOCESE OF CHICHESTER (2006) *Educating the whole child. Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development* Hove: The Church of England.

DoE (1986) *Working together – education and training* London: HMSO.

DoH and DfES (2002) *National health school standard report: reviewing past achievements sharing future plans* Yorkshire: Health Development Agency.

DoH (2003) *Keeping children safe: the government's response to the "Victoria Climbié inquiry report" and joint chief inspectors' report "safeguarding children": presented to parliament by the secretary of state for the home department and the secretary of state for education and skills by command of Her Majesty, September 2003* London: TSO.

DoH (2009) *Reference Guide to Consent for examination or treatment second edition* London: DoH.

DOWARD, J., HINSLIFF, G., MCVEIGH, T. and TOWNSEND, M. (2008) 'Why children are left to die beyond help's reach'. Available at [\[http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2008/nov/16/child-protection-uk-crime?INTCMP=SRCH\]](http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2008/nov/16/child-protection-uk-crime?INTCMP=SRCH) (accessed 27.4.2012).

DUCKETT, P., SIXSMITH, J. and KAGAN, C. (2008) 'Researching pupil well-being in UK secondary schools: community psychology and the politics of research' *Childhood* 15, 1: 89-106.

DUFOR, B. (ed) (1990) *The new social curriculum: a guide to cross-curricular issues* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EMERSON, R.M. (ed) (1983) *Contemporary field research* Boston: Little Brown.

EXTERNAL EXAMINER (2011) *External examiners report academic session 2010 for the MA in religious and philosophical education at the University of Glasgow* Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

FELDERHOF, M. C. (2005) 'RE: religions, equality and curriculum time' *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 26, 2: 201-214.

- FIELDING, M. (2001) 'Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: new departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling?' *Forum* 43, 2: 100-109.
- FIELDING, M. (2004) 'Transformative approaches to student voice: theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities' *British Educational Research Journal* 30, 2: 295-311.
- FIELDING, M. and RUDDUCK, J. (2002) *The transformative potential of student voice: confronting the power issues* (paper presented at the annual conference of the British educational research association, University of Exeter, England, 12-14 September 2002).
- FONTANA, A. and FREY, H. (2005) 'The interview. From neutral stance to political involvement' in DENZIN, N. and LINCOLN, Y. (ed) (2005):695-727.
- FRANCE, M. and FINNEY, S. (2009) 'What matters in the measurement of mattering?: a construct validity study' *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development* 42, 2: 104-120.
- FRAZER, E. (1999) 'Introduction: the idea of political education' *Oxford Review of Education* 25, 1&2: 5-22.
- FREATHY, R. J. K. (2008) 'Three perspectives on religious education and education for citizenship in English schools, 1934-1944: Cyril Norwood, Ernest Simon and William Temple' *British Journal of Religious Education* 30, 2: 103-112.
- FREDERICKSON, N. and CLINE, T. (2002) *Special educational needs, inclusion and diversity: a textbook* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- FURLONG, J. (2008) 'Making teaching a 21st century profession: Tony Blair's big prize' *Oxford Review of Education* 34, 6: 727-739.
- GILBERT, N. (2008) *Researching Social Life* London: Sage.

GLASER, B. (2012) 'Grounded theory' (May 2012). Video lecture at the University of Brighton.

GLASER, B. and STRAUSS, A. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

GLOVER, D. and COLEMAN, M. (2005) 'School culture, climate and ethos: interchangeable or distinctive concepts?' *Journal of In-service Education* 31, 2: 251-272.

GLOVER, D. and LAW, S. (2001) 'Perceptions of pressure: external and internal influences on secondary school policy-making directed at enhanced teaching and learning' *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 24, 1: 45-60.

GOODSON, I.F. and BALL, S.J. (ed) (1984) *Defining the curriculum: histories and ethnographies* London: Falmer.

GREIG, A., TAYLOR, J. and MACKAY, T. (2007) *Doing research with children* London: Sage.

GRIFFITHS, P. and SHERMAN, K. (1991) *The form tutor: new approaches to tutoring for the 1990s* Oxford: Blackwell Education.

HAMMERSLEY-FLETCHER, L. and QUALTER, A. (2010) 'Chasing improved pupil performance: the impact of policy change on school educators' perceptions of their professional identity, the case of further change in English schools' *British Educational Research Journal* 36, 6: 903-917.

HAMMERSLEY, M. and ATKINSON, P. (2007) *Ethnography: principles in practice* London: Routledge.

HANAFIN, J., O'DONOGHUE, T., FLYNN, M. and SHEVLIN, M. (2010) 'The primary school's invasion of the privacy of the child: unmasking the potential of some current practices' *Educational Studies* 36, 2: 143-152.

HARGREAVES, A., BAGLIN, E., HENDERSON, P., LESSON, P. and TOSSELL, T. (1988) *Personal and social education: choice and challenges* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

HARRIS, B. (2006) 'Overview of Every Child Matters (2003) and the Children Act (2004)' *Pastoral Care in Education* 24, 2: 5-6.

HARRIS, B., VINCENT, K., THOMSON, P. and TOALSTER, R. (2006) 'Does every child know they matter? Pupils' views of one alternative to exclusion' *Pastoral Care in Education* 24, 2: 28-38.

HARRIS, S. (1999) *Careers education: contesting policy and practice* London: Paul Chapman.

HARTLEY, D. (2009) 'Personalisation: the nostalgic revival of child-centred education?' *Journal of Education Policy* 24, 4: 423-434.

HATCH, J. (1995) 'Studying childhood as a cultural invention: a rationale and framework' in HATCH, J. (ed) (1995): 117-134.

HATCH, J. (ed) (1995) *Qualitative research in early childhood settings* London: Praeger.

HEATER, D. (1990) *Citizenship: the civic ideal in world history, politics and education* London: Longman.

HEATER, D. (2001) 'The history of citizenship education in England' *The Curriculum Journal* 12, 1: 103-123.

HESSE-BIBER, S. N. and LEAVY, P. (2004) *Approaches to qualitative research: a*

reader on theory and practice New York: Oxford University Press.

HESSE-BIBER, S. N. and LEAVY, P. (2011) *The practice of qualitative research* London: Sage.

HMSO (1944) *Education Act* London: HMSO.

HMSO (1988) *Education Reform Act* London: HMSO.

HMSO (1993) *Education Act* London: HMSO.

HMSO (1997) *Education Act* London: Stationery Office.

HMSO (2004) *Children Act* London: Stationary office.

HODKINSON, A. and VICKERMAN, P. (2009) *Key issues in special educational needs and inclusion* London: Sage.

HOLDSWORTH, R. (2000) 'Schools that create real roles of value for young people' *UNESCO International Prospect* 3, 340-362.

HOLLEY, R. (1978) *Religious education and religious understanding: an introduction to the philosophy of religious education* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

HOLSTEIN, J.A. and GUBRIUM, J.F. (ed) (2003) *Inside interviewing: new lenses, new concerns* New York: Oxford University Press.

HOMAN, R. (2001) 'The principle of assumed consent: the ethics of gatekeeping' *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35, 3: 329-344.

HOMAN, R. (2009) 'The age of consent: children as participants in educational research' *Research in Education* 1, 2: 4-6.

HOMAN, R. (2012) 'Constructing religion' in BARNES, P.L. (2012):183-193.

HOPKINS, E. A. (2008) 'Classroom conditions to secure enjoyment and achievement: the pupils' voice. Listening to the voice of every child matters' *Education 3-13* 36, 4: 393-401.

HOPKINS, G. (2007) 'What have we learned? Child death scandals since 1944'. Available at [<http://www.communitycare.co.uk/Articles/2007/01/11/102713/What-have-we-learned-Child-death-scandals-since-1944.htm>] (accessed 2.5.2010).

HOPSON, B. and SCALLY, M. (1981) *Lifeskills teaching* London: McGraw-Hill.

HOROWITZ, M. (1971) *Peoples and cultures of the Caribbean; an anthropological reader* New York: The Natural History Press.

HULL, J (1984) *Studies in religion and education* London: Falmer.

HULL, J. (1998) *Utopian whispers: moral, religious and spiritual values in schools* Norfolk: Religious and Moral Education Press.

HUNT, D. (2008) 'Why Gandalf doesn't pick up the ring: The case for keeping local control of RE' *Resource* 30, 2: 12-14.

HUNTER, D. and PIERSCIONEK, B.K.. (2007) 'Children, Gillick competency and consent for involvement in research' *Journal of Medical Ethics* 33, 11: 659-62.

INMAN, S., BUCK, M. and TANDY, M. (ed) (2003) *Enhancing personal, social and health education: challenging practice, changing worlds* London: Routledge Falmer.

IPGRAVE, J., JACKSON, R. and O'GRADY, K. (2009) *Religious education research through a community of practice: action research and the interpretive approach* Münster: Waxmann.

ITV (1985) 'Jasmine Beckford inquiry'. Available at
[<http://www.nfo.ac.uk/collections/records/0013-0002-5751-0000-0-0000-0000-0.html>]
(accessed 2.5.2010).

JACKSON, R. (1997) *Religious education: an interpretive approach* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

JACKSON, R. (2005) *Rethinking religious education and plurality: issues in diversity and pedagogy* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

JACKSON, R. (2009) 'The interpretive approach to religious education and the development of a community of practice' in IPGRAVE, J., JACKSON, R. and O'GRADY, K. (2009): 21-31.

JACKSON, A. and MAZZEI, L. (ed) (2009) *Voice in qualitative inquiry: challenging conventional, interpretive, and critical conceptions in qualitative research* London: Routledge.

JAKES, A. (2010) 'The non-consenting 'voice'' *Research in Education* 2, 2: 3-6.

JARVIE, I.C. (2005) 'The problem of ethical integrity in participant observation' in Burgess (2005):68-72.

JOHNSON, S., COOPER, C., CARTWRIGHT, S., DONALD, I., TAYLOR, P. and MILLET, C. (2005) 'The experience of work-related stress across occupations' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 20, 2: 178-187.

JONES, P. (2006) 'Status of pastoral care in schools in the 21st century' *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development* 24, 2: 64-66.

JOSSELSOON, R. (1994) 'Identity and relatedness in the life cycle' in BOSMA, H. A., GRAAFSMA, T. L. G. and LEVITA, D. J. de (ed) (1994):81-102.

- KAY, W. (1997) 'Phenomenology, religious education, and Piaget' *Religion* 27, 3: 275-283.
- KAY, W. (2001) 'Religious education and empirical investigation research seminar lecture notes' (23 October) King's College London.
- KAY, W. (2012) 'Agreed syllabuses' in BARNES, P.L. (2012): 52-61.
- KAY, W. and SMITH, D. (2000) 'Religious terms and attitudes in the classroom (part 1)' *British Journal of Religious Education* 22, 2: 81-90.
- KERR, D. (1999) 'Changing the political culture: the advisory group on education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools' *Oxford Review of Education* 25, 1&2: 275-284.
- KERR, D., LOPES, J., NELSON, J., WHITE, K., CLEAVER, E. AND BENTON, T. (2007) *Vision versus pragmatism: citizenship in the secondary school curriculum in England. citizenship education longitudinal study: fifth annual report* Nottingham: DfES.
- KITZINGER, C. (1987) *The social construction of lesbianism* London: Sage.
- KNOWLES, G. (2009) *Ensuring every child matters* London: Sage.
- KORMOS, J., SARKADI, A. and CSIZER, K. (2009) 'The language learning experiences of students with dyslexia: lessons from an interview study' *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 3, 2: 115-130.
- LAMING, L. (2003) *The Victoria Climbié inquiry* London: HMSO.
- LAMING, L. (2009) *The protection of children in England: a progress report* London: TSO.

- LANKSHEAR, C. and KNOBEL, M. (2004) *A handbook for teacher research: from design to implementation* Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- LAWLOR, C. (2010) *The construction of Islam in religious education at key stages 3 and 4* unpublished EdD thesis, University of Brighton.
- LAWSON, J. and SILVER, H. (1973) *A social history of education in England* London: Methuen.
- LEAHY, R. L. (ed) (1985) *The development of the self* Toronto: Academic Press.
- LENNOX, N., TAYLOR, M., REY-CONDE, T., BAIN, C., PURDIE, D.M. and BOYLE, F. (2005) 'Beating the barriers: recruitment of people with intellectual disability to participate in research' *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 49, 4: 296-305.
- LEVIN, B. (2010) 'Governments and education reform: some lessons from the last 50 years' *Journal of Education Policy* 25, 6: 739-747.
- LEVINE, D. (ed) (1967) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- LEWIS, D. (1993) 'Oh for those halcyon days! A review of the development of school health education over 50 years' *Health Education Journal* 52, 3: 161-171.
- LIBCOM (2006) '1968: a chronology of events in France and internationally'. Available at [<http://libcom.org/history/1968-chronology-events-France-%2526-internationally>] (accessed 1.4.2010).
- LINDSAY, A.D. (1935) *The republic of Plato* London: J.M. Dent.
- LOFLAND, J., SNOW, D., ANDERSON, L. and LOFLAND, L. (2006) *Analyzing social settings a guide to qualitative observation and analysis* London: Thomson Learning.

LOVELESS, A. and COLWELL, J. (2009) *Evaluation of the BA (QTS) complementary placement 2008/9. Report to the training and development agency for schools (TDA)* Brighton: University of Brighton.

LOVEY, J. (1995) *Supporting Special Educational Needs in Secondary School Classrooms* London: David Fulton.

LUMBY, J. (2011) 'Enjoyment and learning: policy and secondary school learners' experience in England' *British Research Journal* 37, 2: 247-264.

LURIA, A. R. (1973) *The working brain* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

MACDONALD, A. (2009) *Independent Review of the proposal to make Personal, Social, Health and Economic (PSHE) education statutory*. Available at [<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/FINAL%20Macdonald%20PSHE%20Review.pdf>] (accessed 24.4.2012).

MACMURRAY, J. (1968) *Lectures/papers on education Special Collections Gen 2162/2* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Library.

MARLAND, M. (2002) 'From 'form teacher' to 'tutor': the development from the fifties to the seventies' *Pastoral Care in Education* 20, 4: 3-11.

MARLAND, M. and ROGERS, R. (1997) *The art of the tutor: developing your role in the secondary school* London: David Fulton.

MARLAND, M. and ROGERS, R. (2004) *How to be a successful form Tutor* London: Continuum.

MARSHALL, S. (2001) 'Do I matter? Construct validation of adolescents' perceived mattering to parents and friends' *Journal of Adolescence* 24, 4: 473-490.

- MASON, J. (2002) *Researching your own practice: the discipline of noticing* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- MAY, P.R. and JOHNSTON, O.R. (1968) *Religion in our schools* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- MCINTYRE, D. (2003) 'Has classroom teaching served its day?' in Nind (ed) (2003):95-114.
- MCPHAIL, P., UNGOED-THOMAS, J.R. and CHAPMAN, H. (1972) *Moral education in the secondary school*. London: Longman.
- MILES, M.B. and HUBERMANN, M.A. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* London: Sage.
- MORGAN, V. and DUNN, S. (1988) 'Chameleons in the vlassroom: visible and invisible children in nursery and infant classrooms' *Educational Review* 40, 1: 3-12.
- MORIARTY, V., EDMONDS, S., BLATCHFORD, P. and MARTIN, C. (2001) 'Teaching young children: perceived satisfaction and stress' *Educational Research* 43, 1: 33-46.
- MORRIS, Z. S., JOHN, P. and HALPERN, D. (2003) 'Compulsory citizenship for the disenfranchised: benchmarking students, schools, and social and political attitudes before the citizenship order' *The Curriculum Journal* 14, 2: 181-199.
- MORSE, J. (ed) (1994) *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* London: Sage.
- NAIRN, T. (2008) 'The Crouch End commune'. Available at [<http://www.newstatesman.com/society/2008/05/hornsey-college-1968-art>] (accessed 5.4.2012).

NARDI, E. and STEWARD, S. (2000) 'The invisible child in the mathematics: a preliminary report on quiet disaffection' *Proceedings of the British Society for Research into Learning Mathematics* 20, 3: 61-67.

NAYLOR, A. and PRESCOTT, P. (2004) 'Invisible children? The need for support groups for siblings of disabled children' *British Journal of Special Education* 31, 4: 199-206.

NCC (1990a) *The whole curriculum: curriculum guidance 3* York: NCC.

NCC (1990b) *Careers education and guidance: curriculum guidance 6* York: NCC.

NEILL, A. S. (1962) *Summerhill*. Available at [<http://newlearningonline.com/new-learning/chapter-2-life-in-schools/as-neill's-summerhill/>] (accessed 5.4.2012).

NIND, M., SHEEHY, K., RIX, J. and SIMMONS, K. (ed) (2003) *Inclusive education: diverse perspectives* London: David Fulton.

O'CONNOR, M., NETTING, F.E. and THOMAS, M.L. (2008) 'Grounded theory managing the challenge for those facing institutional review board oversight' *Qualitative Inquiry* 14, 1: 28-45.

OFSTED (1994) *Religious education and collective worship 1992-1993* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2002) *Sex and relationships* London: HMI.

OFSTED (2005a) *Drugs education in schools: a report from the office of Her Majesty's chief inspector of schools* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2005b) *Personal, social and health education in secondary schools* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2007a) *Making sense of religion* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2007b) *Time for change? Personal, social and health education* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2008) '*Schools to promote community cohesion and ofsted to inspect*'. Available at [<http://ofstednews.ofsted.gov.uk/article/318>] (accessed 18.5.2012).

OFSTED (2009a) '*New inspection system to improve outcomes for pupils*'. Available at [[http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/News/Press-and-media/2009/June/New-inspection-system-to-improve-outcomes-for-pupils/\(language\)/eng-GB](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/News/Press-and-media/2009/June/New-inspection-system-to-improve-outcomes-for-pupils/(language)/eng-GB)] (accessed 1.5.2010).

OFSTED (2009b) *Indicators of a school's contribution to well-being* London: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2010a) *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09* Manchester: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2010b) *Personal, social, health and economic education in schools* Manchester: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2010c) *Transforming religious education religious education in schools 2006-09* Manchester: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2011) *Inspection 2012* Manchester: Ofsted.

OFSTED (2012) '*The framework for school inspection*'. Available at [<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-school-inspection-january-2012>] (accessed 5.4.2012).

OSBORN, M. (2006) 'Changing the context of teachers' work and professional development: a European perspective' *International Journal of Educational Research* 45, 4-5: 242-253.

OSLER, A. and STARKEY, H. (2005) *Study on the advances in civic education in education systems: good practices in industrialized countries* Geneva: International Bureau of Education UNESCO.

PERCY-SMITH, B. and THOMAS, N. (ed) (2010) *A handbook of children and young people's participation: perspectives from theory and practice* London: Routledge.

PETIT, S. and HUAULT, I. (2008) 'From practice-based knowledge to the practice of research: revisiting constructivist research works on knowledge' *Management Learning* 39, 1: 73-91.

PETTIGREW, T. F. (1967) 'Social evaluation theory: convergences and applications' in LEVINE, D. (ed) (1967):241-311.

POLLNER, M. and EMERSON, R. 'The dynamics of inclusion and distance in fieldwork relations' in EMERSON, R. (ed) (1983):235-252.

POWER, S. (1996) *The pastoral and the academic: conflict and contradiction in the curriculum* London: Cassell.

POWNEY, J. and WATTS, M. (1987) *Interviewing in educational research* London: Routledge.

PRING, R. (1984) *Personal and social education in the curriculum: concepts and content* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PUFFETT, N. (2010) 'Government clarifies ban on every child matters' *Children and Young People Now* (10 August).

PUNCH, K. (2009) *Introduction to research methods in education* London: Sage.

QCA (2003) *Work-related learning for all at key stage 4: guidance for implementing the statutory requirement from 2004* London: QCA.

QCA (2004) *Non-statutory national framework for religious education* London: QCA.

QCA (2005) *Sex and relationships education, health lifestyles and financial capability* London: QCA.

QCA (2007) *National Curriculum Key Stage 3 & 4* London: QCA.

QCDA (2009) *Personal, social, health and economic education: curriculum reform consultation report to the DCSF* London: QCA.

RCBDD (1889) RCBDDUK London: HMSO.

REID, K. (2005) 'The implications of every child matters and the children act for schools' *Pastoral Care in Education* 23, 1: 12-18.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COUNCIL (2007) *Towards a national strategy for religious education* London: RE Council.

REVELL, P. (2002) 'The birth of the discipline specialist' *Times Educational Supplement* (4 January).

RICHARDSON, H. (2011) 'When pupils sit on teachers' job interview panels'. Available at [<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-12883110>] (accessed 26.4.2012).

RILEY, J. (1990) *Getting the most from your data: a handbook of practical ideas of how to analyse qualitative data* Bristol: Technical and Educational Services.

RIOTS PANEL (2012) *Executive summary* London: The Riots Communities and Victims Panel.

ROCHE, J. and TUCKER, S.A. (2007) 'Every child matters: 'tinkering' or 'reforming'—an analysis of the development of the children act (2004) from an educational perspective' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 213-223.

ROGERS, C. (1986) *Freedom to learn for the 80s* Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

ROSENBERG, M. (1985) 'Self-concept and psychological well-being in adolescence' in LEAHY, R. L. (Ed) (1985):205-246.

ROSENBERG, M. (1990) 'Reflexivity and emotions' *Social Psychological Quarterly* 53, 3: 3-12.

ROSENBERG, M. and MCCULLOUGH, B. C. (1981) 'Mattering: inferred significance and mental health among adolescents' *Research in Community and Mental Health* 2, 163-182.

ROWE, E.W., KIM, S., BAKER, J.A., KAMPHAUS, R.W. and HORNE, A.M. (2010) 'Student personal perception of classroom climate: exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses' *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 70, 5: 858-879.

RUDDUCK, J. and FIELDING, M. (2006) 'Student voice and the perils of popularity' *Educational Review* 58, 2: 219-231.

RUDGE, L. (2008) 'The place of religious education in the curriculum' in BARNES, P.L. WRIGHT, A. and BRANDOM, A-M. (ed) (2008):9-24.

SAUNDERS, T.J. (1970) *The laws (of) Plato* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

SCHEFFLER, I. (1973) *Reason and teaching* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

SCHIHALEJEV, O. (2009) 'Dialogue in religious education lessons – possibilities and hindrances in the Estonian context' *British Journal of Religious Education* 31, 3: 277-288.

SCHOOLS COUNCIL (1971) *Religious education in secondary schools. Schools Council Working Paper 36* London: Evans Bros Methuen Educational.

SINCLAIR, J.A. (1962) *Aristotle the politics* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

SINGH, D. (2012) *After the riots. The final report of the riots communities and victims panel* London: The Riots Communities and Victims Panel.

SMITH, J.A. (ed.) (2003) *Qualitative psychology: a practical guide to research methods* London: Sage.

SMITH, J.A. (ed) (2008) *Qualitative psychology: a practical guide to research methods* London: Sage.

SMITH, P. (1965) *Philosophy of education* London: Harper & Row.

SMYTH, J. (2006) "When students have power": student engagement, student voice, and the possibilities for school reform around 'dropping out' of school' *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 9, 4: 285-298.

SOAN, S. (ed) (2004) *Additional Educational Needs: Inclusive approaches to teaching* London: David Fulton.

SOMEKH, B. and LEWEN, C. (2011) *Theory and methods in social research* London: Sage.

STAKE, R.E. (1995) *The art of case study research* London: Sage.

STEARNS, D., CLIFT, S. and BLACKMAN, S. (1995) 'Health, sex and drugs education: rhetoric and realities' in AHIER and ROSS (1995):168-182.

- STERN, J. (2007) 'Mattering: what it means to matter in school' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 283-293.
- STRAKER, K. and FOSTER, R. (2009) 'Every child matters: every challenge met?' *Journal of Vocational Education & Training* 61, 2:119-132.
- STRAUSS, P. (1995) 'No easy answers: the dilemmas and challenges of teacher research' *Educational Action Research* 3, 1: 29-40.
- STRAUSS, A. and CORBIN, J. (1990) *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques* London: SAGE.
- STRAUSS, A. (1987) *Qualitative analysis for social scientists* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TDA (2007) '*Professional standards for teachers core*'. Available at [http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/pdf/standards_core.pdf] (accessed 13.5.12).
- TEW, M. (2007) *School effectiveness: supporting student success through emotional literacy* London: Paul Chapman.
- THATCHER, M. (1993) *The Downing Street years* London: HarperCollins.
- THOMPSON, P. (2004) *Whatever happened to religious education?* Cambridge: Lutterworth.
- THORNE, B. (2004) "'You still takin' notes?'" Fieldwork and problems of informed consent', in Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2004):159-176.
- UBANI, M. (2012) 'What characterises the competent RE teacher? Finnish student teachers' perceptions at the beginning of their pedagogical training' *British Journal of Religious Education* 34, 1: 35-50.

- VAN DER ZEE, T. (2012) 'Inspiration: a thought-provoking concept for RE teachers British' *Journal of Religious Education* 34, 1: 21-34.
- WAKEMAN, B. (1984) *Personal, social and moral education: a source book* Tring: Lion.
- WARD, L. and SIMONS, K. (1998) 'Practising partnership: involving people with learning difficulties in research' *British Journal of Learning Disabilities* 26, 4:128-131.
- WATKINS, C. (1999) 'Personal-social education: beyond the national curriculum' *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 27, 1: 71-84.
- WATSON, B. (1993) *The effective teaching of religious education* London: Longman.
- WATSON, J. (2006) 'Every Child Matters and children's spiritual rights: does the new holistic approach to children's care address children's spiritual well-being?' *International Journal of Children's Spirituality* 11, 2: 251-263.
- WEARE, K. (2007) 'Delivering every child matters: the central role of social and emotional learning in schools' *Education 3-13* 35, 3: 239-248.
- WEST, A. and PENNELL, H. (2003) *Underachievement in Schools* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- WHEELER, R. (2006) 'Gillick or Fraser? A plea for consistency over competence in children' *British Medical Journal* 332, 7545: 807.
- WHITE, J. (1982) *The aims of education restated* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- WILSON, E. (ed) (2009) *School-based research: a guide for education students* London: Sage.
- WRIGHT, A. (2004a) *Religion, education and post-modernity* London: Routledge Falmer.

WRIGHT, A. (2004b) 'The justification of compulsory religious education: a response to Professor White' *British Journal of Religious Education* 26, 2: 165-174.

WRIGHT, N. (2008) '*What happened at Hornsey in May 1968*' *1968 And All That*. Available at [<http://www.1968andallthat.net/node/82>] (accessed 5.4.2012).

WRIGHT, A. and BRANDOM, A-M (ed) (2000) *Learning to teach religious education in the secondary school: a companion to school experience* London: Routledge/Falmer.

WRIGHT, A. and MOHAMMED, T. (2000) '*Learning to teach religious education at key stage 4*' in WRIGHT, A. and BRANDOM, A-M. (ed) (2000):142-160.

YOUNG, M. (2008) 'From constructivism to realism in the sociology of the curriculum' *Review of Research in Education* 32, 1: 1-28.

ZWOZDIK-MYERS, P., CAMERON, K., MUSTARD, C., LEASK, M. and GREEN, A. (2010) *Literature review: analysis of current research, theory and practice in partnership working to identify constituent components of effective ITT partnerships* Brunel University West London: TDA.

Appendix 1

The following interviews were conducted with participants during this research and have been listed in chronological order. The codes (below) given to the participants enable the participants to recognise themselves but for no-one else to be able to recognise them.

Teacher J	6.6.09
Teacher N	10.6.09
Teacher PA	17.6.09
Student Angus	15.7.09
Student Paige	15.7.09
Teacher S	17.12.09
Teacher G	16.2.10
Mr G	24.2.10
Teacher D	3.3.10
Teacher P	3.3.10
Teacher M	16.3.10
Students Harry and Leon	18.10.10
Students Rita and Amy	23.11.10
Students Jordan and Joe	25.11.10
Students Ben and Brad	26.11.10
Students Will, Stephen, James and Emily	29.11.10

Appendix 2

New interview questions 26.4.09 after presentation/reflection at the University of Brighton on 25.4.09

Start – Hello. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed and I really appreciate your time.

As I am not quite sure what the interviews will tell me and because I do not want to forget anything you say or try to write it all down would you mind if I record the interview and jots down some notes? If there are things during the interview you would like to say but do not want them recorded please let me know and I will stop the recording and restart it when you let me know (start recording).

How was your day? (as an opportunity for participant to off load, establish rapport and concern and build relationship and trust).

Is it ok if we begin?

Teacher participant questions

1. What are the initiatives that are driving your **school** at the moment?
2. What are the initiatives that are driving your **department** at the moment?
3. The government produced a document called Every Child Matters. What do you think it means to matter?
4. The governments Every Child Matters agenda wants children to
 - Be healthy (Enjoy good physical and mental health. Have a healthy lifestyle)
 - Stay safe (be protected from harm and neglect)
 - Enjoy and achieve (get the most out of life and develop the skills for adulthood)
 - Make positive contributions (being involved with the community and society and not involved in anti-social behaviour)
 - Achieve economic wellbeing (not be prevented because of money from achieving potential in life)

How does the school help students to achieve each of these aims?

Student participant questions

(Year 7 student participant)

1. How far do you think your education is different to the students in the rest of the school (year 8-11)?

OR

(Year 8-11 student participant)

1. How far do you think your education is different to the students in year 7?

2. The government produced a document called Every Child Matters. What do you think it means to matter?

3. The governments Every Child Matters agenda wants children to

- Be healthy (Enjoy good physical and mental health. Have a healthy lifestyle)
- Stay safe (be protected from harm and neglect)
- Enjoy and achieve (get the most out of life and develop the skills for adulthood)
- Make positive contributions (being involved with the community and society and not involved in anti-social behaviour)
- Achieve economic wellbeing (not be prevented because of money from achieving potential in life)

How far does the **school** help you to achieve the Every Child Matters aims?

4. How far does **Religious Studies and Lifeskills(PSHE)/Citizenship** help you to achieve these aims?

Finish – Thank you so much for your time and I hope I can come back to you if I think of anything else?

To end on relaxed terms by reference to the rest of the day.

Make sure recorder is turned off.

Questions and need advice please

1. Do I need to get permission from Head teachers for teachers to talk to me or should I send a letter letting them know?
2. I think I should give student and teacher participants the questions in advance so that they can think about their answers. Do you agree? If I do am I 'giving anything away' in terms of coaching a perceived participant answer by having the Every Child Matters questions or should I remove Q. 3 and/or 4 from the teacher participant list (I am not sure it will have the same impact for student participants so could leave all questions on the list BUT is question 3 and 4 for student participants too similar? If I do include question 4, students in Year 7 and 8 where I teach are taught Humanities (they have 2 terms of RS, 2 terms of History and 2 terms of Geography mixed through the year)!

Appendix 3

4th May 2009

Dear [name of prospective participant],

Hello, I hope you enjoyed the Bank Holiday weekend?

I spoke to you a little while ago asking if it might be possible to interview you as part of my PhD research. Hoping that you are still willing to take part, I would like to provide you with some information as I am aiming to interview all teachers who can take part before the 15th July 2009.

I am enclosing an Information Sheet which explains the aims of my research and I have also enclosed a spare copy of the Information Sheet in case anyone else at your school needs to read/keep a copy. I will aim to contact you week commencing 11th May to answer any questions you may have and if you agree to be interviewed to ask for you to return the signed and dated Consent Form in the pre-paid addressed envelope and hopefully book a date/time/location for the interview to take place at your convenience.

If you need to contact me please do so and my work contact details are on the Information Sheet. My mobile number is 07961 [xxxxxx] (call/text) if this is more convenient.

Thank you for your time – I know how busy this time of year is!
Best wishes,

Amanda
(name of school)

Enc.

Appendix 4

Teacher Participant Information Sheet

Please read the information sheet below. The researcher will contact you no sooner than 48 hours after receiving the Participant Information Sheet to answer any questions you may have and confirm whether you would be willing to take part in the research.

The meaning of 'mattering'.

A critical study of the impact of the Every Child Matters agenda in relation to Religious Studies and Personal, Social, Citizenship, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being Education.

You have been invited to participate in research which will ask for your reflections on what is taught and what is learnt in Religious Studies and/or Citizenship and/or Personal, Social, health and Financial and Economic Well-being Education (PSHE) since September 2008 (the new National Curriculum). The research will also investigate whether the new National Curriculum achieves the aims of the Every Child Matters agenda which is:

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being

As a participant you will be interviewed and asked questions about Religious Studies and/or Citizenship and/or Personal, Social, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being lessons.

Teacher participant interviews will take place during and after regular school hours 9-5pm and weekends. Interviews will take place individually and may take place as part of a forum. Interviews will be held on school premises e.g. a classroom or meeting room, the University of Brighton or at non-educational venues where discretion is assured. Interviews will be no longer than one hour although teacher participants may be asked to a number of interviews during the research. A time that is convenient for the teacher participant will be sought to minimise inconvenience from taking part in the research.

There will be no questions that should cause discomfort or distress to any participant during the interviews. Participants are free to withdraw from the student at any time without giving a reason for withdrawing and without incurring consequences from doing so.

Information and findings that are obtained from the interviews will be kept confidential and individuals and institutions (schools) will not be identified in the research but participating institutions will be acknowledged. Findings from the research can be accessed by contacting the researcher from July 2011.

The researcher can be contacted at
[contact details]

The supervisor can be contacted at
[contact details]

Appendix 5

Teacher Participant Consent Form

The meaning of 'mattering'.

A critical study of the impact of the Every Child Matters agenda in relation to Religious Studies and Personal, Social, Citizenship, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being Education.

- ♦ I agree to take part in this research which is to investigate what is taught and what is learnt in Religious Studies and Personal, Social, Citizenship, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being Education since September 2008 (the new National Curriculum) and to what extent the new National Curriculum achieves the aims of the Every Child Matters agenda which is:
 - Be healthy
 - Stay safe
 - Enjoy and achieve
 - Make a positive contribution
 - Achieve economic well-being

- ♦ The researcher has explained to my satisfaction the purpose, principles and procedures of the study and the possible risks involved.

- ♦ I have read the information sheet and I understand the principles, procedures and possible risks involved.

- ♦ I am aware that I will be required to answer questions as part of an interview.

- ♦ I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will normally be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else.

- ♦ I understand that I can see the findings of the study by contacting the researcher from July 2011.

- ♦ I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving any reason and without incurring consequences from doing so.

- ♦ I agree that should I withdraw from the study, the data collected up to that point may be used by the researcher for the purposes described in the information sheet.

Name (please print).....

Signed.....

Date.....

Appendix 6

Student Participant Information Sheet

Please read this information sheet and I will contact you in a few days to answer any questions you may have and find out if you would be willing to take part in some research.

You might have heard of something called the Every Child Matters agenda, this means that being at school should help you to:

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being

I'm doing some research and I would like to interview you to ask you questions to find out if school helps you to be health, stay safe, enjoy and achieve, make a positive contribution and achieve economic well-being. I would also like to ask you about what is taught and what you learn in Religious Studies lessons, Citizenship lessons and Personal, Social, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being lessons (PSHE/Life skills).

The interviews will take place during regular school hours 8.30am-3.30pm and you will be excused from a lesson for half an hour. Interviews will take place at school e.g. in a classroom or meeting room and at least two students will be interviewed together. A note will be written in your Student Planner to record for parents/carers that an interview has taken place. An interview will be no longer than half an hour long but you may be asked to a number of interviews during the research.

The only inconvenience you may experience from taking part in the researcher is missing thirty minutes of a lesson when you are interviewed. There will be no questions that will make you feel uncomfortable or upset.

You can stop being part of the research at any time without giving a reason and there will be no consequences from doing so.

The answers to the questions that you give will be kept confidential and you will not be named in the research. You can see the findings from the research by contacting the researcher from July 2011.

The researcher can be contacted at
[contact details]

The supervisor can be contacted at
[contact details]

Appendix 7

Student Participant Consent Form

The meaning of 'mattering'.

A critical study of the impact of the Every Child Matters agenda in relation to Religious Studies and Personal, Social, Citizenship, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being Education.

- ♦ I agree to take part in this research which is to investigate what is taught and what is learnt in Religious Studies, Citizenship and Personal, Social, , Health and Financial and Economic Well-being (PSHE/Life skills) lessons and if being at school helps students to:
 - Be healthy
 - Stay safe
 - Enjoy and achieve
 - Make a positive contribution
 - Achieve economic well-being

- ♦ The researcher has explained so that I understand the purpose and reasons of the research.

- ♦ I have read and understood the Student Participant Information Sheet.

- ♦ I am aware that I will be required to answer questions as part of an interview.

- ♦ I understand how my answers will be used, and that any confidential information will normally be seen only by the researchers and will not be told to anyone else.

- ♦ I understand that I can see the findings of the study by contacting the researcher from July 2011.

- ♦ I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason and without any consequences from doing so.

- ♦ I agree that if I withdrawn from the study, the answers I have given to the researcher up to the time I withdraw may be used by the researcher for the purposes described in the information sheet.

Name (please print).....

Signed.....

Date.....

Appendix 8

Information letter to parent

Dear Parent/Carer,

My name is Amanda Jakes and I am the Head of Religious Studies and PSCHE (Personal, Social, Citizenship and Health Education) at [name of school].

Your son/daughter has been invited and has agreed to be interviewed as part of some research. I would like to take this opportunity to write to you to let you know more about this.

The research aims to investigate what is taught and what is learnt in Religious Studies, Citizenship and Personal, Social, Health and Financial and Economic Well-being (PSHE/Life skills) lessons. The research also aims to investigate if being at school helps students to:

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being

The interviews will take place during regular school hours 8.30am-3.30pm. Your son/daughter you will be excused from a lesson for half an hour. Interviews will take place at school e.g. in a classroom or meeting room and at least two students will be interviewed together. A note will be written in the Student Planner to record that an interview has taken place. An interview will be no longer than half an hour long but students may be asked to a number of interviews during the research.

There will be no questions that will make a student feel uncomfortable or upset and students can stop being part of the research at any time without giving a reason.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me and I look forward to speaking to your son/daughter to find out their views.

Yours faithfully,

Miss A. Jakes
(Head of RS/PSCHE)

Appendix 10

Interview with Teacher D 3.3.10 4pm

Int. I have one question for you if that's ok, I'm just wondering if you could clarify your role/responsibilities within [name of school]

Pat. Ok

Int. and then tell me what your, talk me through what your priorities are within your role please?

Pat. Ok,

Int. I might jot down notes so I don't interrupt

Pat. Absolutely, I'm the Assistant Head at [name of school] and the over-reaching role would be Pastoral Care and the Student Ethos so those would be the two over-reaching ones, so within that I am responsible for the year 10 the year group everything from tracking to, pastoral care and support services etc for those young people, I'm also child protection officer I also do all the links with Connexions, er Substance Misuse school nurse you know anything that involves outside agencies to support the, wellbeing of the pupils, um and I'm in charge of a PSHE team which includes the 5 pastoral leaders and then co-opted, people with interest in PSHE, so that's the Pastoral work in terms of the Liturgy I line manage 3 departments Drama Music, and RE um obviously it's my job to ensure that we're keeping diocesan practice within the school so anything to do with SRE, or um anything to do with child protection or welfare that has comes under the Catholic banner, my job's changed recently because with [name of Head of RE] joining the management team he's taking on more of the RE and ethos so he's line managing the lay Chaplin and things there, so those are my main jobs and then on top of that obviously I am the Assistant Head teacher so it's all the different things that come in, I'm in charge of Community Cohesion um bringing that through in charge of bringing the SEAL through I'm the Healthy Schools co-ordinator so in charge of making sure that is all kept, and then lots of fiddly things like I'm in charge of buses and behaviour and all the other things that comes with being an Assistant Head and lots of things that I have probably forgotten, but those those are the main general areas of responsibility.

Int. So thinking about all of those areas then, what are what are your what's your focus what are your priorities within that role?

Pat. I would say my focus is on the wellbeing and health of all the pupils at [name of school] so that's that's you know my main focus, so it's to ensure that everyone as far as humanly possible, um are happy and safe and able to access an education so I I think that's that's probably where I would come from for a priority, so whether that means taking care of discipline and er ensuring that our rules are adhered to, um monitoring is a **massive** (emphasis) part of my job so every every day there's, time for monitoring going around classes checking children are on task that they're not disrupting the learning or behaviour of others and that they're not, being isolated or that their needs are properly are helped, making sure that um pastoral care is at the focus of all we do and I think that the biggest thing at [name of school] that comes forward is the pastoral care, so that the children do feel that they're valued that they feel that they've got a voice, that they feel regardless of whether they've come from Poland in the last year or, they're a special needs child or their gifted and talented or that they're the head boy or head girl that they do have an equal kind of you know chance or stand within the school, that no one is valued above anybody else, um that when things go wrong we seek to find resolutions so, for example if we've had to deal with issues on substance misuse or children, knowing that we've known about either being involved in binge drinking, or drugs or what is the latest one I have dealt with branding I don't know if you've come across that but, branding on their necks by boyfriends or whatever the issue is, that we seek to find a way in which to resolve it that's that's always maintaining the dignity of them um and ensuring that they are constantly able to access the curriculum because I just think that's the main thing they've got to be able to come, and have a right to achieve an education and I think, too many of these external pressures can really sort of destroy a child's self-esteem and personal worth, and then the knock on effect of course is underachievement, so I think pastoral care and tracking pupil progress I don't know maybe it sounds bizarre but it has to go hand in hand so at all times my priority is to make sure that they are not underachieving they're not falling short of all they're capable of and potential of doing and obviously that involves, lots of work with outside agencies and we've got a little mini groups going on in the school bereavement support work (pause) I'm probably waffling now

Int. No not at all

Pat. (laughs) so I so I guess it's from that so I think everything what I would hope everything that my job would stem from that so in terms of the PSHE, in terms of the units that we take on board we have to complete so many of the Citizenship Citizenship units although that is dealt with, across the school as well but I would say that it changes every year because focuses change every year so, um again um one thing that came up a few years back is stress and anxiety and mental health issues, that I don't think we probably did enough on as a school so now we've got units on emotional health and how to deal with anxiety, er we've got units in RE that were written on bereavement so, it's all hopefully trying to support the child and enable them to get the very best out of their education and not have anything, external pressures kind of blocking that potential so I suppose I would hope that would be the priority then to ensure that all child can reach their potential and, to identify what's blocking or stopping and get intervention in that would hopefully get them back on track.

Int. So pastoral is your main priority unpicking any blocking barriers to learning across the whole range that you've explain to ensure that they can access their curriculum I was then going to ask you mentioned something about students being valued and having a voice, could you tell me what that means for you at [name of school]?

Pat. Yes, that's right, um, at [name of school] I think it's never giving up on a child so if I took like a really simple example and then talk about the more general things cos obviously we've got, school council liturgy councils eco reps, um you know a huge variety of different student forums, and um we track every child's involvement we have we've devised like, a community cohesion tracking base so that you know you're not using the same children that every child is, has got an opportunity to to contribute and that you're actually and I know it sounds a bit forced but sometimes you have to do it, as pastoral leaders we pull up the children that have never had a chance to be involved in anything, and therefore our action then is to try and get them into something appropriate that they would value and see because it's kind of developing the whole child, but I think that it's so easy isn't it, just to let your great high flyers or your bolshie kids take the lead in everything and the invisible child I suppose at [name of school] is a huge thing, so it's trying to find them, and then trying to to find ways of working with them that actually gives them a voice and an opportunity, so last year we when the prefects applications came in we've got a large

Philipino community when I say large about 38 children which is you know significant and not one of them applied to be prefect, because culturally you don't put yourself forward you don't you wait for someone to approach you, and the tracking system straight away brought that brought that up and you had these fantastic brilliant children um and so [name of Acting Head] which is the Acting Head and she spoke to them all on a one to one basis and tried to get behind why there hadn't been applications er er and then that was resolved er student listeners you know again we weren't getting an EAL representation and yet we really need to support the EAL children that are joining us later on in the year they, they're struggling and it is still an area that I think we need to improve on so, again sometimes it is a case of um getting people we've organised, where the EAL children do lunch time clubs they teach the other children their language and, bring in their food for them to try and play games with them because it's, it's kind of not trying to force them into a group it's trying to instil an understanding of culture so we do that and then, I think it just comes down to trying to work out what's going on with the child we had a very, well let's say it was assumed we had a very very naughty Polish boy and um I think you know for the first couple of months we probably failed him because, we got very little information on him the parents can't speak a word of English, er he was disrupting lots of lessons, um and it was only until we got another parent to come in as like an interpreter, and the parents didn't feel comfortable coming to the school so we arranged to meet them at the [name of coffee shop] for a coffee and made it very relaxed and had the interpreter there that we actually found out he was coming with specific needs special needs, he was very unhappy we changed, transformed his whole timetable we've got college release course for him we've got, all sorts of different systems set up and now he's gone from being the naughty boy to, the really good boy so I I guess I mean that's just a really really small example but I guess it's just knowing the children that you've got in the school and it's not always easy to know everyone in the school so, it's having really really good um support for form tutors its having really really good, Insets having excellent transition data so, when the children come up from Primary school we take from 4 feeders um my husband will go in at least 8 times so, over 3 months he'll have gone in 8 times the lay Chaplin will go in twice, all teachers go in and teach taster lessons so by the time a child has come up to [name of school], they would have had probably you know up at least 12 lessons 1 hour lessons by different

members of [name of school] they're known we actually have 1 to 1 dialogues with the primary school year 6 teachers, we don't just rely on all the data paper coming up it's actually, a sit down sometimes it takes 4 hours we always take them out for dinner, um to to learn about the child and what it is that makes that child that child not just necessarily what SATs grades they got or even what their best way to learn which of course is important but um you know how things lower down in their life had affected them what kind of personality they are whether they're shy or vivacious, how best to draw them out what would be their interests, so I think it's never giving up on trying to find loads of different ways to understand children um which I know sounds twee, but I think it's really really important, does that answer your question?

Int. Yeah,

Pat. Laughs

Int. You said that [name of school] focuses on the whole child, how does [name of school] could you talk me through how [name of school] works on this whole child idea?

Pat. Right, so what happens is when they are in year 6 they're they're you're sent out different teachers go out and they're known so [name of husband whose Head of Year 7] will know them really really well especially if they've come from the feeder school, so every single member of staff then gets a paragraph on the child it's like a pen portrait, and in addition to all of the their academic scores and the way they learn it will be very much about the child the personality of the child and the needs of the child and the family situation of the child, so when they come in from their they then we then do all CATs tests because we do um although we do take SATs data seriously (sceptical) we do also have the CATs test to show us the raw their raw intelligence and IQ, and then I guess what we do is set really ambitious targets for that child, and that's monitored every 6 weeks so every 6 weeks teachers will, either plus or minus a child's achievement on the targets that have been set from the CATs scores, and then when it's obvious that there are children underachieving because you'll if you if they get 2 minuses and the letter gets sent home and it all goes to the pastoral leader, that's when all the intervention starts coming in, so you could actually minus a child on something like attendance for example you could minus them on er, you know poor homeworks or poor class work but you can also minus them on behaviour and focus, you can also you know record we've got a pastoral, book

system that's always kept in the staffroom which again I know is archaic because of paper but it actually gives you a very close and very instant record of of the children in your year group, so if there's any concerns you might have someone seems a bit lethargic if someone says they haven't had breakfast if someone seems a bit down you know it's it's not ignored and it's, and it's a bit policy and reminded policy that you need to know the children that you teach and if they're if they're displaying behaviour which, is different to their normal behaviour then it must be recorded so, you can look at our pastoral folders and you'll see as well as behaviour and detention, it might be so and so just doesn't seem them self at the moment or you know I noticed someone crying in the corridor they didn't want to speak to me but I wanted to let someone know about it, so I think it is constantly constantly knowing the children in your care, is what helps you actually understand the whole person, and then using all kinds of resources we always make sure that if a parent phones us that they are phoned back that day it's policy you must contact that parent on that day if you can't do it then somebody will do it for you but you must make sure that happens so, constantly having conversations and dialogues with the parents, um the majority of the parents are really supportive at [name of school] but obviously there are some parents that can't bear to set foot in a school because of their own experiences, so we have now a parental focus group evening groups and day groups that meet, and they're helping us reach out to parents so for example we're starting one up, which will help us to reach out to EAL parents who never come in, and um we've also do tours of the school and try and make it kind of fun and coffee and tea and base it around a social event, in very very small groups and different and maybe this will be Bexhill's time Hastings Eastbourne, so we try and draw the parents in and if the parents don't attend parents evening we write and reschedule and we're relentless on that so, it's constantly constantly keeping yourself abreast of all the information about that child, and I'm not kind of accepting that so and so oh he's just a bit moody today or, the parents never come in or, they can't speak the language it's just it's just those kind of things would not be tolerated at all or allowed to be expected at [name of school], so I guess it's that and then and then all the data that we all have like the Raise Online and Fisher family trust and everything like that it's very very very close and careful tracking and monitoring.

Int. So that pastoral side along with any academic concerns that will feed in to?

Pat. Yeah because your pastoral leader is if you've got to look after their social development, but you've also got the the huge part of the job is tracking tracking tracking so you need to know who your underachievers are, and er you need to know the reasons for the underachievers and then you need to have plans in place

Int. On that academic side?

Pat. On that academic side, so you use the data from the Fisher Family whatever or Raise Online and the CATs tests and I would say our, targets are more ambitious than Raise Online targets so you use that data to make sure that nobody is underachieving now, I've just had year 10s have just gone through the minus cycle there's 28 underachieving so each of those 28 children now will have a plan put in place for them, to make sure that we understand the reasons why they're underachieving, and then what we're gonna do about it to stop them from doing that and each child you must have had a conversation with the parent um, so you've got all your stakeholders involved as well.

Int. The book in the staffroom where staff can monitor they're a bit different today or something going on who picks that up?

Pat. Passkies (pastoral leaders!) pick that up every single day, [name of Acting Head] the Acting Principal picks it up every single day the LMT picks it up every single day, um anything from a child protection point of view is there's lots of orange forms in the staffroom and you you fill them in they're they would obviously only go to myself or [name of Acting Head] but we've asked we keep I mean all staff have to be trained haven't they on child protection so every 2 years we train our staff, but we also do lots of refreshers and recaps um at staff meetings, because you need to build up a picture of a child so even if you kind of think well, they've missed breakfast what's the that's no big deal lots of people do it you still have to fill that in because we're trying to get a kind of an overview of a child and suddenly if you get, 4 or 5 orange slips on a child it alerts you to there being something wrong, and so yeah the books I mean I know a lot of schools use Sims and very effectively and I think, we do need to drag ourselves out of the Dark Ages but, I do think what the advantage of the book is that as a head of year I can go down now today I can see how many children were affected or did something or something happened to them and I can pick them all up tomorrow and I don't need to kind of trawl through anything, so you it's it's it's swings and roundabouts um you've got to make sure your staff do record incidents because

some staff are brilliant at it and will record every tiny thing, and some staff don't so it's it's constantly reminding and training but [name of Acting Head] as Principal she can go in and she knows all the children she will be able to identify all the children now um who we've got concerns about and I think it's just a way of communication isn't it so sometimes I think people if they picked up those books they'd think oh God that's, so minor what embarrassing what a small thing or so and so but actually it's all part of actually the child and what's normal behaviour for the child and, if behaviour starts to alter, um you know why because that is a barrier to learning then isn't it?

Int. Do you have any other priorities that haven't been mentioned that come under your role because there seems to be something then about the whole child, listening, knowing them, making sure they can access the curriculum and almost achieve their potential because you said you set really high targets would you say that is your priority not in a nutshell because it hasn't been but that is that's what you do?

Pat. The second part of it is obviously um it's a Catholic school, so therefore the priority is supporting the faith journey of the children as well, so so yes you know number 1 we have to get these children not just for our own data and grades although there's always the pressure on that isn't it to you're a high flying school to always maintain this 80%, breaking of A of English and Maths um so you know you've obviously got the targets the school set you but you are always seeking to make sure the child's not underachieving and hitting potential, so value added becomes very important, and then the other side of it is it's a faith school so all of LMT it's our responsibility to make sure that this is an actual living worshipping, community so yes I'd say another huge (emphasis) part of it is making sure that um opportunities for faith journey is available for everyone, my other big thing is of course um which is you know which is the more tricky one sometimes is the monitoring of staff, so the development of staff you know anyone that has been put in under my line management and also um ensuring that um people are doing their job.

Int. How do you monitor the effectiveness of the faith journey because that would be how does that happen?

Pat. Right, yeah, it's almost impossible (laughs) I don't know we monitor the effectiveness of it because I can tell you or we can give you the statistics of the amount that go on to confirmation or something like that but I think that's quite kind of like that's tokenism it's quite false, I would say that we ensure that they're given

opportunities all the time so the day always starts and ends with a prayer and that's actually monitored like you would monitor someone doing their marking, we monitor staff are ensuring that days and the end of the day starts with a prayer I would say that we give as much opportunity as possible for people to explore their faith journeys because we can't indoctrinate them we can't force them, so we have mass on a Friday followed by breakfast and, um we have a huge (emphasis) range of different er opportunities that they can get involved in connected with Cafod and charity work and the rotary club you know Action for Change and justice work like that I think [name of colleague whose Head of RE] will elaborate to you how we do it through RE because we've got a dual role there, to teach an academic subject and to also support people's personal development, um I think a lot of opportunity is given for reflection um but how you know how do I know that they've been successful on their faith journey is I guess, perhaps that's not important I think perhaps what's important is that they're given as much encouragement and opportunity to develop themselves in that area as possible, they're also given abs all opportunity to challenge there's no problem with challenging faith, so we've got Philosophy clubs and gifted and talented clubs and, the RE lessons are quite open and I don't think there's anyone who can't turn around and say because because I know they do it freely in lessons they don't understand this they don't agree with this they're angry that the Pope said this they find this part of their religion frustrating so, um you know ok 93% of them passed the GCSE RE it's a very high 66% get A* or A in RE so it's a very very popular subject it didn't used to be there has been huge developments over the last few years, pupil forums were really important in that it's it's the leading subject in the school now it was the bottom subject in the school kind of 5 or 6 years ago, so um you know luckily I had a good team to work with when I took it over and [name of colleague whose Head of RE] continued that and moved it even further, so I would say the enthusiasm's great the uptake of A level RE is is great and some really interesting people choosing to do it so it's all good but, can I say they've become better Christians I think time will tell (laughs)

Int. I am happy to turn off unless there's any other priorities that you have on your agenda that we haven't discussed or has that encapsulated pretty much your priorities in your role

Pat. I don't know it's probably been incredibly waffley but yeah I would just go back to the fact that my priority and my role is trying to enable young people to achieve to their potential and not giving up on any of the hurdles