Introduction

This paper reports the importance pre-service teacher education students place on development education issues in their own teaching, how prepared they feel in addressing issues of development, and what factors prevent them from integrating development education into their teaching. The current study adopted a questionnaire and focus group approach, to identify the attitudes and experiences of pre-service teacher education students to the inclusion of development education in post-primary education. Undergraduate student teachers underwent a ‘development education active learning’ intervention during third year. They undertook a 12-week teaching practice (t.p.) experience in fourth year and the research was conducted following t.p.

This paper considers the influence of independent variables such as gender, type of teaching practice school and course of study, on the attitudes and experiences of pre-service teacher education students in regards to the integration of development education in post-primary schools.

Setting the context

Role of the teacher

‘Doing the leaving’ is a particularly Irish experience (NCCA, 2003, p.23). Senior cycle education is comparative with completion and achievement in the Leaving Certificate examination. Similar conclusions can be drawn in relation to junior cycle education. The current examination system dominates teaching, learning and assessment; including teaching approaches, student-teacher relationships, resources, time allocations and approaches to assessment. There is a preoccupation with coverage of course material and preparation for final examinations, at both junior and leaving certificate. Textbooks are, often the only teaching and learning resource
utilised by the teacher. ‘Moreover, they depend more on textbooks than on colleagues when looking for ideas for teaching their subject’ (Callan, 1998, p.2). Questions about best practice are not raised nor are questions relating to ‘how and what one teaches’ (Callan, 1998, p.2). Teachers are expected to instruct their students in the required material for assessment and students are “little vessels” regurgitating the knowledge at will. As a result schools and teachers are being forced to focus more on test scores, targets and accountability and are neglecting the affective domain of teaching and learning (Hargraves, 2003, p.xvii). Consequently, ‘education has in a sense gained the world, but in doing so, has lost its soul’ (Dunne, 1995, p.68).

It is increasingly becoming recognised that teaching is more than the mere transmission of knowledge. Teaching is now viewed as a multi-dimensional role, where the teacher has a number of important functions. The role of the secondary teacher in 21st century Ireland is that of counsellor, motivator, psychologists, coach, mentor, mediator, researcher, teacher’ (Trant, 1998). The need for teachers to become more than mere subject experts is being recognised with Sugrue et al. (2001) outlining the increasing demand on schools to become ‘caring and nurturing institutions rather than focusing exclusively on academic attainment’ (p.6). Teachers are no longer simply required to ensure students achieve academically, they must also aid and encourage them to become caring, mature adults who develop into caring and active citizens. Teaching is more than just instructing students, ‘it is an activity in which the teacher is sharing in a moral enterprise, namely, the initiation of (usually) young people into a worthwhile way of seeing the world, of experiencing it, of relating to others in a more human and understanding way’ (Pring, 2001, p.106). The British Department of Education and Science in their 1985 publication Better Schools highlighted that ‘education should not only be concerned solely with training for work, but should be concerned with general social, moral and intellectual development’ (Lawton, 1992, p.99). It can no longer be assumed that Irish children come to school with values, attitudes and morals “taught or caught” in the home or the church. Therefore, the moral role and significance of today’s teacher is larger than it has been for a long time (Hargreaves, & Fullan, 1998).
Active learning

The model of cognitive thinking or development is rooted in educational theories about mental processes – how information is stored, interpreted and processed. Active learning, which includes cooperative groupwork and student directed learning is grounded in a constructivist approach to learning (Dewey, 1916; Bruner, 1960; Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1986) and involves meaningful learning occurring when students create new ideas or knowledge from existing information or personal experiences. Learning occurs through discovery, exploration, synthesis and application.

Constructivist theories provide the main foundations of ‘active learning approaches’. All genuine learning is active, not passive. It is a process of discovery in which the student is the main agent, not the teacher (Adler, 1982). ‘Learners should organise knowledge for themselves, for example by using discovery methods, rather than having material pre-packaged by the teacher’ (Child, 2007, p.452).

In an attempt to respond to issues of globalisation and rapid social, technical and economic change, Irish curricula advocate varying active pedagogies in post-primary schools, ‘active learning methodologies have been advanced as valuable strategies in facilitating these changes’ (McMorrow, 2006, p.321).

Teaching is a paradoxical profession. Of all jobs that are or aspire to be professions, only teaching is expected to create the human skills and capacities that will enable individuals and organisations to survive and succeed in today’s knowledge society (Hargreaves, 2003, p.1).

Despite policies and curricula (e.g. White Paper on Education, 1995; NCCA, 2007) encouraging the use of active learning methodologies in post-primary schools, difficulties have been encountered in implementing these methods and none more so than from pre-service teacher education students. This use of active learning in second level schools will be of vital importance to our pre-service teachers in their future careers. Recent Department of Education and Science guidelines for reform of second level education in Ireland recommend active learning and group work methods across all subject areas (DES, 2001 cited in McMorrow, 2006), however to date there is a paucity of evidence recounting the use of such methods.
Teaching for diversity, social justice and global awareness

In recent years, a consciousness of the global context in which education takes place has come to the fore. The ‘global-character’ of contemporary Irish education has become evident in policy documents as well as educational discourse. This development has come about as a result of a number of factors e.g. a multicultural Ireland, the work of Irish NGOs, the history of Irish emigration and the multiplicity of cultural ties and political relationships Ireland shares (NCCA, 2007).

Concern about an apparent resurgence of racism, violence and xenophobia in many countries, and the focus on conflict resolution in the island of Ireland, serve to underline the importance of education in areas such as human rights, tolerance, mutual understanding, cultural identity, peace and the promotion of co-operation in the world among people of different traditions and beliefs (NCCA, 2007, p.12).

It is within this context that the need to increase awareness of global issues is advocated.

In a recent publication dated June 20th 2005, the Think Tank on Social Change TASC, published a document Democratic Audit Ireland – which outlined Public Perspectives on Democracy in Ireland. A number of key issues relating to Citizenship emerged from the study. Some of these issues include: the changing nature of Irishness, definitions of citizenship, immigration and the future direction of Irish immigration policy, economic and social rights, vulnerabilities of marginalised groups, the rights of non-nationals and combating racism. As a precursor to this forum, TASC outlined the meaning of ‘active citizenship’ and how it might be realised. Honohan (2004) observed active democratic citizenship as

meaning more than just having our interests represented and getting the business of government done … we have to think what it may involve in the context of the realities of far-reaching social and economic change, increasing moral and cultural diversity, and significant immigration that are part of Ireland’s experience of globalisation (Honohan, 2004, p.1).

Within the context of this paper particular attention is given to the attitudes and experiences of student teachers when integrating topics into their teaching dealing with such areas as ethnic, racial and cultural diversity as well as the global awareness and environmental awareness.
Curriculum Studies module and Development Education intervention

*Curriculum studies* is an existing third year education module completed by pre-service teacher education students at the University of Limerick. Curriculum studies places emphasis on the whole curriculum, going beyond individual subject areas asking the broader philosophical, sociological and political questions. The module addresses such areas as curriculum development, curriculum change/reform, methods of assessment and pedagogy. The multi-dimensional role of the teacher is discussed. Within this 12-week module students spend two hours per week in a tutorial group.

Three tutorials sessions are assigned to a development education active learning intervention, where students participate in active learning methodologies with a development education theme. The purpose of this intervention is two fold. Firstly, it aims to encourage students to incorporate active learning methodologies into their teaching and secondly, it exposes students to development education issues and encourages them to consider how such issues could be incorporated into their own subject area and teaching. During this intervention, students participate in such activities as “food glorious food”, use of visual images to promote discussion on development, “selection of a pen pal”, visitors to the classroom and walking debates.

**Methodology**

This study was conducted with fourth year pre-service teacher education students who had participated in a development education intervention the year previous. Subsequent to the intervention, students had completed a 12-week teaching practice placement. This research was conducted following teaching practice.

**The research instrument**

Based on a review of the relevant literature a questionnaire was devised. The questionnaire underwent a series of revisions and was approved by the Research Ethics Committee at the University of Limerick. The questionnaire was piloted and subsequent changes made.

The questionnaire examined

Students’ attitudes towards development education
Students’ experiences of addressing development education issues while on t.p.
Students’ attitudes towards integrating development education issues in the future
Barriers that prevented the integration of development education issues into their teaching
An ‘expression of interest’ sheet was included so that students could volunteer to participate in focus group discussions at a later date.

Access, data collection and research sample
The students surveyed were fourth year pre-service teacher education students. The researchers visited relevant tutorial groups, assured students of the confidentiality of the study and distributed the questionnaires. Students were invited to complete the questionnaires during the allotted tutorial time. The number surveyed was 166 from a total population of 213 students, giving a response rate of 78%.  

Data Analysis
The questionnaire data was analysed using the computer package Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Selection for focus groups
Students were selected for focus groups on the basis of:

Sex (male/female)
Course of study (PE/Science/Construction/Engineering)
Attempts to integrate development education into teaching while on teaching practice (Always/Sometimes versus Seldom/Never)

Focus groups were conducted with two sets of students. Group one ‘attempted to integrate’ development education while on teaching practice. Group two ‘did not attempt’ to integrate development education while on teaching practice. Each focus group consisted of four students and lasted approximately one hour. The focus groups

---

2 Absenteeism at the time of data collection accounts for some of the non-responses.
were recorded using a digital recorder, the material transcribed and analysed using a thematic approach.

**Profile of respondents**

The sample consisted of 166 full-time undergraduate students enrolled in teacher education programmes (see Table 1 for breakdown of students sampled from each programme of study). The majority of students were between the ages of 21-22 years. Of the 166 students, 39% were female and 61% were male. The gender distribution of the current sample is consistent with that of the university as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Programme</th>
<th>Current Study Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Elective: Maths (34%), Geography (32%), English (17%), Irish (12%) and Chemistry (5%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Construction</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Engineering</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

Within this section the authors will outline the main results from the questionnaires and focus groups.

**Teaching Practice school**

Students completed a 12-week teaching practice placement in the first semester of fourth year. 71% of student teachers attended a co-educational school for their teaching practice placement, with 19% attending a single sex girl’s school and 10% attending a single sex boy’s school. The type of school attended on fourth year teaching practice is outlined in the table below.
Table 2: School type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school on teaching practice</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Community College</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive school</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant relationship found between type of school attended on t.p. and levels of integration of development education.

**Level of interest in development education issues**

Students who participated in the focus groups were asked what development education means to them. Students indicated that development education means ‘protecting people and the world, adequate use of resources, climate change, unequal development, carbon trading, poverty, famine, corrupt governments, awareness, understanding the consequences of your actions, understanding that there is a life outside your subject area and trying to make a difference’.

66% of questionnaire respondents indicated that they had an average level of interest in Third World issues. 21% indicated that they had a high/very high level of interest and 13% indicating their level of interest was low/very low.

The majority of students (85%) indicated that they knew something about Third World issues, with 7% indicating that they didn’t know anything about Third World issues. Only 8% of questionnaire respondents indicated that they were well informed about Third World issues. Students’ main sources of information on Third World issues were (in descending order) television, newspapers, Internet, non-governmental agencies, college courses and lecturers, family & friends and the radio.

**Development education and post-primary schooling**

88% of questionnaire respondents agreed that development education should be included in post primary education. Students made such comments as

*Future generations have to change the world*
I think people have to be taught the implications for their actions, so they can make a knowledgeable and educated choice

Post-primary students are at an age where [they are] easily influenced and so it is important

Our pupils need to realise that there are more important things than a new ipod etc...less materialistic. We are more culturally diverse in Ireland. We need to know why!

34% of questionnaire respondents believed that development education should be mandatory up to and including the Leaving Certificate. 32% believed that development education should be mandatory for all students up to the Junior Certificate. 11% believed that development education should only be provided for students who were interested. 7% believed that Transition Year would be the ideal time to address development education issues. 5% believed it should not be included on the school curriculum and 12% were unsure of how it should be integrated.

Just under half of the students surveyed (49%) believed that development education should be integrated on a cross-curricular basis. 21% believed it should be integrated within individual subjects. 15% believed it should be a stand-alone module and 10% believed it should be integrated as a short course.

**Development education and subject areas**

64% of questionnaire respondents saw opportunities for development education in their main subject area. Students made a number of suggestions on how such issues could be incorporated into their subject area. A number of examples follow:

> In PE you can celebrate diversity, treat everyone equally and try to draw up a contract ensuring everyone treats others, as they would like to be treated

> How science can play a role in helping to solve/combat these issues

> Project work and investigation research, debates etc [in construction]

23% were unsure if they saw a link between development education and their subject area. 13% of questionnaire respondents disagreed that there was a link between development education and their subject areas. Those who disagreed indicated that they didn’t think it fitted into their specific subject area
I find it hard to see how it could be integrated into technical graphics/drawing

As it is very difficult to include such areas in a mathematical setting that could benefit both subjects

Figure 1 below outlines the relationship between gender and response to the question ‘do you see opportunities for development education in your main subject areas?’ As can be seen from the graph, a higher promotion of males indicated that they do not see opportunities for the integration of development education into their main subject areas (p = 0.01).

**Figure 1: Gender by ‘do you see opportunities for development education in your main subject areas’?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development education and teaching practice school**

42% agreed that development education was valued in their teaching practice school.

*Environment was a hot issue in the school, which was shown in the recycling etc*

*Fairtrade was run in the school. School was very multi-cultural and many efforts were made to give everyone’s culture a view*

57% of respondents were unsure, disagreed or strongly disagreed that development education was valued in their teaching practice school.

*My teaching practice school was very self-centred. Concerned only with local factories and individuals in power in the community. Material resources were heavily exploited.*
Never heard it referred to and there was no “ideas” put forward by staff. In an instance after I left the school a special needs assistant was fundraising for an orphanage affected by the Tsunami and not one teacher in the school gave any help: time, money or support.

Foreigners in classes on their own; not integrated with Irish students. Hence little room for equality.

Only 4% agreed that their co-operating teacher integrated development education issues into their teaching. The remainder of respondents were unsure, disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

I didn’t see any evidence in the classroom

Content coverage was the main concern

They never mentioned this to me and I never thought to ask

Integration of development education into teaching

The majority of students did not attempt to integrate development education issues into their teaching while on teaching practice. The results can be seen in the chart below.

Figure 2: ‘I attempted to integrate development education into my teaching’

36% of students never integrated such issues into their teaching and only 4% of students indicated that they always integrated development education issues into their teaching while on teaching practice. Students made such comments as:

I think there was too much pressure on us to teach for our grade – this sidelines opportunities to take risks
I was more concerned with classroom management and subject content. Maybe with more experience I’d integrate it but as yet I don’t have enough courage/competence to delve into this.

I did some lessons relating to selection of timbers and exploitation of third world forests.

Each plan for my 5th year class was based on teaching Development Education with one English class - as part of my final year project.

I was not concerned with integrating development education. My subject area [engineering] does not allow for such issues to be discussed and integrated.

Of those students who did integrate development education issues into their teaching while on teaching practice (always/sometimes), 60% strongly agreed or agreed that they enjoyed teaching about such issues. While 45% strongly agreed or agreed that their students enjoyed learning about development education issues. 52% were unsure.

Figure 3, below identifies the relationship between course of study and response to the statement, ‘I attempted to integrate development education issues into my teaching while on teaching practice’. As can be seen from the graph, those students from the Physical Education and Science Education programmes attempted to integrate development education issues into their teaching most frequently, however higher proportions of students from Physical Education and Materials & Construction programmes also reported having never attempted to integrate development education issues into their teaching while on teaching practice (p = 0.001).

---

3 All of the PE students who indicated that they “sometimes” integrated development education had selected Geography as their elective.
Barriers

Pre-service teacher education students highlighted a number of barriers that they perceived to hinder the integration of development education while on t.p. These include (in order) curriculum constraints, lack of time, relevance to subject topics being taught, students didn’t think about it, pressures of visiting tutors, students were asked to cover specific topics by co-operating teacher and lack of knowledge on the part of the student teacher. Students made such comments as:

*The pressures to get a good grade on teaching practice. The pressures and expectations of co-operating teacher to just do their subject*

*Not sure if it’s relevant to the curriculum; pressures to get curriculum covered*

*Time: mainly but I think you actually do incorporate these issues without realising them: the sponsored run and the incorporation of all pupils in my class, including non-nationals with very bad English*

*Lack of own knowledge: very little time spent on development education in college for us to actually use it in our teaching*

*I think integration of development education is helped if your subject is related to it, for example, geography deals with many issues in development education*

*Teaching practice is such a stressful time that trying to include another topic outside of what one has to teach can just complicate things*

66% of respondents indicated that these barriers always or sometimes prevented them from integrating development education issues into their teaching.
Factors that encourage integration of development education

Focus group participants indicated that having a personal interest in development education encourages teachers to integrate it, with one student indicating that ‘development education is so much a part of my life it is just natural’ (integrated development education on t.p.). Students believed that teaching in a multi-cultural setting encourages the teacher to integrate development education issues into their teaching. Students felt that including development education as part of the assessment criteria for t.p. would encourage them to integrate it more, but ‘only when their tutor visited’. Students also felt that having nationwide events such as fasts, debates and school activities helped to integrate development education.

The future

59% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they plan to integrate development education issues into their teaching when they have graduated from college. However, focus group participants (both those who did and did not integrate development education while on t.p.) indicated that integrating development education into their teaching in the future was not high on their list of priorities. Students believed that discipline and academic performance were of greater importance at the initial stages of their teaching career. One student (didn’t integrate development education on t.p.) indicated that she would integrate development education ‘as long as it wouldn’t compromise my job or open me up to criticism’. Students believed that job security, trying to fit into the organisation, not rocking the boat and being viewed as an effective teacher were more important to focus on in the first few years of teaching. Students highlighted that they would not make any particular effort to integrate development education into their teaching, however, they indicated that it may ‘crop up’ unplanned in some classes. One student (did integrate development education on t.p.) believed that community/local based issues were of more relevance to students than those of developing countries, ‘you have to address things at home before we can address things in Africa’
Figure 4: Gender by ‘I will integrate development education into my teaching when I have graduated from college’

Figure 4 above indicates the relationship between gender and response to the statement ‘I will integrate development education into my teaching when I have graduated from college’. Interestingly, no female respondent indicated that they would not integrate development education into their teaching following graduation, p = 0.01.

Discussion
This study was limited in that; information pertaining to what happened in the classroom was reported by the students through completed surveys and focus group enquiry. No classroom observation occurred on the part of the authors.

Importance of the inclusion of development education in post-primary education
Solace can be taken in the fact that pre-service teacher education students are very positive towards the inclusion of development education in post-primary education with the majority believing that development education has a place on the school curriculum. Just under half of the students surveyed would like development education implemented on a cross-curricular basis, which is similar to the findings of Gleeson et al. (2007) who found that the majority of teachers favoured a cross-curricular approach. However, the study highlighted that ‘the implementation of such an approach requires a culture where collaborative planning and teamwork are prized and facilitated. Since this is unfortunately not the case in Irish post-primary schools there is a danger that the positive rhetoric may not become reality’ (Gleeson et al., 2007, p.66).

15
64% of student teachers, from the current study saw direct links between their subject areas and development issues. While all of this sounds extremely promising, our pre-service teacher education students face a number of barriers within the Irish education system, which limit their attempts to integrate development education issues into their teaching while on teaching practice and potentially their future careers. It appears that the “busyness” of schools rather than the business of schools takes hold and pre-service teacher education students are trying to battle against time, curriculum constraints and attitudes of their own co-operating teachers. While questionnaire respondents indicated their hope to integrate development education issues in their future careers, further questioning in the focus groups found that development education was not high on the list of priorities. Students indicated that such issues as classroom management, academic performance, job security and wanting to be viewed as an effective teacher were of higher priority. Students appear to be already complying with the system where they are afraid to “rock the boat” on entering a school.

While our pre-service teacher education students did plan to integrate development education in the future, we see that few of their co-operating teachers made any attempt to do likewise. Does this mean that our own pre-service teacher education students, with their enthusiasm and belief in the multi-dimensional role of the teacher, will eventually succumb and abide to the system that is currently in place.

**Teacher education and continuous professional development**

The United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UNDESD) highlights the need to focus teacher education and development towards sustainability with Ferreira (2007) indicating that ‘pre-service teacher education provides a strategic opportunity for ensuring that all teachers are ready, willing and able to teach for sustainability when they begin their teaching careers’ (p.226). Changes to the role of the teacher result in implications for teacher development at all levels but particularly in-service (Hanafin and Hyland, 1995, p.7 cited in Sugrue, 2001, p.54). The National Education Convention (1994) acknowledged that changes in content, pedagogy, assessment, relationships, social conditions and the role of the school required fresh approaches to initial and in-service teacher education. If teachers are expected to be
more than just subject specialists they need education and advice on suitable approaches to adopt in order to address such issues adequately with students.

A number of students in this study highlighted their own lack of knowledge as a considerable barrier in implementing development education into their teaching. According to Gleeson *et al.* (2007) ‘it is reasonable to assume that teachers who lack confidence in their knowledge of development issues or in the use of active learning approaches are more likely to rely on textbooks. This has important implications for initial and continuing teacher education and development’ (p.65). Higher institutions and more especially teacher education colleges must step up to the plate. In order for development education to reach the masses of post-primary education – teachers must be adequately prepared, either through initial teacher education programmes or adequate provision of in-service.

**Conclusions and issues arising**

1. Teacher and school culture appear to have a direct impact on the integration of development education into teaching with course coverage, lack of time and demands of other teachers impacting significantly on the integration of such issues.

2. While the majority of students saw direct links between development education and their relevant subject areas, a number appear to view development education as subject specific. Some believed that development education can easily be incorporated into such subjects as religion and geography but may not fit as easily into such subjects as physical education, mathematics and construction studies. Statistically significant differences were found between course of study and integration of development education on teaching practice. A study by Irish Aid/NCCA (2007) concluded that ‘development education is an approach that can be integrated across all subject areas’. The current study reinforces findings by Gleeson *et al.* (2007) who suggested that ‘further work is needed if the potential of development education is to be realised in areas such as mathematics and technology’ (p.65).

3. Pre-service teacher education students believed they would have more immediate priorities in their first years of teaching other than the integration of
development education, such as being viewed as an “effective teacher”. Students felt, after such time, they could prioritise the integration of development education. Are we therefore to assume that our pre-service teacher education students do not see a link between being an effective teacher and teaching the whole person?

4. Pre-service teacher education students appear to be concerned with survival of ‘the self’, their own teaching skills, and their own position in the school and within the classroom. Is this preoccupation with ‘the self’ a potential deterrent to the integration of development education on t.p.?

5. Just over half of the student teachers that did integrate development education issues into their teaching were unsure whether their students enjoyed these classes. If pre-service teacher education students are unsure whether their students enjoy these classes they may be less likely to integrate such issues into their teaching. Therefore, the post-primary student voice needs to be examined in greater detail so as to ascertain their levels of enjoyment regarding development education issues.

6. From the perspective of this study teacher education in development education consisted of an intervention study using active learning methodologies, however if active learning methodologies are not supported within the traditional didactic post-primary setting – what hope remains for the inclusion of development education?

7. Statistically significant differences were found amongst male and female pre-service teacher education students, with female students being more willing to integrate development education in their future careers. The lack of willingness by male teachers to become involved in programmes, such as CSPE, SPHE and RSE had been well documented (NCCA, 2005; Geary & Mannix McNamara, 2007; Gleeson & Munnely, 2003). Greater encouragement and support is required for all teachers, but particularly male teachers, both at pre-service and in-service to help them overcome barriers which inhibit their involvement in such programmes.
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