



EQUITY MATTERS RESEARCH REPORT 2009-11

DRAFT VERSION

Dr Elizabeth Wood
Professor of Education

Dr Keith Postlethwaite
Associate Professor of Education

Dr Martin Levinson
Senior Lecturer

Alison Black
Research Assistant

CONTENTS

Introduction

Literature review

Analysis of the Survey Data

Case Studies

Canada

New Zealand

UK (England)

Ireland

Poland

Commentary

Conclusion and
Recommendations

References

Appendices

Introduction

The aim of this project is to capture the nature and significance of equity policies in the achievement of quality education for all in public education systems. Four key questions guided the design of the study:

1. How do education unions conceptualize equity in education?
2. How are these concepts operationalised, as evidenced in practices and policies?
3. What are the issues for teachers, with regards to the concepts of equity?
4. How can Education International contribute to the international debate on equity in ways that benefit members?

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To carry out a questionnaire survey of EI members regarding concepts of equity as the basis for a qualitative analysis of the views and policies of member organisations;
2. To carry out a number of country-specific case studies in order to identify how equity is conceptualised in education policies and practice.
3. To provide a focused literature review, as an overview of the key issues, and framework for the data analysis.
4. To analyse, synthesise and discuss the evidence discovered in the empirical data and literature review;
5. To identify key trends and developments, and future challenges for EI;
6. To make recommendations for future research;
7. To identify implications and recommendations for teachers' trade unions (policies and practice).

This study begins from the position that equity matters for teachers and for children, and that striving for equity is fundamental to the policy aspirations of national unions, to Education International, to governments and supra-national organizations such as UNESCO and OECD. Section 1 focuses on the literature review, and aims to define the concept of equity, and the factors that contribute to inequity in education. These concepts are contextualized first in relation to Equity Matters for Children, and second in relation to Equity Matters for Teachers. The discussion of the concepts of equity and quality in education draws on international research literature and reports, and indicates

the challenges that are inherent in combining, balancing or trading-off these concepts in practice. This is followed by the Section 2, which focuses on the analysis of the project data from the country-wide Lime Survey. Section 3 presents the country-specific case studies, with a commentary on the issues raised. The fourth and final section synthesizes the main findings and key themes arising from the literature review and data analyses, and identifies possible pathways of development and influence for Education International.

Section 1: Literature Review

The aim of this literature review is to explore the concepts of equity and equality and their relationship to achieving quality in public education systems. The intention is to analyse the different influences that are impacting on equity issues from international, intergovernmental and national organizations and policy drivers, and to indicate the benefits, risks and limitations of these influences.

1.1: Equity Matters for Children

1.1a The Concept of Equity

The need for all children to have access to quality education, regardless of background, has become increasingly prominent in national and international policy agendas over recent years (e.g. Ball and Youdell, 2009; OECD, 2005; UNESCO, 2008). The importance of *quality* is advocated from early childhood onwards, with substantial evidence that attests to the sustained impact of high quality provision on children's educational outcomes and life chances (see Education International, 2009; Sylva et al, 2010; Urban, 2009). However, current international drivers for improving quality have limited impact without attention to equity, for teachers and for children. This is particularly salient in view of consistent evidence that, after children's home learning environments and socio-economic status, the quality of teachers, and of teaching, is the key variable in improving equitable outcomes for children. However, the ways in which the concepts of equity, quality, equality, inclusion, and diversity in education are defined and discussed in the literature differ.

In education, students differ in terms of their socio-cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds, and their life experiences, which may influence differences in outcomes. However, the principles of equity suggest that any differences in educational outcomes should not be dependent on factors such as student background, or quality of educational input, over which students have no control (Perry, 2009). “Equality of opportunity for all students” is often described as the ultimate goal, although this concept is open to interpretation. Brown (2006) distinguishes between horizontal equity (equal treatment of those who are equal) and vertical equity (unequal, but equitable, treatment of those who are not equal, designed to reduce inequality). He suggests that horizontal equity is a starting point that can be used to help achieve vertical equity. The key point is that vertical equity looks at whose situation can and should be improved, and how that can be achieved.

The recognition that education can either magnify or reduce socio-economic and cultural inequalities that exist outside of school is a pre-requisite for addressing equity in education (Matear, 2007). Affirmative action, where beneficial or favourable treatment is given to those who are disadvantaged in some way to enable them to achieve as well as they are able, is often seen as key to reducing such inequalities. To achieve true “equality of opportunity”, the structure of opportunity needs to be understood. Educational structures often favour those with high levels of social and economic resources, and particular forms of social and cultural capital, so affirmative action is needed to ensure that inherent talent from all sections of society is allowed to flourish (Clancy and Goastellec, 2007).

Access to education can be seen as a first step in equitable provision, so all children are able to attend school and progress through the phases. But even where equality of access is achieved there may still be differential provision and a hierarchy within the system. The next step might be seen as considering the quality of that education, particularly considering teacher training, curriculum frameworks, resources and materials. But children need to be able to access *success* in learning (Clancy and Goastellec, 2007; Halinen and Jarvinen, 2008), which highlights the issue of whether educational equity is about ensuring that everyone has access to the same curriculum, knowledge and provision, or ensuring that the educational needs of all are met (Lloyd, 2000; Perry, 2009). Furthermore, *accessibility* is a consideration, especially for children

with special educational needs, and children in nomadic or travelling communities. Education has to be accessible through different means, such as adaptation of buildings, appropriate resources, and outreach provision.

1.1b Factors that contribute to inequity in education

There are many factors that may influence inequitable opportunities and outcomes in education around the world, including gender, income and socio-economic status, ethnicity, indigeneity, culture, religion, language, geographical location, conflict and war, malnutrition, physical health and ability, mental or psychological health and ability, sexualities, education level of parents (e.g. Atweh and Brady, 2009; Clancy and Goastellec, 2007; Jentsch, 2006; Matear, 2007; Perry, 2009; Skutnabb Kangas, 2002; UNESCO, 2008). Different countries use different sub-sets from this set of categories to define diversity, and assess how equitable are their education systems. Gender is probably the most widely used (Clancy and Goastellec, 2007). These factors do not work in isolation, however: a combination of two or more of these factors (such as being poor, female and living in a rural area) can increase disadvantage several times over (Morely *et al*, 2009; UNESCO, 2008). In many countries, these factors are not unrelated. Co-occurrences of ethnic minorities and low socio-economic status (SES) are common. South Africa, for example, no longer segregates by race, but a similar effect is manifested through segregation by social class when it comes to education, as those with the lowest SES are usually African and those with the highest SES are usually white (Brown, 2006; Lemon, 2005). Structural inequities can also be found in countries that are considered to be 'very highly developed' on the Human Development Index from the United Nations Development Programme (2009) (See Section 2). In economically well-developed countries, such as the UK, Canada and the USA, ethnicity and low socio-economic status appear to be two of the main risk factors for underachievement in schools.

General social inequities in a country's society are often reflected in inequities in education. There is much evidence and comment on the mechanisms through which low SES and income impacts (directly and indirectly) on education, for example: through ability to pay school fees; the detrimental effects to a family's income of a child not being available to undertake paid work, due to school attendance (and more generally the

proportion of an income that the cost of school attendance represents); the cultural and social resources available to interpret information and make informed choices in complex schooling systems; the quality of available schooling in disadvantaged areas; teacher supply, quality and retention; the cultural resources available at home to support education; and the accessibility of the mode of delivery of education to children from a variety of backgrounds (Brown, 2006; Giroux and Schmidt, 2004; Matear, 2007; Perry, 2009; Scheopner, 2010; UNESCO, 2008; Welsh and Parsons, 2006). In general, children from more disadvantaged backgrounds do not achieve as highly as those from more advantaged or privileged backgrounds, and these differences can begin from the pre-school phase. For example, inequity in pre-school provision and care means that Universal Primary Education is hard to achieve: children who are cognitively damaged through malnutrition do not get much benefit from education (Education For All Global Monitoring Report, 2009). Inequities in education can be revealed within preschools/schools (the differential effect that a school might have on the learning of different children), between schools (the differential effects of schools on the learning of similar children), and across school systems (the differential effects of schools on the learning of different children).

The quality of available schooling in disadvantaged areas in particular is the focus of much debate. Quality in this sense could refer to a wide range of variables in education, including: pupil-teacher ratios; teacher training and development; teacher retention and overall staff turnover; methods used in teaching; quality of buildings; availability of teaching resources such as text books and other equipment; and availability of extra-curricular provision and support. Access to Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) is increasingly seen as an indicator of equity and quality, even though there are problems with the 'digital divide' – differential access to these resources in schools, homes and communities. One of the recommendations of the Millennium Development Goals report (2008) is providing internet connectivity to countries in the developing world to improve educational provision.

Quality is also associated with test scores and other outcomes indicators, but in this regard there is not a direct relationship between quality and equity. In the UK and the USA, for example, the increased marketisation of the education system has meant that those schools with higher test scores are rewarded both in terms of being seen as more

desirable by parents, and being allocated more resources from government. Such schools are likely to have a relatively low proportion of disadvantaged students, and although in theory families are able to express a preference for schools, it is the less disadvantaged families who are more likely to have the social capital to be able to negotiate the complex admissions process in a way that would enable them to access such schools. As a result, those schools with higher test scores continue to reap the benefits of a more privileged intake. Ironically, the more disadvantaged families whose children are likely to benefit most from such schools, are those who are least in a position to exercise such choice, whether that is due to geographical location, language, or cultural barriers. Those schools that are not seen as so desirable by parents have a more disadvantaged intake, lower test scores, fewer resources from government, and find it hard to escape the cycle. It is probably not a coincidence that “ineffective” schools are often found in disadvantaged areas (e.g. Giroux and Schmidt, 2004; Taylor et al, 2005; Welsh, 2004; Welsh and Parsons, 2006). In a meta-analysis of teacher attrition in public and Catholic schools in the USA, Scheopner (2010) reports that, whilst some teachers are motivated to work in schools with high levels of disadvantage, often for altruistic reasons, it is harder to retain teachers serving low-achieving, low-income and minority students. Therefore teacher retention issues may also be implicated in cycles of disadvantage that perpetuate inequity.

Similarly, in countries where top-up fees are paid by parents, those with higher top-up fees are better resourced, but the most disadvantaged sectors of society cannot afford to send their children to schools with high (or indeed any) top-up fees. So again, those who have most to gain from attending well-resourced schools, which may offer high quality education, are those who are least likely to be able to do so (Brown, 2006; Cele, 2005; Matear, 2007; Motala, 2009). Where there is selective entry by merit to education of a higher perceived quality, those who have had more access in the past to contexts that have enabled them to succeed will probably be most successful within and beyond school (e.g. Clancy and Goastellec, 2007; Taylor et al, 2005). Such access, as discussed above, may well be rooted in socio-economic status, and subsequently perpetuates the benefits accrued in terms of social and cultural capital.

In summary, it is a widely-held view that education is a key to social mobility (e.g. Matear, 2007) and the lower quality of the education that is often received by the most

disadvantaged sectors of society reinforces and perpetuates wider social inequalities. Recently, however, it has been suggested that as more people access higher levels of education, the relative social and economic advantage given by education is decreasing, and instead more advantage in the labour market is given to those who have the kinds of social capital demonstrated by the middle classes (Raffo and Gunter, 2008). However, recent debates about conceptualizing and evaluating equity and quality indicate that these concept remains complex and multi-faceted: it is difficult to 'measure' with any accuracy the combination of the characteristics of educational provision, its effectiveness, and the outcomes that are achieved by children (at any stage of their educational careers) (Gorard, 2010).

1.1c Equity and Quality in Education

At a very basic level, educational opportunities can be considered in terms of the percentage of school-age children enrolled at primary and secondary levels, completion rates of primary and secondary education, grade-level repetition rates, grade level reached, and number of years in education (UNESCO, 2008). In addition, access to high quality early childhood services and provision is seen as fundamental to improving children's educational outcomes and life chances. However, conceptualizing quality in terms of structural and process variables does not provide a clear picture of the equity of provision. This is partly because qualitative inequity can be harder to measure. Input expenditure and resourcing can be compared, but the quality of the teaching and learning that takes place, the conditions in which teachers work, and the wider socio-economic, cultural and historical contexts are less easy to assess.

Nonetheless, contemporary debates on equity in education do consider the nature of quality in education, and the relationship between the two. To obtain international budgetary support, many countries have to demonstrate that they can achieve both high quality and equitable access in education (Penny *et al*, 2008). But this is not necessarily straightforward. Policies that focus mainly on quality run the risk of poor equity, through marginalizing the least able students, as the institutions strive to meet 'quality' targets against which they are held accountable, and policies that focus solely on equity of access are at risk of losing some quality in outcomes (Atweh and Brady, 2009). For

example, in Kenya, Free Primary Education has been a policy aspiration from 2003 onwards, but has encountered problems with feasibility and sustainability, with wide disparities in enrolments, between and within regions, between rural and urban areas and within urban areas, and between genders. Because of lack of infrastructure investment, free public education has been associated with low quality. Nonetheless, with an increasing international focus on equity, more national policies are coming to see equity as an integral part of, or at least a necessary condition for, quality. The research literature on school effectiveness literature has been highly influential in policy development in the last thirty years. However, this field has historically ignored or underplayed issues of equity (Alegre and Ferrer, 2010), and is just beginning to consider the role that equity might play in measures of quality (Gorard, 2010; Sammons and Luyten, 2009; van de Grift, 2009).

Further consideration is given to efficiency and equity, or how much equity is likely to be improved by any given input of resources. High-quality early intervention (for example at pre-school or primary age) tends to mitigate the effects of social disadvantage on education (West, 2006), more so than later educational intervention (for example at secondary or post-compulsory ages). Early interventions could be seen as more efficient (Wößmann, 2008), partly because they are often targeted at children, families and communities and not just 'within schools' (for example, as evidenced in studies supported by the Bernard van Leer Foundation, 2007; 2009; Brooker and Woodhead, 2008). Such strategies, however, are long-term and reform is often determined by the current policy agenda of a country, rather than by longer term experience (Penny *et al*, 2008). Where resources for education are scarce, then the focus may be initially on expanding access to primary education via more private/fee paying schools but with the risk of lower participation (see Kruijer [2010] for trends in sub-Saharan African countries).

The consideration of what a "quality education" looks like is also contestable. For example, in England, the *Every Child Matters* (DfES, 2004) policy agenda promotes a range of outcomes for children's well-being and achievement which should, in theory, promote quality. However, in the UK as a whole, excellence in education has been defined as success in numeracy and literacy (Lloyd, 2000), and these subjects are the focus for testing at ages 5, 7 and 11. The outcomes of tests and examinations in primary

and secondary levels are used as an indicator of performance of the pupils, and of teachers. Similarly, in the USA, the main aspects of education that are judged to be indicative of quality are test scores, possibly because they are easy to compare within and across schools. This is despite the fact that the USA *No Child Left Behind* agenda (similar to *Every Child Matters* in England) points to many important aspects of children's lives, which should all show some progress (Torres, 2004).

At an international level, comparisons of progress and performance are also used to provide indicators of equity and quality, with countries being ranked on 'league tables' of performance. The OECD uses PISA, TIMSS and PIRLS scores (international assessments that judge not only what students have learned but also how well they can apply that knowledge) to compare the educational progress of different countries. Although such scores do not assess interpersonal skills that might be required in later life, the tests are regarded as providing a less curriculum-focused assessment than most national tests. PISA, for example, is a statistical prediction of mean performance of different groups and is useful for revealing how equitable learning outcomes are, and how these are achieved both within and between schools, and across national education systems more generally. While such tests can allow for negotiation of some of the hazards of international comparisons, it should be borne in mind when comparing countries that education systems and their wider national contexts are not evenly matched, so to use certain countries as benchmarks for "what can be achieved" may, at times, be inappropriate (Alegre and Ferrer, 2010; Clancy and Goastellec, 2007). Benchmarking across OECD countries includes mainly those in the 'highly developed and developed world', (which is also the minority world) but has informed the rhetoric of 'world-class' education systems which is applied to majority world countries. This is in spite of the fact that many OECD countries have deeply entrenched problems with equity, equality and quality in their education systems for minority groups (including indigenous populations), and in relation to gender. Furthermore, the 'globalization' agenda means that governments increasingly look to other countries for solutions to local educational problems, or to inform the development of their systems. However, uncritical policy-borrowing is inherently problematic because of differences in the evolution of educational systems over time, and the contemporary socio-political and socio-economic contexts of their development. Uncritical policy-borrowing also ignores the contextual specificity that is central to contemporary cultural theories of learning, and

to informing equity and diversity (Gutiérrez and Rogoff, 2003; Hedegaard and Fleer; 2008.) Any claims to 'world class' education systems must be tempered by the limitation of this term to predominantly developed (minority world) countries, by their use of performance goals rather than equity goals (for teachers and for children), and by the failure consistently to incorporate issues of equity and quality.

The foregoing matters of equity and quality are major international concerns, because it is generally agreed that in many education systems across the world, children from disadvantaged backgrounds tend to achieve lower scores in academic tests than children from more privileged backgrounds (e.g. McGaw, 2008; UNESCO, 2008). In addition, within the broad term 'disadvantage', some groups will be more disadvantaged than others (such as Gypsy Romani Traveller children, [Levinson, 2007; 2008], other nomadic groups, and refugee and asylum-seeking children [Bourgonje, 2010]). The increased privatization and marketisation of education in many countries, where "consumers" have a "choice" of which school their children attend (the implication being that parents will want to send their children to schools which offer a high "quality" of education, illustrated by high test scores in the school), has led to discussions of the tensions between ensuring equity and equity (e.g. Morley *et al*, 2009). In Uganda, for example, the introduction of universal primary education led to many richer parents anticipating a drop in the quality of education, and removing their children from publicly-funded schools and into private education. Following the exodus of more privileged children from the publicly-funded sector, the drop in quality did indeed occur (Penny *et al*, 2008). This illustrates an issue identified by Ball and Youdell (2009), that achieving equality is made more complicated by the fact that, in the developing world, these privatisation tendencies are embedded in, and in some instances accelerated by, efforts to establish universal education provision:

In these contexts privatisation tendencies frequently coexist with, or are presented as a vehicle for achieving, commitments to equality. These are rarely recognised at a policy level as being in tension, and the effects of this juxtaposition are yet to fully play out. (2009: 15)

The relationship between equity and test scores, though, is not clear cut. Some countries manage to achieve high average test scores and high levels of equity across

their education systems. Others, however (notably the UK and Australia) have high average test scores on international tests and low levels of equity according to social background (McGaw, 2008). Consistent with contemporary socio-cultural theories of learning, what seems to matter most, however, is not only the social background of an individual child, but the “average social background” of those in the school. Alegre and Ferrer (2010) demonstrate that the social composition of schools - and thus, the extent to which the distribution of different student groups amongst schools is even or uneven - contributes significantly to the explanation of inequalities amongst students' learning opportunities. They argue that students from disadvantaged backgrounds would benefit from mixing with those from more privileged backgrounds, and of higher ability. The suggestion is that, while those who underachieve at school would benefit from such a mix, those who perform well at school would not be disadvantaged by it. This suggestion is borne out by the finding that the success of the most able children in schools across different countries differs little, but the support given to the least able differs widely between countries, thereby indicating that the impact of schooling and school systems is more profound on the most disadvantaged children (Perry, 2009). However, at the same time, policies and practices that focus on improving equity for pupils are also reliant on better teacher preparation and continuing education programmes, particularly in developing professional knowledge and understanding of how dimensions of diversity intersect, and how they are manifest in classrooms in ways that influence pupils' academic, social, personal and collective success (Milner, 2010).

The foregoing discussion indicates that equity matters for children in terms of their opportunities to participate in formal education, the quality of their experiences in school, the outcomes, and the long-term effects of their performance and achievement. In addition to institutional and structural influences, it is consistently evident that teachers matter in achieving equity for students, and ensuring quality of educational provision and outcomes. Indeed, issues of equity, equality and quality for children and teachers are inextricably linked, and are consistently the joint focus of teacher union policies. The second section turns to equity matters for teachers.

1.2: Equity Matters for Teachers

1.2a Why teachers matter

The foregoing issues surrounding equity and quality for children are also relevant for teachers. Teachers matter because they have a significant impact on student achievement and school quality (OECD, 2005; Scheopner, 2010). Promoting national as well as international goals (such as Education for All) depends on improving teachers' professionalism through teacher education, and improving their conditions of service (Kruijer, 2010). However, whilst teachers are at the 'front line' of delivering or mediating national policies, they may also be working under conditions that do not ensure equity and equality for themselves, or for children. For example, in economically developed countries such as the Australia, New Zealand, UK, USA, educational reform movements have expanded teachers' roles in relation to standards and accountability agendas that link student achievement to teacher remuneration and performance. In a review of primary teacher education in Sub-Saharan African countries Kruijer (2010) analyses the challenges of expanding teacher supply, education and employment in relation to the expansion of primary education as a whole. What links these different education systems are wider issues about equity: teacher performance and student performance may be influenced by non-academic factors which are beyond the remit of schools, and may or may not be addressed by country-specific social and economic policies. In addition, teachers work within systems that carry the legacy of structural and historical inequities, which influence what needs to be achieved, and what can be achieved within the resources available.

The legacy of historical inequity is implicated in 'the achievement gap' (Milner, 2010). The achievement gap amongst different groups or schools or countries is evidenced by standardized test data and international comparisons, and has become established as a powerful educational discourse in terms of where the greatest inequities can be identified (but interestingly the discourse does not always extend to identifying how these gaps can be addressed). Moreover, Milner draws on contemporary research to argue that the perceived achievement gap is an outcome of other gaps, including

the teacher quality gap, the teacher training gap, the challenging curriculum gap, the school funding gap, the digital divide gap, the wealth and income gap; the employment opportunity gap, the affordable housing gap, the health care gap,

the nutrition gap, the school integration gap, and the quality childcare gap.
(2010: 125)

This matrix is useful for summarizing the ways in which structural inequities operate at many levels in countries' socio-economic systems, and how they may be manifest within education settings at all levels, and for all stakeholders. An example here is the 'curriculum gap'. Many countries have moved, or are moving towards, centrally defined curricula with defined learning goals/outcomes, scripted pedagogical routines and practices, and standardized assessments (Ball and Youdell, 2009). The underpinning rhetoric of such curricula is access, equity and entitlement. The reality is that the curriculum may be narrowed to 'the basics' of literacy and mathematics, with teachers teaching to tests for those children who are underperforming or underachieving, thus reinforcing inequity and denying access to broad and balanced educational experiences. In addition, those countries that have embraced 'performativity' link teachers' remuneration and career progression to student outcomes, in spite of the fact that education, by itself, cannot ameliorate some of the conditions of children's lives.

It is useful to set Milner's perceived achievement gap alongside the United Nations (2008) report on the Millennium Development Goals, which include

1. Freedom from poverty and hunger
2. Universal education
3. Gender Equality
4. Child Health
5. Maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS
7. Environmental sustainability
8. Global Partnership.

This report identifies a matrix of gaps in equity that are impacting on the achievement of those goals. The issues that relate directly to education include:

- Primary school enrolment (currently at least 90% in all but 2 regions – Sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia)
- Gender parity index in primary education (currently at least 95% in 6 out of 10 regions, but 95 out of 113 countries that did not achieve this are not on course to achieve this in primary and secondary education by 2015).

- “Poor children receive less or no education”.
- Poor people who do not produce their own food in bad position – high food prices mean that they cannot afford to get enough food or access education & health services (high percentage of income given over to food).

In order to improve equity, the MDG report calls for public investment and public institutions to spend more on education, health and welfare infrastructures. Milner’s representation of the perceived achievement gap is useful for drawing attention to the intersections between areas of inequity in society, and how these impact on education. However, it should not be seen as a matrix of insoluble problems, but rather as a set of challenges in which teachers, and other stakeholders, can have transformative roles.

As indicated in the introductory section, aspirations towards improving the quality of educational provision rest substantially on teachers. Teachers matter within the educational effectiveness agenda because they are highly influential in securing improved outcomes for children. This has been reflected in the aspirations of unions, governmental and non-governmental organizations in terms of increasing teacher supply and improving professional development. However, once teachers are recruited, there are many issues that contribute to inequity between and within countries. Teacher pay, qualifications, status, working hours, working conditions, training and development opportunities, access to study leave; systems of appraisal, and level of support and training provided in the face of reform all can contribute to recruitment, job satisfaction, motivation, retention, and ultimately the quality of education that is delivered (e.g. Cele, 2005; OECD, 2005; Sahlberg, 2007; UNESCO 2008; West, 2006). There are structural inequities within the recruitment process. For example, the costs of further or higher education may disadvantage aspiring teachers from low SES groups; the poor quality of schooling may disenfranchise those who have potential but not the required levels of attainment; and discourses such as ‘primary teaching is for women’ serve to disadvantage men.

Most countries have a ‘mixed economy’ of public and private education, with some public funding of private provision. The ‘creep’ of privatization and quasi-marketisation in and of public education, in countries with developed and developing economies, is also seen as a threat to equity for teachers, as Ball and Youdell (2009) argue:

Forms of privatisation change how teachers are prepared; the nature of and access to ongoing professional development; the terms and conditions of teachers' contracts and pay; the nature of teachers' day-to-day activities and the way they experience their working lives. As the major 'cost' of educational delivery, teachers themselves become the focus of attention when economic rationalities are brought into play within education policy. Private providers of state education services often do not want to be hampered by the constraints of national pay agreements and restrictions on employment related to teachers' qualifications. There is pressure to substitute cheaper workers or introduce short term contracts or systems of performance-related pay. (Ball and Youdell, 2009: 14-15)

Teachers also matter because they are often at the intersection of implementing national or school policies in ways that are age- and culturally-appropriate for children. However, where national policies do provide guidance on improving equity and equality, teachers often find themselves in the position of negotiating paradoxes and finding solutions to dilemmas which result from the abstract nature of national policies, and assumptions about their universal application. An example of this is given by Coles (2008) in the context of the policy 'Every Child Matters' (ECM) (DfES, 2004) in England, which aimed to improve outcomes for children beyond the remit of the curriculum subjects. ECM relies on universal conceptions of children as a homogenous group. In contrast, Coles (2008) demonstrates the ways in which these policies need to be differentiated in their application to different minority and ethnic groups in relation to academic and welfare issues. Coles argues that the ECM goals should be informed by Islamic perspectives on the social, cultural and educational needs of Muslim children. These recommendations can be extended to include the spectrum of social and cultural diversity: teachers need culturally situated knowledge of children's home and community lives, which can lead to more informed ways of developing authentically inclusive practices.

Milner (2010) makes similar claims based on teacher education programmes in the USA, and calls for the development of diversity studies alongside the traditional focus on instructional practices and subject knowledge. He argues that teachers can create a culture of power within classrooms which can be gravely inconsistent with students'

experiences (2010: 123), and can create roadblocks to social justice and equity. For example, focusing on the Gypsy Traveller community in England, Levinson (2007) argues that the social and cultural capital that is developed in minority communities can be manifest in schools as 'negative assets'. This may be because teachers do not have the knowledge to understand how cultural ways of knowing influence children's different repertoires of participation (Gutiérrez and Rogoff, 2003). These issues are explored further in the following section, in the context of the impact of current policy discourses and trends in teacher education.

1.2b Teacher education – in-service and continuing professional development

If teachers matter, then teacher education programmes also matter to their professional preparation and development, and the extent to which they are able to contribute to a social justice agenda. Internationally, there are consistent calls for more, and better, teacher education at pre- and in-service stages. However, changes to teacher education are evident in several countries, and are being informed by neo-liberal and neo-conservative discourses. In the USA established (typically university-based routes to qualified teacher status) are being supplemented by alternative fast-track routes, including online programmes; summer programmes, that lead to temporary licensure; and residency programmes (Kumashiro, 2010: 57). Similar initiatives in England include the Graduate Teacher Programme, School-Centered Initial Teacher Training and Teach First, and are likely to gain further momentum under the policy direction of the current Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government.

Kumashiro (2010) argues that such initiatives signal not only an increase in competition for teacher preparation programmes, but also a devaluing of teacher education altogether: this devaluing is consistent with neo-liberal and neo-conservative discourses in which teaching is seen as 'common sense'. However, such a position is at odds with trends over the last two decades which have been targeted at *increased* professionalisation of teaching, with many countries working towards professional standards and competences (e.g. the four UK countries, New Zealand, USA), and regulation through inspection. Kruijer (2010) describes programmes aimed at upgrading unqualified teachers in sub-Saharan African countries, in response to the supply of ill-

trained or untrained teachers in primary schools. Kruijer documents the positive contribution this policy can make, alongside the conditions that need to be achieved to ensure the success of upgrading programmes, especially if they are to make an impact on equity and quality. As Kirk argues, whilst it is the responsibility of national governments to oversee the quality of the teaching workforce, there is a need to strike a more appropriate balance between professional autonomy and public accountability in teaching (2009: 12). There are global trends towards the adoption of new policy technologies in teacher education (regulation of teacher supply, professional standards, performativity, national and international benchmarking, school inspection regimes). However, there are limitations in the scope and impact of those policies on equity and quality. If concerns for social justice are excluded, or marginalised in teacher education programmes, then policy technologies may serve to improve performance (of teachers and of children) against a narrow set of 'measurable' targets, but may not improve equity or guarantee quality.

In the first section, it was established that schools in disadvantaged areas may be faced with the legacy of structural and historical inequity (this also includes 'outreach' provision for Traveller and Indigenous communities). At a broad level, historical inequity has ramifications throughout the education system for children and for teachers. For example, although post-compulsory education may now be theoretically more accessible in many countries, certain groups in society would not be well-equipped to take advantage of this due to inequitable access to quality education in earlier years (Brown, 2006). More specifically, there may be a desire for teacher recruitment patterns that are representative of a wide range of groups in society, but recruiting those who are themselves from disadvantaged backgrounds may be difficult. Aspiring teachers from such backgrounds may not have had the opportunities to be educated to a high level, so would not be eligible for teacher recruitment (UNESCO, 2008). Therefore in countries that experience 'teacher shortages', this may again be linked to structural inequities, so the cycles of disadvantage that occur for students also occur for teachers in terms of recruitment, training and development, and retention. The OECD report 'Teachers Matter' (OECD, 2005), focused on the key country-level trends in attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers. Nearly 50% of the participating countries reported concerns about teacher supply and retention. The reasons cited included the declining

status of teachers' salaries, and of teaching as a profession, poor working conditions and increasing workloads.

These issues may be exacerbated by the ways in which the 'global economic downturn' is affecting country-level changes in overall status and working conditions for teachers, alongside neo-conservative trends towards the marketisation and privatization of education. Other threats to equity for teachers include the erosion of agreements on national pay and working conditions, the erosion of collective bargaining via teacher unions, the increase in locally differentiated employment contracts, and the increasing use of 'para-professionals' who may be used instead of, rather than alongside, qualified teachers. Thus, whether education is funded by the private or public sector, or via private-public partnerships, there are likely to be points of 'trade-off' between equity and quality for teachers in their conditions of service. However, addressing structural inequities is part of a much wider endeavour, and what matters to teachers are the conditions under which they work on a day to day basis. In a review of international empirical research on attrition of teachers, focusing on public and Catholic schools in the USA, Scheopner (2010) identified some of the positive conditions that influence teacher retention such as good leadership, having access to a mentor and to advice from curriculum specialists, collegiality and positive relationships with colleagues, and developing personal resilience and self-efficacy.

In summary, the foregoing review indicates that equity matters for teachers and for children. Different countries have different trajectories of development towards a social justice agenda that incorporates goals for equity, equality, quality, inclusion, access and diversity. It might be assumed that some countries are further along this trajectory than others, or that there is a clear demarcation between 'developed' and 'developing' countries. However, global trends indicate common threats to education systems which may halt or reverse policies that have aimed towards improving provision and practices. Some of these issues trends are illustrated in the Section 2 and Section 3, which focuses on the data analysis from the Equity Matters study.

Section 2: Analysis of the Country-wide Survey Data

Theme A: Contextual Information

The first section provides the name of countries and unions, and those who responded to the pilot and main Lime Survey. The Case Study countries are in bold. Translations of the Lime Survey were sent to French and Spanish-speaking nations. Word and/or electronic versions of the survey were sent as requested, to facilitate response. As this analysis indicates, not all sections of the survey were completed fully by all the respondents, which has resulted in incomplete or missing data. This means that the data are limited in reliability and generalisability, but nonetheless do have indicative and illuminative value.

1. Sri Lanka: All Ceylon Union of Teachers (ACUT)
2. Nevis in the Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis: Nevis Teachers' Union (NTU)
3. Malta: Malta Union of Teachers (MUT)
4. Ireland: Association of Secondary Teachers Ireland (ASTI)
5. New Zealand: The New Zealand Education Institute NZEI Te Riu Roa . Our members include: • teachers in primary, area schools, and the early childhood sector • principals in mainstream primary, kura and special schools • support staff in early childhood and compulsory schooling sectors • advisers employed by the schools and faculties of education in universities • specialist education staff employed by the Ministry of Education. The interests of all children as learners in schools and centres are at the heart of what we do. For the purposes of this survey NZEI is responding on behalf of our ECE and Primary sector teacher members.
6. Canada: Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF)
7. Slovakia: ZPŠaV NKOS Slovakia (Independent Christian Trade Union of Slovakia) 8. New Zealand: New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association
9. Sweden: Swedish Teachers' Union Lärarförbundet (STU)
10. Israel: Israel Teachers Union (ITU)
11. Germany: Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) Trade Union for Education and Science
12. Denmark: Danish Union of Teachers (DUT)

13. UK: National Association Schoolteachers/ Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT)
14. Ireland (Republic): Irish National Teachers' Organisation (INTO)
15. The Netherlands: CNV Onderwijs
16. Zambia National Union of Teachers: ZNUT
17. Norway: The Union of Education, Norway (UEN)
18. Republic of Cyprus: OLTEK
19. Cyprus: Cyprus Turkish Secondary Education Teachers' Union
20. Poland: Polish Teacher Union, ZNP

NB: An incomplete survey response was received from the National Science Section (NSZZ, Solidarność), which is a higher education union. Some of the qualitative responses have been included in the Case Study for Poland.

21. Lithuania: Christian trade union of education workers - CTUEW
22. Liberia: Association of Liberian Professional Organizations (ALPO)
23. Ghana: Ghana National Association of Teachers (GNAT)
24. Australia: Australia Education Union (AEU)
25. Switzerland: Union of Public Service Employees (French)
26. France: SNES-FSU (French)
27. Maroc Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur (French)
28. Malaysia (NUTP) (incomplete Word version returned Appendix 2)
29. Kenya Kudheia Workers (incomplete Word version returned Appendix 3)
28. Survey from Spanish speaking union returned but responses are not recorded

Reference: [juanbautistamartinez&pct](#)

Plus pilot questionnaires from Poland, South Africa and USA.

The following table shows the countries by their place on the Human Development Index from the United Nations Development Programme (2009). The red indicated the survey was incomplete, the yellow means they have suggested relatively few inequities, but that may also relate to the level of detail in the responses. For the question “What are the main inequities in your country’s education system”, the two countries highlighted in blue, Denmark, and Nevis in St. Kitts, report that they “can’t think of any” (Denmark) or “None, we do not have a problem” (St. Kitts).

Very High HDI developed	High HDI, developing	Medium HDI developing	Low HDI developing
Ireland	Nevis and St. Kitts	Sri Lanka	Liberia
New Zealand	Slovakia	South Africa	Ghana
Canada	Poland	Morocco	Zambia (Kasempa)
Germany	Lithuania		
Denmark	Antigua + Barbuda		
UK	Serbia		
Netherlands	Latvia		
Norway			
Finland			
Australia			
Portugal			
USA			
Switzerland			
France			
Malta			
Israel			
Cyprus			
Sweden			

Theme B: Unions' Concepts, Goals and Policies

Question B1

Question 1 asked 'Could you please give your union's policy statement/s on equity below. If there are no such policy statements could you please outline your union's viewpoint on equity matters'.

The unions' statements vary from having no specific policy formulated (5), to having wide ranging policies that include broad principles of equity, or having more detailed policy statements that focus on specific areas (including a focus on human rights as the basis for equity matters, and the fundamental role of education in improving social justice for societies). The areas targeted for equity policies for teachers and for children include:

Gender, sexual orientation, sexuality, LGBT persons, race, religion, ethnicity, marital status, colour, creed, ethical or religious beliefs, ability or disability, age, political opinion, employment status, family status, social class/income/rich and poor, second language learners

Specifically for teachers, the equity issues identified include

Equal pay, equal treatment, equal conditions and salaries, modelling principles of equity in union practices, equal opportunities for career progression regardless of sex, preventing discrimination on the basis of trade union membership.

The unions provide advocacy and lobbying functions across the areas identified above, as well as areas in education and wider social policy, including funding, equal access to education (including children with disabilities/special educational needs); education as a human right; education as a base for social cohesion and democratic development; education as an aspect of public and governmental funding and responsibility; advocacy against intolerance, prejudice and discrimination; fair and transparent selection procedures; fighting against a limited access to education for certain social groups (depending on their financial status and social background). The following statement from the Teachers' Union of Ireland is an example of a union policy statement which indicates specific areas of activity:

TUI policy on equity is documented through various motions agreed at our annual congresses over a number of years. These include - fair and transparent selection procedures for entry to second level schools requiring all schools to enrol a mix of students in accordance with the local demographic profile; disability/special needs, ethnic minorities, socio-economic profile etc; additional resources (staff, grants, facilities) to ensure schools can meet the needs of particular and special interest groups within mainstream settings; special educational needs; ethnic minorities; those for whom English is a second language; additional weightings for schools (teacher numbers, grants, supports for schools in areas of high socio economic disadvantage).

It might be expected that, where given, the unions' policy statements on equity would include this range of issues. However, it may be that those unions who do not have an equity statement, or who are currently formulating one, might benefit from considering the more detailed equity statements of other countries. See Also Appendix 1. Australian Education Union – Statement on Equity, for a detailed and comprehensive policy statement. The equity goals for the AEU are linked to strategic policy directions, encompassing different levels of governance (commonwealth, state and/or region), and alliances with other organisations. The AEU equity statement also includes the 'characteristics of desirable provision', and the target areas for improvement in terms of equity and quality. As such, it illustrates country-specific equity goals and how these might be addressed. Additional details of unions' statements and the remit of their activities is available on their websites, along with details of current campaigns.

Question B2

Question 2 asked 'Which equity issues are included in union and/or government policies and which have been implemented in practice?' Respondents were asked to select from 15 statements about equity matters. They were able to add any policies that were not included in the list. The respondents were then asked to indicate which of these equity matters were most important for teachers and for students. Appendix 4 shows the Frequency Table for these responses.

Most of the equity issues are contained in union policies, with 22-27 respondents stating each was in union policy (n=32). For each statement, 2-5 respondents stated they were not in union policy. Likewise most of the equity issues are addressed in government policy, with between 24 to 29 respondents stating each statement was represented. (N=32), and between 1-3 respondents stating each was not in government policy.

Two equity statements had 22 respondents saying they were in union policy – the lowest number. These were ‘equity for students with physical disabilities’ (5 stated this was not in union policy, 5 didn’t know or left blank) and ‘equity for students with learning disabilities’ (3 stated this was not in union policy and 7 didn’t know or left blank). Serbia, Lithuania and Germany were the three countries that stated neither of these issues is in union policy, Finland and Latvia said ‘equity for students with learning disabilities’ was not in union policy. The respondent from Zambia did not know if either of these statements was in union policy, and the Finnish survey did not know if equity of students with learning disabilities was catered for. Slovakia, Norway, Cyprus and Sweden gave no comment to either of these, Lithuania did not respond to the learning disability statement.

Two equity statements had 24 respondents saying they were in government policy – the lowest number. These were ‘equity for teachers in terms of career opportunities’ (3 respondents said this was not in policy, and 5 respondents didn’t know or omitted the question) and equity for teachers in terms of pay and phase taught (1 said it was not in government policy, 7 didn’t know or omitted the question). Although 3 respondents stated ‘equity for teachers in terms of pay and conditions’ was not in government policy (the highest number who indicated that a statement was not in government policy) 26 respondents said it was. Lithuania, Germany and Morocco said ‘equity for teachers in terms of career opportunity’ was not in policy, one of the respondents from Ireland and the Swiss respondent did not know, and Israel, Norway and Liberia omitted the question. The Swedish representative said ‘equity for teachers in terms of pay and phase taught’ was not in government policy; Finland, France and Switzerland didn’t know; and Israel, Norway Morocco and Liberia omitted the question. For the item ‘equity for teachers in terms of conditions of service’, Germany, Lithuania and Morocco all state this is not in government policy.

The issues most respondents said were in union policy were 'equity for teachers in terms of conditions of service' (27), 'equity of educational access for students', 'equity for teachers in terms of job security', 'equity of educational resource distribution', 'equity for students of all genders' (26). The issues most respondents said were in government policy were 'equity of educational access (phase)', 'equity across all areas', 'equity of educational outcomes', and 'equity of students of all genders' (29). For the latter two, no respondents said this was not in government policy.

A relatively high amount of "missing data" in the form of non-response, or selecting "I don't know" were found in response to the 'equity for students with learning disabilities' (7), 'equity of students from all cultural/ethnic backgrounds', and 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and qualifications' (6) in statements regarding union policy. The same level of "missing data" was found in response to 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and phase taught' (7), 'equity for teachers in terms of career opportunities', 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and gender', 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and level of qualification', 'equity for students of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds', and 'equity for students with learning disabilities' (5) in statements regarding government policy.

In general, more respondents omitted the question, or selected "Don't know" than chose the "Not in policy" box. The statements with the largest non-response in both categories were 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and phase of education taught' (5 union, 7 government), 'equity for students with learning disabilities' (7 union, 5 government), 'equity for teachers in terms of pay and level of qualification' (6 union, 5 government) and 'equity for students of all cultural ethnic backgrounds' (6 union, 5 government).

The total non-response is 67 for whether a statement is in union policy, and 62 for government policy (spread over 15 statements).

Some unions commented that although some of the policies were in union and/or government policies, it was difficult to state that they had been implemented fully, or achieved. This is because many equity and equality matters are ongoing. The NASUWT respondent indicated that the union

works to ensure that all aspects of its work embeds its commitment to promoting equality and diversity and tackling discrimination and prejudice. However, in relation to Government, while it would be possible to point to aspects of policy

and legislation that aim to address the areas highlighted in the questions set out above, the NASUWT's view is that inequities can be identified in all these areas. In this respect, none of these aspects of Government policy can be said to have been implemented fully given this incomplete achievement of these objectives.

This comment is useful for highlighting the ongoing development of unions' goals and policies for equity, and the extent to which those goals can be 'fully' achieved. It is also interesting to note that, because of the 'global economic crisis' some equity goals have been halted, or even reversed. For example, the respondent from ASTI (Ireland), noted that the 'State has specific policy for promoting equity in education for our indigenous minority, the Traveller (nomadic) community', but the Case Study for Ireland indicates the reversal of some aspects of policy for this group. Similarly, the respondent for Canada (see Case Study), noted

the growing threat coming from international efforts (just arriving in Canada) of conservative fundamentalist arguments for tying teacher tenure and compensation to their students' outcomes on narrow standardized tests.

The NZEI identified a number of threats which would undermine the need to 'raise the tail of underachievement' in New Zealand, ranging from early childhood to tertiary education:

Sadly government education policy is removing a number of 'learning pathways' through rising tertiary fees – and encouraging targeted tertiary funding towards employment and entrepreneurial pathways. Many faculties have been cut or dismantled – such as the Early Childhood Education faculty at some universities.

Question B3

In Question 3, respondents were asked to add any other equity issues, and to indicate whether they were in union and/or government policies. In Q4, respondents were asked to identify the 3 most important equity issues in union policies for students (Q5), and for teachers (Q6), and to give reasons for their choices for students and for teachers (Q7).

The data in this section should be read and understood with some caveats. The issue of context clearly matters in the unions' responses. The NASUWT respondent expressed

concerns that the questions in this section invited an approach that seeks to establish some form of 'hierarchy of equity based on the perceived relative importance of particular dimensions of equalities work'. Some of the respondents noted that it was difficult to indicate which of the items were 'most important', because all were important in unions' policies, and some items (such as funding, gender and socio-economic status) influence equity across the other items. This inter-relationship between items is exemplified by the German respondent in the context of their importance for students:

- Equity of educational access: We have a highly selecting school system
- Equity for students of all socio-economic backgrounds: The selection is superficially done by performance, but in fact by social background.
- Equity for students with disabilities: After the ratification of the UN convention for People with Disabilities by the German government, equity for these students is a very urgent issue.

The intention underlying this section was to obtain some understanding of whether some equity items were more important than others at a particular time, and in the context of each country's trajectory of development. This is because some equity matters may be more pressing than others in a country's education system, and some equity issues may need to be addressed before others. For example, for Zambia, providing access to students from poor and disadvantaged families to quality education, regardless of location, is an important equity goal that aims to overcome some of the country's structural and historical inequities. In countries with scarce resources, access to basic education may have to be prioritised before other equity goals. The respondent for the Teachers' Union of Ireland indicated that equity of resources distribution is important because

weighting of resources in favour of particular interest groups is, in many cases, necessary to ensure that they have equal opportunities [and is] an important mechanism to allow schools to offer adequate service according to student population and needs.

Table 2.1 sets out the 9 equity issues relating to students, and gives the number of times it is mentioned as 'most important' in union policy (highest to lowest frequency).

Equity issues for students	No of times mentioned as most important in union policy
2 educational outcomes	17
1 educational access	16
3 educational resource distribution	14
4 socio-economic	14
6 cultural ethnic	6
8 Learning Disabilities	5
5 gender	5
7 Physical Disabilities	4
9 rural urban	3

Table 2.1 Equity issues for students

Additional responses:

In Sri Lanka, all union correspondence is in three educational resource distribution languages. Equal opportunities are given, and merit is given priority. The respondent from New Zealand indicated access to quality public education for all students as an additional point, and Liberia commented that all issues were important. The respondent from Lithuania noted that the breach of principles of equity at primary and secondary level – the needs of community members (teachers, students, parents) are not taken into consideration .

Table 2.2 sets out the 9 equity issues relating to teachers, and gives the number of times it is mentioned as ‘most important’ in union policy (highest to lowest frequency).

Equity issues for teachers	No of times mentioned as most important in union policy
11 Conditions of Service	16
10 career opportunities	13
12 job security	13

15 pay and qualifications	11
14 pay and gender. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and gender.	8
9 rural urban	6
13 pay and phase of education	4

Table 2.2 Equity issues for teachers

Some gave answers in range 1-8 which have been discounted as it was unclear what they refer to (Nevis, Sweden). The responses for Kenya were as follows:

- a) Teacher unions are always represented in Ministry of Education forums which formulate education policies
- b) Teacher unions formulate policies not to represent teachers who do not attend classes or who absent themselves.

Equity issues for students and teachers

That educational outcomes, access, resource distribution appear most frequently in Table 2.1 is perhaps not surprising in that these are fundamental to achieving equity and equality. These three items are also referred to in relation to other equity issues.

Gender for students was mentioned as an additional factor by 5 respondents. A statement specifically about faith-based education for boys came from Israel: 'There is no equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector since most of its schools do not teach core curriculum and they are under-budgeted'. Ghana notes positive discrimination for 'the girl child' and women in education, stating that it is policy at both governmental and union levels that 'special attention should be paid to the right of girl-child and women to education in view of their special circumstances'. An issue that arose in the Survey and Case Study responses was the level of specificity given about gender issues in relation to achievement. For example, the NASUWT's statement was quite broad:

...the key point in respect of educational gender equality in the view of the NASUWT is that educational provision must be established that ensures that boys and girls are able to have their educational needs met effectively and which

allows them to reach the highest level of attainment of which they are capable. This can require the deployment of approaches to curriculum design and implementation that are designed specifically to address gender inequalities. For the NASUWT, it is this consideration that should be given primacy in strategies to address educational gender inequality.

This comment raises the issue about broad and specific inequities, which is relevant across the survey. For example, In England (as in other countries), gender inequities are inter-dependent because they can be identified broadly on the lines of socio-economic status, ethnicity and differential outcomes of boys and girls. However, it is specific groups of boys and girls who suffer the most marked inequities in terms of their school achievements, and the longer-term impacts of relatively lower outcomes. The Case Studies for Ireland, Canada and New Zealand also identify the groups in which children are more/most marginalised, and for whom specific interventions might be needed (notably children from Indigenous and Traveller communities, and children with special educational needs and disabilities). The key issue here is that, in order to achieve equity, boys and girls, and other minority/disadvantaged groups within countries' populations, may need to be treated differently through the provision of specific programmes or interventions, specialist teachers or dedicated funding. The respondent from Slovakia noted that it is important to secure the same opportunities for 'the weak socio-economic students'.

Focusing on gender equity and teachers, Israel notes that while there is full gender equity at union level, there is no such equity in terms of representation in the country's parliament. New Zealand stated gender equality in terms of pay and employment equity is a union policy. However, there is a disparity of pay between those working in the early childhood phase (up to age 6), from those working in the primary and secondary phases. The NZEI respondent noted that the government has 'refused to acknowledge the results of pay investigations for some of the sector's lowest paid women workers, and undone gains made by previous governments in this area'. (It should be noted here that NZEI represents a range of educational support workers as well as teachers). Lithuania has a Council of Equal Opportunities which is 'responsible for the raising of public awareness towards equity, accepts and solves cases of complaints in the field of equity and gives consultations'. The union itself also provides legal protection and

representation in cases of gender discrimination. Zambia notes that there are more female teachers in urban areas, and that the posting of married teachers to rural areas needs a range of policy solutions (The Case Study for Zambia gives further details of why these are equity issues for teachers and for children). The New Zealand PPTA also commented that teachers suffer relative disadvantage because of geographical isolation, for example, resources, professional development and professional support. Norway has an 'Inclusive Workplace' agreement, which states that there has to be a '40% female share' on every private and public board. Where teachers do have equal pay (for example England, Ireland and New Zealand have equal pay for men and women and across the sectors) they may not have the same opportunities for promotion and salary progression because they may be in smaller schools, or in early childhood (kindergarten) settings. The New Zealand PPTA respondent noted that men outnumber women in promotional positions, and is reflected in income distribution statistics.

The respondents from Ireland raised the issues of job security for all, salary reduction and pension inequities for new teachers (all of which have been caused by 'austerity measures' as a result of the impact of the economic crisis - see Case Study for Ireland for further details). The AST respondent indicated the fragility of teachers' conditions of service: 'An emerging issue is the need for maintenance of high professional standards and non-admission of non-qualified personnel into teaching'. Similarly in Serbia, the three most important issues were pay and level of qualifications, job security and conditions of service. This is because salaries have been frozen for two years so teachers have 'a bad material position'; equity of pay for teachers in preschool education has not been implemented; there are redundancies as a consequence of Government reforms in education, including the pension scheme. In the Netherlands, some rural areas are coping with a decreasing population, and decreasing numbers of students. Fewer schools are needed, and jobs are being lost.

In Poland, the respondent stated issues around sex education and sexuality, noting that schools base their position on the teachings of the Catholic Church in this regard. (It might be implied by this statement that equity issues for gender, LGBT, sexualities might be more difficult to advocate or to achieve under these conditions). The respondent from Lithuania identified two issues: gaining new qualifications for teachers, and equity for teachers in terms of pay.

Questions B10 and B11

Q10 asks whether there are any barriers to achieving equity, and Q11 asks for examples. If respondents do not give any examples, they proceeded to Q12. Those who indicated N/A or omitted the question were Finland, Norway, Antigua and Barbuda and Morocco. 7 countries indicated that there were no barriers to achieving equity, Nevis in the Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis, Denmark, The Netherlands, Cyprus, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia (Cyprus did list an inequity despite answering no). The majority of countries (21) did indicate that there are barriers to achieving equity. Those responses highlighted in blue are from developing countries.

Table 2.3a sets out what are the main barriers, and Table 2.3b summarises some of the main responses to these questions in three areas: structural barriers, barriers for teachers, barriers for children. In Table 2.3a the comments highlighted in bold are those from developing countries. These three areas should be seen as interrelated, in that the structural barriers impact on equity matters (and on the quality of education) in each of the categories.

Funding	<p>Excessive amounts of public funding to private schools at the expense of adequate funding for public schools which educate the majority of students with particular needs</p> <p>Inadequate funding</p> <p>No equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector they are under-budgeted.</p> <p>The govt has not forwarded budget for this year.</p> <p>Some areas of the country have access to more funding than others. Best example, underfunding of indigenous students</p> <p>Inadequate funding to ameliorate socio-economic disadvantage.</p> <p>Inadequate funding for students with learning disabilities or for students with disadvantaged socio economic background</p> <p>Deficit funding</p> <p>Inadequate funding</p> <p>Inadequate funding is a key barrier and impacts in a number of ways</p> <p>Inadequate funding due to economical crises particularly</p> <p>Inadequate funding is always a problem</p> <p>Funding is always an issue.</p> <p>There are substantial discrepancies between local government units when it comes to education financing.</p> <p>Demographic aspect- population decline brings about reduced expenditure on education. Fewer students means less money transferred to a given school according to the principle of so-called educational vouchers.</p> <p>Inadequate funding may lead to lack of equity in rural schools as the resources and educational materials may be less</p>
---------	---

Cultural/ ethnic	<p>Inadequate policy response to the particular needs and circumstances of Indigenous students</p> <p>No equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector they are under-budgeted.</p> <p>Underfunding of indigenous students</p> <p>Barriers to access to leadership positions for black and minority ethnic teachers</p> <p>A system of education and curriculum that is still largely euro-centric in nature that fails to cater adequately for those from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds.</p> <p>Schools have insufficient supports to cater effectively for those for whom English is a second language</p>
SEN	<p>Integration of disabled children is done without the necessary resources, with the consequence that even teachers who are in favour of this in theory are now against it.</p> <p>At the expense of adequate funding for public schools which educate the majority of students with particular needs</p> <p>Adequate funding for students with learning disabilities</p> <p>Schools have insufficient supports to cater effectively for those with special educational needs</p>
Socio-economic	<p>Inadequate funding to ameliorate socio-economic disadvantage.</p> <p>Adequate funding for students with disadvantaged socio economic background</p> <p>Ireland has a very unequal income distribution with consequences extending beyond families into schools</p> <p>Research is consistent in indicating that children from low income families, including those dependant on social assistance, have lower literacy levels, leave school earlier and experience more difficulties while at school.</p>
Curricular inequity	<p>A self-managing school system that enables schools to determine and interpret curriculum contextually</p> <p>There is no equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector since most of its schools do not teach core curriculum</p> <p>The extent to which the curriculum and qualifications structure supports the promotion of equality and diversity</p> <p>A system of education and curriculum that is still largely euro-centric in nature that fails to cater adequately for those from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds.</p>
Resources	<p>Integration of disabled children is done without the necessary resources</p> <p>Inadequate distribution resources between schools and systems</p> <p>inadequate resources</p> <p>Resources are not properly distributed.</p> <p>Some areas of the country have access to more resources than others.</p> <p>Inadequate funding may lead to lack of equity in rural schools as the resources and educational materials may be less</p>
Teacher training/ professional development	<p>Inadequate teacher professional development</p> <p>Teacher professional development is inadequate especially in terms of up skilling for working with the above groupings (SEN, EAL)</p>
Pay	<p>Educators in nurseries and creches are badly paid.</p> <p>Tough negotiations are taking place with the Government regarding the issues of teachers' pay</p>
Rural/ urban	Uneven distribution of manpower between rural and urban areas

	Some areas of the country have access to more funding and resources than others. Inadequate funding may lead to lack of equity in rural schools
Gender	(Educators in nurseries and creches are badly paid.) As a consequence you don't find men working in these sectors.
Selective schooling	Selective school structure A selective philosophy even in schools themselves and in the minds of teachers and parents
Age	Impact of age discrimination on teachers and the education system generally
ICT	ICT is very poorly developed both in terms of access to broadband, hardware facilities and software and digital mediums
Staffing	Reduction of the number of teaching posts in secondary education, resulting in larger classes.
Class size	Reduction of the number of teaching posts in secondary education, resulting in larger classes.
Private public divide	Excessive amounts of public funding to private schools at the expense of adequate funding for public schools
	Tough negotiations are taking place with the Government regarding the shortcomings of the education reforms
	The impact of far right racist and fascist organisations on the schools system,
	Prejudice related bullying
	Shortage of teachers
	Trends of privatization and deregulation
	The mainly half-day school system
	Mismanagement issues.
	Lack of follow through on policies.
	Main barriers are the broader inequalities in Irish society Schools cannot compensate for society and notwithstanding the best efforts of the State and the development of various interventions to "target" educational inequalities, the external environment is still dominant.

Table 3a: Barriers to achieving equity

Structural barriers	Barriers for teachers	Barriers for children
Conditions of service Discrimination	Access to leadership positions for black and minority ethnic teachers. Impact of age discrimination on teachers and the education system Pay and salaries, promotion	Lack of positive role models
Funding/resources, distribution Management/mismanagement	Salaries, regional disparities, urban/rural inequities. Teacher shortages Excessive amounts of public funding to private schools at the expense of adequate funding for public schools	Buildings and facilities, support for learning, quality of provision (especially for SEN, minority and indigenous students). Most students with SEN in public section schools – lower funding. Class size

		Access to internet and ICT
Broader inequalities in society, very unequal income distribution	Schools cannot compensate for society	Impact on children and families – achievement and outcomes
ITE and CPD	Inadequate teacher professional development (quantity and quality) Up-skilling needed especially for SEN, minority and indigenous students, second language learners	Lack of skilled/specialist teachers
Privatisation and deregulation	Selective philosophy even in schools themselves and in the minds of teachers and parents	Selection, choice, access
Urban/rural	Teacher supply	Fewer educational resources in rural areas Access
Demographics	Teacher demand/supply	Lower school enrolment
Education reforms and policies Impact of economic crisis.	Teachers' pay and conditions Privatisation Reversal of some policy gains in pay, pensions.	Curriculum 'Euro-centric' – fails to cater for those from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds; content/choice/focus Inadequate policy response to the particular needs and circumstances of Indigenous students. The extent to which the curriculum and qualifications structure supports the promotion of equality and diversity

Table 3b: Barriers to achieving equity: the impact of structural barriers on teachers and children

Funding and resources underpin most of the areas identified here, although there are concerns about the misuse, mismanagement or misdirection of both. The country-specific responses in the Survey give more contextual detail about some of the socio-cultural differences between countries, which explain specific inequities:

In the "inferior" school forms are mainly those children with a difficult social background or a different cultural background. Most schools are not really barrier-free for people with disabilities. Boys do in several disciplines perform much worse than girls. Girls have much worse opportunities after compulsory schools going into the job market than boys. (GEW)

The main barrier is the selective school structure. Other barriers are: a deficit funding; a selective philosophy even in schools themselves and in the minds of teachers and parents; trends of privatization and deregulation; the mainly half-day school system. (GEW)

There is no equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector since most of its schools do not teach core curriculum and they are under-budgeted. (ITU)

Regarding these three areas as interrelated indicates that there are potentially virtuous and negative cycles of inequity. For example, the Case Study for Zambia indicates that when young women do not have access to secondary or tertiary education, they cannot gain the qualifications needed to enter teacher education programmes. These factors then impact on the supply of female teachers, and the lack of positive role models for girls. Issues of access to education (for boys and girls) are compounded by rural/urban funding and resourcing, as well as wider socio-economic and socio-cultural factors. In Serbia, students from poor families cannot afford fees for Higher Education, and students from rural areas have no access to different education institutions in higher secondary education. Similarly the barriers identified in the quotations above from the GEW indicate the structural inequities in society are mirrored in the education system. A negative cycle may be created when children from disadvantaged backgrounds are placed in low-performing schools, especially where there are low expectations of student performance. In terms of creating virtuous cycles, and improving equity matters, the solutions to these problems are multiple, complex and interdependent.

In looking at the barriers to equity for the teachers, funding again emerges as a key influence. But it is not simply the amount of funding available, but how, and where in the system that is used. The issues of 'where' relates to age phase, to specific inequities, and to the rural/urban agenda. For example, there are issues of rurality in Zambia and Liberia, as well as in New Zealand, Australia and Canada, which may also link with the barriers for indigenous populations. Where ITE and CPD are identified as requiring more

investment, there are specific area for attention (as evidenced in other areas of this study – see Section C), such as improving cultural knowledge and understanding of diversity, and enabling teachers to support children with disabilities and special educational needs.

Whilst the data in this study indicate that these structures and conditions for inequity exist, it is much more challenging to understand the relative importance of characteristics (such as social class, ethnicity, gender, special educational needs), and how those intersect, in explaining educational under-achievement among specific groups of children. More nuanced research is needed how these 'barriers' to equity work in individual countries, and for specific communities. Such research would also provide the contextual detail that is missing from monitoring reports that focus on educational outcomes in curriculum subjects.

Question B12

Question 12 asks: What do you think are the main inequities in your country's education system? Question 13 asks for examples of these inequities.

Table 4 gives a summary of Q12 and Q13, showing the equity issues identified in the survey, and the total number of occurrences in each of the main categories (socio-economic, cultural/ethnic, SEN, gender, rural/urban, general funding, government, achievement, and 'other'). The table does not imply a hierarchy as the respondents were not asked to list these items in terms of their ranking (from most to least important). Whilst these equity issues have been categorised for the purpose of the analysis, one of the respondents commented that there are 'some very complicated policy questions here'. This comment is applicable across the categories, because many of these issues are inter-related, as is evident Table 3, and in the Survey and Case Study responses (and as reflected in the literature review). Moreover, the responses indicated many culturally-sensitive issues. For example, the Israel respondent commented that 'There is no equity in the Jewish ultra orthodox sector [for boys] since most of its schools do not teach core curriculum and they are under-budgeted'. In common with the comment from the Poland respondent about the influence of the Catholic Church on education, faith-

based influences on equity are perhaps less amenable to national or supra-national strategic solutions.

The categorisation in Table 4 indicates some overlap between the statements (e.g. inequities in SEN provision are attributed to resources, and to lack of teachers and/or specialist teachers). The highest number of statements about country-level inequities is for socio-economic and cultural/ethnic. This is consistent with the issues raised in the literature review: poverty and low socio-economic status are consistently associated (and often correlated) with poorer outcomes for children, for example in low levels of literacy, participation in education, age of leaving school, career and employment opportunities. However, other school-level factors are implicated, such as school choice, user fee systems, privatisation, and access to early childhood education.

The category of culture and ethnicity gives some indication of which minority groups are likely to be most disadvantaged, and which aspects of the education system are implicated in sustaining those disadvantages (resources, curriculum, participation rates, school choice policies). In the section on SEN, the lack of support is strongly indicated (insufficient staff and insufficient specialist staff) as are the limitations in resources and facilities. Gender remains an important area of general and specific equity issues, but is less frequently mentioned than the previous two categories. The country-specific case studies provide details of gender equity issues for teachers and for children, and suggest that, whilst this is an area in which much progress has been made, further progress is needed. The issue of rural/urban inequities was indicated by developed and developing countries in relation to resourcing, teacher supply, and access to educational provision. This category intersects with the general funding and resource distribution categories, because of infrastructure and governance factors that operate at national and regional/state levels, such as teacher education, pay and conditions of service, as well as general lack of co-ordination between government departments. This last factor is significant in light of the issues raised in the literature review, namely that complex problems require co-ordinated solutions across several areas of government (such as health, housing, social welfare).

The category on achievement can be seen as reflecting some of the previous categories, but there are some specific indicators of what influences achievement (for example, access to libraries and ICT). This section also reflects the argument proposed

by Milner (2010) that the achievement gap is part of a matrix of equity gaps in society's provision. As dimensions of diversity intersect, so do dimensions of inequity and inequality.

Inequity	Statement (as typed on survey)	Number
Socio-economic	<p>Literacy and overall educational achievement levels closely related to income and class</p> <p>socio-economic background</p> <p>social background</p> <p>social & economic disadvantage</p> <p>social inequities</p> <p>User fee system; massive socio-economic inequality in the wider society</p> <p>Socio-economic background</p> <p>socio-economic differences</p> <p>Past school choice policies have disadvantaged those from low socio-economic backgrounds.</p> <p>educational disadvantage for those from low socio economic backgrounds</p> <p>socio-economic background</p> <p>poverty</p> <p>Socio economic status</p> <p>rich/poor</p> <p>divide between rich and poor</p> <p>rich and poor</p> <p>economical polarisation</p> <p>Outcomes for low SES students</p> <p>social polarisation</p> <p>Preliminary (elementary) school education from weak social groups.</p> <p>Massive disparities in income due to the user fee system (it is not clear whether this is school income)</p>	22

Cultural/ ethnic (including language)	<p>Students of all cultural ethnic backgrounds</p> <p>Cultural ethnic background</p> <p>The euro-centric nature of the NZ curriculum presents barriers to indigenous and other ethnic groups. Past school choice policies have disadvantaged the above groups.</p> <p>Aboriginal education</p> <p>Issues of family background, especially for migrants.</p> <p>Aboriginal funding</p> <p>Cultural / ethnic background</p> <p>Ethnic and cultural background educational disadvantage for those from cultural minorities</p> <p>Discrimination against immigrant students</p> <p>Discrimination of the Arab Sector</p> <p>Traveller children</p> <p>Access and outcomes for Indigenous students</p> <p>English as a second language (support for)</p> <p>Francophones in minority setting</p> <p>Policy for inter-culturalism is under-developed. All foreign national children are entitled to access to schools and 2-years English language support. No policy in place to ensure that the familiar pattern of under-achievement of migrant children does not occur.</p> <p>Francophone minority</p> <p>Inadequate funding for supporting education of foreign national students</p> <p>Children of immigrants coming from North Africa are finding it very difficult to integrate in our rigid educational system.</p> <p>Resources for immigrant children</p> <p>Resources for immigrant families</p> <p>Indigenous minority, Traveller community, has unacceptably low levels of educational participation and achievement. Very complicated policy questions here.</p>	20
SEN	<p>Schools not suitable for students with learning disabilities</p> <p>Classes are too big - needs of students are not being met, especially those who have literacy or numeracy problems</p>	16

	<p>Special needs</p> <p>Special educational needs (supports for)</p> <p>Not enough teachers to help students with literacy and numeracy difficulties</p> <p>Not enough student support services to assist students with emotional and behavioural problems</p> <p>Learning disabilities</p> <p>Schools do not have enough specialist staff - teaching and otherwise - to respond to problems presented by students - emotional and behavioural; learning disabilities; literacy and numeracy problems</p> <p>There is little provision for teachers to work with children with special needs</p> <p>Learning disabilities / special needs</p> <p>Inadequate funding for special needs services</p> <p>Physical and learning disabilities</p> <p>Learning disabilities</p> <p>Physical disabilities</p> <p>Resourcing for Students with disabilities/special needs</p>	
Gender	<p>Gender issues</p> <p>The principles of gender equality are respected in the education sector; there are rare cases of discrimination on the grounds of gender in the education sector.</p> <p>Gender</p> <p>Issues of gender.</p> <p>Gender</p> <p>Gender in the Jewish Ultra-orthodox sector</p> <p>gender issues</p> <p>Imbalances in terms of teacher distribution in terms of gender. More Female teachers in urban areas.</p> <p>Gender</p> <p>Strong gender stereotypes among population and educational system</p>	10
Rural/ Urban	Rural areas are neglected.	8

	<p>funding urban/rural</p> <p>Centre-Peripheral; Urban-rural</p> <p>resources urban/rural areas</p> <p>rural - urban inequities</p> <p>urban versus rural</p> <p>urban/rural</p> <p>urban versus rural issues</p> <p>lack of effective means of preventing discrepancies between geographical regions</p>	
General funding	<p>Resource distribution</p> <p>Funding</p> <p>Resources distribution is not balanced</p> <p>Inequitable distribution of resources between schools and systems</p> <p>General resource distribution</p> <p>Inequitable public/private funding arrangements</p> <p>Regional inequities</p> <p>Low pay for teachers</p>	8
Government	<p>Education is seen in isolation to other issues</p> <p>There is little cross-government department work to support education</p> <p>No coordination within Departments</p> <p>National/regional government</p> <p>Lack of effective means of preventing discrepancies in infrastructure</p> <p>Lack of appropriate education for teachers</p> <p>Unequal working conditions in various types of educational institutions</p>	7
Achievement	<p>The achievement gaps within and among groups can be very large (for example, urban/rural, race-ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, etc.)</p> <p>Select policies for entry</p> <p>Lack of appropriate education provided for pupils</p>	<p>12 (1</p> <p>relates</p> <p>to</p> <p>multiple</p>

	Students not being able to graduate from school School and centre communities are not always inclusive Unfriendly infrastructure in schools (for staff and for children with disabilities) Lack of/uneven access to ICT 'digital divide' 16% rate of early school leaving (i.e. leaving school without school leaving qualification is unacceptably high) Limited/uneven access to library facilities Early childhood education (provision, access, quality, qualifications of workers all affect achievement) Hunger and disease in the poorer schools (Zambia) Hunger (Canada)	categories)
Other	"social reproduction"	
	bullying is a major issue in NZ schools	
	Promotions and appointments are political	
	There is inequity in Higher Education	
	Quality education for all	
	No long term planning	
	traditional choices	
	There is little understanding of human rights or children's rights in teacher education and/or in the contextual curriculum interpretations.	

Table 4: The Main Inequities in countries' education systems.

The issues raised in this section relate to the concepts of vertical and horizontal equity identified by Brown (2006). Whilst equity goals indicate high aspirations, the responses in this section suggest specific inequities may need to be considered in terms of vertical equity: whose situation can and should be improved, and how that can be achieved.

Question B14

Question 14 asks: Has your union influenced government actions on any inequities in your country's education system?

The responses to this question have been set out in Table 5, as given by the respondents. The full responses have been included in order to provide a 'mirror image' of the main inequities, the specific country-level focus of their policy activities, and the various ways in which they are able to influence policies.

As is to be expected, unions engage with governments about these issues, and some interesting mechanisms for engagement are outlined. Unions often stated that although progress was being made, that progress was slow.

Country/union	Statement of influence on government
Ireland INTO	The INTO is in constant contact with the Department of Education regarding education issues, and has succeeded in having many educational issues included in the national partnership agreements over the years. Progress has been made slowly. For example, an additional 6,000 primary teachers were appointed in the last decade to support children with special educational needs in mainstream schools. The number of special needs assistants has increased from 2000 to 10,000 also over the last decade. The INTO also succeeded in increasing the number of EAL teachers in the system. However, because of recent cutbacks, numbers are being reduced again. (INTO)
Ireland ASTI	ASTI has always been a professional voice for teachers and the status of teachers' unions in Irish society is largely due to the public's identification of the advocacy role of the unions for a better and fairer education system. ASTI always takes part in public consultation processes, legislative processes, and negotiations in relation to education policy. Our core policy concerns are frequently reflected in both policy and legislation.
Ireland TUI	Through union involvement a minimum level of additional resources are in place to meet the needs of those students for whom English is a second language. Some additional resources have flowed to schools in respect of special education needs (additional co-ordination with an allowance attached, improved psychological services, additional staff depending on nature and type of special need). Some specific professional development/in-service initiatives are in place. Additional teacher allocations and grants have been agreed for schools located in communities of significant economic and educational disadvantage. A new initiative has been agreed to improve access to ICT facilities.
Australia AEU	Significant improvements in learning outcomes for girls and pay/conditions for women teachers. While educational access and outcomes for Indigenous students remain a national problem, there have been improvements and the union has been a significant force behind them.
Poland ZNP	The ZNP takes part in international actions such as Education for All and tries to involve the government in such initiatives. It co-creates educational policy

	and undertakes civic initiatives. The ZNP is a member of the Coalition for Equal Chances being an anti-discrimination group whose first meeting took place on 19th April 2010. At the ZNP there has also been created an Equal Treatment Committee whose aim is to promote equity and improve anti-discrimination law valid in Poland via e.g. training courses provided for equal treatment experts (anti-discrimination law, equality in education, good practice examples, etc.). We prepare opinions, bills, legal regulations or protest letters addressed to the national authorities. Moreover, the ZNP has been working on the code of conduct being a several year-long project. We aim by that to improve status and legal protection of education workers and enhance professional and ethical responsibility towards pupils, colleagues and parents. (ZNP)
Zambia ZNUT	Equal pay for equal qualifications. Teachers with degrees, whether in primary or secondary education get same salary. Salaries for both females and males teachers with same qualifications are the same. Posting of teachers, emphasises on posting teachers in rural areas and the introduction of rural hardship allowance has encouraged teachers to go and work in rural areas. Introduction of re-entry policy for girls who get pregnant while in school.
UK NASUWT	Issues associated with barriers to achieving equity within the education systems in UK are highly complex and continue to be the subject of significant debate. However, particular examples of policy in respect of equity in these education systems that have been the subject of recent focus have included barriers to access to leadership positions for black and minority ethnic teachers and on this issue the NASUWT has been involved in joint work with the National College, the body responsible for entry into and development within school leadership role in England. Other areas of recent attention have focused on the impact of far right racist and fascist organisations on the schools system, prejudice related bullying, the extent to which the curriculum and qualifications structure supports the promotion of equality and diversity and the impact of age discrimination on teachers and the education system generally.
Serbia TUS	TUS is against closing of rural schools considering the negative influence for the access to education for rural children
Israel Teachers' Union	Our union supports schools which integrate immigrant children and children of foreign workers. Also our union helps schools in the periphery and schools at the Arab sector (ITU)
Slovakia ZPŠaV NKOS	We are in contact with government and make social dialog with government.
Canada CTF	Social advocacy and child poverty, aboriginal education, francophone in minority settings, numbers of teachers have increased despite declining enrolment. Increased funding for special needs. Collaboration on programs for francophone minority students. Increased attention given to child poverty/ resources for immigrant families by way of programs (CTF)
New Zealand NZEI & NZPPTA	<p>NZEI has successfully bargained for pay increases for our support staff members in schools. NZEI has successfully fought for the recognition of primary and ECE qualifications as equal to those of secondary school teachers. (NZEI)</p> <p>Development of non-sexist teaching resources; pressure to effect more inclusive educational policies; equal pay for women and men teachers and equal treatment in terms of conditions regardless of sex or marital status.</p>

	(NZPPTA)
Malta MUT	The Union has always taken industrial and/or legal action in cases of inequity. The MUT's insistence in this area has championed a method of drafting collective agreements which offer the same opportunities to all on all levels.
Sweden STU Lärarförbundet	Representations in governmental investigations.
Malaysia	All children in Year One would be compulsory to attend school. Penalty imposed for parents that failed to enrol child to schools. We have successfully advocate free textbooks for all children. We have lobby to the Government not to reduce the budget for the education sector especially aids for the poor children, i.e. cash assistance, clothing assistance, school and etc. We have advocate better facilities for all types of school We have also lobby for better access for internet/ broadband including machinery schools, Tamil and Mandarin schools...facilities for all schools especially in rural schools.
Country/Union	Statement of influence on government

Question B18

Question 18 gave 10 statements about equity and asked the respondents to rate their union's priorities. This analysis focuses on whether the statements are implemented or not in government policy, and the level of union priority.

General

Three respondents did not complete this question (Antigua and Barbuda, Finland and the Netherlands.) These were removed these prior to analysis, leaving n=29. Once this had been completed, 2 statements had more than 2 respondents who omitted the statement – 'Resources should be shared equally between rural and urban areas' - the UK, Liberia and Switzerland omitted this statement. 'All phases of compulsory schooling should be equally resourced' – the UK, Sweden Norway and France omitted this statement.

Nevis said none of the statements were in union policy, commenting

The union has not developed policies, per se, because we really do not have a problem. Public education is free to all citizens and non-citizens and private education is paid for but that is optional to parents.

Israel listed most statements as having been achieved, except 'Students with physical disabilities should be integrated into regular/ordinary classrooms' which it listed as a high priority.

Already achieved

Two statements had more than 50% state they were achieved – 69% of the respondents said the statement “Boys and girls should have equal access to all phases of compulsory schooling” had already been achieved. One country (Nevis) commented this was not currently in union policies, no countries stated it was not a priority, and 1 omitted the question (Latvia). This was the statement that had the highest mean in both developed and developing countries. 51% of respondents stated that the statements teachers in the different phases of compulsory schooling should have the same employment status, 2 respondents said it wasn't in union policies (Nevis and Switzerland) with 2 people not completing the question (Sweden and Morocco). 10% said it was in policy, but not a priority and 24% said it was a high priority. This had the third highest mean in both developed and developing countries.

48.3% stated that the equity statement compulsory schooling should be provided to all students free of charge had been achieved, with another 34.5% giving it a high priority. Nevis stated it was not in union policy, and France omitted the question. This statement had the second highest mean in both developing and developed countries.

Highest priority though not achieved:

This section details the responses that had the largest number of responses in the “In union policies and high priority” selection. The statement that stands out is “All phases of compulsory schooling should be equally resourced”. 55% of respondents stated this was a high priority, only 1 stated it had already been achieved (Israel). 10% of respondents commented it wasn't in union policies (Nevis, Germany, Republic of Cyprus) and 4 omitted the question (as discussed previously).

“Resources should be distributed equally between rural and urban areas” had 51% of respondents say it was a high priority, 17% saying it was already achieved, and 4 respondents stating it was not in union policy (Nevis, Sweden, Latvia and Morocco).

44.8% of respondents said that both these statements were in union policy and a high priority: "Students of all socio economic backgrounds should have equal access to all phases of compulsory schooling" and "Students of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds should have equal access to all phases of compulsory schooling". 38% of respondents said they had already been achieved. 3 respondents said neither was in union policy, and 2 said they were in policy but not a priority. No one left out these statements.

Not in union policy:

The statement that had the highest frequency of respondents stating it was not in union policy out of all the statements was "Students with physical disabilities should be integrated into regular/ ordinary classrooms". 24% of respondents stated this was not in union policies (Nevis, Denmark, Cyprus, Liberia, Serbia, Latvia and Morocco). However, 34% said it was in union policies, and 38% said it was already achieved. There is a significant difference ($p=0.000$) between the mean rating of developed and developing countries. Developed countries average rating is 1.60 – (1=not in union policy, 2=in union policy, not a high priority) whereas developing countries rate it at 3.33 (3= in union policies, high priority 4= already achieved).

The statement "Teachers in different phases of compulsory schooling should have the same level of qualifications" had 17% respondents state this was not in union policies. However, 31% said this was in union policies and was a high priority, and 45% said it was already achieved. The countries that did not have it as union policy were Nevis, Slovakia, Sweden, the Republic of Cyprus and Switzerland.

When a comparison of developed and developing countries is carried out, more respondents select that policies are 'in union policies and already achieved/ a high priority' in developed countries rather than developing ones. The latter are more likely to suggest they are in policy but not a priority.

Question B20

In Question 20, the respondents were asked to rate their agreement to 18 statements from along a 4 point scale "Strongly disagree" to "agree". There was an option for undecided, and to omit the question. The results are laid out in Table 5 in order of ascending means.

Since it is questionable whether the response options for each question represent an interval scale, there are clearly risks in quoting means and standard deviations. In the text means are always interpreted alongside modes, and standard deviations are used only to give an *indication* of the spread of scores. Used in these ways the statistics do have some utility.

Table 5: Question 20 descriptive statistics (total n=29)

Key: 0=undecided, 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3= agree, 4=strongly agree.

	N	Mode	(Frequency of mode)	Mean	Std. Deviation
20 [13. Boys and girls should receive different types of education.]	27	1	75%	1.11	.424
20 [10. Boys and girls should be separated into different schools.]	28	1	69%	1.21	.499
20 [2. Girls do not benefit from accessing all the phases of compulsory schooling.]	29	1	72%	1.31	.541
20 [16. Teachers should receive different pay according to performance-related indicators (e.g. student learning outcomes).]	28	1	59%	1.75	1.110
20 [5. Students who attend fee paying schools achieve better outcomes than those in state funded schools.]	29	1	72%	1.76	.951
20 [1. Students with physical disabilities will achieve poorer outcomes in special separate schools.]	24	3	31%	2.00	1.285
20 [7. Students achieve poorer outcomes in rural schools because of the lack of educational resources.]	29	1,3	31%, 31%	2.00	1.102
20 [4. Students should be separated into different education pathways according to their abilities and performance, e.g. academic, technical, and vocational.]	26	1	31%	2.04	1.148
20 [18. More government funding should be available to support parental choice of school.]	26	2,3	24%, 24%	2.04	1.216
20 [15. Students of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds should be enabled to receive education in their home language.]	25	3	24%	2.28	1.308

20 [9.Students with learning disabilities will achieve better outcomes in special separate schools.]	24	2	24%	2.38	1.279
20 [6. Parents should be able to choose schools for their children.]	24	3	35%	2.67	1.049
20 [12.The cultural and ethnic backgrounds of all students should be reflected in the school environment.]	28	3,4	38%, 38%	2.93	1.245
20 [17. Students with learning disabilities should be integrated into regular (non specialist) classrooms.]	27	3	52%	3.04	.940
20 [3.Students from different religious groups should be able to attend schools which respect their diverse beliefs.]	26	4	37%	3.04	1.148
20 [11.Equal pay structures for teachers across all phases of education leads to better quality teaching in all phases of education]	29	4	48%	3.14	1.125
20 [8.Teachers should be free to choose which schools they work in.]	28	4	44%	3.18	.983
20 [14. Teachers' salaries should increase according to the number of years in service.]	29	4	48%	3.21	1.013

The statements related to gender were strongly disagreed with by the majority of respondents, with little deviation around the mean. No respondents agreed with the statements "Boys and girls should receive different types of education", "Boys and girls should be separated into different schools". Only one respondent agreed that "Girls do not benefit from accessing all phases of compulsory schooling".

Beyond these statements there is a wider standard deviation about the mean, showing that opinion is much more varied. This is especially evident in the statements which have multiple modalities, an equal number of respondents agreeing and disagreeing with a statement. "Students achieve poorer outcomes in rural schools because of the lack of educational resources" is strongly disagreed with by almost a third of the respondents, and agreed with by another third of respondents. One quarter of respondents agree that "More government funding should be available to support parental choice of school", and another quarter disagrees.

The statements that most respondents agree with to some extent with are related to Teachers Conditions of Service. Only 4 respondents strongly disagreed that “teachers’ salaries should increase according to the number of years in service”. 5 respondents disagreed that “teachers should be free to choose which schools they work in”, and one was undecided. 3 respondents strongly disagreed, and one disagreed that “equal pay structures for teachers across all phases of education leads to better quality teaching in all phases of education” (1 undecided). The rest of the respondents agreed to some extent with these statements.

The school environment and how it caters for students with different cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds were other statements that had a high level of agreement. The integration of students with learning disabilities was another equity statement with which most agreed.

There is a statistical significance in the difference in the mean level of agreement between developed and developing countries for only 1 statement “Students achieve poorer outcomes in rural schools because of the lack of educational resources”. Developing countries tend to agree/ strongly agree with the statement (mean= 2.70) and developed countries tend to disagree with the statement (mean=1.62). (mean difference = 1.068, $t=2.759$, $p=0.01$). The responses to this question need to be considered in relation to the trajectories of development for the countries in the survey. For example, the Case Study for Zambia gives further information about rural/urban issues with regard to teacher supply, resources, and student outcomes.

Comment [KCP1]: I'd use Mann Whitney U rather than t for this as t relies on data being parametric. Ours is probably not interval and we haven't tested for normality so on both counts it's dodgy to call it parametric.

Theme C: country-specific factors regarding equity

Question C1

Question C1 listed a number of statements for the respondent to rate to what extent each was a problem in achieving equity, with the themes of (1) teacher education and development, (2) teachers’ conditions of service, (3) teachers’ working practices, (4) student population, (5) classroom conditions. The scale ranged from “Significant problem”, “Slight problem” “Not a problem” and “Don’t know” (this option was only selected 14 times). The default was “no answer” if none of the above options were selected. This was used 16 times out of a possible 812. No statement had more than

three people select either "I don't know" or no answer. 3 of the sample did not make it this far in the questionnaire, so these were removed from the analysis – leaving n=29 respondents.

The statements which had more than 50% of respondents state they are a significant problem are:

"Lack of training to work with students with special educational needs" 59%. 35% stated this was a slight problem, and only Norway and Portugal stated it was not a problem.

"Discipline/anti-social behaviours" 59%. 31% stated this was a slight problem, and 10% said it was not a problem (Sweden, Norway and Morocco).

Pay was also rated as a significant problem by 45% of the sample, 31% stated it was a slight problem, and 21% not a problem.

The number of students in the class was rated as a significant problem by 48% of the respondents, and another 48% rated it as a slight problem (cumulative percent = 96%). Only one person rated this as not a problem, by the representative from the Republic of Cyprus.

The statements which had more than 50% of respondents stating they are a slight problem are:

Working conditions – 62% stated this was a slight problem. 31% stated it was a significant problem, and the respondent from Nevis said it was not a problem.

Access to support staff – 59% stated this was a slight problem, 24% labelling it as a significant problem, and 3 saying it is not a problem. (Republic of Cyprus, Lithuania and Serbia).

Lack of opportunities for peer learning and collaboration across all phases was seen as a slight problem by 55%, 21% viewed it as a significant problem, and 17% as not a problem.

The administrative work teachers undertake is seen as a slight problem by 52% of the sample, 31% see it as a significant problem and 17% see it as not a problem.

The diversity of students in class (culture, ethnicity etc) was seen as a slight problem by 52% of the sample, while 24% saw it as a significant problem, the remaining 24% saw it as not a problem.

Job security was viewed as a slight problem by 48%, 35% saw it as not a problem, and 5 respondents stated it was a significant problem. Those who saw it as a significant problem were those in Ireland (1), the UK, Portugal, Serbia and Morocco. (It is interesting to note how many of these countries are affected by the current economic climate, which is impacting significantly on public sector funding).

Ability of students in a class was seen as a slight problem by 45% of the respondents, 24% viewed it as no problem, and 21% viewed it as a significant problem.

While adequate classroom spaces were seen as a slight problem by 41% of the respondents, 31% viewed it as not a problem, and 24% as a significant problem.

Access to educational books listed as a slight problem by 45%, although another 45% listed it was not a problem. 2 countries raised it as a significant problem – those in Liberia and Zambia.

The statements which had more than 50% of respondents' state they are not a problem are:

62% state that lack of access to quality initial teacher training for all phases of compulsory schooling is no problem: 21% state this is a slight problem, with respondents in Sri Lanka, Zambia, Liberia and France stating it is a significant problem. There was no additional contextual information from France to explain why this is a significant problem, but the respondent did comment that there is a current reduction in the number of teaching posts in secondary education, resulting in larger classes, and that increasing the number of teachers is a main objective of the union, alongside combating educational failure at junior level, and providing individual assistance. ,

Different levels of initial qualification for teachers across different phases: 62%. 24% state it is a slight problem and Germany and Liberia say it is a significant problem.

Access to writing materials 62%: 31% state it is a slight problem, and the respondent from Liberia says it is a significant problem there.

Finally, the age range of students in class is not seen as a problem by 59%. It is a slight problem for 24%, and respondents from New Zealand, Liberia, Switzerland Portugal and France see it as a significant problem.

Theme D: Implications for Education International's Goals and Policies

Questions D1 and D2 focused on the role that EI can play at national and international levels, in achieving or promoting equity goals. The statements include positive feedback on aspects of the work of EI that are considered to be valuable and successful. EI is seen as exerting influence through supra-national as well as international and national levels. Because of this, the original statements have been included in full for further consideration by the EI team. Countries across the HDI spectrum all identify important roles for EI, from 'supporting countries which have not implemented actions against inequities', to helping countries to coping with new realities such as migration, trends towards privatisation, shifting ideological paradigms, and the impact of the economic crisis. In addition, EI can extend its' roles in disseminating information to countries for international comparisons, articulating global goals; providing evidence of best practice; facilitating exchange and discussion. EI clearly has a key role to play in helping countries to develop strategies for realising their own as well as international aspirations in education.

National roles	International roles
Conduct awareness seminars for teachers Have essay competitions Have drama or short plays in electronic media	
	EI would have to visit the countries that are rife with the problem and try to arrest it, if the authorities would have it. If it is a culture of the country, then it would have to be fought to alleviate the inequalities.
Both Union and management should have easy access to EI experts to put forward questions of a delicate nature concerning new realities that we are starting to face in the phenomenon of	Organisation of conferences in which employers and unions meet together and learn and discuss issues are important. EI should also regularly survey the situation of the

immigration.	different countries and promote good practices, even of smaller countries. Another priority should be that EI helps in union recruitment - we believe that little can be achieved by Unions without proper membership rates. Our membership stands at around 90% but in other countries membership rates are far too low to be considered as serious
ASTI has always highly rated the importance of international teacher unity and a strong voice for the profession at regional and global level. For Ireland, work EI is conducting on trends such as privatisation in education, performance related pay for teachers, etc, is vital to keep us informed of new ideological paradigms which will invariably be reflected in Irish debate and public discourse.	It is doing a good job currently, especially via its role in GCE and the achievement of the MDGS, 2 and 3
It is critical that EI and its affiliates continue to champion and support high quality public education. The foundation of this includes: • a nationally consistent high quality public education system • provision of high quality public education that targets, reflects and recognises the special nature, rights and needs of indigenous peoples • high quality initial teacher education • high quality trained support staff • high quality specialist staff • the provision of ongoing and high quality professional development. Three key critical items to consider in policy • It is vital that high quality public education provides opportunities and promotes equitable achievement outcomes for all learners. This must occur in a holistic environment where the barriers to education are eliminated and learning environments are physically, emotionally and intellectually safe and nurturing • It is important that those who work in education experience good working conditions and all barriers to progression, promotion and professional development are removed. These barriers include those based on discrimination and gender bias • In addition to what is required for all learners, educational opportunities for indigenous peoples must respect, support and enable indigenous peoples to: • communicate effectively in their own languages • take pride in their identity; and • participate and succeed in their culture and community and that of the wider world.	
Accessing and disseminating the best information available for comparative purposes	Use the media, frame the messages in a manner that the media can't ignore.

Articulating global goals; providing evidence of best practice; facilitating exchange and discussion	Articulating global goals and achieving international accords in respect of them
Here we think that EI can have an important role in supporting countries which have not implemented actions against inequities.	
Mutual pressure on governments	Mutual pressure on governments to solve identical problems of most education systems around the world
A key area in which Education International can support the work of the NASUWT is through research based activity that allows for objective and informed analysis of equity-related policy and practice in a wide range of education systems and with which practice in the UK can be compared. This would complement work to evaluate the effectiveness of provision in the UK with that elsewhere by highlighting potential strengths and alternative approaches where current arrangements have been identified as being in need of refinement or possible replacement.	Education International has a well established range of policy objectives focused on equity which it continues to pursue through its work in relation to the joint UNESCO/ILO apparatus on the status of teachers, its activity as part of the Global Campaign for Education which continues to focus on educational inequality in developing countries and in its commitment to the development of a comprehensive policy on education. There is a risk that these areas of activity may be given less emphasis as a result of understandable concerns relating to action being taken in a significant number of countries to tackle sovereign debt issues and the ongoing consequences of the global economic and financial crisis. EI must make clear that, notwithstanding the importance of these matters, no excuse can be accepted for downgrading the importance of equalities issues for all those with responsibility for the development and implementation of education policy. In particular, EI must work closely with affiliates to counter pressures from business organisations in a range of countries that equalities legislation should be relaxed given the alleged costs of compliance for employers. EI must use its influence to argue strongly that the solution to the economic challenges confronting many countries is not to reduce the legal protection against discrimination and prejudice members of affiliate organisations enjoy in their workplaces.
International comparative information always useful.	Continuing to highlight inequities and sharing information across unions. Influencing international organisations that then influence governments.
Lobby our governments to increase funding to education and recruit all the trained teachers not yet employed	Lobby with donors and multinational co operations to increase funding to developing countries in the education sector. Organise forums for education sensitising govt officials from developing countries on equity.

Equity has to be an important factor EI's advocacy for quality. Teacher organisations need to be more concrete in our advocacy. EI could help us gather and use examples of how equity or the lack of equity makes a difference for quality and has an effect on individuals, working life and society. We need a stronger focus on ways of sharing, exchanging and make available good and bad examples of politics and policy effects within the EI family. Research is an important tool in the knowledge society. EI could initiate more research on equity, giving us evidence for our definition and our arguments.	
Informative role (provide information). Guidance (Give guidelines to proceed with)	Promoting knowledge interaction and solidarity among member Unions
Carry out comparative research deepening knowledge about how other countries and trade unions solve problems related to unfair treatment. Promote good practice examples - organise conferences and seminars on equity and quality in education.	It can present opinions on equality problems arising in the field of education at the level of supranational structures. Another solution is lobbying of government. The EI can also undertake actions whose aim is to monitor the observance of legal regulations by the governments.
Political aspect. CTUEW refers to the EI adopted documents and statements when participating in the negotiations with the government. The participation of CTUEW member in various conferences and activities, discussions organised by EI helps them to take active participation in the trade union movement at national level.	Promoting social dialogue at international, European level and in Lithuania.
Highlighting the significance of adequate funding of public education and international evidence of negative consequences associated with undermining/residualising public education through inequitable funding arrangements, privatisation, right-wing 'parental choice' agenda ...	EI plays an important role in promoting and advocating for education for all, equality and social justice.
Going on doing the good job it has been doing, especially with statements, that could influence the national policies seminars and projects that could inform and share experiences	Advocating for participating in international forums e.g. International Labour Organizations and campaigning for the member states to sign I.L.O conventions which stipulates "equity in education" in their respective countries.
Provide comparative data and analysis across countries with special reference to strategies that have proven effective or ineffective. A specific study on 'class size' and implications for teaching and learning would be helpful.	Primarily lobbying and raising profile of issues and injustices. Strong, accurate and comparative data must be a feature of this.

Help to fund translation, publishing and dissemination of the Report on this survey results.	Promote different aspects of equity among member organisations, publish and disseminate a CD or booklet on the results of this survey.
	Best practices in various countries should be shared within the members of Education International.
Continue to work with the two affiliates in Liberia instead of only one.	Support and interventions.

Summary

The analysis of the Survey data has given some broad characteristics of inequity and inequality for teachers and for children, and some of the specific factors that cause or sustain these characteristics. There are contextual variations between the countries, relating to their position on the UN Human Development Index, and their specific trajectories of development. This may go some way to explaining the varying emphases in the responses. However, it is interesting to note that there are some similarities in country-specific issues which go across the HDI criteria. The issues raised in the Survey are examined in greater depth in Section 3: the country-specific case studies.

Section 3: Country-Specific Case Studies

Case Study Design

The case study questions were informed by the analysis of the country-wide and country-specific survey data. The questions were divided into two sections: generic and country-specific. The aim was to enable in-depth exploration of generic issues, and country-specific issues, in order to capture variations in policies and practices, and trajectories of development with regard to equity matters. Each of the case studies draws on their responses to the survey, and to the case study questions, and any additional documents sent by the respondents to clarify country-level issues.

Not all the respondents followed the case study questions as they were set out in the email and attachment. The NASUWT in England provided the same responses in the case studies as they had in the survey, so these have been used in the case study analysis. However, most countries provided sufficient details to develop the cases either through additional documents and reports, or through links to their websites. Where these have been used to deepen the analysis, or exemplify key issues, their references are included in the text. In two countries (New Zealand and Ireland) more than one union was included in the case study, because they responded to the survey. As is common in many countries, the unions in these two countries represent teachers in different phases of education, and teachers have a choice of union affiliation. These two countries also provided the most detail, which has contributed to the depth and length of their case studies.

Case Study countries (The first five countries are in the OECD)

Canada
New Zealand
England
Ireland
Poland
Zambia

Case Study questions

Generic

1. With reference to your government's policies, to what extent is equity regarded as an intrinsic feature of the quality of education?
2. In what ways are government policies used to enforce equity (e.g. through the measurement of teacher performance, school effectiveness criteria, targeted resource provision, CPD)?
3. Are there any specific trends or influences in your country which may undermine equity goals in education?
4. Are there any specific trends or influences in your country which may enhance equity goals in education?
5. Are there any current targets in your country to improve equity
For teachers For children
6. What are the main means of delivery for these targets (e.g. curriculum policies; accountability via testing, teacher appraisal; teacher training and supply; teacher remuneration)?
7. All country respondents identify a lack of equity for disadvantaged groups in their societies.
8. Are there any incentives to recruit teachers from minority groups?
9. Are there any incentives for teachers to work with minority groups (e.g. through strengthening professional development; using a multi-cultural or anti-bias curriculum)?
10. What are the main issues around resource allocation? Is resource allocation based on needs (at individual school-level) or on

Country specific

11. In your country, which aspects of equity in education are becoming more important?
12. In your country which aspects of equity are becoming less important?
13. Give examples of policies or programmes which are good examples of addressing equity in education.
14. What, in your view, would be the outcomes of an education system that fully addressed the issue of equity?
15. What, in your view, would be the outcomes of an education system that failed to address the issue of equity?

16. What steps should be taken to make the education system in your country more equitable?

17. For each example, please indicate who has prime responsibility for taking this step (e.g. government; unions; educational administrators; head teachers/principals; teachers; parents; students)

EQUITY MATTERS: CANADA Case Study

Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF)

Founded in 1920, the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) is a national alliance of provincial and territorial teacher organizations that represent nearly 200,000 elementary and secondary school teachers across Canada. CTF is also a member of the international body of teachers, [Education International](http://www.ei-ie.org) (www.ei-ie.org). For background information on CTF, their website is: <http://www.ctf-fce.ca/AboutUS/Default.aspx>

The CTF policy on equity is as follows:

CTF, as an instrument of the teaching profession, has a responsibility to advocate and pursue the implementation of policies designed to alleviate economic and social inequalities, insofar as they are related to education. CTF representatives to local, provincial/territorial, national and international meetings and conferences have the responsibility to put forth the concept of equality in educational systems, and to model the principles of equity in their practices.

Equity is regarded as an intrinsic feature of the quality of education 'To a great extent' in Canada. Items 2, 4, 9 were identified as the most important issues in the union's policies for children, to enable everyone to have an equal opportunity regardless of background, specifically: funding rural/urban; aboriginal funding; divide between rich and poor; francophone minority; resources for immigrant families; unequal spread of resources and funding.

Items 9.11.15 were identified as the most important issues in the union's policies for teachers, because

Everyone has equal opportunity, regardless of where they live. All should have acceptable working conditions to operate in. All should be paid according to fair process without favouritism.

The union's policies have impacted on government actions in the following areas:

- Social advocacy and child poverty; aboriginal education; francophone in minority settings.
- Numbers of teachers have increased despite declining enrolment.
- Increased funding for special needs.
- Collaboration on programs for francophone minority students.
- Increased attention given to child poverty/ resources for immigrant families by way of programs

In Q 16, the three main goals identified to achieve equity included adequate funding, human resources, material resources. One of the barriers to achieving equity for students is that some areas of the country have access to more funding and resources than others. The 'best example' was given as the underfunding of Indigenous students (Survey Q 11.) In the Case Study questions, the respondent was asked to expand on the impact of funding inequities for teachers and for children in Indigenous communities and rural-urban areas. The responses are as follows.

a) Indigenous:

In Canada, public education is a responsibility of the provinces and territories. However, the Federal government has responsibility for Aboriginal school children living on reserves. Federal government put a 2% cap on increases to educational funding (on reserves) a number of years ago. Increases in expenditures at the provincial/territorial level outpaced 2%. The Assembly of First Nations of Canada estimate that the average expenditure in education for each Aboriginal child compared to those students in the public system is \$2000-\$3000 less per child per year on average.

b) Rural/Urban:

In rural Canada:

- Schools are generally smaller because of population density, allowing for less program opportunities (curriculum choice)
- Residents generally earn less, reducing fund-raising capacity

- Economics of schools result in rural students having far less access to public libraries, museums, health professionals (psychiatric, psychological) etc.

The respondent identified a widening divide between the rich and the poor in Canada. The following reasons were given for the ways in which this is influencing equity for teachers and for children.

In households and communities where there is low SES (Socio Economic Status) there are:

- Less reading resources at home
- Less opportunity for supporting schools through fund raising activities
- A greater need for school breakfast and lunch programs

Research shows that kids who have the home supports and encouragement, adequate school resources and full tummies simply do better in school.

With reference to a lack of funding and resources, and an unequal spread of resources, the following statements expand on how these factors influence equity for teachers and for children, and on the quality of education.

Again, urban areas have an advantage, as identified in #1, and #2, which speaks to resources re SES. Funding for public education in Canada (on average as a % of total consolidated government expenditures) has dropped consistently in last 20 years, and is now at the lowest level recorded. We are below the OECD average. The ageing 'boomers' and attendant increase in health costs will continue to challenge this fraction of expense for public K-12 education.

The following section describes policies that promote equity in society, and advance equitable conditions of service for teachers.

- Teachers are paid according to qualifications and experience.
- There are policies against homophobia

- There are policies against racism
- There are policies that encourage the hiring of more women for administrative positions
- There are policies that encourage the hiring of minorities where qualifications are “equal”

The following section focuses on some of the main advances or achievements in equity for students in the last five years. Regarding equity for students, the best examples are in the efforts towards:

- Inclusionary practices re students with special educational needs
- Increased curriculum, resource, and program supports for BGLT (Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Transgender) students (and teachers)
- Canada continues to make strides in “resiliency”, students who perform at least average despite SES background
- Canada does well in achieving success in immigrant students
- We have made some advances in addressing our major issue, that of support for Aboriginal students, but we still have a long way to go in this category.

CTF policy on inclusion.

- A caring society provides education for all children.
- Integration of students with special needs should ensure the rights of all children to an education, and an equitable distribution of resources among all students.
- Students with special physical, intellectual or emotional needs benefit from learning in the most enabling environment, provided that environment has been adapted to meet their special needs.
- While regular classroom placement should be the goal of integration, it should not necessarily be assumed to be the only or best placement option for all students at every stage of their education. **Additional contextual information (provided by Myles Ellis on behalf of CTF).**

Curriculum and program policy development are seen as effective ways of achieving equity goals.

The CTF has recently started using international comparative data as a means for considering equity and quality in Canada's education system in the following ways.

...as more and more policy is driven by TALIS and PISA we find ourselves using data from these sources that the media generally ignores in making our points. Governments use test data to compare schools in efforts to better direct resources.

The following specific trends or influences may undermine equity goals in education teachers and/or for children.

We see efforts right across the country where education budgets are being slashed to address deficits. That generally translates into less money for:

- Special needs
- After school programs
- Curriculum resources
- Educational assistants
- Technology
- Class size concerns

For example, the Nova Scotia Government is calling for a 20% + cut in the Department of Education budget. This would mean a substantial cut in teacher positions alone.

All country respondents identified a lack of equity for disadvantaged groups in their societies. The following three questions explored this issue further in the context of Canada:

a) *Are there any incentives to recruit teachers from minority groups?*

Yes, i.e.

- Aboriginal teachers (where qualified)
- Francophone minority language teachers
- Efforts at hiring practices re: immigrants

- b) *Are there any incentives for teachers to work with minority groups (e.g. through strengthening professional development; using a multi-cultural or anti-bias curriculum)?*

Yes – Professional Development, curriculum development

- c) *What are the main issues around resource allocation at individual school-level? Is resource allocation based on needs or on outcomes?*

Funding at the provincial/territorial level, it varies. Also, schools in high SES areas can/do augment lack of resources in fund raising. Many rural schools/urban schools in impoverished areas/northern schools do not have that luxury.

The main equity issues for teachers' employment and careers are identified as follows:

The growing threat, coming from international efforts (just arriving in Canada), of conservative fundamentalist arguments for tying teacher tenure and compensation to their students' outcomes on narrow standardized tests.

The CTF identified areas in which EI could help the country to achieve its goals at national and international levels: Accessing and disseminating the best information for comparative purposes. Use the media: frame the message in a way that the media cannot ignore.

Commentary

The key themes that emerge from this case study are funding, resources and socio-cultural diversity. Funding cuts may sustain inequities, as indicated in the differential in funding between the Aboriginal children compared to those in the public system, and the reduced capacity of schools in areas of low SES to raise additional funds. In common with other countries, it is not just a lack of funding and resources, but an unequal spread of resources that impact on vulnerable communities. Canada, like New Zealand, is below the OECD average for the proportion of GDP spent on education. Therefore

addressing these gaps may remain problematic in the face of funding cuts, and the privatization agenda.

The areas identified for cuts in funding are likely to impact on those communities that are already disadvantaged, because they are less likely to be able to compensate for the lack of additional support and services. Teachers also bear the effects of these cuts through larger class sizes, and a reduction in human and material resources. That these cuts are happening in a highly developed country such as Canada (as in other HDI countries) is testament to the extent of the economic downturn, and the ways in which this might impact on equity and quality in education (and perhaps ultimately on education as a driver for social justice).

The issue of socio-cultural diversity is significant in a country that has long-established patterns of migration, as well as a large Indigenous population. However the concept of 'diversity' can be used in a way that masks diversities within groups that may be seen as homogenous because of their identification as, for example, Indigenous, Aboriginal, Travellers. Aboriginal groups in Canada differ in their histories, culture, economic contexts, and life-style choices. They live in urban and rural contexts, some very remote, and include the following: those on reserves (sometimes referred to as First Nations or Indian Bands), others from that group not on reserves, Inuit communities in the north, and Métis communities. As in other countries that have identified significant equity issues with Indigenous communities, it is important not to group them (or any other minority communities) together without acknowledging variations in their socio-cultural and historical contexts.

It is also interesting to note that children from some immigrant communities do well in Canada. In terms of equity, it might be useful to understand why children from some groups succeed better than others, and what implications that might have for understanding home, community and school factors in their experiences and outcomes. Such factors are often masked by macro-level international league tables, so within- and between-country comparisons of such micro-level data might be a useful way of understanding human agency in ameliorating disadvantage.

EQUITY MATTERS: NEW ZEALAND Case Study
New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI) Te Riu Roa
New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association (NZPPTA)

NZEI is a professional and industrial organization that represents the interests and issues of around 50,000 members, including teachers in the early childhood and primary sectors, and education support workers. NZEI supports the promotion in education of partnership, participation and protection under Te Tiriti o Waitangi to enhance Māori aspirations. The website is www.nzei.org.nz

The New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association/Te Wehengarua (PPTA) is the professional association of the post-primary teaching profession. For more than 50 years PPTA members have worked in schools and nationally to ensure all young people in New Zealand have equitable access to good quality state education. The PPTA represents teachers and principals in secondary and area schools, and teachers in intermediates, technicraft centres, and community education. The website is www.ppta.org.nz

Detailed responses were provided to the case study questions by the respondents for both NZEI and NZPPTA. These responses were content analysed for key themes, with illustrative statements provided for each theme (see Table 3.1: Analysis of Case Study Questions for NZEI and NZ PPTA). Inevitably there is some overlap between the themes (for example, inadequate funding for ITE and CPD programmes impacts on specialist training to work with children in the Indigenous communities). However, Table 3.1 gives an overview of current trends, as well as examples of success and further challenge for the unions.

Table 3.1: Analysis of Case Study Questions for NZEI and NZ PPTA

Issue	NZEI (EC and Primary)	NZ PPTA (Post-Primary)
Funding/Resourcing	Inadequate funding SES students CPD Government raising tertiary fees. ECE faculties cut in some universities. Recession – government cutting budgets to the bone.	Inadequate funding CPD More resources for schools in poorer communities. Resources and capacity in the significant Pacific Island languages and cultures are scarce at best. (See Q3 for

Condition of Service	<p>BUT election due in 2011. Refugee and migrant education – not many resources to enable curriculum access. Operations grant funding – schools allocate resources (see Q15c). Resource allocation currently based on needs – new policy is 'money follows success'. There will be an emphasis on outcomes – particularly implementing and achieving national standards.</p> <p>Salaries should increase with qualifications gained. Primary and ECE teachers should be = to secondary teachers. Government has reneged on commitments to 100% qualified teachers in ECE. Teacher appraisal idiosyncratic. Employment issues – salaries and promotions (see Q16). National Government disbanded pay equity unit (2009) so problems with monitoring pay (Q16). Pay and employment – gaps across all sectors.</p>	<p>positive benefits for students of respecting language and culture). An appropriate cultural approach has to be supported by considerable investment in time and people and resource development. Insufficient funding for equity. Global economic downturn (Q13) Funding to support innovation and change is minimal.</p> <p>Possible unjustified use of fixed term (non-tenured) employment; inequitable provision of classroom release time for part-time teachers (see Q1 For further issues). National Government disbanded pay equity unit (2009) so problems with monitoring and addressing pay and other disparities (Q5). Union endeavours to effect changes via collective bargaining have been rebuffed by the government and its responsible agency, the Ministry of Education. Focus on testing and national standards as a means of measuring educational achievement and teacher quality (see Q12). Teacher performance and performance pay measures have been steadfastly resisted by teachers and their unions.</p>
ITE/CPD	<p>Inadequate training for teachers working with diverse learners (see Q15 for details). Promotion of human rights education for teachers and learners is needed. Some incentives to recruit Māori and Pasifika teachers (but see Q15 for threats)</p>	<p>Training and development of teachers in culturally appropriate education needed. Cash incentives are available to recruit and train people steeped in Māori language and culture. Once trained, however, graduates must compete for placement and positions in schools on the open market. (Q16a) There are no incentives for teachers to work with minority groups. Some Māori-based curriculum resources are</p>

		available but teachers are largely responsible for developing their own resources. Little is available in the main Pacific Island languages. (Q16b)
Tail of educational disadvantage/ underachievement	Impact of child poverty on children, low SES, Indigenous Māori and Pacific Islands communities. Further details of Equity Policies and reports were provided, and are appended in this report.	Low SES Indigenous Māori and Pacific Islands communities – over-represented within the low SES strata in NZ. BUT significant improvement in achievement and engagement in formal education where the medium of instruction and the curriculum is language and culture based (Q7 and Q8 for examples of equity funding and provision, e.g. Kotahitanga). Disparities in school funding (see Q6) are visually apparent from a simple drive-by (of schools) and are also evident in the tail of educational underachievement as indicated in PISA and national achievement data.
Curriculum	Eurocentric curriculum Narrowing of curriculum to literacy and numeracy – undervaluing arts and social justice issues Contextual (cultural) interpretations needed. Refugee and migrant education – not many resources to enable curriculum access.	Development of culturally appropriate curriculum and resources. A Māori curriculum has been developed, but implementation hampered by a lack of teachers, resources and professional development.
Discrimination – equity issues (gender, ethnicity, sexualities etc)	NZ schools have one of the highest rates of bullying in schools in the OECD. Sexuality, disability- 'othering' (see Human Rights). NZ has the highest rates for young persons' suicide in the OECD. Refugee and migrant education generally not considered in ITE/CPD.	Opportunities for female teachers. = pay (m/f), = treatment (CoS) Gender disadvantage for women teachers and principals. Insufficient numbers of fluent speakers of Māori trained as teachers. Schools in better resourced communities fare better via locally raised funding (Q6) Re government policies – more tends to be seen in rhetoric than is seen in action. At a general level for students

		at secondary level, positive changes to curriculum and assessment practices are 'more equitable'.
SEN	Integration of children with SE Needs into regular classrooms. Teachers' professional development – SEN theory being integrated into ITE.	Issues embedded in comments about student underachievement, especially minority groups.
Human rights	Social justice, bullying, homophobic bullying, cyber bullying. Education for human rights and NZ Bill of Rights - Equity principles of the Treaty of Waitangi	
Other	National standards are flawed – likely to damage rather than enhance children's education. Positive views of the ECE curriculum – Te Whāriki. Elsewhere education policy is more by edict than any meaningful consultation process. Commitment to indigenous curriculum for Māori for use in kura kaupapa and bilingual units embracing Māori education.	Students who have been part of a specific initiative, programme or trial have benefited briefly, but such initiatives are not universal or enduring (specifically for Māori students). Comparative data used from OECD and EI, generally comparisons made with Australia, UK and Canada because of migration of teachers to and from those countries

Funding and resourcing/Conditions of Service

As in other areas of this study, funding and resourcing underpin equity matters for teachers and for children. The pay gap (between sectors and between male and female teachers) is identified by both unions (also discussed under CoS). Financial barriers to closing this pay gap for teachers (and for support staff and support workers) include:

- Refusal of the government to action the recommendations of the pay investigations and Pay and Employment Equity (PaEE) reviews.
- Absence of any legal support or obligations for good employer practices and anti-discrimination policies.
- The recession 'the government is cutting budgets to the bone at the moment'. (NZEI)

There is some flexibility at school level in how resources are deployed. However, headteachers can make their own decisions about resourcing, for example, some may choose to run 'overly large classes (New Entrants classes of 30)', which is within regulations, but 'not good practice' (NZEI).

As in other countries, the effects of the economic crisis are being felt, along with trends towards performance management. Whilst resource allocation is currently based on needs, the new policy is that 'money follows success', which indicates a shift to a culture of performativity whereby the government will use testing and national standards to measure educational achievement and teacher quality. These issues were identified by both unions. The NZEI stated that this will lead to an emphasis on outcomes, particularly implementing and achieving national standards, which may not include time for other areas of the curriculum such as the creative arts and social justice issues. The PPTA indicated that teacher performance and performance pay measures have been steadfastly resisted by teachers and their unions.

Conditions of Service

Closing the pay gap was identified as an equity issue by NZEI, and by PPTA, regarding the gender disadvantage for women teachers and principals. Although pay parity between primary and early childhood teachers was achieved in 2002, some disparities remain. There are specific inequities across the sectors, with the exception of the kindergarten sector. This is because less than 1% of teachers in this sector are male. However, in the primary sector, men are more likely than women to hold positions of responsibility or management:

While men make up only 15% of the primary teaching workforce, over 48% of principals are male. One in four men is a principal, compared to 1 in 8 women. In a further breakdown of schools, men are three times as likely as women to be principals in larger, high decile, urban primary schools, thereby attracting higher salary and additional prestige. (NZEI)

Therefore the pay gap is not so much at the level of starting salaries, but opens up with subsequent units of responsibility and promotions. There are also pay gaps for support staff and support workers, who are represented by NZEI. In addition, pay parity between

primary and secondary teachers means that any salary gains must be applied across the sectors, and thereby increase the overall budget.

New Zealand has a system of collective bargaining, but it seems that agreements are not being implemented. For example, in 2009, the National Government disbanded the pay equity unit and moved that all recommended pay investigations would not occur, and recommendations from pay investigations would not be honored. This meant that even though the gaps were recognised nothing could be done to close them, and there is no agency to centralize the information or monitor the results of the completed recommendations.

One of the main equity issues for the NZEI was that while teachers are centrally funded and salaries are determined through collective bargaining, each school board of trustees makes its own employment decisions – particularly where principalships are concerned. These decisions are not nationally aggregated or monitored for any bias. Boards have little if any EEO or human rights training and will often rely on stereotypical gendered views when making a decision. Equally principals, while they are trained teachers, do not always have school management training and often have little understanding of EEO principles. Principals will generally have the final say over professional development and acting-up opportunities. Often the discrimination is unintentional – but it is discrimination all the same.

The PPTA respondent echoed the previous comments from the NZEI. Other conditions of service priorities identified by the PPTA included:

- The possible unjustified use of fixed-term (non-tenured) employment and the inequitable provision of classroom release or non-contact time for part-time teachers as significant high priority concerns.
- Inequitable provision of domestic and sick leave provisions (related to tenure).
- Barriers to women teachers to contribute to, influence or advise on in-school and system level policy issues and awareness of and training in practices to prevent bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Some advances have been achieved as a result of the 2007 Collective Agreement negotiations, including:

- recognition of absences for childcare as service for the purposes of sabbatical leave applications,
- 100 teacher relief days for Māori teachers responsible for organizing the national biennial Kapa Haka contests,
- two days paid leave for teachers to attend their partner at the birth of their child,
- the introduction of limited (not pro-rated) non-contact for permanent part-time teachers with a teaching load of 0.5 and above.

ITE/CPD

The NZEI response indicates that much progress has been made with the ECE curriculum, but there remain issues with equity in ITE/CPD programmes. The following comments link CPD with improving equity for a range of minority groups:

With regard to other minority groups, and in particular ESOL and refugee and migrant learners, although there is scope for anti-bias values education within the curriculum, there is little if any inclusion of these issues in most ITE programmes. Also this year the government has decided that all professional development and learning will target teaching the National Standards. There is little scope for inclusive or human rights education in schools. The ECE curriculum is more inclusive in general – but there is little opportunity for teacher education in these areas. Refugee and migrant education issues are not generally considered. Although there are schools in some centres with exemplary practice in this area, there are not many resources available to enable accessing the curriculum. The education system is heteronormative and there is a prevalence of homophobic bullying.

Teacher education issues were also indicated by PPTA in relation to additional training to support social and cultural diversity and to reflect the cultures of migrant and Indigenous communities.

Tail of educational disadvantage/underachievement

'Quality Early Childhood Education' is seen as a way of lifting the tail of underachievement (NZEI), but with concerns about the numbers of qualified ECE teachers in these settings. However, a policy tension is that the shift of government funding to 'tertiary pathways' is leading to the reduction in ECE faculty in some universities.

The NZEI respondent noted that 'Success in education must be supported by children living in healthy and safe environments – sadly this is increasingly not the case in NZ'. This comment indicates that, even in those countries identified as 'highly developed' in the Human Development Index have pockets of high poverty and low achievement. The PPTA respondent also noted that an appropriate cultural approach has to be supported by considerable investment in time and people and resource development.

The links between funding, quality and equity outcomes is made by the PPTA:

Schools in better resourced communities fare better in this respect than those in low socio-economic areas and Māori and Pacific Island communities, even during the current global crisis. The disparities that result are visually apparent from a simple drive by and are also evident in the tail of educational underachievement as indicated in PISA and national achievement data.

The NZEI respondent considered that equity is not, in reality, regarded as an intrinsic feature of the quality of education. However, it is a strong feature of the unions' policy. A similar comment was made by PPTA: 'More tends to be heard in rhetoric than is seen in action'.

Curriculum

The curriculum, like NZ, is bi-cultural and children may access the curriculum through Te Reo immersion or bi-lingual classes. The success of the ECE curriculum has led to demands for a similar language and cultural approach in primary and secondary sectors, which is a significant challenge to current and historical policy contexts. However, despite its success the ECE curriculum is under threat:

Te Whāriki – our wonderful ECE curriculum is a very inclusive document – should be declared a national treasure – but delivery of Te Whāriki is also under threat due to funding and staffing issues. (NZEI)

There have been historical tendencies for the New Zealand curriculum to be 'Eurocentric', which reflects patterns of human migration, and the spread of ideas from the west in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, new patterns of migration and settlement require changes in curriculum design and content, in order to achieve cultural relevance as a means of ensuring equity. In secondary education, some Māori-based curriculum resources are available, but teachers are largely responsible for developing their own. The PPTA respondent indicated that changes to curriculum and assessment practices were seen as being more equitable for secondary students:

At a general level for students at secondary level, the abandonment of norm-referenced, national examinations and their replacement with standards-based assessments (unit and achievement standards) has allowed for the development of curriculum and learning options that are more suited to the diversity of the student population, more relevant to modern learning needs and more equitable in terms of status of the assessed learning outcomes at the end of compulsory schooling. This transition has taken place over the last decade.

However, whilst these changes were 'far-reaching', they were poorly planned and resourced, and risked foundering without the support from teachers and their union. This comment illustrates the fact that curriculum reform is, by itself, likely to have limited impact without support for teachers, and support by teachers. The PPTA indicated that funding to support innovation is minimal.

Discrimination – equity issues (gender, ethnicity, sexualities etc)

The NZEI respondent identified the following equity issues as problematic for children.

With regard to equity for students, we are trying. There is increasing awareness of the impact of bullying, particularly homophobic bullying, and schools are trying to safeguard students. Unfortunately cyber bullying and

child and young person suicide are increasing. NZ has the highest rates for this tragic occurrence in the OECD.

There is no human rights education (as such) in NZ schools, although there is an opportunity to include human rights education in the curriculum. Children and young adults learn about human rights violations in other countries, but nothing about their own rights as citizens in NZ and the world.

NZ schools may not be the safest environment for children who are 'othered' for whatever reason - sexuality, disability etc. NZ schools have one of the highest rates for bullying in schools in the OECD.

Schools in NZ are generally small; for the most part they do not model equitable societies. On the other hand NZ might not be an equitable society as we have the third largest income gap in the OECD countries and an increasing number of children (over 30%) are living in hardship or extreme hardship.

The PPTA respondent also identified specific inequities for the Māori and Pacific island communities, and advanced a number of strategies to increase cultural appropriateness of the curriculum, and to support inclusive practices:

While Māori is an official language in New Zealand there are insufficient numbers of fluent speakers trained as teachers. That needs to be addressed to enable Māori-medium education to become more widely available. Equally, while a Māori curriculum has been developed within the formal NZ Curriculum the lack of teachers, resources and professional development hampers implementation and effectiveness. Resources and capacity in the significant Pacific Island languages and cultures are scarce at best.

Anecdotal and, increasingly, research-based evidence indicates that confidence in and respect for one's language and culture, and confirmation of that through ongoing learning experiences leads to much improved outcomes and significantly higher achievement rates for the students involved when compared with those whose educational experience is almost solely mainstream.

Concerns with language and culture are also important for teachers who are Māori or Pacific Island, because recognition and respect for their cultural identity and the

underlying value thereof is significant in terms of their māna and their confidence as effective teachers.

These strategies have implications for funding and resourcing, as well as for ITE/CPD provision. Achieving equity goals, and improving quality, are resource-hungry. As the PPTA respondent indicates where special projects have been funded, these have resulted in improving the experience of outcomes of Māori in mainstream schools where the majority are excluded. However, reduced funding and support lead to reduced quality of the programmes, leading to 'cartoon versions'.

Some equity funding is provided on a contestable or project-based basis. The total is regarded as insufficient and schools seek to make up for shortfalls from locally raised funds, voluntary levies and foreign-fee paying students.

The PPTA respondent identifies some positive advances which impact on culture and diversity:

The Kapa Haka provision [for teachers] is also seen as an equity advance for Māori students for whom engagement in Kapa Haka is a significant language and cultural experience and, sadly for many, a first such experience.

More generally for students, those lucky enough to be part of a specific initiative, programme or trial may have benefitted briefly but...such initiatives are not universal, nor enduring.

Special Educational Needs

The NZEI indicated areas of potential progress for children with SEN in the context of ITE programmes:

With regard to Special Needs education, this year the Teacher's Council has emphasised the need for ITE programmes to include special needs education theory and experience. The government has also made this a priority. We have yet to see how this work will be realised in practice as there are already

comments from university ITE providers that the costs of these and other changes make delivering ITE prohibitive.

In addition, general issues of funding and resourcing impact on provision for children with SEN.

Human Rights

In the Survey, the NZEI respondent made several references to human rights issues, and acknowledges that this is an area of personal interest: 'understanding of human rights and equity principles that underpin NZ society, particularly the Treaty of Waitangi'; 'learners' awareness of their own and others' place and rights'. These issues were developed in more detail in the case study, and in additional documents sent by the respondent. Human rights, and children's rights, feature strongly in NZEI policy, and in their policy advice to pressure groups and government organizations. The issues raised under this theme were related to discrimination, and the tail of underachievement.

There is no human rights education (as such) in NZ schools – although there is an opportunity to include human rights education in the curriculum. Children and young adults learn about human rights violations in other countries – but nothing about their own rights as citizens in NZ and the world.

There are few opportunities for EEO or human rights training (for the schools' boards of trustees), and the focus on literacy and numeracy is likely to impact on the scope for providing human rights education for children.

Commentary

Within the overall analysis, (as in the other case studies) there is a matrix of equity issues for teachers and for children, which are interdependent. Two key issues emerge from the NZ case study: the ongoing efforts to improve educational provision for children in the main Indigenous communities – Māori and Pacific Islands; and efforts to improve teacher education and conditions of service. The reasons for the first theme are clear: children from these communities are most likely to be 'over-represented' in low-SES households, and most likely to attend publicly-funded schools at primary and secondary levels. Several areas of progress were noted by both unions in this regard.

The NZEI respondent highlighted the many benefits of the Early Childhood framework (Te Whāriki) which was designed as a bi-cultural curriculum, and seems to have enjoyed acceptance and success. The PPTA respondent also indicated the significant improvement in students' achievement and engagement in formal education where the medium of instruction and the curriculum is language and culture based, and where students seem to be benefiting from special projects. In relation to the second issue, in common with other countries, efforts to improve teacher education and conditions of service are integral to efforts to improve educational outcomes for children. There are clear indications of areas where teacher training needs to improve, especially with regard to children from the Māori and Pacifica islands communities, and for children with special educational needs.

The pace and direction of changes in the curriculum, in conditions of service, and in performativity are similar to those in England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and the USA. These countries are all 'Very High Developed' on the HDI, (See Section 2) but all identify concerns with neo-liberal or neo-conservative agendas regarding public sector reform, and specific changes to education (linking teacher pay and performance via pupils' outcomes, narrowing of the curriculum, testing arrangements). Like New Zealand, Australia and Canada have large Indigenous populations, and data from these countries indicates similar equity issues for children. These in turn make complex demands on teachers' professional knowledge and expertise. Whilst there are calls for *more* resources for minority groups in particular, there are also calls for *better targeted* resources for children and for teachers (for example ITE and CPD training, financial incentives, culturally appropriate training and curriculum development).

Comparative data are used in New Zealand from OECD and EI, but because of proximity and jurisdiction comparability, close comparisons with Australia are more frequent, followed by UK and Canada, largely because of the migration of teachers to and from those countries.

Although both respondents identified a range of equity matters for children and for teachers, the NZEI respondent ended on a positive note:

...times are hard and there is little if any government will to advance equity issues in education – either for teachers or for children. Having said that – I've been in this particular battle for some time and I think it's a winnable one – but I do believe it will take legislative support or unions to win.

EQUITY MATTERS: IRELAND Case Study

Three teachers' unions responded to the survey and case study: the Teachers' Union of Ireland (TUI), the Irish National Teachers' Organisation (INTO), and the Association for Secondary Teachers Ireland (ASTI). The representatives of all three unions provided detailed responses to the case study questions regarding equity for teachers and for children. Their responses provide an overview of the nature of government and unions' policies with regard to equity matters, and, at the same time, indicate the threats to further progress that have arisen because of the economic crisis in Ireland, and the 'austerity measures' that are being introduced. As in other countries, the equity issues are both general and relative. The Irish state has specific policies for promoting equity in education for the Indigenous community – the Traveller (nomadic community), and for children with special and additional needs. In common with the Case Studies for Canada and New Zealand, the Indigenous community emerges as experiencing both general and relative inequities.

The unions' statements on equity are as follows:

TUI policy on equity is documented through various motions agreed at our annual congresses over a number of years. These include: fair and transparent selection procedures for entry to second level schools requiring all schools to enrol a mix of students in accordance with the local demographic profile; disability/special needs, ethnic minorities, socio-economic profile etc; additional resources (staff, grants, facilities) to ensure schools can meet the needs of particular and special interest groups within mainstream settings; special educational needs; ethnic minorities; those for whom English is a second language; additional weightings for schools (teacher numbers, grants; supports for schools in areas of high socio economic disadvantage.

It is an object of the Organisation to promote the interests of education and to support the concept of equal access to full education for all children and to strive for the raising of educational standards. INTO

ASTI has no formal statement as such on equity in general. ASTI has strong reputation for being to the forefront in various advocacy and lobbying campaigns for greater equity in education policy. Our motivation for such campaigns has been driven by policy adopted at our annual conference which in turn reflects the views of the educators. The rationale therefore for support for equity campaigns is ethical.

The main equity issues for teachers

Schools do not have enough specialist staff; class sizes are too big so the needs of students are not being met; policy for inter-culturalism is under-developed; no policy to ensure that the familiar pattern of migrant children does not occur; teacher allocation is internally linked to capacity of a school to offer wider subject, curriculum choice and provide additional supports and services according to student needs; pension issues for new teachers; pay and pensions; CPD for specific age/minority groups.

The main equity issues for students

Social and economic disadvantage, special needs, early childhood education; social class – literacy and overall achievement levels are closely related to income and class; emotional and behavioural problems; learning disabilities; 16% rate of early school leaving; weighting of resources; the digital divide (those who do/do not have access to ICT at home and/or in schools) .

There are specific equity issues regarding early childhood education include funding, training and employment of teachers. Ireland is among a very small number of countries that lack a fully established early education service. Notwithstanding some efforts in this regard in the past 10 + years access is limited, restricted and very varied. Given evidence that effective early education gives children a head start in terms of educational development this is no longer acceptable. Increased investment is essential to maintain quality, ensure an up to date service for a modern world.

There have been no cutbacks in services for children under five in terms of education. Free pre-school scheme will continue according to the budget. Provision for three year olds is in the private community and voluntary sector where the level of qualifications required by the staff is pitched at Level 5 on the qualifications framework which is the

equivalent of one year post second level school. The INTO has expressed concern that this level has been pitched too low. Children of four and five who attend primary schools are taught by qualified primary school teachers who are graduates.

The INTO respondent proposed three areas for development in this sector to improve equity and quality:

- Enhance the level of qualification required of staff in the pre-school sector (three to four year olds) from Level 5 to graduate level for the leaders and a minimum of Level 5 qualification for support staff.
- Infant classes in primary schools need to be fully equipped and resourced to provide a play based curriculum which is age appropriate.
- CPD is required for teachers in the infant classrooms (ages 4-6) in order to ensure that the most up-to-date methodologies and approaches to learning for the particular age group are employed.

Investment and Resource Allocation

As noted by the TUI (section 5) inadequate investment in education has many impacts and in this regard teacher numbers, teacher allocations and teacher expertise are interrelated. In some areas, progress that has been made is being halted or reversed due to reduced resource allocation to education and related services (such as support for Traveller education, and for special educational needs). Potential areas where reduced resource allocation might influence equity for children include:

Additional supports for children with learning disabilities and children with learning difficulties (INTO: 1). The abolition of teaching positions of Visiting Teachers for Travellers (VTT) the Resource Teachers for Travellers (RTT). In future, support for this group will be provided by 'learning support teachers', whose services can be applied for under the General Allocation System (INTO: 2). (NB Travellers are considered to be the most marginalised group in the country (INTO: 11).

The TUI response indicates that it is a government policy to integrate those with special needs and members of the Travelling community into mainstream education. This has led or will lead to the closure of special schools and centres. The difficulty is not so much in the closure of such schools and centres but in the fact that sufficient additional funding is not being made available to mainstream schools to support integration. (TUI: Section 6/7). While there are some enhanced allocations this is insufficient to truly promote equity of access and outcome for many students. In similar fashion some schools, because of population mix are unable to draw on any additional finances from private family contributions. Further enhancement of capitation grants is necessary to enable such schools to develop their supports and services to students in a manner that ensures greater equity e.g. library services, provide additional in school activities, out of school activities etc.

Additional resources are needed for support services such as educational psychologists, secretarial, support staff (especially for language and SEN) and classroom assistants.

The ASTI response (Q9) underscores these views:

The austerity measures brought in so far have raised class sizes, eliminated categories of specialist teachers – specifically for Traveller children and migrant children, reduced funding to schools, and curtailed funding for school programmes and libraries. Invariably, these measures will impact on schools... The capacity of schools to meet needs is very significantly constrained. ASTI has conducted in-depth qualitative research which shows that schools are not able to provide teacher-intensive, small group programmes for SEN students and students at risk of early school leaving. The official line from the Government for all public sector workers is “doing more with less”.

The INTO respondent highlighted the importance of sustainability of initiatives:

Intervention programmes need to be sustained over time if progress is to be maintained. There is sometimes an assumption that if a child is doing fine, supports can be removed. However, the child is usually doing fine because the supports are there. Teachers' influence on pupils learning is significant, therefore, there is a need to be constantly investing in ensuring that teachers remain

motivated and upskilled and informed of developments in education, teaching and learning, so that they can enhance educational outcomes for an increasingly diverse pupil population. Schools alone cannot compensate for difficult social and economic circumstances, therefore, family and community supports are also required if educational outcomes for disadvantaged children are to be improved.

Access to education

The Traveller community in Ireland has unacceptably low levels of educational participation and achievement. This is consistent with findings from other countries regarding Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) communities. However, it is clear that some strategies combine to sustain inequities for this minority group. A government survey found that 'some schools use all kinds of restrictive admission policies to exclude Travellers, those with special needs, the children of immigrants and low achievers'. However, the policy issues here are 'very complicated'; it is evident from the responses that funding to this community is being reduced, in spite of these equity issues, and in spite of the unions calling for additional resources, as the TUI respondent noted:

In practice, schools especially those under private management and publically funded, are able to frame general admissions policies that espouse equality of access but enable them to select certain students out. (TUI: Section 1)

For children with special and additional needs, parents can choose whether to send their children to a special or a mainstream school. The policy of integration (also for Traveller children) has led or will lead to the closure of special schools and centres. The difficulty is not so much in the closure of such schools and centres but in the fact that sufficient additional funding is not being made available to mainstream schools to support integration.

Public-private – the 'mixed economy' of provision and funding

The TUI response on this matter gives a detailed account of what policies are in operation, and the effects these have on equity in the education system, via funding

mechanisms, school choice and selection procedures. As such, the response provides some insights into the tensions, and slippage, between policy and practice.

In Ireland each school under law is required to publish a policy concerning admission and participation as set out in Part IV, Section 15, Education Act, 1998

“ (d) publish, in such manner as the board with the agreement of the patron considers appropriate, the policy of the school concerning admission to and participation in the school, including the policy of the school relating to the expulsion and suspension of students and admission to and participation by students with disabilities or who have other special educational needs, and ensure that as regards that policy principles of equality and the right of parents to send their children to a school of the parents’ choice are respected and such directions as may be made from time to time by the Minister, having regard to the characteristic spirit of the school and the constitutional rights of all persons concerned, are complied with,

(e) have regard to the principles and requirements of a democratic society and have respect and promote respect for the diversity of values, beliefs, traditions, languages and ways of life in society,

(f) have regard to the efficient use of resources (and, in particular, the efficient use of grants provided under [section 12](#)), the public interest in the affairs of the school and accountability to students, their parents, the patron, staff and the community served by the school, and

(g) use the resources provided to the school from monies provided by the Oireachtas to make reasonable provision and accommodation for students with a disability or other special educational needs, including, where necessary, alteration of buildings and provision of appropriate equipment”.

This legal provision addresses admission to and participation by students with disabilities or special needs and also advocates the principles of equality and right of parents to send their children to a school of their choice. In practice this legislation

although useful is a far cry away from what is actually necessary to bring about a truly more equitable system. In fact, if one examines a number of national policy documents and legislation it becomes clear that a commitment to real equity or a substantial move in that direction is not explicit. In practice, schools especially those under private management and publically funded, are able to frame general admissions policies that espouse equality of access but enable them to select certain students out.

An audit by the Department of Education and Science on school enrolment practices in post-primary in 2008/2009 found that particular types of students (special needs, newcomers, those from low socio-economic backgrounds) were concentrated in certain schools within certain catchment areas. It found that some schools use all kinds of restrictive admission policies to exclude Travellers, those with special needs, the children of immigrants and low achievers. However, the Department has not yet addressed this in any meaningful manner in terms of requesting all schools to admit a reasonable, relative mix of students in accordance with the population mix in their general catchment area.

Instead schools are allowed to administer selection criteria such as – has a sibling or parent been a previous student, religious background or the school is ill equipped to cater for student need. In addition, although admission/entry tests per se are no longer acceptable to select students for entry, schools have been able to continue to administer such tests under the guise that they assist streaming of students after they receive a place. School practices have not been interrogated sufficiently to establish if such tests are still being used to actually select students for admission. The TUI sees this as enabling gross inequity.

The equity issue becomes more obvious when one examines the manner in which schools receive state funding both in respect of teacher salaries, per student grants and other grants. In Ireland approximately 730 schools from three different traditions and origins provide post-primary education. The range of schools (below) operate all around the country and offer the same national curriculum, within which subject choice/options and type of supports available to students varies considerably. (Note – details in table below represent estimates only).

School type	Student Numbers	Public funding		
Vocational Schools/ Colleges	254 (25 have ceased to provide post- primary education or offer very limited provision)	teachers salaries	Capital programme for infrastructure	per student grant most have access additional loading to combat disadvantage
Community and Comprehensive Schools	92	teachers salaries	Capital programme for infrastructure	per student grant many have additional loading in to combat disadvantage
Voluntary Secondary Schools (Non-fee paying but may seek small voluntary contributions)	Approx 300	teachers salaries	Capital programme for infrastructure (often enhanced by private fundraising or religious institutions)	per student grant lower than above – not of great significant given other factors, additional loading in small number of cases to combat disadvantage.
Voluntary Secondary Schools (Fee paying)	Approx 56	teachers salaries	Very limited (rare) access to funds for infrastructure	no access to per student grant

For profit private (very small number)	Very small number - under 5			

Of critical observation is that the vast majority of fee paying schools (56) fall within the voluntary secondary sector, with teacher salaries met by the state. Although they have a marginally higher pupil: teacher ratio (one student), and are not in receipt of a per student capitation grant, the level of fees charged by schools contribute to exclusive recruitment practices. Fees range from as little as €4000 to over €10,000 and are only affordable by those on high middle to high income. They therefore act as a selection mechanism based on socio economic background, although some colleges reserve a small number of places for people living in their local communities or from less well off backgrounds. The highly inequitable situation is well demonstrated by the fact that some of these schools draw in up to €4m (depending on size) per annum, far exceeding the monies that would be available under the per student state grant. While the private schools have to maintain capital and day to day running costs from the fees collected or other fundraising activity, a considerable amount is used to bolster the educational and social experience of students by including additional tutorials, a strong pastoral system, additional subject choice and options at higher level studies (which affect progression to third level), social activities and in some case access to exclusive and high quality sporting facilities. TUI believes this adds up to state supported educational apartheid (Peter MacMenamin, General Secretary).

In tandem many non-fee paying Voluntary Secondary Schools serve communities or families that can afford to make small voluntary contributions to enhance the state grant per student enabling wider subject choice/options and/or additional extracurricular activities and pastoral support to be offered. These advantages are borne out when progression to third level education is examined. Fee paying schools and others that levy parents for voluntary contributions show higher than average student progression to third level, higher progression to universities and colleges of education as opposed to the Institutes of Technology that offer 'applied' studies and also show higher progression to the high status third level courses.

The detailed TUI response indicates equity issues that are echoed in the overall findings of the study. If these comments are set alongside those made about the provision of early childhood education in Ireland it can be argued that inequities that emerge in the earliest years of education can be sustained and even exacerbated in later years for some children. In addition, the structural inequities that exist in society can act to sustain inequities for teachers and for children.

CPD for teachers

Major barriers to CPD for teachers are the lack of a framework of CPD, and of funding. Teachers' contracts only stipulate the number of teaching hours. Teachers engage in CPD generally in their own time and at their own expense. Where national programmes are introduced they are supported by CPD during school time. However, CPD for teachers is far more comprehensive than up-skilling in new curriculum areas. (INTO: 5b) Specific areas in which CPD is required are identified as special educational needs; literacy and numeracy (especially in lower secondary); language needs; ICT across the teacher range and age group; pre-school (in order to implement the new Early Years curriculum – 'Aistear'); minority groups; multi-cultural education. The TUI also identified ICT as an area of concern because of the 'digital divide' in society, the need to use ICT to bridge the 'home-school' divide, and the need to resource ICT infrastructure in schools to enable these developments. Teachers' professional development is inadequate especially in terms of up-skilling for working with the above groupings. ICT is very poorly developed both in terms of access to broadband, hardware facilities and software and digital mediums.

It is not only additional or targeted CPD that is significant in addressing equity matters. INTO (3) identifies the need for an increase in support services for children and for teachers, such as speech therapists and educational psychologists.

The TUI indicates that, in recent years, CPD has incorporated more attention to generic issues such as differentiated materials, active learning strategies and classroom management. CPD support has typically been confined to a small number of teachers as opposed to targeting the full range of teachers involved. Inadequate professional development shows a failure to recognise the changing composition of the student group

in many schools and the specific and general teacher expertise necessary to translate 'inclusion policies' into practice in classrooms and schools. (TUI: Section 4).

Implications for EI

ASTI has always highly rated the importance of international teacher unity and a strong voice for the profession at regional and global level. For Ireland, work EI is conducting on trends such as privatisation in education, performance related pay for teachers, etc, is vital to keep up informed of new ideological paradigms which will invariably be reflected in Irish debate and public discourse. It is doing a good job currently, especially via its role in GCE and the achievement of the MDGS, 2 and 3

TUI - Provide comparative data and analysis across countries with special reference to strategies that have proven effective or ineffective. A specific study on 'class size' and implications for teaching and learning would be helpful. Primarily lobbying and raising profile of issues and injustices. Strong, accurate and comparative data must be a feature of this.

INTO - International comparative information is always useful. Continuing to highlight inequities and sharing information across unions. Influencing international organisations that then influence governments.

Summary

The responses from the three unions consistently paint a picture of high demands on resources to sustain equity, which are difficult to meet in a climate of austerity measures. The implication of these shared perspectives is that without effective CPD it may be harder to achieve the quality of teaching that is needed to support goals for equity and quality. The ASTI respondent commented that 'Schools cannot compensate for society', as did the INTO respondent 'Schools alone cannot compensate for difficult social and economic circumstances, therefore, family and community supports are also required if educational outcomes for disadvantaged children are to be improved'. In common with the overall findings from the study, these comments do not imply a sense of 'helplessness' but rather indicate the need for the matrix of social and economic problems to be addressed from co-ordinated policy perspectives.

As in other regions of the world, there are structural inequities in Ireland. Patterns of achievement for children are related to income and social class: children from low income families have lower levels of literacy, leave school earlier and have more difficulties at school. TUI and INTO indicate the need for increased resource allocation, and changes in resource distribution, as the key strategies for addressing equity matters in education, and more widely in society. Therefore, working within the current economic climate of reduced allocation, and more targeted distribution, creates a number of challenges for sustaining equitable policies and practices. Each of the thematic areas identified in this case study are interdependent, so that changes in one area (such as resource allocation) will inevitably impact on other areas, such as teachers' salaries and pensions; CPD for teachers in specialist areas; access to specialist education support for children in minority groups.

EQUITY MATTERS: ENGLAND Case Study

National Association for Schoolteachers Union of Women Teachers

The NASUWT is one of several teacher unions in the UK which includes members across the teaching profession, from pre-school (birth to 5) to post-compulsory (age 16) education. The NASUWT represents teachers from the four UK countries England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland have their own devolved governments, funding arrangements and education systems, which are not identical, but share some common features.

The NASUWT'S website address is www.nasuwt.org.uk

Most Department for Education policies in relation to educational equality policy in England can be accessed through its Teachernet website, www.teachernet.gov.uk

In Wales, the Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills is the relevant department

<http://wales.gov.uk/about/civilservice/departments/dcells/:jsessionid=5tWwMhJbsy9fvvykFzvGlnq5sx3hfTbBjG6C7p5hg6CKpqNphl53!-1109583048?lang=en>

The corresponding department in Scotland is at

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education>

The corresponding department in Scotland and Northern Ireland is at

<http://www.deni.gov.uk>

The qualitative responses that were given to some of the items in the Survey were repeated in the Case Study responses. The NASUWT website carries detailed information about unions and government policies, and about recent and ongoing campaigns that focus on equity matters.

Case study responses

In the Survey response, the NASUWT emphasised that the issues on which this survey are focused are reflected in all areas of the Union's work: the union's equity statement indicates that the NASUWT is committed to an approach that seeks not to inappropriately compartmentalise its work in relation to equality and diversity.

The NASUWT has been at the forefront of campaigning for equality in the workplace, education and wider society. The Union is at the forefront of

formulating policy on equality issues relevant to teachers and within education in general and we have a long and proud tradition of standing up to all forms of prejudice, discrimination and intolerance throughout society. (Q1 – statement on equity)

The NASUWT provided a broad policy statement in Q3, rather than a detailed specification of union priorities. The reason for this was stated as follows. Firstly, the union works to ensure that all aspects of its work embed its commitment to promoting equality and diversity and tackling discrimination and prejudice. Secondly, in relation to government, while it would be possible to point to aspects of policy and legislation that aim to address the areas highlighted in the questions set out above (3, 4, 5, and 6), the NASUWT's view is that inequities can be identified in all these areas. In this respect, none of these aspects of Government policies can be said to have been implemented fully given the incomplete achievement of these objectives.

The NASUWT did not specify any priorities or 'hierarchy' of equity issues for teachers or for children. This is because the union believes in a holistic view of equalities-related activity which should be based on the clear principle that addressing all forms of discrimination and prejudice should be of equal importance, and that understands the connections between different aspects of equalities work as they relate to distinct groups. The union's website provides information on relevant union and government policies, along with past and current campaigns focusing on equity matters.

Examples of recent initiatives and campaigns are given with regard to barriers to achieving equity (Lime Survey, Q. 10). Issues associated with barriers to achieving equity within the education systems in the UK are highly complex and continue to be the subject of significant debate. However, particular examples of policy in respect of equity in these education systems that have been the subject of recent focus have included barriers to access to leadership positions for black and minority ethnic teachers. On this issue the NASUWT has been involved in joint work with the National College, the body responsible for entry into and development within school leadership role in England. Further details of this work can be accessed at http://www.nasuwat.org.uk/consum/groups/public/@equalityandtraining/documents/nas_download/nasuwat_005377.pdf

Other areas of recent attention have focused on the impact of far right racist and fascist organisations on the schools system, prejudice-related bullying, the extent to which the curriculum and qualifications structure supports the promotion of equality and diversity, and the impact of age discrimination on teachers and the education system generally. Information about all these issues is available on the NASUWT's website.

In relation to these issues highlighted in the response to Question 11, the Union has had a significant influence on the shape of Government legislation, policy and practice. The extent of this is set out in materials referred to above available on the NASUWT website. There is also extensive information available on this aspect of the Union's work available in the Trade Union Congress' 2009 Equality Audit which highlights the impact of the NASUWT's work in areas including, pay, pensions, health and safety and professional development. The report can be accessed at <http://www.tuc.org.uk/equality/tuc-16977-f0.cfm>

In relation to question 1, the NASUWT believes that, where it is appropriate, pupils with disabilities and special educational needs should be educated in mainstream settings with effective access to additional support where necessary. However, the NASUWT is clear that a genuinely inclusive education system involves the provision of special and alternative settings, working in partnership with mainstream schools, for pupils for whom an objective assessment of their needs indicates that this would represent the most effective means by which their needs can be met.

In the NASUWT's view, a policy aspiration that resources should be shared equally between urban and rural settings, as implied by Question 7, is inappropriate given the complexities associated with establishing a system-wide model of genuinely equitable funding. For example, seeking crude equity in the funding of urban and rural areas would involve no account being taken of the differences in levels of socio-economic deprivation or special and additional needs that require additional funding and which can be identified in both urban and rural contexts.

In the NASUWT's view, issues raised in Question 9 about the funding of different sectors raise comparable considerations in relation to the need to base funding

decisions on the specific needs of these sectors. A crude policy of uniform funding of all sectors could result in serious inequities given the inability of such a system to take account of the distinctive needs each sector may have. Further information about the NASUWT's position on school funding can be found at

<http://www.nasuwt.org.uk/InformationandAdvice/NASUWTPolicyStatements/SchoolFunding/index.htm>

For some items, the nature of the issues raised means that it is not possible to give accurate responses to these items in the manner prescribed in the response form. In relation to items 1 and 17, it is clear from the responses given elsewhere in this response that the NASUWT's view is that the setting within which pupils with special educational needs are educated is dependent upon an objective assessment of the nature of their needs and where these might best be met.

In respect of items 6 and 18, in the context of the education system in place in England, parents have the ability to express a preference for a particular school but the necessary constraints in an education system working with finite resources means that it is not always possible to ensure that this preference can be met. While there may be circumstances where it is legitimate for parents to seek to send their children to particular schools, a key concern in this respect derives from the fact that the current system of school admissions is based on a particular notion of parental choice that casts parents as consumers of educational services within a context of a quasi-market for school places. The competition between schools generated by this approach not only seeks to secure choice between providers as a benefit in itself, but is also intended to encourage all schools to raise standards of achievement as a result of the serious potential consequences for any school appearing to be less successful than its competitors. The NASUWT believes that this conceptualisation of parental choice is based on an outdated and inappropriate view of the ways in which relationships between schools and parents should be developed and sustained. The existing model of choice generates competition between schools rather than the greater levels of institutional collaboration that are essential to the effective and sustainable delivery of key aspects of educational provision.

Items 10, 13 and 15 relate to the extent to which educational provision should be personalised for individual children. The responses indicated that while a minority of pupils in the education systems in place in UK are educated in single-sex settings, the key point in respect of educational gender equality in the view of the NASUWT is that educational provision must be established that ensures that boys and girls are able to have their educational needs met effectively and which allows them to reach the highest level of attainment of which they are capable. This can require the deployment of approaches to curriculum design and implementation that are designed specifically to address gender inequalities. For the NASUWT, it is this consideration that should be given primacy in strategies to address educational gender inequality.

On item 15, the extent to which educational provision should be made in a pupil's home language, or in the principal teaching language used in the setting within which they are educated, is a matter that should be determined for each pupil on the basis of professional judgements made by teachers and headteachers. Critical in this context is the extent of support made available to staff in schools to support pupils and staff in schools in these circumstances. In the context of the education systems in the UK, significant proposed reductions in public expenditure announced by the Government place at risk the ability of local authorities to maintain current levels of support for pupils with English as an additional language. This is a matter of serious concern to the NASUWT and its members working in front line classroom roles.

The current pay arrangements in place in the overwhelming majority of state funded schools in England involves, in effect, automatic periodic progression up the pay scale unless information gained from the performance management process gives rise to concerns that this would be inappropriate. Through its work in social partnership with the previous (New Labour) Government, the NASUWT was closely involved in the development of guidance that recognised the need for these arrangements to be implemented in schools in a way that reflects fully the letter and spirit of equal pay and equality legislation and to ensure that comprehensive arrangements were put in place to ensure compliance with these statutory provisions. The future of these robust arrangements in respect of pay equality has been placed in significant doubt by the commitment of the Government (a Coalition government of Conservatives and Liberal Democrats took office in 11 May 2010) to alter radically the contractual provisions' under

which teachers are employed and to place more schools beyond the scope of these provisions.

The respondent gave a comprehensive view of the ways in which EI can support the work of the unions at national and international levels. A key area in which Education International can support the work of the NASUWT is through research based activity that allows for objective and informed analysis of equity-related policy and practice in a wide range of education systems and with which practice in the UK can be compared. This would complement work to evaluate the effectiveness of provision in the UK with that elsewhere by highlighting potential strengths and alternative approaches where current arrangements have been identified as being in need of refinement or possible replacement.

This final comment is challenging in that it is difficult to compare equity-related policy and practice in a wide range of education systems, because of wide variations within and between countries. Not all countries participate in international monitoring regimes such as PISA, PIRLS and OECD reports (the thirty OECD countries are predominantly economically developed, northern hemisphere countries, with only one in South America [Mexico], two in Asia [Japan and Korea], two in Pasifika [Australia and New Zealand] and two in the middle-east [Israel and Turkey]. Even within the OECD European countries, there are significant variations between the Scandinavian, the southern European and the former eastern bloc countries – Europe is not a homogenous entity. OECD monitoring reports (such as *Education at a Glance*, 2006) provide statistical information across a number of indicators (from pre-school through to tertiary and higher education). These statistics can be indicative of both subtle and significant differences that have implications for equity. In addition, the statistical analyses within the OECD indicators do not give any indication of the quality of education systems.

The NASUWT respondent provided further suggestions for the future work of EI:

Education International has a well established range of policy objectives focused on equity which it continues to pursue through its work in relation to the joint UNESCO/ILO apparatus on the status of teachers, its activity as part of the Global Campaign for Education which continues to focus on educational

inequality in developing countries and in its commitment to the development of a comprehensive policy on education. There is a risk that these areas of activity may be given less emphasis as a result of understandable concerns relating to action being taken in a significant number of countries to tackle sovereign debt issues and the ongoing consequences of the global economic and financial crisis.

EI must make clear that, notwithstanding the importance of these matters, no excuse can be accepted for downgrading the importance of equalities issues for all those with responsibility for the development and implementation of education policy. In particular, EI must work closely with affiliates to counter pressures from business organisations in a range of countries that equalities legislation should be relaxed given the alleged costs of compliance for employers. EI must use its influence to argue strongly that the solution to the economic challenges confronting many countries is not to reduce the legal protection against discrimination and prejudice members of affiliate organisations enjoy in their workplaces.

Finally, the respondent from the NASUWT expressed reservations about the design of the survey, and the purposes to which the data might be used:

Given the importance of equity-related work to EI and its affiliates, it is necessary for the NASUWT to reassert its reservations about key aspects of the methodology associated with the this research and the potential uses to which it may be put. There is a need for EI to be much clearer about the aims of this research, the definition of 'equity' adopted within the context of the research and the need to avoid the development of policies that privilege unjustifiably certain aspects of equity-related policy and practice over others. The NASUWT would be please to discuss its concerns in more detail with members of the research team if this would be helpful. However, it is important to note that the NASUWT will look to raise these issues with appropriate officials within EI to seek reassurances about the concerns it has identified in relation to this research.

It can be concluded that the response of the union to the survey reflects these concerns. However, it should be noted firstly, that the research team (in EI and Exeter)

collaboratively decided against imposing a single definition of equity or equality as this might have constrained the views and responses of individual countries. Secondly, there was no attempt to 'privilege unjustifiably certain aspects of equity-related policy and practice over others'. The items in the Lime Survey that focused on identifying the main inequities in each country's education system was an attempt to capture the *variations* within and between countries that differ in terms of their GDP, and in the context of socio-cultural-historical trajectories of development. This is a pragmatic acknowledgement that, although all aspects of equity and equality may be important, only some may be the focus of attention, or indeed a priority, at any one time, in unions' and/or governments' policies. This is because of scarce resources, changes in the economic conditions for development and progress, or changes in governments.

Commentary

As the NASUWT respondent notes, there are significant costs to employers of equalities legislation. The case studies for England, Ireland, New Zealand and Canada all indicate that the current economic downturn is influencing equity issues in countries that would be considered 'highly developed' in economic terms, and in the HDI index. In common with the case study for Ireland, equity matters across the UK are being influenced by the 'austerity measures' of the current British Coalition (Conservative and Liberal Democrat) government, and by an ideological shift towards increasing privatisation of public sector services. Although England is a member country of the EU, its education policies have, in recent years, looked more towards the U.S.A. rather than to other European countries. This influence is evident, for example, in the current promotion of free schools and academies in the primary and secondary education sectors, promoting parental choice, potentially relaxing the requirement for some adults who teach in schools to have qualified teacher status, and in the marketisation of education services. These factors are having an impact on global trends in education, as well as at national level, and are likely to impact on equity matters for teachers and for children, as evidenced in the findings of this study.

These indicators suggest that continued progress towards equity matters for teachers and for children may be at risk, and that the progress that has been made towards equity and quality may not be sustainable. An example of an area of potential risk in equity and quality is in the Early Years phase. In England, those who hold qualified teacher status

are on the same pay scale on entry to the profession, when they work in state-funded schools. This includes teachers in Early Years Foundation Stage settings (age birth-5), such as nursery schools, children's centres, and reception classes (age 4-5) in primary schools. This long-standing commitment to parity of pay and status may be eroded by the Government removing the requirement to employ a qualified teacher in Children's Centres in deprived areas. This policy change may result in sustaining inequities through lower quality of educational experiences and poorer outcomes for children. (This is in spite of the fact that research evidence shows that the highest quality and the best outcomes are achieved in settings which employ qualified early years teachers). This is one example of how equity and quality may be linked in the earliest years of children's education, and how these might be undermined by shifts in government policies. The advances in early childhood education and care that were made under the previous New Labour governments were widely regarded as contributing to greater social justice, but it is this sector that has seen some of the most immediate cuts under the austerity measures. Other, 'austerity measures' in the public sector mean that funding will be targeted on 'the most disadvantaged' children and families. For example, there is also the threat to buying in support services for at-risk children, as these services are now a 'commodity choice' for individual schools. Those under threat include children with special needs and disabilities, and children from vulnerable groups, such as Gypsy-Traveller children.

In addition, although teachers have parity of pay and status on entry to the profession, it is unlikely that this will be sustained over time. Career (and salary) progression is more varied in primary and secondary schools according to the size of the school, and the opportunities for leadership and management roles. (Qualified teachers in the private sector do not have to be paid on national scales).

As a result of these socio-political and socio-economic trends, unions in economically developed nations may find themselves having to fight new battles for equity, equality and quality. This reflects the evidence presented in this study, namely that each country has its own trajectory of development with regard to equity matters, but that the gains made over time can easily be eroded under new political and economic conditions. .

EQUITY MATTERS: POLAND Case Study

Polish Teachers' Union (ZNP)

Currently the Polish Teachers' Union (ZNP) is the largest affiliated union in the country, and was established in 1905. The following site has further details on the ZNP http://www.znp.edu.pl/element/581/General_information

The ZNP took part in the initial pilot survey, so information from this, along with the actual survey and case study details are included here. In the pilot survey, the respondent provided the following background information about the education system, which illustrates the 'mixed economy' of public and private funding of education in Poland:

In 2008/09 almost all pupils attended public-sector schools (98 %). Most of the funds come from the state budget. In line with the Education System Act of 1991, schools can be of two types: public (state) schools, which offer free education within the framework of the core curricula, and non-public schools. The latter can be civic (social), church or private schools. All these schools may have their own curricula, which are approved by the Minister of National Education. They are financed by fees received from parents. Funds can also come from private enterprises and foundations. Non-public schools with the rights of public schools are eligible for a grant calculated according to the number of pupils, which equals 100% of the average cost of educating a pupil in a public school. Non-public schools in Poland have the right to issue school certificates that are recognized by all other schools and by the universities. They may be distinguished from the public schools by their individualized teaching programmes, by a wider range of curriculum choice and by a higher standard of foreign language teaching. The administration, organization and decisions relating to the use of financial resources by schools are the subject of consultation between the school and the body running the school, i.e. local authorities (gminy) – in case of kindergartens, primary and lower secondary schools, and district authorities (powiaty) – in case of upper secondary schools.

In Poland there are more than 326 private (non-public) high schools and more than 130 public high schools. However, the numbers of students in public high

schools is much bigger (approx 1,300,000 [60% of pupils] to approx 600 thousand [30% of pupils] in private schools).

The union's policy statement/s on equity is as follows:

In its policy the ZNP applies a definition of the concept of equity included in EU directives. It appears in reference to: preventing discrimination in the workplace (salary, professional career); preventing discrimination on the basis of trade union membership; fighting against a limited access to education for certain social groups (depending on their financial status and social background); religion; promotion of sexual education despite the opinion endorsed by the church. The ZNP trade union does not have one policy paper concerning equity/equality in education. There are many statements on different issues, fragments of which include opinions on different aspects of equality in education. In Poland teachers have lowest salaries in Europe. This situation is unfair but rules about how the salaries are established are the same for all teachers in Poland independent of type of school or region. Is this Equity in this case?

Items 1, 2 and 6 were identified as the most important issues in the union's policies for children:

- Equality of educational access.
- Equality of educational outcomes.
- Equity for students of all cultural ethnic backgrounds.

The following reasons were given (Q5):

50% of pre-school children, mostly from socially and economically underprivileged areas, do not go to kindergartens, which influences considerably their educational pathway. As a result of the political transformation in Poland, there are more and more disadvantaged people. There are at present about 1 million of malnourished children in Poland. Educational policy regulations do not include the question of gender discrimination (e.g. in curricula).

Items 10, 14 and 15 were identified as the most important issues in the union's policies for teachers for the following reasons (Q7):

- Equity for teachers in terms of pay.
- Equity for teachers in terms of career opportunity.
- Equity for teachers in terms of status.

Though officially, qualifications are required and provided, standards of education call for modernisation as they are inadequate to current needs. There is a discrepancy in working conditions and the quality of teachers' in-service training between public and non-public schools. Gender issues need to be solved as well in education. Women employed in education receive a lower pension because of maternity leave and still must fight against the so-called "glass-ceiling".

The Teachers' Charter, being a form of collective bargaining, guarantees the same pay conditions and working time conditions for all teachers. More than 90% of teachers receive higher education. So there is no discrepancy.

The government protects insufficiently people of a different sexual orientation. When it comes to the implementation of sexual education at school, it opts for the position typical of the Catholic Church. (See details at the end of the case study regarding diversity the religious affiliations of Polish citizens).

The main inequities were identified as follows:

- lack of appropriate education provided for pupils
- lack of appropriate education for teachers
- lack of effective means of preventing discrepancies in infrastructure
- lack of effective means of preventing discrepancies between geographical regions

The respondent described the range of actions taken by ZNP on equity issues, and their involvement in initiatives at intergovernmental level.

The ZNP takes part in international actions such as Education for All and tries to involve the government in such initiatives. It co-creates educational policy and undertakes civic initiatives. The ZNP is a member of the Coalition for Equal Chances being an anti-

discrimination group whose first meeting took place on 19th April 2010. At the ZNP there has also been created an Equal Treatment Committee whose aim is to promote equity and improve anti-discrimination law valid in Poland via e.g. training courses provided for equal treatment experts (anti-discrimination law, equality in education, good practice examples, etc.). We prepare opinions, bills, legal regulations or protest letters addressed to the national authorities. Moreover, the ZNP has, over a number of years, been working on the code of conduct. The aim is to improve the status and legal protection of education workers and enhance professional and ethical responsibility towards pupils, colleagues and parents.

The respondent identified the following main goals which the education system should achieve in order to ensure equity:

- no discrimination to young teachers (salary)
- access to kindergartens (50% of children, mostly from disadvantaged backgrounds, do not go to kindergarten)
- access to education in socially underprivileged areas
- teachers' qualifications in non-public institutions

There are some barriers to achieving equity in the country's education system, which were identified as follows:

There are substantial discrepancies between local government units when it comes to education financing. There is also a demographic aspect: population decline brings about reduced expenditure on education. Fewer students means less money transferred to a given school according to the so-called principle of education vouchers. (Q11)

The ZNP respondent noted that it was particularly difficult to answer some of the questions above as the existing legal regulations in Poland only theoretically guarantee equal treatment to all. This stands in opposition to the practice. Sometimes questions did not make it possible to differentiate these issues. For example, the problem of children with learning disabilities is not easily solved. Although one should opt for their complete

integration, such a decision would require adequate preparation of teachers and the implementation of architectural solutions. In the event of no possibilities at our disposal, parents prefer to choose institutions where their children could work with specialists and can feel comfortable.

What role can EI play?

It can present opinions on equality problems arising in the field of education at the level of supranational structures. Another solution is lobbying of government. The EI can also undertake actions whose aim is to monitor the observance of legal regulations by the governments.

Additional response: The following section includes the perspectives of the National Science Section NSZZ Solidarność. Because the Survey was not fully completed, the responses used here are drawn from the qualitative comments, and add the union's perspectives on educational development in Poland. The union has around 18,000 members in a range of higher educational institutions, as indicated in the statement on equity.

The Section's aim is to protect the rights, dignity and interests of trade union members employed in higher education institutions, institutes and other education units. The Section promotes the development of education and science as well as aims to raise public awareness as to both the sectors' importance for economic, intellectual and cultural growth and for the creation of national identity and for democracy.

The union does influence the government regarding specific conditions of service and remuneration for higher education workers.

From the initiative KSN that the Polish Parliament accepted, a three-step programme that increased the remuneration levels of higher education workers

The inclusion of 50% non-tax deductible costs as the basis for income tax calculations was adopted at the majority of higher education institutions for employees whose work was protected by copyright.

KSN gives opinions on the proposals of bills and decrees that apply to science.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHNIC AND NATIONAL MINORITIES IN POLAND

The following information was provided by the ZNUT respondent. It is included here for the purpose of illustrating what 'diversity' means for one country (and how that varies across countries in the survey). The information is also useful because it indicates rates of participation in education for minority groups, and whether the education system caters for their home/community languages and religious affiliations.

Poland is relatively mono-ethnic, homogenous country. According to the official statistics there are approx. 100,000 legal migrants in Poland (and 38 Million Polish citizens in total). The majority of them are without families, so we have in our schools very few children from abroad (e.g. in Warsaw, where the number of migrants is the biggest we had in last year but it's only about 1000 migrant students). Only 30% of all migrants' children living in Poland don't speak Polish well enough to learn in Polish schools. So it is very difficult to answer questions about access of migrant students to education.

Also ethnic and national minorities are quite small, approx. 200,000 citizens. Their children can choose between Polish public schools or their own schools which are usually also public (an exception to this rule are very small ethnic or national groups, which provide teaching in their own language rather than in non-public institutions like their cultural centers).

A report of the Polish Ministry of the Interior Administration provided the following figures concerning minorities:

Poland is inhabited by the representatives of 9 national minorities: Belorussians, Czechs, Lithuanians, Germans, Armenians, Russians, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Jews and 4 ethnic minorities: Karaites, Lemkos, Roma and Tartars. Further in Pomorskie province there are Kaszubs - the community which used regional language.

After the nationwide census, which was carried in 2002, it was possible to determine a precise number of the representatives of national and ethnic minorities.

Germans are a national minority. A nationwide census, which was carried out in 2002, declared Germans nationality 147,094 citizens of Poland. The German language schools account for the majority of all educational institutions intended for national minorities.

The general number of education institutions where the German language is taught in 325 with 37 005 pupils. Most members of the German minority are Catholic and only some of them are Protestants (the Evangelical-Augsburg Church).

Ukrainians are a national minority of 27,172 citizens of Poland. The statistical data on educational activity conducted in the last decade demonstrate that the number of Ukrainian minority schools and schoolchildren is increasing. Ukrainian language is taught in 136 schools for 2,774 pupils. The number of Ukrainian teachers is also growing. Most of them have higher education. In terms of religion, Ukrainians resident in Poland are members of the Catholic Church of Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite and Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

Belorussians are a minority of 47,640 citizens of Poland mostly resident in the Podlaskie province where they account for a significant percentage of the local population. The Belorussian language is taught to 3,664 pupils in 40 public schools. Nearly all teachers are qualified to teach the Belorussian language, since they are graduates of higher philological studies. The majority of them are members of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

Lithuanians are a national minority. A nationwide census which was carried out in 2002 declared Lithuania nationality 5,639 citizens of Poland. In the municipality of Puńsk, the Lithuanians account for over 80% of the local population and in effect they hold the majority of seats in the local government. They are also represented in the council of the Sejny district (powiat). They have a well organized educational system. In 2003/2004 their mother tongue is taught at all levels of education in the total of 19 schools. They are attended by 720 Lithuanian children and adolescents. All teachers of the Lithuanian language have university diplomas. The majority of Polish Lithuanians are of Catholic Church.

Slovaks amount to 1,710 citizens of Poland and live in the area of Spisz and Orawa. Slovak language is taught in 11 schools for 331 pupils. Slovaks are members of the Catholic Church.

Russians are a minority of 3,244 citizens of Poland.

The majority of Russians resident in Poland are members of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church. A small fraction of them are the old-believers, and since 1983 they are represented by the Main Board of Old-believers. It was established in the second half of the 17th century as a result of a split of the Russian Church in the aftermath of the Council of 1654. At the end of the 18th century they arrived in the Suwalskie region.

Jews in the number of 1,055 citizens of Poland are dispersed and live in five different provinces. Today there are no public schools in Poland where either Hebrew or Yiddish is taught as a mother tongue. In Warsaw and Wrocław there were established two private schools where Hebrew is taught. Courses of Yiddish are organised by Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland. Jews profess Judaism.

Armenians, of whom there are 262 citizens of Poland.

Czechs are a national minority. A nationwide census which was carried out in 2002 declared Czech nationality 386 citizens of Poland. In Poland there is no public school where they could learn their mother tongue.

Roms are an ethnic minority. A nationwide census which was carried out in 2002 declared Roma nationality 12,731 citizens of Poland. The majority of children and adolescents of Roman origin attend public schools where they are covered by the integrated educational system side by side with Polish pupils. There are also a few Roma classes. The Parish Primary Roman School in Suwałki is a special case, as it is the only non-public school teaching children of Roma origins free of charge. But about 30% of Rom children do not attend any schools at all. The Roma in Poland are mainly members of the Catholic Church but members of this community are in the Pentecostal Church and are Jehovah's Witnesses.

Tartars, of whom there are 447 citizens of Poland, live in indigenous Tartar colonies in the Podlaskie province (Bohoniki and Kruszyniany) - 319, pomorskie province - 28, mazowieckie province - 22, wielkopolskie province - 20. Until the end of the 14th century, Polish Tartars used to live in the lands of the Grand Lithuanian Duchy. Their predecessors were either émigrés or refugees from the Golden Horde or Crimea. The Polish Tartars have lost their mother tongue and they have no minority schools of their own. They are Muslim.

Lemkos (Łemkowie) – a population of 5,850 citizens of Poland. Some Lemkos view themselves as Ukrainian ethnic group, while others declare themselves as a separate national minority. The Lemkos Association and some public schools organize to teach their tongue. The Lemkos are members of the Catholic Church of the Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite and Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church. In terms of religion, Ukrainians resident in Poland are members of the Catholic Church of Byzantine-Ukrainian and Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

Karaites are the smallest ethnic minority in Poland. A nationwide census which was carried out in 2002, declared Karait nationality 43 citizens of Poland. The Karaites lost their mother tongue and this is why it is not taught by any public school. The Karaites stand out among other national minorities as they have their own distinct religion which stems from Judaism.

EQUITY MATTERS: ZAMBIA Case Study

Zambia National Union of Teachers (ZNUT)

Zambia is situated in the east central area of the African continent and, like other African countries, incorporates indigenous African, Islamic-Arabic, and Western heritages. The Zambia National Union of Teachers was founded in 1953 as the African Teachers' Association, which transformed into Northern Rhodesia African Teachers' Association (NORATA) in 1960. On 15th June, 1962 the Association became a union and changed its name to Northern Rhodesia African Teachers Union (NORATU). On 4th March, 1964 NORATU was changed to Zambia National Union of Teachers (ZNUT) and had the first recognition agreement signed between it and the Ministry of Education.

Currently there are approximately 71,000 teachers and lecturers in Zambia, and ZNUT has over 38,000 members. Its membership cuts across all sectors (Early childhood, Basic, High, and Tertiary Education). Within the sector there are two other unions; Basic Education Teachers Union of Zambia (BETUZ) (16,000 members) and Secondary Schools Teachers Union of Zambia (SESTUZ) – 6,000 members.

Further details of the ZNP can be found on the website:

<http://www.znut.org.zm/about.php>

Zambia carries a historical legacy of colonialism and poverty which is more acute in rural than urban areas. However, it would be over-simplistic to position 'poverty' as the main influence on equity or as the main barrier to development. National policies are addressing educational provision, from early childhood onwards, drawing on national and international frameworks such as UNCRC and Education For All goals (Chinunda, in Education International, 2009). These policy frameworks set out clear aspirations for the development of education in Zambia. However, the responses from the ZNUT indicate a range of challenges, and some structural barriers, to achieving equity, which are related to cultural and historical contexts.

The ZNUT goals on equity include

- Access to basic education for all children of school-going age, regardless of their economic and social background.
- Equal pay for equal qualifications.
- Employment of all trained teachers to give a chance to every child to have access to a teacher.
- Equal opportunities for career progress for all teachers, regardless of their sex.

Uneven distribution of resources emerges as the main equity issue, and impacts on children and teachers in different ways (items 3, 4, 9 students: 10, 11, 12, teachers – Lime Survey section 2).

- Equity of educational resource distribution (3)
- Equity for students of all economic backgrounds (4)
- Equity across all geographical areas (rural and urban) (9)

These items are important for students because of the policy aspiration to give access to students from poor and disadvantaged families to quality education, regardless of their location.

- Equity for teachers – career opportunity (10)
- Equity for teachers – conditions of service (11)
- Equity for teachers – job security (12)

These items are important for teachers because they relate to their motivation and career development:

Teachers are motivated to work because they are assured of a good future and an opportunity to progress and advance in terms of training and promotion'. (Survey, Q7)

Inadequate resources, the shortage of teachers, and the uneven distribution of teachers between rural and urban areas were seen as barriers to achieving

equity (Survey Q11), with the main inequities being resource distribution, and imbalances of teacher distribution in terms of gender (Survey Q12).

The case study questions aimed to explore these issues in more depth, with contextual explanations given for their impact on equity matters.

The uneven distribution of teachers between rural and urban areas impacts in the following ways on the equity of provision:

- Higher pupil -teacher ratio (60 to 1) per class due to the shortage of teachers in rural areas.
- Reduced contact time between teacher and pupil due to large number of pupils in a class.
- Low quality of education - less individual attention is given to children due to the high numbers of pupils in some classrooms.
- Few female teachers to act as role models for rural girls hence reduced completion rates for girl child in rural schools.
- Shortage of classroom space, resulting in double class or shift for teachers.

The uneven distribution of resources impacts on equity for children and teachers in the following ways:

- Shortage of learning and teaching aids, 4 to 5 children sharing one text book.
- Shortage of teachers, high pupil – teacher ratio.
- Large classroom cause management problems and lead to poor teaching- output low quality of pupils being churned out.
- increased dropout rates at both grade 7 and 9, because the number of places available reduces in higher grades.

The uneven distribution of resources impact on quality of education in the following ways:

- High dropout rates from schools

- Pupils reading below grade levels
- High illiteracy-levels
- Low numeracy levels among pupils

The main barriers to access to basic education for all children of school-going age, regardless of their economic and social background include:

- Legal frame and policy: for example the Zambian constitution has not enshrined education as a human right, so that every child would have the right to education. Therefore no one is held accountable for the provision of education.
- Budget allocations to the Educational sector are below the UNESCO recommendation of 24% of the country's GDP. In Zambia it is currently at 19%.
- Shortage of classroom space.
- Distances between schools and homes, an average of 8km between schools in rural areas, making it difficult for children below the age of 7, and girl child, to walk long distances.
- Poverty levels are too high in some rural parts of Zambia, hence some parents prefer using the kids to work in fields or work for food.
- Hunger, in some cases, children have nothing to eat - health and nutrition provisions in educational institutions not attractive to learners.
- In some cases people see the type of education being provided as not being relevant to the environment.

Inadequate resources, the shortage of teachers, and the uneven distribution of teachers between rural and urban areas were seen as barriers to achieving equity. The main reasons for resources being channeled into urban areas are political, economic and structural:

- Its' political, because of the large population in urban and the number of literate people, their voices are louder than those in rural areas.

- Urban areas tend to expend very fast because people are migrating from rural areas in search of employment, and demand for education is greater.
- Stronger lobby groups
- Private schools are emerging more in urban areas because parents can afford to pay for their children.
- Resource allocation also goes with population.

In addition, there is an equity issue regarding the low deployment of female teachers to rural areas. The reasons for this are cultural and structural:

- Female teachers shun rural areas because of distances they have to travel to find their basic needs, as most of our rural areas are less developed in terms of infra-structures such as shops, markets, roads, and hospitals, no piped water, electricity etc.
- Fear of not finding male partners to marry them. Very few working men (in rural areas).
- Sometimes it is just attitude.
- Implementation of the policy on teacher deployment has not been implemented effectively.
- Policy on teacher deployment not being implemented- Especially with AIDS-policy advocating against separating partners for a long period of time.
- Administrators tend to listen to female teachers.
- Marriages, most female teachers are married in urban areas and past practice in Zambia has been females who get married to join their husbands and not vice versa
- Employment opportunities in urban areas, such as mines and other industries are concentrated in urban areas and the workforces mainly are males.
- Transfer policy: when men are transferred from rural stations to urban areas, they also move with their spouses.

The survey identified 'unfriendly infra- structure in schools' as a barrier to equity. The nature and impact of this was identified as follows:

- Sanitary problems (No availability of water born toilets and also the location of toilets within the schools). In the absence of proper sanitation girls and females would prefer to stay away from school to avoid embarrassments.

Other barriers to equity include

- More schools being constructed in urban areas. More resources being channeled into urban areas.
- Too much concentration on basic education
- Infrastructure in most learning institutions is not user-friendly to the disabled.
- Lack of appropriate equipment for those with learning disabilities.

In spite of some of these barriers, in response to Q14/15 in the Survey, the ZNUT indicated the ways in which the union had influenced government policies. These included

- Equal pay for equal qualification.
- Teachers with degrees, whether in primary or secondary education, get the same salary.
- Salaries for both females and males teachers with same qualifications are the same.
- Posting of teachers, emphasises on posting teachers in rural areas and the introduction of rural hardship allowance has encouraged teachers to go and work in rural areas.
- Introduction of re-entry policy for gets who get pregnant while in school.

Three of the main goals for achieving equity (Q16) identified by ZNUT are as follows

- Access to basic education for all school age children.
- Distribution of resources to both rural and urban areas.

- Removing gender disparities at all levels of education.

In order to achieve these equity goals, the following areas need to be addressed: more classrooms and schools; training of more teachers; learning and teaching materials for both urban and rural schools; providing more females in rural areas as models.

The main gender disparities for teachers and for children are as follows:

- Opportunities for further studies are limited for female teachers due to lack of sponsorship.
- Promotions are limited for female teachers, because available positions are only available in places far away from their marital homes or hard to reach areas.
- Most female teachers and girls are allocated to Arts subjects as opposed to sciences and this limits their opportunities to pursue other challenging courses.
- Most of the schools or institutions, especially in rural areas are manned by male administrators.

The ZNUT identified areas in which EI could help the country to achieve its goals at national and international levels:

- Lobby our governments to increase funding to education and recruit all the trained teachers not yet employed. (national)
- Lobby with donors and multinational corporations to increase funding to developing countries in the education sector. Organise forums for education to sensitise government officials from developing countries on equity. Sensitise member organisations on the roles they can play to promote equity in their countries. (international)

Commentary

The case study for Zambia indicates many structural problems that arise from the country's historical legacy, and from its current economic position. However, the equity issues identified here should not be seen as insurmountable barriers to progress. The ZNUT is active in national and international forums, and is well-informed of the wider

socio-cultural and contextual features of Zambian society. Zambia was a case study in the Pan-African Early Childhood Education seminar (Education International, 2009). This report noted that Zambia has high poverty levels of around 67% of the population, which are exacerbated by rural to urban migration. Provision of ECE education and services is constrained by availability and accessibility (for example to private fee-paying settings that are beyond the reach of poor families), and by other social factors such as child labour, and the impact of HIV/AIDS on family composition. As indicated in the survey and case study findings, access to early childhood education is an equity issues, because it can provide a 'head start' for children, which can lead to virtuous cycles of achievement in subsequent education. These examples demonstrate how one equity problem may need several solutions, based on an alignment of resources and priorities across different government departments and/or funding providers.

It is worth making some comparisons with another African nation, based on the Survey responses – Liberia (ALPO) and Kenya. ALPO identified all equity issues in the survey as being important, with poverty and social class being identified as the main inequities. ALPO does influence government actions, but did not give any details. The main equity goals were to make education a priority through budgetary allocations, to increase the number of schools, to increase resource distribution across urban and rural areas, and address gender issues. One practical solution was being proposed by ALPO, namely providing basic rural housing for teachers to attract them to areas of historical teacher shortage. In common with Zambia the ALPO wants EI to provide support and interventions at international level.

The Survey response from Kenya indicated four main goals: free primary education; government aids to secondary education; bursary for less fortunate children; and constituency development funds. 50% channelled to education i.e. building classes, buying books and stationery. Additional perspectives on teacher education and supply in African nations are provided in the case studies detailed by Kruijer (2010) specifically on strategies for up-grading unqualified primary teachers in Tanzania, Malawi and Nigeria. These initiatives propose that positive outcomes can include improving the position of female teachers, increasing the proportion of female teachers in primary schools, providing positive role models for girls, improving skills needed for teaching children with

special educational needs, and improving the quality of educational provision in rural areas.

The case study of Zambia indicates that many different factors are implicated in equity matters, for teacher and for children. This means that they are not amenable to simple solutions. Although some of the proposed strategies are inevitably resource-hungry, it would be inappropriate to see poverty as the main cause and explanation of some of the equity issues described here, without some consideration of why such widespread poverty continues. Pence and Nsamenang (2008) see 'within-country' poverty in African nations as a direct outcome of previous and current colonial interventions, and pose the following questions:

Why can't Africa garner the means to provide for its next generations in spite of its rich material and human resources, which have thus far been drained by and for foreign interests?

Why does the development community stigmatise African children's participative learning, and deeply felt efforts to contribute to the family's survival as inappropriate child labour, whilst less actively criticising international economic systems that relegate Africans to being price-takers rather than price-fixers – a very significant contributor to poverty in Africa? (Pence and Nsamenang, 2008: 33).

The case study of Zambia indicates that issues of equity and quality are inextricably linked via socio-political, historical, cultural and structural factors. Thus it can be argued that contextual factors must be considered in individual country's trajectories of development. The issue that 'In some cases people see the type of education being provided as not being relevant to the environment' perhaps indicates that intergovernmental goals and aspirations (such as UNCRC, EFA, MDGs) need to be carefully contextualized to avoid a dominant 'western' or 'Eurocentric' perspective on educational institutions and practices. It is also interesting to cross-reference this issue to the case study for New Zealand. The response of the NZ Post-Primary Teachers' Association (Survey) noted a similar issue as one of the barriers to equity in the context of the country's diverse communities:

A system of education and curriculum that is still largely Eurocentric in nature that fails to cater adequately for those from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds.

One of the key themes of this report is that each country has its own trajectory of development regarding the evolution of its education system within wider social policies. There are common issues with regard to the cultural specificity of those trajectories, in that many of the equity matters are country-specific (especially with regard to indigenous peoples) as well as international (for example, with regard to human and children's rights to education). What differs in Zambia is the post-colonial legacy which still sees the influence of minority world systems and values on majority world development. The findings from this case study indicate that Zambia, along with other African nations, needs the support to find its own ways forward to solve problems and challenges, and achieve its equity goals.

In the final section of this report, the main issues are drawn together from the survey and case study data, with implications for Education International.

Section 4: Discussion and commentary

The unions that have participated in the study have demonstrated their ongoing aspirations and progress towards equity, equality and quality in their education systems, and their roles in advocating and supporting equity goals for teachers and for children. The outcomes of the study indicate that equity matters because education (perhaps more than any other public service) is expected to contribute to a social justice agenda for children, for families and for society. It is also evident that the pace and direction of social, economic and cultural changes are making complex demands on teachers' professional knowledge and expertise. At the same time, the financing and resourcing of education is changing as a result of global trends that are impacting in different ways on education systems. These economic conditions, in particular, raise questions about the progress and sustainability of equity matters across all regions of the world.

In summary, the main equity matters that have been identified in this study are as follows:

- There is a need for increased resources, and for redistribution of resources.
- Whilst progress continues to be made on equity matters for teachers, there are a number of threats to teachers' pay and conditions, arising from different influences. Progress that has been made in some countries towards equity goals may be reversed or stalled by the global economic downturn and 'austerity measures'.
- There are country-specific inequities, but it is important to avoid uncritical dichotomies between developed and developing countries (e.g. the responses from the Zambia and Canada unions mention hunger/poverty as barriers to learning and as an equity issue).
- There are challenges in different countries and in different sectors, from pre-school through to higher education.
- There are threats to professional autonomy and professionalism, through the use of 'para-professionals', centrally defined curricula, testing and assessment regimes, and through the changing landscape of teacher education programmes.

- More funding is needed for professional development at pre- and in-service levels.
- Professional development programmes need to pay more attention to understanding diversity in society, specifically cultural ways of learning and acting.
- The withdrawal or reduction of funds and programmes is having a specific impact on minority and disadvantaged groups (e.g. Indigenous communities in Canada, NZ, and GRT communities in Ireland).
- The 'cascade effect' of inequities in education impacts on children's trajectories and opportunities, from pre-school through to higher education.
- The 'cascade effect' of inequities in education impacts on teachers in terms of career progression, deployment, and opportunities for professional development.
- Inequities in education are situated within a matrix of inequities in society.
- Multiple and co-ordinated solutions are needed – e.g. children in poor health and in poverty are unlikely to benefit fully from education.

Contexts matter

It is argued here that in terms of equity matters, then contexts also matter. The introductory literature review in Section 1 provided the background for considering the complex intersections between equity, equality and quality in education systems around the world, and incorporated many of the equity issues that are identified in 'global monitoring' reports from organisations such as OECD and UNESCO. Whilst this review served to indicate broad issues and trends around equity matters for teachers and for children, the findings of this study indicate that these need to be contextualized within each country's socio-cultural-historical and economic 'niche'. Each country is at a different stage, and each country is subject to ongoing internal and external influences, some of which may be perceived as threats to equity (for example, the global economic downturn; privatization; international economic competitiveness). Although the trajectories of the countries surveyed in this study indicate that continuous improvement and development around equity matters is an aspiration, those trajectories may be disrupted, and even reversed, by factors that are beyond the control of national governments. For example, in several 'very highly developed' countries the impact of the global economic downturn has resulted in 'austerity measures' that are impacting on

teachers' salaries, pensions, and recruitment. The 'digital divide' was identified as a problem in Ireland, and is, therefore, not just an equity issue for developing countries. In New Zealand the gains made in the early childhood sector are being eroded because of cuts in public sector funding (and the choices that governments are forced to make as a result of the economic downturn). As indicated in the literature review, there are equity impacts of these 'trade-offs': for example, the choice may be narrowed to extending fee-paying education across all phases, or lowering the quality of the provision.

These findings from this study indicate that there are complex intersections between equity and quality. Both are vulnerable to reductions in public sector funding, and to increases in fees. The achievement gaps identified by Milner (2010) can also be seen as equity gaps and, as such, are vulnerable to changing economic contexts. The question of which groups stand to lose the most benefits from the economic downturn remains open. For example, in England, educational provision and related services for children under five will no longer be universal. Instead, funding will be targeted not just at 'the disadvantaged' but at 'the *most* disadvantaged'. In terms of equity it is not yet clear just how disadvantaged children will have to be in order to receive provision and services. In terms of equity in education, and in society, such policies have potential knock-on effects in relation to individuals' life chances, and to social justice.

Whilst the case studies have predominantly descriptive value by portraying national contexts and trends, there are some comparative elements regarding national, regional and global concerns. There are varying socio-political/historical/cultural differences in the trajectories of development in countries' education systems, along with beliefs and assumptions regarding how global, regional and national pressures are mediated. The range of choices available (for example, where and how funding should be targeted) is also influenced by the range of constraints, and the range of demands that are made on country's education systems, especially in relation to inequities in society. These influences operate at the level of national governments and in the governance of education, along with national and regional differences in the demands and expectations of what education can accomplish. The study also exemplifies that achieving and sustaining equity is a dynamic and shifting process. For example, although England is considered to be a very highly developed country on the HDI, the gap between the rich and poor has actually widened in the last twenty years, and national evidence indicates

that relatively poor performance among some children from low SES groups continues to widen across the primary and secondary phases.

Funding and Resourcing Matters

It is perhaps not surprising that the findings from the research indicate that resources are a common concern in human, material and financial terms. The findings from the study indicate that, whilst there are calls for *more* resources for minority groups in particular, there are also calls for *better targeted* resources for children and for teachers (for example ITE and CPD training, financial incentives, culturally appropriate training and curriculum development). This reflects the arguments made by Brown (2006) regarding horizontal and vertical equity. Whilst the findings indicate that unions uphold in principle the equal treatment of those who are equal, in reality the nature and scale of equity matters suggest that vertical equity may have to be a strategic priority. That is, unequal, but equitable, treatment of those who are not equal has to be considered in order to reduce inequality. There is evidence that unions are focusing on vertical equity to look at whose situation can and should be improved, and how that can be achieved.

Achieving equity goals is undoubtedly expensive, and it is tempting to state that more resources are the answer to improving equity and quality. However, the issues are complex. Much of the literature in the field points to the need for redistribution of resources in order to improve equity in education: this is because equal treatment of everyone does not necessarily result in equal opportunities (eg Brown, 2006; Deluca and Stillings, 2008; Matear, 2007; Motala, 2009; UNESCO, 2008). As noted in the literature and analyses of the data, structural inequities in society need multiple solutions. At a national level, there are four aspects that affect how much is spent on education as a whole: the national wealth of the country; what proportion of that wealth is allocated to the budget revenue; what proportion of the budget is allocated to education; and what external resources are provided (e.g. through aid, or private financing). Countries with lower levels of national wealth may spend a lower proportion of that wealth on education, which means that achieving equity goals may be more challenging. Those people with a higher income are less affected by underfunding in public services (such as health and education), as they are able to buy those services privately. Those who are already in poverty, however, must rely on publicly funded services, and when the funding of these services suffers, so does the quality of the services that disadvantaged people receive

(UNESCO, 2008). Even relatively small top-up fees (including in the private/dependent sector) can prove to be a barrier to participation for families at the lower end of the socio-economic range. Therefore sustaining equity goals and aspirations is intrinsically linked with sustaining the quality of services for the most disadvantaged groups within societies.

The patterns of resource distribution (be that financial or human capital) within education are also subject to wide variation. Resources may be allocated to schools in many ways, including: proportionately depending on the number of pupils; as a reward for good performance; to specific programmes designed to fulfill certain functions; in combination with private funding; and weighted according to perceived need. Although there is an international commitment to achieving universal primary education, some countries (particularly those in the majority world) use a fee-based system to “top-up” school resources. There may be some form of exemptions for the most disadvantaged families, but only in schools where this can be afforded (for example through public subsidies). Different schools, however, often charge different levels of top-up fees, dependent partially upon the level of disadvantage of their intake, so more disadvantaged families would pay less for their child’s education, but this might be at the expense of the quality of the school environment (Penny et al, 2008; Motala, 2009; UNESCO, 2008).

More generally, there are calls for centralized resource allocation that is based on need, in order to better support the schools who work with the most disadvantaged children (e.g. Brown, 2006; Lemon, 2005; Motala, 2009; Welsh, 2004; West, 2006), rather than resource allocation based on outcomes, that does little to address the wider structural and social inequalities that often lay behind variations in performance (Cele, 2005), or decentralized resource allocation that leaves schools in disadvantaged areas least able to resource quality education (Penny *et al*, 2008). Resource allocation for students with special educational needs (such as physical or communication difficulties) is, in some countries, dependent on need, and extra resources are channeled towards schools where such children attend. However, as Perry (2009) pointed out, the level of support given to the least able children in school varies widely between countries, and this is evident in the findings of this study. The level of support is dependent on a range of factors such as teacher supply, teacher development and training for children with special educational needs and disabilities. In contrast, resourcing for more general

socio-economic disadvantage does not often work in the same way: how disadvantage is defined is important in determining levels of resourcing (Deluca and Stillings, 2008).

While there is clearly a reduced capacity of schools in disadvantaged areas to raise their own funds, governance and decision making can still be devolved towards the school level (Brown, 2006; Deluca and Stillings, 2008; UNESCO, 2008). This can help schools work towards appropriate strategies for their own context, and also involve the school users more in decision making. Such reforms, however, may need to be supported by help for schools and communities to develop their own governance capabilities (Brown, 2006; Singh and Taylor, 2007). However, in a reduced resource environment (austerity measures and the economic downturn) this capacity for fund-raising is likely to be compromised, and the evidence from this study indicates that schools in low SES areas are already making difficult choices. These factors raise questions about the overall policy environment for education at national and international levels.

Policy matters

Policy-making in education has increased substantially in the last forty years, with many countries in the minority world continuing to look to the majority world not just to find out what is happening, but to find out what works. Policy technologies in education have been driven by neo-liberal and neo-conservative agendas, with increasing control over curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and teacher education, and inspection and regulation via national standards and testing regimes. The performativity agenda links child and teacher performance, regardless of the differential conditions that influence equity gaps. Whilst such policies have been formulated to improve outcomes and promote accountability, some have had unintended negative consequences. Not surprisingly, there is evidence of resistance to some aspects of these policy technologies in England, Canada and New Zealand, with unions playing a key role in mediating their reach and impact.

The findings from this study indicate that policy activity is needed across a number of areas in order to address equity in education. However, from a policy technologies perspective, national and international policy drivers may not consistently work together in order to achieve equity goals. The evidence indicates some tensions between monitoring of performance goals and monitoring of equity goals, as evidenced in recent

critiques of the school effectiveness literature (Gorard, 2010) . The former may focus on specific 'curriculum-focused' outcomes such as literacy and numeracy, which narrows the range of options available in other areas such as the arts and human rights education. Not only are some equity goals in education difficult to 'measure', they may also be difficult to achieve in isolation from other policy drivers (such as housing, health, welfare, resource distribution). Moreover, the internationalization of policy-borrowing and policy-making has potential benefits and limitations. In a comparative study of education policy making between two UK countries (Scotland and England) and other EU countries, Grek and Ozga (2010) discuss the concept of 'policy soup' in which different stakeholders try out their ideas in a variety of ways:

The proposals that survive over a series of meetings, that meet several criteria, are technically feasible and fit with dominant values are translated into the domestic policy sphere in order to test their relevance to the national mood, their budgetary workability and the support they will receive. (2010: 947)

If social justice and equity matters are not part of the 'policy soup', then they will not become integral to the overall mix, perhaps because they are part of a wider ethical and moral commitment to what, and who, education is for. Furthermore, budgetary workability (especially in countries with declining public sector funding, or in countries with World Bank or substantial NGO funding) may be likely to dominate over less tangible issues as national mood and overall support for certain policy directions.

In summary, whilst resources (financial, material and human) have been identified in this study (and in the wider literature) as one of the key issues in achieving equity and ensuring quality in education, it would be erroneous to see this solely as an issue of 'costs' to public funding, or to individuals. Education is an investment, which has benefits for young people, and for society as a whole. In the context of global trends, it might be tempting to see the 'pay-off' from investment in education solely in financial terms, such as creating a better educated workforce, where all can contribute to economic progress. This is very much the rhetoric of neo-liberal and neo-conservative governments. However, the most tangible 'pay-off' must be to provide education for all, and to enhance equity for all, which entails a commitment to embedding equity goals in the policies of national and supra-national organisations.

Curriculum matters

There is some evidence from this study that the school curriculum may be implicated in sustaining inequities in terms of cultural relevance, subject choices and the sustainability of special programmes. It is evident from the study that traditional as well as new patterns of migration and settlement require changes in curriculum design and content, in order to achieve cultural relevance as a means of ensuring equity. It can be argued that one of the main policy mis-directions of the last forty years (certainly in some developed countries in the minority world) is that governments have increasingly mistrusted professionals and sought hegemonic solutions to curriculum reform (the 'one size fits all' approach has been driven by school effectiveness studies). Universal notions of 'best practice' or 'effective practice' may fundamentally undermine opportunities for equity. In particular, the neo-conservative discourse of performativity creates a culture of blame, which potentially positions teachers as responsible for factors that are well beyond their control, and that operate at international as well as national levels (as evidenced in the matrix of 'gaps' identified by Milner, 2010). However, where educational reform programmes are linked to wider social reform, there may be increased capacity for reducing non-academic barriers to learning, and to place more value on the forms of social and cultural capital that children develop in their families and communities.

It can also be argued that true equity is only likely to be realised if the (typically western) educational discourse breaks away from individualized concepts of ability and motivation and recognises that these are socially constructed (in the same way that 'mental health problems' are socially constructed). In addition, there is much that teachers and others could do in a suitable resource and policy framework to raise outcomes for people who are positioned as 'less able', marginalized or disadvantaged, and therefore not able (or less likely) to succeed. It is mainly the professionals who are close to children (and often to their families and communities) on a day to day basis who can achieve the depth of understanding of these complex issues. However, additional support and training for diversity was identified as an equity issue in this study.

Teacher education matters

Some countries are continuing to improve teacher education, and to extend qualified teacher status across all phases, along with equitable pay structures (from preschool to the end of compulsory education). In the UK context, Kirk (2010) describes the characteristics of teachers for the 21st century, in terms of increasing and more complex demands on their professional knowledge, skills and dispositions. In contrast, neo-conservative movements towards greater privatization of public education are freeing schools (such as Charter Schools in the USA, and Free Schools and Academies in England) from legal mandates around the employment and working conditions of teachers; the employment of para-professionals; and ensuring minimal inspection and quality assurance requirements. The threats to equity for teachers that are posed by government decentralization, de-marketisation and privatization of public education are detailed by Ball and Youdell (2009) and Kamushiro (2010). These trends may serve to undermine the goals of equity, equality and quality by privileging private (corporate) needs, and individual choice, rather than public good. A contrasting perspective is that de-centralisation may free teachers from the constraints of some of the neo-liberal reforms of the last forty years, and may enable them to regain some control of education, especially via curriculum design, pedagogical approaches, technological innovations and new literacies.

There are also calls for greater understanding of the values, cultures and beliefs of indigenous populations, as well as migrant groups. The survey and case studies indicate that just as dimensions of diversity intersect, so do dimensions of inequity and inequality. The findings of this study indicate that increasing social and cultural diversity has implications for pre- and in-service teacher education programmes. It is not sufficient to include 'diversity' issues at a surface level: rather there is a need to include cultural and contextual diversity in teacher education, in relation to understanding child development and home-based child-rearing practices, to promoting cultural theories of learning, and to defining culturally relevant pedagogies and curricula. This applies to majority and minority world countries, for different reasons. In majority world countries, western discourses of child development have sometimes been privileged over local (country level) perspectives and issues, as exemplified by Pence and Nsamenang in African nations (2008). In addition, with contemporary patterns of global migration and settlement, as well as the needs of indigenous communities, all teachers require knowledge of 'deep' rather than 'surface' cultures. Minority groups cannot be treated as

homogenous or static, as there will be many variations within communities, as well as changes over time. It is also important for teachers (and unions) to understand the ways in which dimensions of diversity intersect, and how those intersections might exacerbate inequity (such as socio-economic status/ethnicity/gender). As a respondent from New Zealand noted,

Anecdotal and, increasingly, research-based evidence indicates that confidence in and respect for one's language and culture, and confirmation of that through ongoing learning experiences leads to much improved outcomes and significantly higher achievement rates for the students involved when compared with those whose educational experience is almost solely mainstream.

Conclusion: unions matter

What emerges from this study is a picture of widening diversity in school populations, of increasing demands on teachers, and of increasing complexity in their roles and responsibilities. It can be argued that national policies, institutional practices and structural factors may act in different ways to mitigate for or against equity for children and for teachers. There are continuing international demands for improving the quality of education, and setting more ambitious goals that will prepare young people for the complex demands of the 21st century. This study has exemplified the importance of national policies in education (as well as in related areas such as health, social care, welfare) as a means of leveraging change.

The work of teacher unions is sometimes seen as defending the special interests of teachers. However, the scope and remit of their policies, and of their advocacy activities, indicates shared concerns for teachers and for children, across all stages of education. In addition, the unions' responses have indicated their focus on human and children's rights as the basis for aspiring to and achieving greater equity in their education systems. Education is seen as being a social benefit, and not just a commodity. As this study has revealed, the impact of their work can be demonstrated in government policies and educational practices. Examples of national advocacy initiatives link with the aspirations of Education International, namely to link global advocacy to national action.

This study has contributed to understanding the complex interplay of different historical and socio-cultural contexts and structural dynamics that influence equity, equality and quality in the education systems of different countries. That equity matters for children and for teachers is indisputable. Education can and does contribute to social justice through the commitment of professional teachers, and their national unions and federations. The evidence from the Equity Matters study proposes that this commitment needs to be nurtured and sustained in light of contemporary changes and challenges. What remains at stake is how countries can work towards achieving greater equity for teachers and for children, with the support of their unions and Education International, in the context of global and national trends.

References

- Alegre, M. À. and Ferrer, G. (2010) 'School regimes and education equity: some insights based on PISA 200', *British Educational Research Journal*, 36: 3, 433 — 461. First published on: 17 June 2009 (iFirst).
- Atweh, B. and Brady, K. (2009) Socially response-able mathematics education: implications of an ethical approach. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 5(3), 267-276.
- Ball, S. and Youdell, D. (2009)
- Bernard van Leer Foundation (2007) *Early Childhood Matters*, June 2007: Number 108. Netherlands, Bernard van Leer Foundation.
- Brown, K. (2006) "New" educational injustices in the "new" South Africa: a call for justice in the form of vertical equity. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(5), 509-519.
- Cele, N. (2005) Effective schools operating with amazing (dis)grace of human resources strategy, policy and practice: a South African case. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(3), 223-236.
- Clancy, P. and Goastellec, G. (2007) Exploring access and equity in higher education: policy and performance in a comparative perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(2), 136-154.
- Coles, M. I. (2008). *Every Muslim child matters: practical guidance for schools and children's services*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books.
- Deluca, M. and Stillings, C. (2008) Targeting resources to students with special educational needs: national differences in policy and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(3), 371-385.
- Department for Education and Skills (2004) *Every Child Matters*. DfES Publications
- Education International (2009) *Pan-African Early Childhood Education Seminar Report. THEME 'Quality early childhood education: every child's right'*. Brussels, Education International.
- Giroux, H. A. and Schmidt, M. (2004) Closing the achievement gap: a metaphor for children left behind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5, 213-228.
- Gorard, S. (2010) Serious doubts about school effectiveness. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36:5, 745-766.

- Gutiérrez, K.D. and Rogoff, B. (2003) Cultural ways of learning: individual traits or repertoires of participation? *Educational Researcher*, 32:5, 19-25.
- Halinen, I. and Jarvinen, R. (2008) Towards inclusive education: the case of Finland. *Prospects*, 38, 77-97.
- Hedegaard, M. and Fleer, M. (2008) *Studying Children: a Cultural-historical Approach*. Maidenhead, McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Jentsch, B. (2006) Youth migration from rural areas: moral principles to support youth and rural communities in policy debates. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 46(3), 229-240.
- Kirk, G. (2009) *In UCET's View: Occasional Paper No. 20*. Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers, London, UCET.
- Kirk, G. (2010) *Implications of the Primary Reviews for Primary Initial Teacher Education/Early Years Programmes*. Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers, London, UCET.
- Kumashiro, K.K. (2010) Seeing the bigger picture: troubling movements to end teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61: 1-2, 56-65.
- Grek, S. and Ozga, J. (2010) Governing education through data: Scotland, England and the European education policy space. *British Educational Research Journal*, 6:10, 937-952.
- Lemon, A. (2005) Shifting geographies of social inclusion and exclusion: secondary education in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. *African Affairs*, 104, 69-96.
- Levinson, M.P. (2007) Literacy in Gypsy Communities: Cultural Capital manifested as negative assets, *American Educational Research Journal*, 44:1, pp.1-35
- Levinson, M.P. (2008) Not Just Content but Style: Gypsy Children Traversing Boundaries, *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(3), *Special Issue: Early Childhood Education and Care*, eds. Cleghorn, A. & Prochner, L.
- Lloyd, C. (2000) Excellence for *all* children – false promises! The failure of current policy for inclusive education and implications for schooling in the 21st century. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(2), 133-151.
- Matear, A. (2007) Equity in education in Chile: the tensions between policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27, 101-113.
- McGaw, B. (2008) The role of the OECD in international comparative studies of achievement. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 15(3), 223-243.
- Milner, H.R. (2010) What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2)118-131.

- Morley, L., Leach, F. and Lugg, R. (2009) Democratising higher education in Ghana and Tanzania: opportunity structures and social inequalities. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29, 56-64.
- Motala, S. (2009) Privatising public schooling in post-apartheid South Africa – equity considerations. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(2), 185-202.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2005) Teachers Matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teacher. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Publishing.
- Pence, A. and Nsamenang, B. (2008) *A Case for Early Childhood Development in sub-Saharan Africa*. Working papers in early childhood development, Netherlands, Bernard van Leer Foundation.
- Perry, L. (2009) Characteristics of equitable systems of education: a cross-national analysis. *European Education*, 41 (1), 79-100.
- Raffo, C. and Gunter, H. (2008) Leading schools to promote social inclusion: developing a conceptual framework for analyzing research, policy and practice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(4), 397-414.
- Sacks, J. (2002) *The dignity of difference: How to avoid the clash of civilisations*. London, Continuum
- Sahlberg, P. (2007) Education policies for raising student learning: the Finnish approach. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(2), 147-171.
- Sammons, P. and Luyten, H. (2009) Editorial article for special issue on alternative methods for assessing school effects and schooling effects. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20(2), 133-143.
- Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2010) *Early Childhood Matters: Evidence from the Effective Pre-school and Primary Education Project*. London, Routledge.
- Schleicher, A. (2007) Can competencies assessed by PISA be considered the fundamental school knowledge 15-year-olds should possess? *Journal for Educational Change*, 8, 349-357.
- Singh, P. and Taylor, S. (2007) A new equity deal for schools: a case study of policy-making in Queensland, Australia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(3), 301-315.
- Skutnabb Kangas, T. (2002) Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1(3), 179-205.
- Taylor, C., Fitz, J. and Gorard, S. (2005) Diversity, specialization and equity in education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(1), 47-69.

Torres, M. S. (2004) Best interests of students left behind? Exploring the ethical and legal dimensions of United States Federal involvement in public school improvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(2), 249-269.

UNESCO (2008) *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2009*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations (2008) *Report on the Millenium Development Goals*

United Nations Development Programme (2009) *Human Development Report 2009 Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development*.

van de Grift, W. (2009) Reliability and validity in measuring the value added of schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20(2), 269-285.

Welsh, P. J. (2004) Equity, economics and educational need: some tensions between consumer and producer interests in the management of secondary school admission procedures in Thanet, UK. *School Leadership and Management*, 24(2), 191-203.

Welsh, P. J. and Parsons, C. (2006) Social justice, service delivery and welfare reform: the politics of deprivation, disaffection and education in the district of Thanet. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(1), 39-57.

West, A. (2006) The pre-school education market in England from 1997: quality, availability, affordability and equity. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32(3), 283-301.

Wößmann, L. (2008) Efficiency and equity of European education and training policies. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 15, 199-230.

Woodhead, M., Ames, P., Vennam, U., Abebe, W. and Steuli, N. (2009) Equity and quality? Challenges for early childhood and primary education in Ethiopia, India and Peru. *Working Papers in Early Childhood Development*. Netherlands, Bernard van Leer Foundation.

APPENDIX 1. AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION UNION – STATEMENT ON EQUITY

See attached document AEU Presentation to Review of Funding for Schooling Panel July 2010 plus Policy Document 'A Charter for Fair Go Schooling'

1. INTRODUCTION 1.1. The AEU supports public schooling. Public schools and public school educators provide an inclusive and comprehensive environment in which all students are welcome, in which their special needs are recognised and met, and in which each student is supported to develop to his or her maximum potential regardless of cultural, social, economic, ethnic background, gender, sexual preference or personal circumstances.

1.2. It is important that disadvantage is recognised as a community issue affecting whole schools. Programs designed to address disadvantage should be aimed at building community capacity to improve outcomes for students

1.3. Within this context the AEU recognises that there are many schools that need additional resourcing in order to provide their students with the same opportunities as students in other schools.

1.4. It is therefore imperative that funding address disadvantage on a whole school, community, and system basis, with greater resourcing going to those schools in greatest need.

2. POVERTY AND EDUCATION 2.1. Socioeconomic disadvantage is a key factor that overarches and exacerbates other problems of inclusive practice and therefore must be addressed as a priority to achieve equality of outcomes for all students.

2.2. The AEU acknowledges that poverty and disadvantage are matters that originate outside of school, but that the nature of schooling can either increase or decrease inequality.

2.3. The AEU supports curriculum, pedagogical and educational practices that lead to greater access and equity for all students, which reject the exclusion and alienation of any students, and which recognises the importance of high expectations.

2.4. It will work with and support community organizations that are seeking to alleviate poverty in the community. In particular it will continue to support and contribute to the work of the National Coalition Against Poverty (NCAP).

3. RESPONSIBILITY AND FUNDING

3.1 The AEU notes as an improvement the principles of funding expressed by MCEETYA at its meeting in Auckland in July 2002 (Background Paper 1), which give greater primacy to public education and call for a collaborative partnership between the states and territories and the Commonwealth in funding. It notes that these were endorsed by all states and territories, but not by the Commonwealth.

3.2 Commonwealth and state or territory governments must give greater priority to equity and disadvantage in funding decisions and work in partnership with each other, teacher unions and the teaching profession to achieve equity for Australian children.

3.3 The Commonwealth government should increase its role as a funder of initiatives and programs designed to create greater equity in Australian society.

3.4 It should resume funding for the Australian Center for Equity Through Education.

3.5 The AEU asserts that issues of disadvantage are inherently part of all funding and policy decisions and supports the idea of an “Equity impact study” for major educational decisions made by governments. Schools should also consider the impact on poverty and disadvantage in all decisions.

3.6 Within a context where schools are given the flexibility to find the most appropriate solutions, departments must accept responsibility for the situation overall. It cannot be left to individual schools to decide whether equity is an issue for it, and whether it gives priority to programs to counter disadvantage.

3.7 All jurisdictions should have a comprehensive and coordinated plan to tackle disadvantage and inequity through education. There should be clear responsibility for matters of equity in all education departments.

3.8 Some matters of equity and disadvantage are best dealt with by giving schools extra funding for the particular profile of student need in their school, as in the case of specific disabilities. The AEU also strongly reaffirms that in many circumstances disadvantage is a community issue and that the collective resources of the community are an important consideration in dealing with equity. There is therefore an ongoing need for programs that target schools and their communities that are collectively experiencing disadvantage.

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF DESIRABLE PROGRAMS

4.1. School programs designed to alleviate disadvantage and create greater equity are likely to have the following characteristics: • They are directed at schools where disadvantage is greatest. • They focus on capacity building and enabling at the school level. • Financing is sufficient to make a substantial difference to the school, and sufficiently ongoing to allow at least medium term certainty. • They provide resources which can be used flexibly through school and community based decision making. • The objectives, targets and outcomes are explicit, measurable where appropriate, and broad enough to tackle fundamental and ongoing issues that may not be susceptible to measurement. • The school works cooperatively with other schools, government and community departments and agencies. • They focus on improving outcomes for students. • They engage teachers, parents and other education staff in the development of programs. • They are focussed on whole school.

4.2. Whilst each school must be given the opportunity to decide its own solutions to its own problems, the following areas should be targets for expenditure: • Reduced class size with a priority for disadvantaged schools; • Public early childhood facilities; • Early problem identification and additional support in literacy and numeracy; • Provision of additional teacher support; • Additional staffing to provide time for parent, community and interagency liaison; • Additional promotion positions with a focus on welfare. • Additional time for induction and mentoring; • Additional time for teachers to meet, and for counselling of students; • Professional development in relation to behaviour management and changed pedagogies.

4.3. Within a context which provides adequate funding and staffing levels and does not further increase workloads, and where agreement is reached between the relevant Branch or Associated Body and employing authority, the AEU will support initiatives which have the potential to increase equity and lessen disadvantage. Potential areas for further work include: • Curriculum/school change; • Middle years schooling; • Appropriate pedagogies; • Full service

schools (including related health issues); • Alleviation of disadvantage; • The role and delivery of VET in schools, and other matters related to the relationship between school and work; • Funding of school based initiatives; • Sectoral inequalities (EC, Primary, Secondary, etc.) • Targeted Resources for Special Programs; • Student welfare and behaviour management; • Whole of school mapping and tracking of whole of student issues; • Congruence between home and school in development of integrated programs; • The use of targets, and their relationship to other assessment and reporting issues; • The importance of teacher recruitment, training and induction.

4.4. The AEU supports the idea of pilot projects in a number of these areas. In particular, it believes it is time for Commonwealth and state/territory governments to initiate well-funded and researched projects in the area of full service schools. This Charter should be read in conjunction with other AEU policies, including, (but not limited to): Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education – 2002 Anti Discrimination – 1989 Combating Racism – 1987 Early Childhood Education Policy 2003 Education in Rural Areas – 1989 Elimination of Sexism in Education and Employment – 1988 Gender Equity – 2002 Sexual Orientation and Gender Preferred Identity – 1995 Special Education – 1987 Students with Special Needs – 1996

APPENDIX 2: Response from Malaysia

How do education unions conceptualise equity in education?

No child should be left behind including stateless children.

Free education for all children

Provision of scholarship to children with good academic result to further their studies.

Creating vocational school and skill training centre for the other groups.

To mould holistic child with different values and best practices.

How are concepts of equity operationalised, as evidenced in union policies and practices?

All children in Year One would be compulsory to attend school. Penalty imposed for parents that failed to enrol child to schools.

We have successfully advocate free textbooks for all children.

We have lobby to the Government not to reduce the budget for the education sector especially aids for the poor children, i.e. cash assistance, clothing assistance, school and etc.

We have advocate better facilities for all types of school

We have also lobby for better access for internet/ broadband including machinery schools, Tamil and Mandarin schools...facilities for all schools especially in rural schools.

What are the issues for teachers, with regards to implementation of these concepts in their practice?

Some parents are still not sending their children to school especially the minority group (the aborigine)

No cooperation from the parents of drop-out children.

Implementation and enforcement are rather slow especially in the intermediate level.

Teachers' organization does not have the negotiation rights, we can only give our opinion and it is the Government's jurisdiction.

How can Education International contribute to international debates on equity in ways that benefit members

Best practices in various countries should be shared within the members of Education International.

Dissemination of information related to equity and rights of education.

To give continuous awareness campaigns to remind leaders of members of Education International the importance of education for all children regardless of race and status.

APPENDIX 3: Response from Kudheha Workers, Kenya

Q1. How do education unions conceptualize equity in education?

Ans. i) Free primary education in Kenya

ii) Government aids to secondary education

iii) Bursary for less fortunate children

iv) Constituency development funds. 50% channelled to education i.e. building classes, buying books and stationery.

Q2. How are concepts of equity operationalised, as evidenced in union policies and practices?

Ans. a) Teacher unions are always represented in Ministry of Education forums which formulate education policies

b) Teacher unions formulate policies not to represent teachers who do not attend classes or who absent themselves.

Q3. What are the issues for teachers with regards to implementation of these concepts in their practice?

Ans. Teachers sign code of ethics which stipulate clearly what are expected to do and behave.

Q4. How can E.I. contribute to international debates on equity in ways that benefit members?

Ans. Advocating for participating in international forums e.g. International Labour Organizations and campaigning for the member states to sign I.L.O conventions which stipulates "equity in education" in their respective countries.

Appendix 4: Frequencies

Question 2: Frequency Table

2 [1. Equity of educational access.i.e. all students have access to every phase of compulsory schooling.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	7.1	7.1
	in union pol.	26	81.3	92.9	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [10. Equity for teachers in terms of career opportunity.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.7	10.7
	in union pol.	25	78.1	89.3	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [11. Equity for teachers in terms of conditions of service.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	6.9	6.9
	in union pol.	27	84.4	93.1	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [12. Equity for teachers in terms of job security.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.3	10.3
	in union pol.	26	81.3	89.7	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

[13. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and the phase of education taught.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.7	10.7
	in union pol.	24	75.0	85.7	96.4
	don't know	1	3.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [14. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and gender.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.7	10.7
	in union pol.	25	78.1	89.3	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [15. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and level of qualifications.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	7.7	7.7
	in union pol.	24	75.0	92.3	100.0
	Total	26	81.3	100.0	
Missing	9	6	18.8		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [2.Equity of educational outcomes i.e. all students have equal opportunities to achieve positive outcomes from their schooling.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.7	10.7
	in union pol.	25	78.1	89.3	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [3.Equity of educational resource distribution.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.3	10.3
	in union pol.	26	81.3	89.7	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [4. Equity for students of all socio- economic backgrounds.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	10.7	10.7
	in union pol.	25	78.1	89.3	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [5. Equity for students of all genders.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	7.1	7.1
	in union pol.	26	81.3	92.9	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [6. Equity for students of all cultural ethnic backgrounds.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	7.7	7.7
	in union pol.	24	75.0	92.3	100.0
	Total	26	81.3	100.0	
Missing	9	6	18.8		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [7. Equity for students with physical disabilities.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	5	15.6	17.9	17.9
	in union pol.	22	68.8	78.6	96.4
	don't know	1	3.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [8. Equity for students with learning disabilities.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	3	9.4	11.1	11.1
	in union pol.	22	68.8	81.5	92.6
	don't know	2	6.3	7.4	100.0
	Total	27	84.4	100.0	
Missing	9	5	15.6		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [9. Equity across all geographical areas e.g. rural and urban.][1. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in union pol.	2	6.3	7.1	7.1
	in union pol.	25	78.1	89.3	96.4
	don't know	1	3.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [1. Equity of educational access.i.e. all students have access to every phase of compulsory schooling.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.3	3.3
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	7	21.9	23.3	26.7
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	22	68.8	73.3	100.0
	Total	30	93.8	100.0	
Missing	9	2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [10. Equity for teachers in terms of career opportunity.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	3	9.4	10.3	10.3
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	11	34.4	37.9	48.3
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	13	40.6	44.8	93.1
	Don't know	2	6.3	6.9	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [11. Equity for teachers in terms of conditions of service.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	3	9.4	10.3	10.3
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	9	28.1	31.0	41.4
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	17	53.1	58.6	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [12. Equity for teachers in terms of job security.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	2	6.3	6.9	6.9
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	11	34.4	37.9	44.8
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	14	43.8	48.3	93.1
	Don't know	2	6.3	6.9	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

[13. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and the phase of education taught.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.6	3.6
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	8	25.0	28.6	32.1
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	16	50.0	57.1	89.3
	Don't know	3	9.4	10.7	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [14. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and gender.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	In gov pol, not implimented fully	8	25.0	28.6	28.6
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	19	59.4	67.9	96.4
	Don't know	1	3.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [15. Equity for teachers in terms of pay and level of qualifications.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.7	3.7
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	5	15.6	18.5	22.2
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	21	65.6	77.8	100.0
	Total	27	84.4	100.0	
Missing	9	5	15.6		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [2.Equity of educational outcomes i.e. all students have equal opportunities to achieve positive outcomes from their schooling.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	In gov pol, not implimented fully	15	46.9	50.0	50.0
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	14	43.8	46.7	96.7
	Don't know	1	3.1	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	93.8	100.0	
Missing	9	2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [3.Equity of educational resource distribution.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.4	3.4
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	17	53.1	58.6	62.1
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	10	31.3	34.5	96.6
	Don't know	1	3.1	3.4	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [4. Equity for students of all socio-economic backgrounds.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	2	6.3	6.7	6.7
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	17	53.1	56.7	63.3
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	11	34.4	36.7	100.0
	Total	30	93.8	100.0	
Missing	9	2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [5. Equity for students of all genders.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	In gov pol, not implimented fully	9	28.1	31.0	31.0
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	20	62.5	69.0	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [6. Equity for students of all cultural ethnic backgrounds.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	In gov pol, not implimented fully	13	40.6	48.1	48.1
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	14	43.8	51.9	100.0
	Total	27	84.4	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
	Sy stem	2	6.3		
	Total	5	15.6		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [7. Equity for students with physical disabilities.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	2	6.3	6.9	6.9
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	12	37.5	41.4	48.3
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	15	46.9	51.7	100.0
	Total	29	90.6	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [8. Equity for students with learning disabilities.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.6	3.6
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	13	40.6	46.4	50.0
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	13	40.6	46.4	96.4
	Don't know	1	3.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	87.5	100.0	
Missing	9	3	9.4		
	Sy stem	1	3.1		
	Total	4	12.5		
Total		32	100.0		

2 [9. Equity across all geographical areas e.g. rural and urban.][2. label]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not in gov pol	1	3.1	3.3	3.3
	In gov pol, not implimented fully	13	40.6	43.3	46.7
	In gov pol, fully implimenting	16	50.0	53.3	100.0
	Total	30	93.8	100.0	
Missing	9	2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		