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A case study exploring the opportunities and possibilities of inclusive practice in a practical curriculum

Abstract
This research aimed to answer the question ‘What elements of a craft based practical skills curriculum can be considered inclusive?’ It explored the experiences of student and staff participants within the curriculum, qualitative data was gathered from students and staff and corroborated through observation. Thematic analysis drew pre-set codes from Scollon’s (2005) mediated discourse. The analysis indicated inclusion was enacted through practical curriculum, however, staff lacked understanding of inclusive concepts and a structure enabling them to make this explicit in the planning. The key recommendations arising are a shared definition of inclusive practice and incorporation of inclusion into staff training.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1: Context
The research was conducted in ‘specialist education’ provision for young people with learning difficulties, behavioural problems or special educational needs. A search of the initial literature revealed that contemporary understandings of inclusion were predominantly focused on inclusion into mainstream provision, therefore, in this definition, students in specialist education are already excluded. Further research revealed a range of literature on inclusion as a teaching practice, therefore the focus of this research is on the curriculum and teaching, not geographic location.

1.2: Rationale
This research arose from a lack of clarity around the concept of inclusive practice in a setting where the curriculum was predominantly practical skills. Much of the contemporary teacher education, government policy (Department for Education, 2020) and inspection framework (Ofsted, 2022) include reference to inclusion and inclusive practice. I believe therefore, that is important for those working in the education sector to have working understanding of inclusion that is relevant and workable within their area of specialism. In order to achieve this, I have attempted to answer the question ‘What elements of a craft based practical skills curriculum can be considered inclusive’.

1.3: Research
The research is a qualitative study conducted within constructivist-interpretivist paradigm. I have chosen this as it is concurrent with my understanding of knowledge as being socially, constructed and learning as an interplay between existing and new knowledge (Myhill, 2005). The research design had drawn heavily on the idea that all social interactions are mediated through material and environment, further that this mediation creates a recreates habitus (Scollon, 2005). The term habitus stems from the work of Bourdieu (1977) who argued that we all learn a set of preferences and beliefs through which we understand our social world. Further that these are formed within the cultures and communities in which we live (for more information on this see literacy review). Based on this research I have developed the following five sub-questions
a) How are craft-based resources and tooling employed to promote inclusion in practical sessions (mediation of material and environment)

b) What links can be identified between the mediation of material and environment, inclusion in practical tasks and student engagement in wider learning (mediation of material and environment)

c) How much consideration do staff give to family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences in the planning process? (habitus)

d) To what extent are the family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences in the planning process visible in the items produced (habitus)

e) How is new cultural understanding co-produced in the practise (re-construction of habitus)

To answer these questions, I have used two other models. Firstly “Head Heart and Hands” as posited by Rouse (2010) and Singleton (Singleton, 2015) based on the initial work of Shulman (2004). The framework relates to the conative, psychomotor and affective domains, this is not only useful in understanding social inclusion in a practical environment but also integrates well with the motion of mediation through material and environment. Secondly the capabilities approach (Nussbaum, 2003; Terzi, 2007; Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012) which identifies ‘functionings’ drawn from the individual’s culture background and prior learning which can be combined to create capabilities. This is especially useful in understanding inclusion from the point of view of students with cognitive challenges as it allows for different starting points and levels of integration.

The fieldwork consisted gathering qualitative data through a series of semi structured interviews with both staff and students to gain a deep understanding of the experience of practical curriculum from those within it (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017; Marvasti and Freie, 2017). This was then corroborated through field observations in order to gain insight into of how the social actors interacted with the material and environment to create social meaning (Scollon, 2005). All data was interpreted and coded through the process of a thematic analysis with initial codes being drawn from Scollen’s (2005) framework of mediated discourse. From the initial coding four overarching themes were then identified and used for presentation of the analysis.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1: Development of Inclusion
There is currently no one, clear definition for the idea of inclusive education with much of the discourse being on the place of education rather than the education itself. Inclusive education remains problematic, and contentious despite politicians', scholars', and practitioners' efforts to create inclusive schools, inclusion being embedded in so many social arenas results in differing understandings its definition (Qvortrup and Qvortrup, 2018). Further, these definitions are often determined by policymakers, theorists, and academics and can be seen to have little regard for the perspectives of the students (Douglas, 2013). However, inclusion is defined, the fact that inclusive education remains in the UNESCO (2019) declaration supports the assertion that the development of inclusive education continues to be a seemingly elusive goal. Due to this lack of definition it is important that research enables educators to recognise opportunities for inclusion within their work with students

To gain an insight into the historic development of the concept of inclusion and its roots in disability rights it is useful here to include a brief overview of global political policy. Prior to the mid-20th century people with physical, mental or learning disabilities were considered ineducable removed from main stream society to live out their lives in institutions. A pivotal moment is The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) which gave all school age children the right to an education and their parents the right to choose that education. Whilst children with disabilities are then educated, they remain segregate and there is no move towards integration until The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (United Nations, 1966). This convention has a wide remit, however, importantly it introduced the concept of integration into main stream schooling. It is not until the publication of The Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) that governments are mandated to move towards educating children with disabilities in mainstream schools. The expansion of the term inclusion to include other marginalised groups of children is not enshrined into the World Education Forum in Dakar (UNESCO, 2000), with a further move in 2020 to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” (UNESCO, 2020, p. 10) This broadening of the scope of inclusion and
focus on inclusion as everyone educated in one place puts the onus onto schools which may lack the knowledge and resources for its implementation.

This research has been conducted in an organisation for students with behavioural, social, emotional and learning difficulties. Consequently, the students are already excluded from the mainstream environment and from the high ideal of all students educated in one place. Therefore, the focus of this research is necessary on the teaching practices and the ability and nature of the curriculum to be inclusive. For this purpose, I define inclusion as removing as many barriers as possible to all students' involvement and learning, including discrimination based on disability, colour, gender, age, religion, and sexual orientation (Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012). The alternative curriculum employed by the organisation based on experiential learning and the practical application of skills and knowledge is well placed for building an understanding of how curriculum can promote inclusion.

2.2: Constructs of knowledge
The understanding of teaching can be seen as a continuum ranging from a dialectic approach with teacher seen as knowledge giver and student as receiver, to a co-construction of knowledge in which student and teacher are equal partners in an act of enquiry. The former sees knowledge as fixed with predetermined learning expectations, often influenced by political pressures (Goodwyn and Fuller, 2014). This is undoubtably well intentioned and intended to convey a core knowledge which enables the student to function in society (Abrams, 2012). However, Myhill (2005) argues that this approach tends towards content from one culture (usually the dominant culture) which then remains uncontested. The danger here is, subconsciously accepting one cultures knowledge and practices as a measure of ability (Coles, 2013) and failure to take account of the prior knowledge of marginalised groups can lead to disadvantage, acculturation or exclusion (Myhill, 2005). The later sees learning as a social practice and knowledge as a political and emancipatory practice, moving from a purely internal process, to one which exists in the interactions between people and situated in their social and cultural world (Freire, 2000). In this view curriculum enacts inclusion not through remedial intervention (Frith, 2002) but through building knowledge and understanding based on socio-cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977)
Poor outcomes can be viewed in two ways. As noted previously my definition of inclusion for this project is removing as many barriers as possible. In this understanding barriers to learning are seen as being in the physical and social environment. An alternative view, one often linked with didactic approaches to teaching sees the individual as deficient or dysfunctional (Terzi, 2007). Uta Frith (2002) reasons that this deficit manifests as “behavioural phenomena” (Frith, 2002, p. 4) requiring external remedial intervention (Street, 2012). However, Coles (2013) argues that didactic teaching can lead to content becoming “separated from any understanding of social practice” (Coles, 2013, p. 55), further, that knowledge becomes decontextualized packages of information designed to meet specific learning outcomes (Coles, 2013) and teaching outcome is focused on the test or assessment rather than the wider acquisition of knowledge. Whilst in Frith’s (2002) understanding social and cultural influences is one of interference in the learning process as opposed to capital which can form a platform for building knowledge and understanding (Bourdieu, 1977) it could be argued that a curriculum which decontextualizes knowledge from experience has the potential to advantage some groups of learners (Coles, 2013) and therefore, adversely impact outcomes for learners who are not from the dominant culture or those with learning difficulties.

2.3: An understanding of habitus in a practical curriculum
In order to employ Scollons (2005) framework to a specific curriculum it is necessary to build an understanding of Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus as Scollon (2005) draws heavily on this in constructing his work on mediated discourse. This concept can in simple terms be understood as a “learned set of preferences or dispositions by which a person orients to the social world” (Edgerton and Roberts, 2014, p. 195). Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1977) argues that each of us has an individual habitus, that is formed from birth. This Habitus informs the way we see the world and act within the social space we inhabit relevant to our gender, class, culture and socio-economic status. Further, that the habitus of the dominant culture inherently reproduces itself and maintains structures of power (Bourdieu, 1977). From Scollon’s (2005) standpoint habitus is constructed through mediation means within a site of engagement, a child becomes a social actor within their cultural, social, economic environment. However, where Bourdieu (1977) sees reproductions of power, Scollon (2005) argues, mediational means have possibility to reshape preferences, effectively
reconstructing the habitus. Further actions within the creative realm are often observed as human interaction and these actions and interactions between people and between the person and the environment provoke reactions giving the actor a reflection of both self and the action (Glaveanu et al., 2013).

Taking Bourdieu’s concept of habitus as a basis it can be argued that teachers need to understand knowledge not only from the perspective cognitive or academic, or indeed from a practical skills perspective but also the way the social and cultural impact upon the habitus. Prior experiences lay the groundwork for later understanding, learning is understood as an interplay between existing and new knowledge, However, most teachers understand knowledge almost exclusively in terms of school curriculum, with little acknowledgement of out-of-school learning experiences (Myhill, 2005). Therefore, in understanding the level of inclusion within a specific curriculum it would appear vital that social and cultural background is held in the consciousness of the teacher.

2.4: A framework for exploring inclusion in a craft curriculum

There is little research on the inclusion or possibilities for inclusion in a craft-based curriculum. However, taking Scollon’s (2005) premise that all actions and interactions are mediated through material and environment it should be possible to examine the inclusive nature of the curriculum. In Scollon’s (2005) understanding discourse is not just as spoken or written interactions but as all social interaction, or as mediated actions. Moreover, action can be seen as mediated through material, or ‘mediational means’ and the environment, including the other social actors within it the site of engagement (Scollon, 2005). Drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus any action taken reproduces the accumulation of history in specific sociocultural contexts and these actions create new positions and reproduce the identities of social actors (Scollon, 2005). This is achieved through a process of multiple social interactions which are themselves grounded in the mediation and manipulation of material (Scollon, 2005). Therefore, that examination of a practical skills curriculum through the lens of mediated action has potential to reveal inclusivity.

As previously noted there is a strong argument for knowledge to be understood in its social context and this is also true with practical and creative knowledge. Contemporary thinking around creativity tends to emphasise the cognitive understanding which then leads to concepts of individual deficit (Glaveanu et al., 2013) similar to those identified previously. In
arguing for a broader understanding of creativity Glaveanu et al. (Glaveanu et al., 2013) would appear to concur with Scollon (2005) positing that to understand human action, and, for the action to be symbolic, intentional mediation through artefacts and tools is a prerequisite. Further, Glaveanu (2013) argues that equally important is environment, or site of engagement, and in the unison of this socio-culturally constructed environment with both body and mind. This is a shift in positional understanding, from the individual to group dynamic moves away from individual deficit to an understanding of the person as a social actor, acting through mediational means within the site of engagement. (Scollon, 2005). This positioning allows for an understanding of inclusion through a holistic view of each individual as both a person and a member the communities to which they belong and interact. However, Scollon (2005) believes communities of practice are a flawed concept as communities are inherently exclusive. Rather, Scollon (2005) offers a concept of a nexus of practise, the point of interaction with any and all social actors, including strangers one mediated action at a time. consequently, the habitus is never fully developed, therefore, the creation of knowledge becomes inclusive through the constant enactment and re-enactment of social interaction.

2.5: A three-fold vision of inclusive pedagogy
For a curriculum to be considered inclusive it will need to take a holistic view of the students it will serve. To move the understanding of practical activity and creativity as understood by Scollon (2005) and Glaveanu (Glaveanu et al., 2013) into the arena a of teaching and learning it is worth examining Shulman’s (2004) three-fold understanding within which he identifies pedagogy as necessarily being constructed of three parts corresponding to the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains. This can be understood as an apprenticeship of the head, apprenticeship of the hands and apprenticeship of the heart (Rouse, 2010). In exploring this and its possibility for inclusive teaching, I take for a starting point an Rouse’s (2010) understanding that barriers to inclusion are inherent and even created by normative classroom practise. Practises such as didactic teaching methods, inappropriate examinations and assessment methods disadvantage marginalised groups by requiring skills and knowledge over and above that required for by the learning outcomes (Hipwell and Klenowski, 2011; Behizadeh, 2014) leading to labels of deficit (Coles, 2013). The problem
with this is that it leads to teachers believing that the students required specialist teachers who have knowledge and skills that they themselves don’t possess (Rouse, 2010). The danger here is that the education system becomes absolved of its responsibility to these students and barriers to inclusion remain (Hipwell and Klenowski, 2011). Shulman’s (2004) pedagogical framework of knowing, believing and doing (Head, Heart and Hands), can be seen to provide a platform for understanding how curriculum and teaching strategies can provide inclusivity. That is, inclusion is enacted by the teacher not only having a strong knowledge of the subject area (Head) but also a belief that the student is able to achieve (Heart) and removes the barriers (hands) that would otherwise inhibit achievement. It is possible therefore, that by fulfilling these three-fold pedagogical aims’ and making explicit the inclusive elements there is potential to change practice and create a more socially just learning environment.

Head, heart and Hands can also be applied to the students as a model for inclusion through viewing head to be related to the cognitive domain and conceptual understanding, hand to the psychomotor domain and the development of practical skill and heart to the affective domain in establishing and re-establishing behaviours (Singleton, 2015). Similarly the hands can be seen as relating to engagement in practical application, head to reflection and heart relational knowing and expansion of values (Sipos, Battisti and Grimm, 2008). What both these explanations have in common it their recognition of the need for holistic and experiential approach to learning. This practical application of knowledge and skills, through relational understanding (Singleton, 2015) has the potential to increase engagement which is “the most important predictor of successful learning outcomes” (Carpenter et al., 2016, p. 13) for children with learning difficulties. However, it is still necessary to consider the importance of place, being a stimulating and authentic environment. It is the combination of environment and the engagement in application of knowledge through practice that has possibility for experience that can transform the student’s perspective of the world, as well as creating new ways of seeing and being within it (Singleton, 2015). Therefore, in this application the model promotes inclusion at the engagement level whilst also opening opportunities for recreation of habitus.
2.6: Capabilities approach
As discussed further in research design my standpoint is one of education as a social construct (chapter 3.2). However, it is worth exploring the capabilities approach due to its potential to address the duality of understanding between inclusion as an individual or social construct. The capabilities approach originally mooted by Amarta Sen foregrounds agency and wellbeing as a necessary human condition for freedom (Crocker and Robeyns, 2009). The basis of the approach is that all human beings have what Sen calls functionings, these are the “beings and doings that individuals have reason to value” (Terzi, 2007, p. 449), or what a person needs to be able to do to function. Capabilities then can be seen as the ability to combine these functioning’s, thus enabling the achievement of wellbeing and agency. However, as there is no prerequisite for equality of outcome, the internal view of disability can be seen as unrealisable functionings (Terzi, 2007) and the focus can be moved to realisable functions. Thus, in taking a capability approach the internal understanding of disability and deficit can be included within the social aspect of education. Therefore, the capabilities approach in education can be considered a social practice, including, but not solely acquisition of knowledge (Walker, 2003). Nevertheless, by determining what circumstantial aspects may cause impairment to become disability, how this effects capacities and an analysis of the interplay between the individual and environment, inclusion and equality can be claimed (Terzi, 2007).

Applying the Capabilities approach to learners with disabilities, highlights the need for education that supports students to participate in the existing social frameworks as well as to attain agency through reflection, thereby increasing their opportunities for freedom and developing the will to learn (Terzi, 2007). Further, as argue, functionings can be combined to enable capabilities which connect to and interact with the social, economic, family, and political world of the individual (Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012), thus, enabling knowledge acquisition through engagement. Therefore, it can be argued that the application of a capabilities approach allows each student to engage within practical skills curriculum, to the extent that their individual functionings allow, through differentiation of task, thus capabilities are developed through the social actions within the workshop environment.

In a practical curriculum, a capabilities approach would require that teachers examine how all functionings of the student are employed, drawing on the experiences, cultural and social
capital of the individual as well as the cognitive. Whilst Sen makes no attempt to identify a list of capabilities, Nussbaum (2003) suggests a list of 10 “Central Human Capabilities” (Nussbaum, 2003, p. 41) that she considers to be a social minimum; 1. Life, 2. Bodily Health, 3. Bodily Integrity, 4. Senses, Imagination, and Thought, 5. Emotions, 6. Practical Reason, 7. Affiliation, 8. Other Species, 9. Play, 10. Control Over One’s Environment (Nussbaum, 2003) all of which can be applied directly to practical, experiential learning. However, if these minimum standards are applied then targeted outcomes should be inherently ambiguous and vary depending on the situation (Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012). Indeed, it could also be argued that if a one size fits all environment and the curriculum do not provide equal opportunities for dignity and respect then capabilities will not be realised. In this view the whole policy direction of including everyone in the mainstream education environment would be seen as flawed (Terzi, 2007). This further validates the argument for inclusion in curriculum rather than geographic location.

2.7: Summary

Whilst Scollon’s (2005) mediated discourse provides a basis for this study, understanding discourse in the broader sense of social interaction and how this creates and recreates habitus form a basis for building understanding of inclusivity within a practical curriculum. Head, Heart and Hands (Shulman, 2004; Rouse, 2010) compliments this, understanding of hands as being related to the psychomotor domain observed in the mediated action through the mediation of material. Heart relating to the affective domain, changing student’s world view, creating new understanding and recreating habitus through mediated social interactions within the site of practical engagement. Whilst, head, relating to the cognitive domain, can be seen as learning and functional knowledge created at the nexus of practice. The Capabilities approach (Nussbaum, 2003; Terzi, 2007; Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012) focuses the learning by requiring the identification of existing school and socio-cultural skills and knowledge. This identification of functioning’s and capabilities in both the cognitive and psychomotor domains is key to understanding how well inclusion is planned into practical curriculum.
Chapter 3: Research Design
3.1: Methodology
The research design I have chosen for this investigation is a qualitative investigation using an educational case study model. I prefix case study with educational in order to position it within this specific area of research (Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012). This empirical research into inclusivity is bounded within the specific curriculum of practical skills and all research has been conducted within one organisation, albeit across two different campuses. Further, as previously outlined (chapter 2.4), the research draws on mediated discourse to provide a framework for the investigation and is therefore bounded within the mediated actions of the individual actors, within the site of engagement (Scollon, 2005). A case study is necessarily bounded (Salkind, 2010; Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012) and, therefore, despite Costly’s (2010) argument that a case study is not a methodology in itself, it has proven to be a strong platform for an empirical study within the specified boundaries of this project (Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012). The use of an educational case study here has allowed for the presentation of data that I believe will enable the organisation within which the investigation has taken place to make explicit the inclusive nature of its practice, thus, informing planning activities of practitioners (Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012) as well as future teacher training. Further, a deeper understanding of the inclusive nature of a practical curriculum may reveal potential implications within a wider educational field (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010).

Whilst the investigation is, as outlined above, a case study it has also drawn on the traditions of action research and discourse analysis. Taking Salkind (2010) argument that the foundation of action research exists in the principals of social justice the underpinning principals are important to this study. As, can be the data analysis (Chapter 4), this investigation is intended to increase social justice through making it explicit. However, the investigation should not be considered an "explicitly political socially engaged democratic process" (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood and Maguire, 2003, p. 13). Its intention is to inform and guide practice not to bring about social change in and of itself (Altrichter et al., 2002). Nevertheless, it aligns with action research in the context of its intent to improve situations or life experiences (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). The intent to draw on discourse analysis may appear a poor fit for research into practical activity, as it is usually understood to be the
analysis of the spoken or written word as it is used or applied within a social context (Salkind, 2010; Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012). However, as previously detailed (chapter 2.4), Scollon (2005) takes a broader view of this, identifying not only verbal or written interactions but all social interactions, between all social actors within their communities and with the wider world at the nexus of practice. It is on this broader understanding of discourse analysis therefore, that I draw on to inform my research.

3.2: Paradigm
Understanding ontology as “the filters through which we see and experience the world” (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000, p. 91) my epistemological understanding fundamentally sees knowledge as socially constructed. Therefore, in designing the research, I have taken a constructivist, interpretivist standpoint, a standpoint that sees knowledge as constantly being constructed and reconstructed through the interactions of individual actors within a social group (Grix, 2002). Further, based on the understanding derived from Scollon (2005) as outlined earlier (chapter 2.4), that the interactions of these actors can be seen as mediated through material and environment. Drawing on a view of Habitus (Bourdieu, 1977) I also take the position that knowledge and social structures establish themselves within their own cultural understanding, further that this habitus will always reproduce itself, this is especially prevalent within the dominant culture (see chapter 2.3). Freire (2000) argues that education should have an intent to break down the inherent power structures identified by Bourdieu (1977) through enabling students to view the world critically. However, taking for a baseline Scollon’s (2005) argument that reality is not only constantly evolving, but mediated through everyday interactions with material and environment, the educational case study methodology enabled me to examine these mediated interactions and their possibilities for re-creating habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). Nevertheless, it remains important to recognise and reflect upon any external structures of power as these may influence and distort what counts as creation of valued knowledge, thus excluding the knowledge of marginalised groups (Coles, 2013). It is this understanding of socially constructed knowledge that underpins the understanding of inclusion in this research.
I have attempted to build an understanding of how (if at all) practitioners understand the impact of social, cultural and other external influences impact the ways in which their students come to understand their world through construction and reconstruction knowledge. Drawing on Scollon’s (2005), interpretation Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus, as outlined in the previous chapter (2.3), I have explored the extent to which teachers include concepts of family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences in the planning. Moreover, if the production and reproduction of habitus is mediated through material as Scollon believes, are these concepts of family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences reflected in the final product. This has been important to the study because social and cultural background informs how the child sees the world and what they value within it (Bourdieu, 1977). Taking the premise that this understanding of sociocultural norms is created through social interactions with material and environment, and this has the power to recreate understanding and habitus I believe there are implications for a practical curriculum. That is, a practical curriculum mediated through the material of the item and environment of the workshop have potential to create new understanding within the affective domain. further, a practical curriculum which draws upon sociocultural understanding and develops individual capabilities (see chapter 2.6) identified from this (Walker, 2003; Terzi, 2007; Nussbaum, 2015), could lead to more socially just outcome for students. I have taken a view, therefore, that developing a knowledge of how these influences define the student’s understanding and interactions within wider social situations could be used to develop and differentiate curriculum and further inform teaching practice.

3.3: Insider research
Working as an insider researcher I have had the benefit of understanding organisational context and its associated language. Mercer (2007) argues that there are pros and cons to insider research, citing arguments that only outsiders can give a truly neutral view of the interactions of people within a situation as only the outsider can distance themselves enough to give an objective account. However, she counters this with an argument that outlines a deeper empathy through shared experience. I agree with Costly Elliot and Gibbs (2010) who identify the advantages of an insider’s relationship with both the subject matter and the situation being researched as providing greater access to the social knowledge and
understanding required in qualitative research. However, close relationships with the communities being researched also provide a need for self-reflection (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Therefore, there has been a need for continuous reflexivity and to consciously turn the research on myself, taking a critical view of my own personal values and understanding through the research undertaken (Hamdan, 2009). As an insider of some years it has my relationship with the community being researched and my personal biography will have been shaped through the functions and roles undertaken over this time (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Therefore, it has been important to recognise how my insider knowledge has impacted on my thinking and avoid being drawn in to a normative understanding and acceptance of the status quo (Hamdan, 2009). Further it was crucial to recognise and reflect on how my insider status may influence my access to the community and its members. Individuals may feel an obligation to participate (Kim, 2012) or not wish to participate due to perceived issues of power (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Moreover, participants may have told me what they think I want to hear or to recite organisational mantra, which could adversely affect the reliability of the data collected. Whilst care has been taken to avoid any unethical abuse of my position (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010), I am very aware that I used my influence as a respected colleague, my position within the organisation and my professional relationship with the gate keepers to gain the access I needed. Further, that if this had not been the case and I didn’t hold this position it may not have been possible to gather the data within the short window available.

A further benefit of being an insider is in the identification of channels of dissemination within existing systems for the benefit of the organisation (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). However, it is important to recognise and reflect upon the power of this dissemination and its power to form or change understandings of others, who may not have access to the information that has informed the research. Having been a practitioner in this field I have been able to share empathy as well as a common language throughout the process and have tried to establish social access that ensured that staff participants represent themselves as individual professional educators rather than reproduce the views of the organisation. It is the representation of these views that is imperative to understanding the elements of inclusive practice within a practical curriculum (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010).
3.4: Methods
The intention had been to collect data from a wider geographical area. Whilst time consuming, this would have had the advantage of drawing data from a range of diverse local cultures, however, delayed ethical agreement resulted in less ambitious data collection. The research was conducted across two centres belonging to the same educational trust, both were in England and all were teaching the same practical skills-based curriculum. There were some differences in the specific practical skills taught, however, despite the crafts varied nature they still provided the bounded environment required for a case study (Salkind, 2010; Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012). Despite the small sample, a determined effort has been made to maintain a balance of gender and ethnicity within participant recruitment. The participant body was formed of one member of teaching staff and one student from each centre. Of the four participants, two identified as female and two as male and two identified as having a learning difficulty. Overall this gave a variety of differing views and standpoints, however, there was a strong white British bias within the group with only one participant being from a non-white background and no participants identifies as having a physical disability, I have maintained a consciousness of this in the analysis of data. Drawing from the reviewed literature, specifically, Rouse’s (2010) argument that teachers should have strong subject knowledge (head), teaching staff were selected for their deep understanding and expertise within the craft they were teaching. This decision enabled me to draw clear data on the deployment of tools and differentiated tasks to support learning, the result of which is reflected in the data presentation (chapter 4.4). The staff members who agreed to take part were asked to identify students who they thought would be willing to participate. This enabled early shortlisting which was necessary if the data was to be collected in the short timescale available. Student participants were then selected for their diverse nature and differing levels of cognitive functioning.

The majority of the data was collected through semi-structured interviews allowing for the collection of qualitative narrative (for interview questions see appendix 1). The semi-structuring allowed me to scaffold the interviews (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Whilst this presented some risk of distorting or controlling the narrative short timescales meant it was necessary as it allowed for shorter interviews and therefore a reduction in the time required to transcribe and analyse the date produced. All interviews were conducted in the
practical workshop (site of engagement) with the tooling and craft items present (mediation material), this acted as a prop to assist the participants to provide “real life narrative” (Marvasti and Freie, 2017, p. 7) “strong on reality (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017, p. 378). All interview questions relevant to social and cultural understanding were framed in way which made them relevant to the production of craft items within the site of engagement (mediated discourse) this was effective in putting participants at ease with the interview through being able to relate to their work and their world. Extracting information in this real-life environment enabled me to draw on the participants perception of their own social reality (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood and Maguire, 2003) and gain a deeper knowledge of their understanding of the inclusive nature within practice-based learning.

Audio recordings were made of each interview; this enabled me as researcher to be more engaged with the participant as well as to focus on the body language, gestures, feelings and emotions as well as the spoken word (Mills, Durepos and Wiebe, 2010). As Popescu and Popescu (2019) argue, citing Albert Mehrabian, only 7% of communication is in the actual words spoken with 38% being the verbal part of speech not including words, tone, cadence etc and the remaining 55% being body language, therefore this method proved useful in drawing out information, especially where participants were less eloquent. However, as the discussions were mediated through the material, participants spoken response alone were often inadequate, it was necessary therefore to adapt my interview technique to ensure data was complete. By phrasing my own responses to participants narrative in a way which also described their mediated actions within the practical task, and the use of photographic evidence of the item produced (or in production) the data was robust enough for later analysis. Following the interviews, non-participatory observations were carried out, it was not logistically possible to observe the interviewed student in all cases; however, observations were undertaken in the relevant workshop with the relevant staff member which proved sufficient in answering the research questions. It is not possible to completely negate the presence of an observer influencing the group dynamic, therefore, an awareness of this possibility was maintained (Mills, Durepos and Wiebe, 2010) and care was taken to minimize impact through constant reflection during the collection and analysis process (Hamden 2009). My position as an insider research outlined earlier (chapter 3.3) provided
me with the skills and knowledge required, through organisational understand and shared common language (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010), to negate the majority of my impact on the social dynamic of the session. Data was collected through the use of observation record documents (appendix 2) within which the categories aligned to the interview questions, continuing the theme of understanding as mediated through material. The qualitative data gathered proved useful in corroborating data produced from the interviews (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017), ensuring narrative was concurrent with practice and identifying any anomalies. A field journal was kept throughout the entire data gathering process, this was a simple way for me to keep track of my thoughts, discussion details, frustrations, and questions. These notes were significant since they served as a reminder of judgments I’d made, personal ideas, and topics requiring further research. Entries were consistently made into the journal immediately following interviews and observations to ensure that finite details were recorded, not forgotten or misremembered.

Where was it stored and how was it protected?

All data, including digitised copies or participant agreements (appendix 3) were stored in the Personal Vault on Microsoft OneDrive©. This is a protected area within OneDrive© with an extra layer of security for important or sensitive files. All audio recordings were held on password protected devices and at the earliest opportunity moved to the vault and transcribed for analysis. Transcripts were anonymised and stored as password protected documents, all notes from interviews were digitised and password protected. Similarly, observation records were digitised and password protected and all original notes hardcopies of research instruments etc were destroyed once digitised. Following analysis, coding was completed using Excel, this was also password protected and stored in the vault (see chapter 4.2). The participants were informed that the data collected was for the sole purpose of the research project, that this would not be shared with any third party and that on completion of the project all data will be permanently deleted. Whilst no participants chose to withdraw from the process, all were aware that if they did all data supplied by them would be destroyed immediately (British Educational Research Association, 2018).

3.5: Summary
The intent of the research design was to draw qualitative narrative from the individual actors within a practical curriculum. The overall design changed little from conception to
implementation, other than the initial intent to draw data from a wider geographical area, (noted in chapter 3.4) which proved over ambitious. The use of an educational case study (Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012) provided the effective boundaries necessary to produce results within the tight timescales of the project. Further, mediated discourse (Scollon, 2005) provided a framework giving structure to the case study and bounding it within an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm (Grix, 2002). Holding interviews within the site of engagement (workshop) with the mediated material (tools and product) present improved data collection by creating a focal point for narrative. This resulted in more enthusiasm from participants and more relevant data, whilst also acting as an aid memoir and communication aid. Further, discourse analysis enabled the teasing out the nuances of the interactions in teacher student relationship in order to understand the level to which socio-cultural considerations inform practice.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

4.1: Purpose of analysis
As outlined in chapter 3 the purpose of the research is to explore the inclusive nature of a practical skills curriculum. Therefore, the analytical process is intended to identify how inclusion is currently achieved by the practitioners as well as to explore any further opportunities which could be used to further promote inclusion and social justice within the curriculum.

4.2: Analysis Process
The data gathering process is qualitative, understanding people as actively creating and recreating their own interpretations in order to make sense of their world (chapter 2.2, 3.2) and how they interact within it (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). Therefore, data has been gathered through in-depth interviews and analysed through a process of thematic analysis. As there is no consensus on what thematic analysis is or how to conduct it, I identify it loosely here as a technique for finding, analysing, and reporting themes and patterns in data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). As noted previously (chapter 2.2, 3.1), the initial
questions and field observation records corresponded to Scollon’s (2005) framework of mediated discourse, specifically, mediational means, site of engagement, mediated action and habitus. This framework was chosen for its potential to reflect the practical nature of the curriculum. However, during the research process it became clear that whilst Scollon’s (2005) framework supported the practical aspect there was a need further consideration from a pedagogical angle. Therefore, Rouse’s (2010) model of head heart and hands and the capabilities approach (Terzi, 2007; Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012; Nussbaum, 2015), support the exploration of the impact teachers have on inclusion within the curriculum (Chapter 2.5,2.6).

In analysing data, it has been crucial to read and reread the material prior to coding in order to fully understand its meanings, critical issues, and immediate primary ideas (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). Further, as qualitative research prioritises a conversational approach that allows for variation in the precise wording of questions and prompts it was necessary to pay attention to the variability and consider its implications for the comparability of the data across data sets (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). An exact and detailed verbatim account of all spoken words from the Interviews was transcribed for analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) and observation field notes were transcribed to form a thick description of what was observed (appendix 2). All data was transcribed within 24 hours of collection and, despite the time constraint, this allowed for some initial analysis to inform and modify the data collection process itself (chapter 3.4) (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). Whilst the research began with some predetermined codes these were modified, and adjusted in response to the data, (Cohen Manion and Morrison 2017) with further codes generated through the review of transcripts (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). Therefore, by process of visiting and revisiting the datasets I was able to ensure consistency through modification and refinement (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017).

**Once coding was completed** the relevant coded data extracts were collated within identified themes. There is no single best theoretical framework for qualitative research, or even a single best approach (Braun and Clarke, 2006). However, it was crucial for this research that the theoretical framework and research techniques were able to support the questions I was attempting to answer (Braun and Clarke, 2006). As detailed in the research design
(chapter 3.4), Scollen’s (2005) work provided a structure which provided strong basis from which to explore the mediation of action through material and environment. However, whilst Scollen’s (2005) work and the initial theoretical categories I derived from it gave direction to the planning and conduct of the interviews and observations, and an initial structure to the data collection (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017) the research questions, whilst derived from mediated discourse (Scollon, 2005) have to do with inclusive practice. Therefore, I have, derived four broad themes from my initial 35 codes for the presentation of the data. The four themes are; Ability inclusion, Engagement inclusion, Social inclusion and Cultural inclusion, these themes relate directly back to the research sub questions stated in the chapter 1.3 (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017).

4.3: Delimitations
As detailed previously (chapter 3.1) a case study is necessarily bounded, Therefore It was important for all research to be undertaken in the practical environment, student participants to be involved in the practical and staff participants to be teaching practical craft skills. Moreover, as further noted (chapter 3.5), for staff participants to have a deep knowledge and understanding of the craft they were teaching as this would ensure strong the subject knowledge which is required to teach craft skills (Rouse, 2010). Due to time restrictions it was not possible to write to parents and guardians to request permission for interview so all students interviewed were above the age of 18 and able to consent to interview. However, this had little impact as the centres catered for students 16 to 25, therefore, the majority of the cohort were above 18 years. No students with deprivation of liberty safeguards (DOLS) were invited to participate as there was no direct benefit to these individuals (British Educational Research Association, 2018).

4.4: Themes

4.4.1: Ability Inclusion
There are clear opportunities within the practical craft sessions for using or differentiating a craft activity to support students who were less technically able to achieve positive outcomes, effectively removing the barriers which exclude students from participation (Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012). Staff inherently consider this when planning activities for
their students, one member of staff stated, when referring to a student with lower technical ability “I didn’t want him doing a little face or a little character cus that would be really - really hard but said look you could use all the colours that he [a cartoon character] has got, that he’s made up of and just work it out in your way”. Whilst the teachers weren’t explicit in referring to this as inclusion, this mindset sets it apart from what Rouse (2010) identifies as teachers' sometimes, pessimistic and dismissive views of students potential and value, which limit or prevent different ways of thinking. Moreover, this was corroborated in my observations of the practical sessions, as I noted in my observation record “all students have individual projects which have varying levels of complexity and technical requirements to support them at a level appropriate to their level of skill and ability”.

The practical work was also effective as a mediation tool to support communication within the workshops and further promote inclusion. My observation notes stated “the teacher uses a lot of demonstration to support verbal instruction” and the student was “able to replicate all practical instruction and directions as required.” This illustrates that practical application through mediational means (Scollon, 2005) has the power to engage students with poor receptive and expressive language skills or other low verbal interactions. Taking the position that motivation is driven by a need for success of mastery and understanding (Singleton, 2015) this use of the craft as a communication mediator can be seen to enable the student to engage. Further these newly identified functioning’s allow the individual to become a more prevalent social actor within the environment, this was evident in a comment by a teacher who said of one student “he is very quiet [...] sometimes he appears as if he doesn’t quite know what he is doing or what he wants to do but [...] when he is doing his [practical] work [...] I see a very strong side of his personality like, he is very decisive! I would argue here that this improvement in social inclusion is meeting a fundamental human need to belong (Singleton, 2015) further that this is intentionally mediated through the material and craft-based resources which actively promote inclusion.

4.4.2: Engagement Inclusion
Current thinking is that engagement is the most significant predictor of successful learning (even more so than IQ) and many educators have focused on engagement as the basis for successful learning in children with disabilities and believe that the study of engagement has the potential to be the key to maximising learning (Carpenter et al., 2016). Therefore, I
would argue, disengagement is effectively exclusionary. Evidence from this research suggests that the levels of engagement in the practical sessions is high, one teacher participants said that “most of them [students] engage really well” and “there are times when students don’t want to engage but it is kind of rare, I don’t know why (laughs)” I believe the why here is answered by Singleton (2015) where she identifies the four areas which are crucial to engagement as “success and need for mastery; curiosity and need for understanding; originality and need for self-expression; relationship and need for involvement with others” (Singleton, 2015, p. 9). These relate directly to the effective and psychomotor domains of the head heart and hand model identified Earlier (chapter 2.4) and are enacted through engagement with a practical curriculum, evidence of this was seen in staff interviews in statements like; “the moment that they realise that I am the one that has made this and I have made something useful for myself here, you can see the satisfaction that they get from that and that helps to develop more interest in – in doing some more work” and “once they are motivated to engage, they work fairly independently”.

Subsequently the students are included in the learning through engagement with the practical activity.

The wider cognitive and social learning within the session were further supported by the contextualisation of learning within the practical task. One teacher told me proudly that “everything they make here […] is something that can be used, something that is useful. We don’t do decorative stuff, everything they [the students] make is a product of use, for themselves, for family and friends or to give back to their community”. Contextualisation at this level is especially important because when students can put what they have learned to use in a way that benefits others, especially their local community, they become more motivated and engaged (Singleton, 2015) both within the learning environment and in the wider social aspects of their world. As I outlined earlier the current education systems has a tendency to decontextualize learning (Coles, 2013), many students with learning difficulties struggle with this as there is nothing to scaffold understanding. One of the students, when asked about his practical work stated “if you were on a course in Uni you do the theory, you wouldn’t end up doing a lot of the practical work which for me is the real experience”. This evidence suggests the that the mediated of learning through craft-based resources is used by teachers to give context to the learning thus supporting inclusivity through engagement.
4.4.3: Social inclusion
The practical curriculum supports social inclusion through mediation with a stimulating and authentic environment (Singleton, 2015). Moreover, from the interviews staff were clear on the intentionality of this inclusion, one teacher stated that all the students were “around a round space and even though everyone is working on their own bit, you can say something to that person, or, you can say something to that person (pointing), they are all kind of in visual range”. The environment is socially constructed therefore brings together body and mind in unison Glaveanu (2013) enabling engagement in both the cognitive and affective domains. This was corroborated in observation, workshops employed a communal arrangement, with students and teacher in a united learning process concurrent with a social model of learning (Freire, 2000). Students were situated around a central table and teachers were not teaching from the front, but moving around facilitating learning and generating opportunities for group working and social interaction (Räisänen et al., 2016). Mediation through environment is concurrent with Scollon (2005), outlined previously (chapter 2.3) whereby social interaction is mediated through the site of engagement. The environment as outlined above can therefore be seen to remove barriers to inclusion inherent and even created by a normative classroom (Rouse, 2010).

Building on the inclusive practices already identifies in this chapter inclusion is also intertwined in the mediation with the material through interaction with the craft item, the tooling and the process of making (Scollon, 2005). These mediate social interaction through encouraging engagement but at the same time they also allow for disengagement, in practice this is observed as students dropping in and out of social interaction as and when they feel comfortable to do so. In the words of the teacher “you can have conversation with someone, or you don’t have to, but you can engage socially if you want to”. However, taking Scollon’s (2005) argument that all interactions can be understood as social, choosing when to interact and when to abstain can also be considered social interaction.
The social aspect of the session also opens up wider social interaction which draws on the social backgrounds. The mediation of social interaction through material and environment forms a platform on which students can build skills needed to participate in the existing social frameworks further they are able to gain agency through reflection, thereby increasing their opportunities for independence (Terzi, 2007). Observations of interaction within the revealed that discourse flowed between the practical tasks in hand and wider social aspect including family, homelife etc as well as popular culture such as television or games. In interviews teachers were clear that this was not always the case, one stating “group dynamics can be different in every session and sometimes you can get lovely bits where you can just step back and the conversation just going on and you don’t have to be involved, you can just watch it evolve and that’s lovely” whilst another stated “if you have got a good combination of students […] the engagement is quite good socially. If they get on you find that they enjoy doing the [practical] work, they enjoy their conversations with each other and the session goes really well but if you get students who don’t get on with each other, then, the social aspect becomes a barrier [to learning]”. Nevertheless, as noted earlier evidence suggested that levels of engagement were generally very good, therefore, I would argue that social action rooted in the actual, everyday activities are created at the nexus of practice and social discourse (Scollon, 2005) and that the intersection of environment and practical activity create these conditions. Further if we consider knowledge to exist between people and within their social and cultural world, then dialectic relationships can neutralised (Freire, 2000). Moreover, if we consider social interaction as a mirror to action, workshop practice can produce conditions which act as a sounding board for the students (Singleton, 2015). Therefore, through a process of reflection they can become more able to integrate in wider society through new cultural understanding.

4.4.4: Cultural inclusion
Along with stimulating teaching environments, learning is also impacted by external factors such as family, culture, and community (Singleton, 2015), therefore, to be inclusive teaching practice should draw on this. When asked about this in relation to student’s design work one teacher stated “when I say to them ‘design something that you want to make’ I do encourage them to think personally about it […] and they do come up with all sorts of designs for themselves. Further when talking about an item the student had made they stated “that they could have put a decorative sign or image there or something like that but
were happy with it plain, cus as far as they were concerned, that’s it – it’s a functional item.”

Whilst this could have been seen as a lack of design we could also view that this could be seen as cultural knowledge. In a working-class family functionality would certainly trump design and this should be considered an important source of knowledge (Walker 2003), this was further confirmed in student interviews where it was stated that “I learnt all of that and sort of built up the skills and then after that I was sort of allowed to choose what I fancied making.” Staff don’t plan explicitly for inclusion of attitudes, interests, belonging and relationships (Singleton, 2015), however, at the point of design or choice of item to be produced clear consideration is given to interests and influences outside of the learning environment. Further, design work drew on ethnic cultural and familial influences. An example of this was the production of a piece which the teacher described as based on “a monument in Ethiopia that was called the Aksum, [...], it’s quite a historic monument” and the item was produced using “techniques that were erm used back in Ethiopia; you don’t see bags like that over here [England]”. This was however not restricted to ethnic culture, a strong focus on traditional craft also drew on local culture such as the traditional crafts from a student’s home town. Socio-cultural along with other external influences were implicit in the design process and therefore often inherent in the final product. However, making this explicit in the planning may further increase inclusivity.

An unexpected outcome was the potential for practical activity to link popular culture to traditional cultural understanding. As with the young person mentioned earlier who drew on the colours of a cartoon character, many students drew on popular culture. An example of this was a young person who approached a participant asking to learn how to use a specific technique saying “I was watching a movie about Vikings and [the technique] makes a lovely noise” (it is in fact silent and the teacher believes the noise was added for effect) despite the initiative coming from television, they learnt traditional craft skills which link back to their own cultural identity through reflection on self and action (Glaveanu et al., 2013). The teacher said “It’s becoming more and more they see something in a movie or whatever and they think ‘can I actually do that’ and I love that”. Therefore, through mediated action and material (Scollon, 2005) the student was able to create new cultural understanding.
For inclusion to be enacted there is a need for the individual to be comfortable with who they are and what they are able to become (Terzi, 2007). An individual will develop, often as a response to their community, and this development is fluid and dynamic (Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012). In one interview (mediated through a craft item) a student told me what she had made “It’s a flag for my identity” this was overtly visible in the item produced, reflecting informed life choices (Walker, 2003) and self-identity. As her teacher told me making the flag “gives her a chance to embrace it [her identity] and a chance to express, and she needs to do that, and she needs to feel comfortable in doing that”. Therefore, practical items serve as a mediator for confronting the emotions that are the context for interpreting and reacting to life experience (Singleton, 2015). Through the material individuals forge their identities within the communities to which they belong and these same communities give them the means to be acknowledged and to have our worth validated (Terzi, 2007). Further, through this interaction students derived values and beliefs that are shaped by connections they make with others (Singleton, 2015) as noted in a student’s words “With my autism I like routine and structure but also like to sort of push those a little.”

Processing their own experience through an interactional exchange with other students enhances social learning (Singleton, 2015), therefore, the exchange of ideas within the design aspect of a practical curriculum can promote better understanding of other. Cross pollination of ideas is present in the workshops as can be seen from student comments such as “I definitely learn a lot from tutors and also, I have many ideas from other students” and “there is so much you can do with glass that I have got ideas from other students work. I think ooh I like that I’m going to use this in mine”. The abundance of student work displayed within the environment creates further opportunity to draw inspiration from the work of others. However, in interviews, staff this were less positive with a comment being made such as “you know what autistic students are like they are very much this is my project […] and don’t acknowledge that other people are actually making different things”. However, when asked about making items for others or community staff were more enthusiastic with statements such as "if you make a project for someone […] think about what they like so that when your making something make it with them in mind. There was a clear intent in the planning for students to make for others, further there is a common understanding that the student should be encouraged to think about the culture and interests of the other
person. I would argue that this is an important aspect of curriculum and can be seen as an interplay between the students own cultural understanding and that of the other (Myhill, 2005), thus building new knowledge and cultural understanding. There is then opportunity, through mediation with material to embed new skills within the affective domain such as being able to relate to others in diverse ways, to perceive and express concern for other people, to live with and toward others, to be able to imagine the circumstances of others and to feel compassion for those circumstances (Walker, 2003). Taking Scollon’s (2005) view that habitus is formed through the mediation of material within the students own social setting, the opportunity presented here may be that the practical work within a student community has the power to reinvent habitus through social understanding, and create new cultural understandings.

4.8: Summary
Craft based resources need to be considered as all tools, equipment and materials used within the practical curriculum. These are used to promote inclusion in two overarching ways. Firstly, resources are used to provide differentiation within the task enabling all students to participate in one group, drawing on what each is actually able to achieve and setting task within that skill level (Terzi, 2007; Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012; Nussbaum, 2015), Secondly, by centralising the importance of the practical item, it becomes a mediational tool to support and encourage social interaction within the environment (Scollon, 2005).

It is therefore, through this that links can be identified between the mediation of the material, within the specific learning environment and the promotion of wider learning through building basic functionings and knowledge (Terzi, 2007; Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012; Nussbaum, 2015) more closely related to traditional classroom knowledge within the cognitive domain (Shulman, 2004; Rouse, 2010). Moreover, in the affective domain actions mediated through material can be seen to enable students to better deal with emotions, such as feelings of success and failure and appreciation for material whilst also building enthusiasm and motivation. Further, the social interactions produced by environment can improve attitudes toward other and better understanding of the values and views of others.

The design process is where the greatest level of consideration is given to sociocultural and other outside interests. A high proportion of this was drawn from popular culture which served well in engagement inclusion. However, there was also evidence staff drawing on cultural and historic influences. The outlier in this was the ability of practical craft to enable the rediscovery of traditional
culture through drawing on popular culture. The visibility of the cultural influences in the finished article varied and was often restricted to aesthetic rather than functionality. However, it often informed the social interactions within the group and the design work of others, it is therefore at this intersection of design, material and environment there is potential for a new shared social understanding.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and implications

5.1: Discussion
A curriculum based in practical skills is inherently more inclusive than a traditional classroom-based model. Practical curriculum draws on a wider range of skills and knowledge in order to undertake a practical activity both skills and knowledge need to be employed at the point of application. Different Socio-cultural backgrounds value and create different forms of knowledge (Myhill, 2005) therefore a child growing up in a traditional middle-class white family may be surrounded by books whereas a typical working-class family may value practical skill over cognitive learning (Chapter 2.2). Further marginalized groups may have more specific skills that, whilst of no benefit within a classroom setting are more likely to be of benefit within the broad set of skills required in a practical curriculum. Where traditional classrooms create barriers through creating certain expectations of outcome (Coles, 2013), practical skills curriculum creates a more level playing field where all skills and knowledge are valued equally (chapter 2.6). As opposed to the view that barriers to participation in learning are internal and requiring external intervention (Frith, 2002; Coles, 2013), the practical curriculum offers many different access points on which further knowledge and skills can be built (chapter 4.4.1). The effect of this can be seen to actively remove barriers to participation.

As a practical skills curriculum is by its nature experiential it creates a constant eb and flow between knowledge and application, thereby, giving learning context. Traditional classroom based teaching practices tend towards the didactic, decontextualizing knowledge from application (Coles, 2013; Goodwyn and Fuller, 2014). This decontextualization can be difficult to access, especially for students who have learning difficulties such as autism and those from marginalised groups who may struggle to connect the dominant cultures knowledge with their own word experience (Chapter 4.4.2). However, as practical skills are a part of all culture’s items produced can draw influence from it, thus providing further context to the wider learning (chapter 4.4.4). The research process concluded four themes that can be seen as inclusive elements of the curriculum; these were Ability, Engagement, Social, and Cultural. These should be considered as broad themes which could be
further developed through further research, however, I believe they provide a basis for understanding inclusion within a practical skills curriculum.

5.3: Context
Whilst there is clear evidence that inclusive elements are all inherent within the curriculum what was less clear was how well this was understood by the staff delivering the sessions. A deeper knowledge of inclusive practices within the curriculum would, in the first instance, promote an understanding of how the current practices of adaption of tooling and practical task can be considered inclusive (chapter 4.4.1) at the level of both ability and cultural inclusion. Further, how a deeper understanding of drawing on culture and background within the production of a practical item can draw out knowledge and skill that are inherent in the sociocultural histories of the individual. The conscious incorporation of culture and background at the planning stage would increase levels of inclusion (Chapter 4.4.4) within the curriculum which further increasing engagement. Moreover, the continued consciousness of socio-cultural background within the design and making process could, through its expression within the artefact promote cultural understanding between students (chapter 4.4.3). Therefore, developing knowledge and skills can be seen to enable the students to access and better engage with existing social structures (Terzi 2007).

5.4: Recommendations
As previously noted increased consciousness of inclusion and inclusive concepts would allow teachers to maximise these within their teaching. Therefore, I would recommend the implementation of a common understanding of inclusion and, of how this situates within the curriculum, which it is hoped this research would inform. Further, for this understanding to be documented within organisation policy. However, as policies often have limited effect on practice this understanding should integrated into existing staff training programmes and professional development opportunities. This would benefit the organisation through better outward expression of inclusive practice both at the organisational and practitioner level.

5.5: Limitations
The reliability of the empirical data is undermined by the narrow sample; to gain a fuller understanding further research is needed with a larger and more varied sample. Due to time constraints the students interviewed were above the age of 18; further study involving children of school age would, I believe yield very interesting results. The initial indications of curriculum having the power to recreate the habitus of the individual is much under-researched and would require a
longitudinal ethnographic study to prove or disprove this theory, however this study could form a basis for future research.

5.6: Reflection on the research process
The use of an education case enabled for the data to be collected and presented within the short timescales of the study (Briggs, Coleman and Morrison, 2012), the application of a framework of Mediated discourse (Scollon, 2005) to the care study provided a strong foundation for both the development of research questions the examination of practical activity. All interviews took place in the workshop (Site of engagement) with the product and the equipment (mediated means) present, this enthused the participants and acted as an aid-memoir and focus on the subject, enhancing participant voice (Guenette and Marshall, 2009). The use of audio recordings was successful, however, there was a need to adapt my interactions so ensure non-verbal evidence was recognised and recorded (chapter 3.4). Through the use of field observations, I was able clarify corroborate or refute data gathered from participant narrative and the open structure of the observation record form provided opportunity to record a thick real-life account of the actions and interactions of the participants in line with narrative data

References


**Postscript: Narrative Critical Reflection**

Following the work done in EE814 and EE815 it became clear my belief that the curriculum was inclusive was based on common sense assumptions for which I had no evidence. Further that the organisation was unable to express how its work was inclusive, I therefore wanted to address this in my final year. Discussions with my EE815 tutor and the EE815 EMA feedback was that I needed to target a specific disadvantaged group which narrowed the research focus. Following discussions with the gate keeper it became clear that the two non-negotiables of the research would need to be practical skills, the organisational focus and inclusive practice, the masters focus. Having written TMA01 and TMA02, I noted in my reflective journal that this was not the focus I wanted to follow. I wrote a shortened version of TMA02 on the original idea and submitted this to my EE822 tutor who agreed that this would be a suitable change. Reflecting on this change now I can see that it made writing more difficult, the TMA, nor the feedback lead directly into the final dissertation and the literature initially reviewed had to be revised. However, had I not of changed the focus I would have regretted it and it would have been less useful to the organisation, further I have had initial discussions with the gate keeper regarding dissemination through the current E&D training and been invited to present on an internal training programme for new staff.

The main difficulties in the actual research process came from late ethical agreement from my organisation. Initially I misunderstood the process, applied quite late and was surprised to be presented with a lengthy form to complete (Appendix 6). However, the insights gained on the ethical researcher course and the OU ethical grid (appendix 5) were really helpful in completion of the document, further found I was able to cut sections from my TMAs which
fit nicely into some sections of the form. Unfortunately, response from this was quite slow, the form was returned for more information and ethical approval was not granted until late in the term. My contingency to reduce the number of interviews/observations and the geographical spread was enacted, however, as I noted in my journal and in chapter 3.3 this was only possible within the timescales due to my position as an insider researcher.

Prior to enrolment on the masters programme I had little experience in research or, for that matter academic writing and had been accepted based on my vocational qualifications and work experience. From starting very much on the back foot I have had to learn skills from referencing to the development and redevelopment of research questions. I feel that I learn best from interaction with others, however, as a mature learner I struggle a little with digital forums (a skill I will need to continue to develop) and as interaction with my work colleagues was also restricted due to Covid 19 I have sometimes found it difficult to develop my thinking. However, I believe the outcome is not only a viable piece of research, but that the ‘artefact as mediation’ is a replicable part of the methodology that could be transferred to other areas. However, in future research I would look at the models currently used by the organisation incorporate them as part of the research methodology.
Appendix
1: Research and interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central research Question</strong></td>
<td>How much consideration do staff give to family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences in the planning process? (Habitus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What elements of a craft based practical skills curriculum can be considered inclusive</strong></td>
<td>How are craft-based resources and tooling employed to promote inclusion in practical sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the family, social, cultural and other outside interests and influences in the planning process visible in the items produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What links can be identified between the mediation of material and environment, inclusion in practical tasks and student engagement in wider learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is new cultural understanding co-produced in the practice (re-construction of Habitus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Interview Questions

**Student Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mediational Means** | What is it you have made? | • How did you make it?  
• What was the process? |
| **Site of Engagement** | How did you feel when you were making it? | • Working with others?  
• Engagement with the material? |
| **Mediated Action** | What is it used for? | • How do you use it?  
• Do you use one of these at home?  
• Do you know anyone that has one? |
| **Habitus** | What was your thought process in designing/choosing to make it? | • Why did you choose to make this in the style you did?  
• What are your ideas based on? |

**Staff Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mediational Means** | What craft items have been produced? | • Who decides what to produce?  
• How did you support the student to achieve |
| **Site of Engagement** | How well did the students engage? | • In the making process?  
• In the wider aspects of the session? |
| **Mediated Action** | Does the finished item have a purpose, if so what and if not why not? | • Does it reflect the student’s personality?  
• Is it culturally appropriate? |
| **Habitus** | What do you know about the student outside of the teaching and learning environment? | • What is there cultural and historic background?  
• What is there current socioeconomic situation and communities?  
• How does the object reflect the above?  
• How do you understand ‘existing skills’?  
• What skills and knowledge did they draw on in the design and making process?  
• How much do you draw on student ideas? |
### Field Observation Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Brief Description

*Outline of Observed situation*

#### Thick Description

*Detailed notes of what is observed*

#### Social Actors | Mediation Means | Site of Engagement | Mediated Action | Habitus
---|---|---|---|---
People within the observed situation | Craft items, tools etc - is the item of use | Workshop environment | focus is on social actors as they are acting | Links to cultural, sociocultural & historic ethnography
3: Letters and agreements

3.1: Information Letter - Interview

E822 Information letter for adults Interviews

What is the aim of this interview?
The aim of the interview is to gain an individual's perspective on an aspect of education, childhood and youth studies as part of a small-scale investigation for a Masters qualification designed to contribute to knowledge and practice in my chosen area of specialist. This particular interview is designed to help answer the question "What elements of a craft-based practical skills curriculum can be considered inclusive?"

Who is conducting the research and who is it for?
This interview is part of my studies on the Open University Masters module E822 ‘Multi-disciplinary dissertation: Education, Childhood and Youth’. On this module I have an opportunity to design a small-scale investigation which will generate findings relevant to and of value to practice settings. The interview has been agreed with my tutor to be an important part of this design to allow me to include the perspectives of selected participants in addressing the above research question. I will be analysing the data collected and reporting my findings in the dissertation I submit to the University as my final assessment for my Masters qualification.

Why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been chosen as your experiences and opinions would be highly valuable in helping to address a question which is considered one which will have value for your setting and others like it.

If I take part in this research, what will be involved?
The interview is intended to last no longer than 30 minutes at a place which I will negotiate with you and others in the setting to be mutually convenient. If there is anyone also affected by the interview, such as a member of staff, they will also have been consulted about when would be a convenient time and permission has been granted from your college principal. I would like to ask your consent to make an audio recording of our discussion so that I can refer back to what was said more accurately than would be possible just from my notes. If you do not wish to be audio recorded, I will accept your wish, and rely only on my written notes. Only I will have access to the audio recording. I do not need to share this with those at the University or in this practice setting. I will transcribe and anonymise the interview before sharing any part of this with my tutor or it form part of the final dissertation. Your contribution will be recognised by a pseudonym and you will be asked if you would like to suggest what name should be used. Any other real names referred to during the interview will be removed and renamed.

What will we be talking about?
The focus of the interview will be to find out your perspective on the choice of items made within the workshop, the design and making of the item and how this relates to the socio-cultural and historic backgrounds of the students in the sessions. I can share the questions with you in advance, if you would like.

Will what I say be kept confidential?
Your participation will be treated in strict confidence in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018). No personal information will be passed from me to anyone else. Your consent forms will be stored safely in our professional setting as agreed with the senior leader overseeing the safe conduct of this research. In the case of the audio recording and my notes of the interview, these will be kept confidential and tipped up as soon as possible. However, if you disclose anything during your interview which I consider means that you might be unsafe or have been involved in a criminal act, because this is a safeguarding concern, I will need to pass this immediately to the organizational Designated Safeguarding Officer. The anonymised records of the interview will be stored securely on password protected devices and the original notes and recording will then be destroyed. I will be submitting an analysis of the data collected from the interviews as part of my dissertation submitted as the end-of-module assessment. I also plan to present my findings to relevant audiences. I can confirm that neither you as an individual nor the setting will be identifiable in any of these reports and presentations.

What happens now?
After reading this information sheet, please review and complete the consent form. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw your consent at any point up by letting me know, until the time I am using your data in my University assessments. As soon as you let me know you wish to withdraw, your consent forms and any data collected will be destroyed 30th July 2022.

What if I have other questions?
If you have any other questions about the study I or my tutor would be very happy to answer them. Please contact me at or contact my tutor.

The ethics protocols and documentation to support the E822 Multi-disciplinary Dissertation: Education, Childhood and Youth have been developed with advice from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee and have been confirmed by the Chair as fully compliant with the Open University’s Ethics Principles for Research with Human Participants. Link: http://www.open.ac.uk/research/ethics/ethics-principles-for-research-with-human-participants.pdf
3.2: Information letter – observation

E822 Information Letter for Staff Participants: Observations

I, Mark Higgins would like to observe an activity led by you in your provision. I am studying for a Masters in Education with the Open University, and this observation is part of my studies.

What is the aim and focus of this observation?
The aim of the observation is to gain a perspective on the activities taking place in. This is to focus on an aspect of education, childhood and youth studies as part of a small-scale investigation for a Masters qualification. The investigation is designed to contribute to knowledge and practice in my chosen area of specialism and the data collected from this observation is designed to help answer “What elements of a craft based practical skills curriculum can be considered inclusive”

Who is conducting the research and who is it for?
This interview is part of my studies on the Open University Masters module E822 ‘Multi-disciplinary dissertation: Education, Childhood and Youth’. On this module I have an opportunity to design a small-scale investigation which will generate findings relevant to and of value to practice settings.

Why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been invited because I feel observation of your session will be helpful in allowing me to build knowledge and information that will enable me to answer my research question. The observation has been agreed with my tutor to be an important part of my small-scale investigation’s design and outline permission has been granted from senior leadership.

If I take part in this research, what will be involved?
The observation will last for approximately 1 hour at the time and place which has been negotiated as convenient. I will be present, but not participate and will take notes about the activity. For those involved it will therefore not change the activity.

Will the data collected at the observation remain confidential?
Your participation will be treated in strict confidence in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018). No personal information will be shared with anyone else. I will type up my observation schedule notes and transcribe any recordings as soon as practical in a way in which all identifiable features will be removed. The original handwritten notes will be destroyed and the anonymised digital files stored on password protected devices. I may share the anonymised files with my tutor. I will be submitting an analysis of the data collected from the observations as part of my dissertation submitted as the end-of-module assessment. I also plan to present my findings to relevant audiences. I can confirm that neither you as an individual nor the setting will be identifiable in any of these reports and presentations.

What happens now?
After reading this information sheet, please review and decide whether you want to complete and return the “Observations Consent Form”. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you have the opportunity to withdraw the record of the observation completely for up to a week after the observation and, in this case, all data collected during the observation would then be destroyed.
If you require more information or do not wish to take part in the observation, please contact me on or my tutor.

The ethics protocols and documentation to support the E822 Multi-disciplinary Dissertation: Education, Childhood and Youth have been developed with advice from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee and have been confirmed by the Chair as fully compliant with The Open University’s Ethics Principles for Research with Human Participants. Link: http://www.open.ac.uk/research/sites/www.open.ac.uk_research/files/ethics/Ethics%20Principles%20for%20Research%20with%20Human%20Participants.pdf
3.3: Consent form - interview

INTERVIEWS CONSENT AND ASSENT FORM
(to be completed by all participants and, if the participant is a child/young person
under age 18, with and by their parent/carer/guardian)

If this request relates to a child/young person under the age of 18 and a child or young
person would benefit from this, please would a parent, carer or guardian read these
questions to them and, if necessary, complete the replies for them.

Please indicate YES or NO for each of the questions below and return the completed
form by Monday 25th April 2022 to Mark Higgins

Have you read (or had read to you) the information about this interview?    YES  NO
Has someone explained this interview to you?                   YES  NO
Do you understand what this interview is about?                  YES  NO
Have you asked all the questions you want?                      YES  NO
Have you had your questions answered in a way you understand?    YES  NO
Do you understand if it is OK to stop taking part at any time?   YES  NO
Will you have an adult present with you?                        YES  NO
Are you happy for the interview to be audio recorded?            YES  NO
Are you happy with how your data will be stored?                 YES  NO
Do you understand that your and any other real names as well as any identifiable
information will be removed from what will be shared after the interview? YES  NO
Are you happy to take part?                                       YES  NO

If any answers are ‘no’ you can ask more questions. But if you don’t want to take part,
please let me know and don’t sign your name.

If you do want to take part, please write your name and today’s date

Your name ___________________________________________

Date ____________________________________________

If the person to be interviewed is a child or young person under 18 and you are happy for
the child or young person you are responsible for (as their parent, carer or guardian) to
participate, please could you also sign and date below.

Print name ___________________________________________

Sign ____________________________________________

Date ____________________________________________

Return form to   Mark Higgins

Thank you for your help.

The ethics protocols and documentation to support the E122 Multi-disciplinary Dissertation: Education, Childhood
and Youth have been developed with advice from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee and have
been confirmed by the Chair as fully compliant with The Open University’s Ethics Principles for Research with Human
Participants. Link: http://www.open.ac.uk/researchsites/www.open.ac.uk.research/files/documents/Ethics-
Principles-for-ResearchwithHumanParticipants.pdf
3.4: Consent form - observation

E822 OBSERVATIONS CONSENT FORM FOR SETTING

Please indicate YES or NO for each of the questions below:

Have you read the information about the planned observation?   YES  NO
Has the nature and aims of this observation been explained to you?  YES  NO
Do you understand what this observation will involve?  YES  NO
Do you understand how your data will be collected from the observation? YES  NO
Are you happy with how your data will be stored?  YES  NO
Have you asked all the questions you want?  YES  NO
Have you had your questions sufficiently answered?  YES  NO
Do you understand that you can withdraw your consent up to a week after the observation? YES  NO
Are you happy to take part in the observation?  YES  NO

If any answers are 'no' feel free to ask for further information. However, if you don't want to take part, please just let the researcher know (as soon as practical) and don't sign your name.

If you consent to participate, please write your name and today's date. You can withdraw consent up until the week after the observation by letting me know.

Your name __________________________________________

Date __________________________________________

The researcher who will conduct the observation, to sign below:

Print name __________________________________________

Sign __________________________________________

Date __________________________________________

Return form to Mark Higgins

Thank you for your help.

The ethics protocols and documentation to support the E822 Multi-disciplinary Dissertation: Education, Childhood and Youth have been developed with advice from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee and have been confirmed by the Chair as fully compliant with the Open University's Ethics Principles for Research with Human Participants.

### 4: Reflection evidence grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Feedback received, targets achieved, and areas of development worked on</th>
<th>How did this shape my dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding:</td>
<td><strong>TMA01 Feedback</strong> Feedback in on knowledge and understanding was good, however it will be important to read more deeply on issues that affect my context</td>
<td>I used the OU library, publish or perish and the wider internet to find relevant material, where this was unavailable I purchased hard copies either second hand or Kindle edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TMA02 Feedback</strong> Better connections need to be made between theory and practice</td>
<td>When making contextual references in my journal I tried to make links with relevant literature so that it was to hand when I came to write the dissertation. Further – use reflective journal entries as a basis for reviewing literature has reviled some interesting articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Forum discussion</strong> I need better phrase my understanding of concepts where there is no ‘one’ definition</td>
<td>Reading other researchers work and noting the way they identify disputed concepts in my journal I was able to identify how they had done this and adopt a similar style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Feedback from colleagues</strong> was that there may be alternative ways of addressing the goal.</td>
<td>My initial thinking drew heavily on the capabilities of the students including their social cultural background. Further research revealed that using the head, heart and hands model was a god way to cross-examine evidence. It also fitted well with the overall concept of mediated discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis and evaluation:</td>
<td><strong>Discussion with tutor</strong> I need to make sure clear links are made between the text and the research question</td>
<td>As part of the redrafting process I have attempted to make sure I use PEEL paragraphs and that through this I link my thinking back to the research questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TMA 01</strong></td>
<td>Through a process of drafting and redrafting I have repositioned the content in my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I need to ensure the arguments are my own rather than letting the literature and empirical data speak for me.

EMA making argument and citing author as opposed saying according to [author]

Conversation with tutor the changes in direction of this project have made it more difficult as I has meant refocusing the research questions

Notes in my journal have helped to frame my belief that inclusive education relies not only in gaining as deep as possible understanding of the individual from a social and cultural perspective but also in the teachers awareness of this, ability / willingness to include this in their practice and use of this to plan teaching with ambition and belief in the student

Difficulties obtaining ethical agreements

Late ethical agreement meant that all data collection had to be arranged and in the last four weeks before the end of term and undertaken in the last two. this resulted in a narrower than expected number of interviews.

Structure, communication, and presentation:

As I have noted elsewhere, currently your plans are unnecessarily complicated Mark, and for success I advise you simplify your plans

I have taken every opportunity every opportunity look back and reflect on both my position within the group and the perceived position as an outsider in order to maintain the quality of the data – this is reflected in my data presentation

TMA01 feedback
I need to understand the affect of my insider status on the research

TMA02
There were issues with the way I linked appended to the main text

Through discussions with my tutor I have developed better practice in this area – hopefully the links to appendices in the dissertation are clear concise and useful
## 5: Ethical grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question to consider</th>
<th>Your thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External/ecological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>What are the values, norms and roles in the environment in which I am working and are they likely to be challenged by this research?</td>
<td>There is a strongly ethos and understanding that underpins the organisation in which the research was carried out. It is important to keep this in mind and be sensitive to it in the research and in the presentation. As an insider it is easier to understand and work with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of all parts of the institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the group/individual I am working with and the institution as a whole? How does it affect the participant(s)?</td>
<td>The participant are staff and students at two campuses. As an employee of the trust not the individual provisions I have a strong understanding of the organisational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive communication – awareness of the wishes of others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>How might my work be viewed/interpreted by others in the institution? How will the language I use be interpreted?</td>
<td>It was important to generate and present the data in such a way that it draws on current understandings in the organisation and builds knowledge onto this existing understanding. However, there is also a requirement identify and make explicit any issues that and this could be controversial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities to sponsors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are my responsibilities to the people paying for or supporting this research (local authority, my school, external bodies)?</td>
<td>The research is self-funded and the only supporter is the organisation I am conducting the research within. However, nothing is ever without cost and it is important for me to be aware of the cost implications to the organisation through its time and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of practice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have I worked within the British Educational Research Association guidelines? Are there other relevant codes which might also be applicable? Am I aware of my rights and responsibilities through to publication?</td>
<td>Having read the BERA guidelines, whilst all these guidelines are relevant, the one that stands out as being important to this specific study is the research to be of direct benefit to individuals with a DOLS. I do not think this research has a direct benefit and for this reason there are no participants with a DOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency/use of resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Have I made efficient use of the resources available to me, including people’s time?</td>
<td>Using semi structured interviews rather than narrative made them far more time efficient. There was no very little resource used and above peoples time. As an insider researcher there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---

---

---
was also only a relatively small impact on the teaching session during field observations as I understand the curriculum, the student profile and can use common technical language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of evidence on which conclusions are based</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Have I got enough evidence to back up my conclusions and recommendations?</th>
<th>As noted in my conclusions and critical narrative the data was less than originally intended, however I feel there was enough data available to have arrived at the decisions that I did within the boundaries of the research. As stated in conclusions the work is only a baseline and further work being undertaken would be beneficial, especially with its application to children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>What legal requirements relating to working with children do I need to comply with? Am I aware of my data protection responsibilities? Am I aware of the need for disclosure of criminal activity? Do I need written permissions?</td>
<td>Ethical control of potentially sensitive material and data gathered was above and beyond that required under the data protection act. As an insider researcher I already have a DBS certificate held within the organisation and they are able check this through the update service as and when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Are there any risks to anyone as a result of this research?</td>
<td>The main risk is to the participants through identification in the final research. Every care has been taken to remove reference which could identify the participants within the dissertation. Research findings could also pose a risk to others if it is felt as a result of the findings that a member of staff does not act in the best interests of the organisation, however given the nature of the research this is unlikely. Finally, there is also clearly a risk to me and my position in the organisation if the research were to be badly received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequential/utilitarian

<p>| Benefits for individuals | 10 | What are the benefits of my doing this research to the participants? Would an alternative methodology bring greater individual benefits? | It is hoped that this research brings benefits to the students and staff (present and future) through promoting a better understanding of inclusive practice within the curriculum, increased engagement and better learning outcomes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits for particular groups/organisations</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>What are the benefits of my doing this research to the school/department? Could these be increased in any way? How will I ensure that they know about my findings? Is my work relevant to the school development plan? Can I justify my choice of methods to my sponsors?</th>
<th>It is hoped that it will serve to enhance the image of the organisation through being able to outwardly express a strong inclusion policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most benefits for society</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is this a worthwhile area to research? Am I contributing to the ‘greater good’? Is it high quality and open to scrutiny?</td>
<td>There are possibilities that wider dissemination of the findings and further research could benefit other organisations with a similar offer or ethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of harm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Are there any sensitive issues likely to be discussed or aspects of the study likely to cause discomfort or stress?</td>
<td>Whilst the issues are intended to be researched generally rather than pertaining to any specific individual there are pressing concerns. However, sensitivity of issues will always be in the perception of the individual it is important to keep this in mind at the point of data collection, presentation and dissemination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for the researcher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Am I going to be able to get enough data to write a good thesis or paper? Am I aware of my publication rights? What might I learn from this project? Will it help in my long-term life goals?</td>
<td>The data is limited by timescales; however, I believe there is enough to support the findings. I believe undertaking this research gives me skills and knowledge that will improve my ability in my current career, whilst I currently have no plans to change jobs the skills and knowledge gained would likely be of benefit to me in acquiring and maintaining other employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deontological**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance of wrong – honesty and candour</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Have I been open and honest in advance with everyone who might be affected by this research? Are they aware that they can withdraw, in full or in part, if they wish?</th>
<th>I believe I have been open and honest with all participants, gatekeepers and other stakeholders throughout the process of undertaking this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Have I treated all participants fairly? Am I using incentives fairly? Will I acknowledge everyone involved fairly? Can I treat all participants equally?</td>
<td>I believe all participants were treated fairly and equally, no incentives were offered at any time and participants were willing to be part of the research process based on there knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Have I explained all the implications and expectations to the participants? Have I negotiated mutually beneficial arrangements? Have I made myself available when those involved might wish me to be? Are the participants clear about roles, including my own, as they relate to expectations?</td>
<td>All implications and expectations have been explained, making myself available at a time to suit them was challenging in the tight time scales allowed. However, all interviews were carried out in the participants own location by prior agreement with them, albeit sometimes at short notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell the truth</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>If there is any need for covert research, how will I deal with this? What will I do if I find out something that the participants/school/department do not like? How will I report unpopular findings?</td>
<td>There is no covert research – all research has been honest and open. In reporting findings that could be unpopular I have tried to highlight positives and identify negatives as possible areas for improved performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep promises</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Have I clarified access to the raw data and how I will share findings including at publication? How will I ensure confidentiality?</td>
<td>No raw data will be shared with anyone. All hardcopies will be digitised and then destroyed. All digital data is stored in a digital vault. All data will be deleted as soon as it is no longer required for this research project and will be used for no other purpose than this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the most positive good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is there any other way I could carry out this research that would bring more benefits to those involved?</td>
<td>I believe that this research design is the best fit for the research being undertaken. Inclusion needs to be explored through the real-life narratives of those within the organisation so a quantitative study would not reveal the necessary information. Further the strength of the methodology was its intent to be within the site of engagement with the mediated means.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relational/individual

<p>| Genuine collaboration/trust established | 21 | Who are the key people involved? How can I build a constructive relationship with them? | My position as an insider researcher means that I am in most cases known to the participants. This position has helped me to gain social access to the participants I needed to carry out the project. |
| Avoid imposition/respect autonomy | 22 | Am I making unreasonable or sensitive demands on any | All participants were aware that participation was voluntary and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmation of findings</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>What steps will I take in my methodology to ensure the validity and reliability of my findings? Can I involve participants in validation? Will I report in an accessible way to those involved?</th>
<th>Whilst time does not allow for participants to corroborate findings. The outcome was shared with a colleague to corroborate or refute findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect persons equally</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>How will I demonstrate my respect for all participants? Have I treated pupils in the same way as teachers?</td>
<td>All participants were treated as equals and all narrative and opinions were treated as being of equal value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6: Organisational ethics form

Research Proposal for permission to conduct research at xxx

Name:

Project Status: Awaiting Academic Institution Approval/ Approved on date:

Date of Submission to REB:

Explain in the right-hand column how your proposed project relates to the xxx charitable objectives and the Vision and Values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>charitable objective 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>charitable objective 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charitable objective 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain which area of practice is addressed in your research.

1. Describe the setting/context of the research.
   What is your role/background/experience

2. What is the research question(s)? What are the aims and objectives of the investigation?
   Explain what you want to do. Refer to Research Ethics Policy Guiding principles (pages 1 & 2).

3. What is the rationale for the study?
   Why do you want to do this research? Explain your reasons.

4. What are the key literatures on the topic that help you explore the question? List 5 – 10

5. What research approach (methodology) will be used?
   Explain why you have chosen this approach and how you intend to use it?

6. Outline your research plan and explain
   - what methods of data collection you intend to use eg surveys, interviews, observation, reflective journal/diary entries, creative work
   - how you will analyse your data once collected
   Consider your responses to points 5 and 6 in relation to Research Ethics Policy; Research priorities and duty of care point 4 (page 2).

   - how the research complies with ethical guidelines - work through the Research Ethics Policy and state clearly in relation to the sections Research priorities and duty of care
(page 2) and Other principles (page 3) how you have considered and addressed all potential ethical concerns.

7. What is the project schedule?
   Provide an outline of this and consider any implications for the student and/or college

Signature: Representative of the xxx Research and Ethics Board

Print Name:
Date:

Signature: College Principal/Assistant Principal or Departmental Manager

Print Name                                   Job Title:
Date:

Once all signatures have been collected please return this form to xxxxxx at xxxxxxx
7: Ethical Appraisal Form

E822 Ethical Appraisal Form
Masters: Education, Childhood and Youth

NB: it should be noted that The Open University is unable to offer liability insurance to cover any negative consequences students might encounter when undertaking ‘in-person’ data collection. It is therefore very important that you follow appropriate research protocols which should include seeking Gatekeeper permissions to undertake any data collection within your setting and adhering to ethical principles for the safety of yourself and your participants.

Because ethical appraisal should precede data collection, a completed version of this form should be included with TMA02 for those developing a Small-Scale Investigation (SSI) and as part of the EMA submission for those completing an Extended Literature Review and Research Proposal (EP) form of the Dissertation.

Fill in section 1 of this document with your personal details and brief information about your research.
For section 2, please assess your research using the following questions and click yes or no as appropriate. If there is any possibility of significant risk please tick yes. Even if your list contains all “no” you should still return your completed checklist so your tutor/supervisor can assess the proposed research.

Section 1: Project details

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Student name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Project title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Supervisor/tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. MA pathway (where applicable) Inclusive pathway

g. Intended start date for fieldwork April 2022

h. Intended end date for fieldwork June 2022

i. Country fieldwork will be conducted in United Kingdom

If you are resident in the UK and will be conducting your research abroad please check www.fco.gov.uk for advice on travel.

Section 2: Ethics Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does your proposed research need initial clearance from a ‘gatekeeper’ (e.g. Local Authority, head teacher, college head, nursery/playgroup manager)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have you checked whether the organisation requires you to undertake a ‘police check’ or appropriate level of ‘disclosure’ before carrying out your research?¹</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have you indicated how informed consent will be obtained from your participants (including children less than 16 years old, school pupils and immediate family members)? Your consent letters/forms must inform participants that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.²</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Will your proposed research design mean that it will be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge/consent at the time (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)? If so have you specified appropriate debriefing procedures?³</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ You must agree to comply with any ethical codes of practice or legal requirements that maybe in place within the organisation or country (e.g. educational institution, social care setting or other workplace) in which your research will take place. If required an appropriate level of disclosure (‘police check’) can obtained from the Disclosure and Barring Service (England and Wales), Disclosure Scotland, AccessNI (Northern Ireland), Criminal Records Office (Republic of Ireland), etc.

² This should normally involve the use of an information sheet about the research and what participation will involve, and a signed consent form. You must allow sufficient time for potential participants to consider their decision between the giving of the information sheet and the gaining of consent. No research should be conducted without the opt-in informed consent of participants or their caregivers. In the case of children (individuals under 16 years of age) no research should be conducted without a specified means of gaining their informed consent (or, in the case of young children, their assent) and the consent of their parents, caregivers, or guardians. This is particularly important if your project involves participants who are particularly vulnerable or unable to give informed consent (e.g. children under 16 years, people with learning disabilities, or emotional problems, people with difficulty in understanding or communication, people with identified health problems). There is additional guidance on informed consent on the Masters: Education and Childhood and Youth website under Project Resources.

³ Where an essential element of the research design would be compromised by full disclosure to participants, the withholding of information should be specified in the project proposal and explicit procedures stated to obviate any potential harm arising from such withholding. Deception or covert collection of data should only take place where it has been agreed with a named responsible person in the organisation and it is essential to achieve the research results required, where the research objective has strong scientific merit and where there is an appropriate risk management and harm alleviation strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does your proposed design involve repetitive observation of participants, (i.e. more than twice over a period of more than 2-3 weeks)? Is this necessary? If it is, have you made appropriate provision for participants to renew consent or withdraw from the study half-way through?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are you proposing to collect video and/or audio data? If so have you indicated how you will protect participants’ anonymity and confidentiality and how you will store the data?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does your proposal indicate how you will give your participants the opportunity to access the outcomes of your research (including audio/visual materials) after they have provided data?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Have you built in time for a pilot study to make sure that any task materials you propose to use are age appropriate and that they are unlikely to cause offence to any of your participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is your research likely to involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. adult/child relationships, peer relationships, discussions about personal teaching styles, ability levels of individual children and/or adults)? What safeguards have you put in place to protect participants' confidentiality?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Does your proposed research raise any issues of personal safety for yourself or other persons involved in the project? Do you need to carry out a ‘risk analysis’ and/or discuss this with teachers, parents and other adults involved in the research?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or the use of NHS data?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered ‘yes’ to questions 12, you will also have to submit an application to an appropriate National Research Ethics Service ethics committee (http://www.nres.npsa.nhs.uk/).

---

*Where participants are involved in longer-term data collection, the use of procedures for the renewal of consent at appropriate times should be considered.*