Institutionalizing an "Ethic of Care" into the Teaching of Ethics for Pre-service Teachers

Michelle Hawks & Thashika Pillay

Institutionalizing an "Ethic of Care" into the Teaching of Ethics for Pre-Service Teachers

Michelle Hawks[*]
Thashika Pillay
University of Alberta

This paper calls for the acknowledgement and institutionalization of an ethic of care into the education of decision-making processes for pre-service teachers. The impetus for this paper came from the author's experiences with teaching a mandatory ethics and law course for pre-service teachers. Over the course of their teaching and as expounded upon in this paper, the authors illustrate how the course goals, aims, objectives and readings ignore discussions on gender in the teaching profession. Using a critical feminist policy analysis, the authors analyze the ethical perspectives taught in the required textbooks. Findings suggest that the absence of the "ethic of care" perpetuates a gender regime and teaching as "women's work" while ignoring ethical perspectives founded outside of the rational male perspectives. This notion of mandating an ethic of care into the teaching of ethics for pre-service teachers is our attempt to address issues of power and privilege by pointing to a gap in the curriculum of university ethics courses.

As doctoral students and sessional instructors at a major Canadian university, the authors have both taught a required course for pre-service teachers on ethics and law for teachers. From our perspective, the main objectives of this course are: (a) to provide students with the necessary skills to make ethical decisions when they begin their teaching careers; and (b) for students to have a rudimentary understanding of the law and its possible impact on teaching. In addition, the teaching guidelines for the course ask instructors to focus on sections of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and case law that might directly impact one's actions as a teacher or that has impacted teachers in the past. One goal of this course, unlike philosophy and religious based ethics courses, is to give students a brief understanding of the theory and then provide the support needed to help them engage that theory in making ethical decisions. Typically, there is a presentation of a number of ethical perspectives, such as teleological or utilitarian, followed by case studies to provide guidance towards a proposed course of action to help students work through each ethical perspective.

On the first day of class, we start with an activity wherein there are two lists: on one side the class considers what constitutes moral/right/good as a person in society and on the other side, what does it mean to be immoral/wrong/bad. Students are prompted to consider

---

[*] Correspondence can be directed to Michelle Hawks at hawks@ualberta.ca

what they think a good versus bad teacher would look like/do/act in their classroom. Inevitably at this point, there is at least one person who indicates that a good teacher cares. Since the required textbook for the course does not include the ethic of care, and personal attempts to suggest that caring was more than just saying "I care," this project stemmed from a desire to know what it means to care, ethically, and in practice in teaching since so many teachers identify that as a goal or aspect of a "good teacher."

As female doctoral students who are also qualified classroom teachers, this notion of infusing an ethic of care into the teaching of ethics for pre-service teachers is our attempt to address issues of power and privilege by pointing to a gap in the curriculum of university ethics courses and specifically the privileging of so-called rational male ethical perspectives. As such, this article will, first, examine how the ethic of care is addressed in the official curriculum of a mandatory course on ethics for teachers and, second, consider whether an ethic of care should be mandated into the teaching of ethics.

A Review of the Relevant Literature

There are two main areas of literature that inform our research into the ethical perspectives used in this course on ethics and law for teachers. First, we look at the feminization of teaching as a profession. This is important to show both our understanding of the vast literature on the topic of feminization of teaching as well as the foregrounding for why a discussion around the ethic of care is so important. Second, we examine the teaching of ethics and illustrate how an ethic of care could address one gap within the teaching of ethics for teachers. The gaps present in the literature review propel us to consider care as an ethical perspective wherein we examine previous theorizations of the ethic of care as well as its function as a guiding framework for this article.

The Feminization of Teaching

To begin our discussion of the feminization of teaching we would like to note that we are not creating this gendered binary between the feminine and the masculine or between male and female. This binary has been created and emphasized throughout the evolution of the teaching profession in many different ways. Our goal is merely to make note of this phenomenon; it is not to encourage or make any statements as to the efficacy of this type of categorization. With that said, we will look at the ways in which teaching can be seen as feminized through the lenses of quantification, history, and gendering.

To view the feminization of teaching through the quantitative lens, we focused on the numbers presented by Statistics Canada from the 2011 Census and the three different ways in which Statistics Canada made note of the feminization of teaching from their perspective. First, we looked at the amount of people who are teaching across the country. In total numbers, there were 464,445 teachers in Canada in 2011; 344,635 of which were women, thereby making women 74% of the population of teachers (Statistics Canada, 2011). In other words, almost three-quarters of all teachers in Canada were women. This trend became even more interesting when we noted that 59% and 84% of secondary and elementary teachers, respectively, were women in that same year (Statistics Canada, 2015b). We noticed that as you go farther down the so-called hierarchy of the educational system, in the areas in which teachers are perceived to have less formal knowledge

requirements to teach, women outnumber men by a significant margin, an observation also acknowledged by Wood (2011). This is so evident that a Statistics Canada (2015a) report *Back to School... by the Numbers* acknowledged that teaching is "a profession dominated by women." This last indicator also references the 2011 National Household Survey indicating that both elementary and secondary teaching are two of the most common occupations for women, fifth and 19th respectively (Statistics Canada, 2011). According to the national statistics, we can see a clear trend, as noted by Statistics Canada as well, indicating that women overwhelming work in K-12 education as opposed to men.

It has been noted by several scholars that having more women teachers is actually a historical trend in Canada (Kelleher et al., 2011; Kimmel, 2008; Richards & Acker, 2006; Theobald, 2006; Wotherspoon, 2009). As the public school system developed in Canada and schooling became compulsory, there was a profound shortage of men able to teach. As such, many districts grudgingly began hiring young unmarried women to fill the roles (Miller, 2011; Wotherspoon, 2009). In order to maintain control over the school system and women's influence in the classrooms, men were placed in positions of administration (Richards & Acker, 2006; Wotherspoon, 2009). Women were also sought after to fill the roles of teachers as women were seen as cheap labor (Kelleher et al., 2011). Wotherspoon (2009) concurred, and his findings demonstrated that since census data first became available in 1921, Canadian women teachers have also always earned less than men.

Teaching is also perceived as feminized due to a process of what we will call *entrenched gendering*. Our concept of entrenched gendering is based on the idea of gender regimes, wherein if an organization or institution has consistent practices around who is recruited for work, the recognition of social divisions, and an expectation of how emotional relations are organized and conducted as in schools, armies or sports clubs, then a gender regime exists (Connell, 2002). While Connell (2002) maintained that gender regimes can change, the gendering of education was prescribed from the start and has not changed in over 100 years.

In part, the existence of the gender regime takes into account "how symbolic representations of gender are drawn on" (Ranson & Dryburgh, 2011, p. 38). Historically, this concept derives from the ideals of the gender dichotomy, specifically the idea that women are "natural" caretakers (Blackmore, 2011; Drudy, 2008; Kelleher et al., 2011). These historic ideas of a gender binary do two things that are important to our study. First, the binary reinforces who should be seen as teachers, to the point where students suggest that men should not be teachers (Cushman, 2012; Wallace, 2007). Second, the binary reinforces a second binary between rationality and emotionality, such that maleness or masculinity is associated with the former and female or femininity, the latter (Blackmore, 2011). Both of these ideas come together to further entrench the idea that women should not be in administration, and, thus, that women's ways of knowing and decision making are deemed irrelevant.

The research indicates the extent to which the feminization of the teaching profession exists. For the purposes of this paper and moving forward, it is important to keep in mind that the majority of the people working in the teaching profession are women. This was a historical creation based on the idea that women were seen as "natural" caretakers but is also the result of the Canadian public school system's practice of viewing women teachers as cheap labor. This entrenched gendering suggests that women's ways of knowing are, and have always been, disenfranchised from educational decision making despite women

having worked in this profession far more than men for well over the past one hundred years.

The Teaching of Ethics

Teaching ethics in postsecondary has particular characteristics that are important to consider when discussing the teaching of ethics. The first distinction to be made, is that ethics as traditionally understood is considered a subdiscipline of either philosophy or religion (McGraw, Thomas-Saunders, Benton, Tang & Biesecker, 2012; Rowe, 2015). This understanding and teaching of ethics is distinct from applied ethics, which is typically found in "business, biology, journalism, law or medicine" (McGraw et al., 2012, p. 131) and more specifically in "bioethics, medical ethics, business ethics, legal ethics, journalism ethics, and engineering ethics" (McGraw et al., 2012, p. 132). While it is important to distinguish between theoretical and applied ethics, it is also intriguing that education as a professional application is missing, although nursing and mass communication are mentioned in later lists made by McGraw and his coauthors (2012). As ethics courses move towards a more applied route, it has also been noted that most professors teaching ethics courses at universities do not have degrees in either philosophy or religion, but in the professional area in which they are applying ethics (McGraw et al., 2012). This leads to questions of purpose and theoretical background for those students engaged in applied ethics courses.

One justification for having applied ethics is the result of theoretical ethics courses in philosophy and religion departments not meeting the needs of those working in the professions (Rowe, 2015). However, the teaching and learning of ethics continues to be very important for normative (Smith, Satris, Starkey & Fishman, 2014) and professional reasons (Crook & Truscott, 2007; O'Neill & Bourke, 2010). Knowing how to think carefully through ethical decisions, avoid relativism, and ensure the most "good" comes from a situation are several normative reasons for studying ethics (Smith et al., 2014). There is also a need to ensure that teachers as a profession maintain their status by following their province's code of ethics, as without the code there is a perception that teachers are merely just performing a job or service and not acting in the role of professionals (Crook & Truscott, 2007; O'Neill & Bourke, 2010).

Given that most ethics courses occur outside of their perceived homes in philosophy or religion departments, it is also important to analyze how and why ethics courses are being taught in their applied homes. Overwhelmingly, case studies are of paramount importance in applied ethics (Campbell, 1997, 2008; Crook & Truscott, 2007; Hasinoff & Mandzuk, 2015; Rowe, 2015; Strike & Soltis, 2004). While case studies seem to be the implicitly agreed upon method for assisting new teachers in developing ethical reasoning, researchers depict multiple ways in which the teaching and learning of ethical reasoning can occur. Rowe (2015) included six aspects in an ethics course: (a) Allowing the development of students' ethical understandings to grow; (b) Engage in the practice of ethical thinking; (c) Allowing students the space to inquire, take opposing viewpoints, etc.; (d) Listen from and learn about a myriad of perspectives and ideas in relation to ethical thinking; (e) Dialogue; and (f) The presentation of ethical heroes who are able to do things right (pp. 194-196). Smith et al. (2014) looked for a convergence in the recommendation for action from the three ethical perspectives that they present in their framework. Kretz (2014), on the other

hand, called for prospective teachers to engage with their emotions; otherwise ethical decision making, especially in courses, becomes merely a thinking exercise that will rarely, if ever, manifest itself into any ethical action once students become teachers. As evidenced from Rowe's (2015) inclusion of dialogue and Kretz's (2014) desire to engage emotions, there is a movement for the teaching of ethics to go beyond solely examining the rational and, thereby, to also include the emotional. However, caring -- as a perspective in its own right -- does not appear to be a consideration in any of these understandings of the teaching of ethics. In order to rectify this problem, we propose that caring become an aspect of ethical teaching for prospective teachers.

Care as an Ethical Perspective

We base our general understanding of the ethic of care in the perspective that Nel Noddings (2010) suggested, but with a few caveats. Noddings' (2010, 2013) understanding and articulation of caring in the one-caring and cared-for relationships is based solely on expectations of motherhood. Part of her goal is being "concerned with making the voice of the mother heard in both ethics and education" (Noddings, 2013, p. 182). Given that her ethic of care relies heavily on modelling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation in maintaining relationships between teacher and students, it is not difficult to see this mothering aspect in her conception of caring. This idea of caring, as including the female voice and intuition into education, is meant as a counterpoint to the presumed male ideal of justice.

Beyond the concern of creating another dichotomy between "women's" ethical perspective of caring and "men's" perspective in justice, are additional concerns around intersectionality. For example, Bowden (1997) points out that both Nel Noddings and Sara Ruddick present their ethics of care from the perspective of middle-class, Western, white women, ignoring other signifiers of identity. Given these concerns and in light of these limitations around understandings of the ethic of care, we would like to draw upon the concept of the ethic of care as a "third space" in order to expand on this concept.

Ethic of Care as a "Third Space"

According to Zembylas (2008), an ethic of care among teachers has been found to play a key role in the enrolment and progress of vulnerable students, with empathy cited as the hallmark of a caring relationship. Zembylas (2010) also contended that an ethic of care should be centered around examining education for vulnerable populations, and must consider issues of power relations and privilege. We therefore, draw on Homi Bhabha's (2004) concept of the third space in attempting to address this gap with the concept of the "ethic of care". The third space represents a strategy of enunciation that disrupts, interrupts and dislocates the dominant discursive construction of US and THEM.

Within this third space, educators, students, and knowledge making are all transformed by encounters with difference and multiplicity," for it requires a "rethinking of pedagogy as an engagement" with difference and multiplicity (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 302). This "third-space pedagogy" emphasizes "the importance of openness to otherness" through a cultivation of not merely reciprocity but multiplicity (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 303). Significantly, though, "before creative and transformative

encounters can even take place, students and teachers need the [relevant] theory to see both themselves and others" (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 303). This insight enables us to better understand how everyday assumptions consistently reinforce hegemonic ways of being and seeing but further may begin to recognize how a multiplicity of knowledges and ways of being and seeing can "complicate and might transform social practices" (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 303).

Foss (2015) contended that Wilson and Lewiecki-Wilson's (2002) third-space is "a political contestation and a remaking of subjectivity" (p. 306). Therefore, if such a pedagogical approach is to "encourag[e] the transformation of knowledges including those of the teacher and the academy as well as those of the students," it "must preserve a process that is dynamic and open" (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 306). Wilson and Lewiecki-Wilson (2002) affirmed that all teachers and students, "can indeed participate in remaking social and physical landscapes of the university" (p. 307). This remaking will only occur, however, if teaching is grounded in an understanding of the third space being where educators must embark on transforming their teaching in ways that compel them to engage with issues of difference and multiplicity. Then, and only then, will we be able to learn if "the transformative process engendered by the third-space classroom" can "extend beyond the university to other, larger, social spaces" (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002, p. 307).

The third space, however, cannot occur organically but must be intentional wherein there must exist a "structure which gives meaning to experience (Schoenhofer, 2002, p. 37). According to Black, (2005), "the intentionality for living as a caring individual is a mind-set, an attitude, and a choice that changes one's perspective, and ultimately, one's behavior…. [It] refers to a willingness to care, and a willingness to enter into a caring relationship with another person" (p. 417). As such, moving beyond the rational to include an ethic of care and, thereby, ensure a diversity of perspectives while teaching ethics, requires the deliberate construction of a framework that is both inclusive of caring as an ethical perspective and also highlights intentionality as a distinct aspect of caring.

Methodology

Critical Feminist Policy Analysis

Most policy analysis models approach policy in a gender-neutral manner. This fact belies the many ways our society is organized around gender, which is often regulated through policy. Traditional policy studies are characterized by what Audre Lorde (1984) terms the "master's tool" and is primarily a mechanism for holders of power to find cost effective ways to pursue their goals (Ball, 1990; Marshall, 1997; Scheurich, 1994). Therefore, "to discern the master's tools we need to deconstruct the concepts, problems, subjects and interpretations that formulate policy studies" (Marshall, 1997, p. 6). While gender may appear to be absent or irrelevant, the decisions that emerge from such policies have gendered consequences, and it is the feminized professions of teaching, nursing and public sector workers who are the most affected. According to Hawkesworth (1994), this is due to the notion of androcentrism whereby "assumptions, concepts, beliefs, arguments, theories, methods, laws, policies and institutions" may all be gendered (p. 105).

Posing the woman and gender question is central to discerning the master's tools and uncovering the patriarchal origins of our society and its institutions. This posing of the woman/gender question means determining the extent that research and teaching fails "to take into account the experiences and values that seem more typical of women than of men" (Bartlett, 1990, p. 837). The woman/gender question pushes us to consider how the onto-epistemological foundations of structures, institutions and organizations misrepresent the experiences of women, and thereby distort our specific knowledge of phenomena—such as leadership and teaching —as gender-encompassing (Bensimon, 1989; Marshall, 1997). By posing the woman/gender question, we can better extrapolate the patriarchal roots of how institutions function, given that current understandings suggest that the bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic functionings of institutions are more compatible with men's experience and understanding of leadership.

This propels us to bring in the woman/gender question in order to consider how policies can go beyond simply "add women and stir," such as in the case of one of the texts we will be analyzing in this article. That approach would not change the functioning of policies but simply force women to attempt to act as men and continually show women as deficient. Therefore, we advocate for a feminist critical policy analysis. According to Marshall (1997) and McPhail (2003) for a policy to be viewed as feminist critical policy analysis it is not sufficient to include women, but rather must include a number of additional elements. For the purposes of this paper, we have chosen to focus on the following three elements.

First, analysis poses gender as a fundamental category. All policy is women's policy: looking at policy through a gender lens recognizes that "all policy issues are of concern to women" (Brandwein, 1995, p. 252). For too long "women's issues" have been relegated to a few issues that seem to directly affect women such as reproductive rights and violence against women, which limits policies of interest to women to a few "pink" policies. But every policy affects women (Marshall, 1997, p. 8).

Second, analysis is concerned with the analysis of differences, local context, specificity and power (such as gender and race), and historicity (Barrett & Phillips, 1992; Marshall, 1997). After all, in order for women to be considered equal to men, women's difference must be recognized (Irigaray, 1993) rather than suppressed (Marshall, 1997). Therefore, there exists multiple feminisms and multiple identities: multiple feminist perspectives exist which may share commonalities, but each highlight important perspectives from different vantage points (McPhail, 2003). Underlying a feminist policy analysis are core feminist values. Brandwein (1986) illustrated these feminist values, including elimination of false dichotomies, the reconceptualization of power, valuing process equally with product, renaming or redefining reality consistent with women's reality, and acknowledging that the personal is political (McPhail, 2003).

Third, the goals of a feminist policy analysis are multiple. "Feminist analysis is most obviously putting women in where they have been left out, about keeping women centre stage" (Pascall, 1997, p. 7). "The first goal is making women visible in policy. Making women visible has many facets, including how men and women are treated differently or the same; the underlying assumptions and stereotypes of women embedded in policy; and how women's lives and roles are regulated and constrained by policy" (McPhail, 2003, p. 44). Second, feminist policy analysis must work to transform institutions. Feminist analysis questions the purpose of the institutions or organization's structures, practices and values in order to do away with or reform those that disadvantage women and others (Marshall,

1997). Third, it is an interventionist strategy. The aim of feminist critical scholarship is to dismantle systems of power and replace them with more preferable ones (Pateman, 1986). Thus, unlike traditional policy analysis which feigns neutrality, "feminist policy analysis is openly political and change-oriented" (Marshall, 1997, p. 9).

Critical feminist policy analysis places at the center of analysis the power, policies and structures that restrict access; this work often demonstrates how privilege is maintained and the disempowered are perpetually silenced. This type of analysis asks us to not only problematize the institutions and structures of society that maintain unequal and unjust social and political relations but, furthermore, to problematize, contest and call for changes around the knowledges that sustains their continued hegemonic existence and this privileged position in society.

Questions

Given the entrenched gendering we have documented within education and the deliberate discounting/omission of "female" ethical perspectives in the teaching of ethics, we chose to highlight gender in the questions that we asked. To do that we modified two of the questions found in McPhail's (2003) critical feminist policy analysis to help guide our inquiry into the policy network that exists around this course on ethics and law for teachers. Our modifications are meant to focus on the area highlighted by McPhail, but to not focus solely on how women are involved in the process, because this discounts other gender identities that may be centered or ignored. To that end, our questions are:

1. Who is involved in making, shaping and implementing the policy?
2. How can an ethic of care be institutionalized as policy?

Findings and Analysis

We analyze four books for the purposes of this study, *Teachers and the Law* by A. Wayne MacKay, Lyle Sutherland, and Kimberley D. Pochini (2013), *The Ethics of Teaching* by Kenneth Strike and Jonas F. Soltis (2004), *Ethics and Law for Teachers* by Kenneth Crook and Derek Truscott (2007), and *Building an Ethical School* by Robert J. Starratt (1994). Each of these books has been used in past semesters for our university's ethics for teachers course and will be used to answer our first question. To answer the second question, we analyze our recollections of how students respond to a case study that we both use when teaching this course.

There are two elements to our analysis that attempt to address our questions. For the first part of the analysis, we examine the four books individually. Within each book, we consider who is actually writing the book, with regards to gender as well as background knowledge of the authors. This information is obtained from the book's introduction as well as university information, to illustrate, quite literally, who is involved in making the books used to support the policy network. Then we turn our attention to the ethical perspectives that each set of authors has chosen to focus on in developing their individual ethical frameworks. Finally, we look at the intentionality of the books, looking specifically at the inclusion or exclusion of the ethic of care within the book's ethical framework. This final step includes examining how the author(s) use or refer to the ethic of care within the

specific text, and if they have included the ethic of care in their framework, conclude with a short discussion on the author's interpretation of caring as it relates to intention as we have described it above.

For the second part of the analysis we turn to the implementation and institutionalization of policy. Specifically, we analyze a case study around a job advertisement of a large school board in Canada and the implications of the responses we received to the case study. Using this case study, we hope to shed some light on how ethical perspectives are perceived by the students using them and what the implications may mean for the study of ethics in a post-secondary institution.

The Books

MacKay, Sutherland, and Pochini (2013). MacKay et al. (2013) presented their book as a way to use the law as a framework for looking at the roles and responsibilities of teachers in their classrooms. They discuss the evolving rights of teachers when it comes to copyright and *in loco parentis*, as well as the idea of balancing rights between the various stakeholders with regards to creating a safe environment in schools (p. xiii.). To initiate this discussion, the authors first present a brief look at how the legal system functions, followed by a delineation of the areas of law most likely to impact teachers specifically. The majority of the book is broken into areas of law in which the authors see teachers' roles reflected. These sections include teachers as parents, as guardians of equality and as agents of the police.

The authors of this book are two men and one woman. Though it is interesting to note that the previous two editions of this particular book were written only by the two male authors, MacKay and Sutherland. While adding a female author is an improvement, given that these two male authors have worked together on this book previously, this implies some power differences between the three members. In addition to the gender makeup of the group of authors, it is important to keep in mind that they are all lawyers and not teachers, which will likely impact their perspective on each of the roles they see teachers holding.

One of the most startling issues with this particular book is that ethics is never included or even mentioned in the text. This is particularly problematic given that ethics is considered to be the foundation of the legal system (Bickenbach, 2012). So, to completely ignore this foundation can be seen as problematic, and potentially sending the message to pre-service teachers that ethics are not important, only the law should be considered when making a difficult decision.

As this book did not look at ethics in relation to education, there is no potential for us to discuss their use of the ethic of care. However, in considering the concept of intentionality, an analysis of this text provides the opportunity to look further at the binary that some have created between rationality and emotionality, whereby the law is seen as rational and ethics are considered emotional and therefore deemed unimportant.

In summary, this book is a bit of an anomaly. While it is the only one of the four books to have a female author, it is also the only book that deals solely with the legal aspects of teaching, ignoring the ethical altogether. This of course limits our ability to analyze which ethical perspectives they use in their framework, and how the ethic of care is dealt with through either its presence in or absence from the overall framework. For the purposes of

our study, this book exemplifies rational decision making by only allowing rational legal decisions to influence pre-service teachers' conceptions of the issues they may face while teaching.

Strike and Soltis (2004). Strike and Soltis (2004) were concerned with the ethical thinking and decision making of teachers. They present their book as a way to help teachers work through dilemmas they will face while teaching. The book starts with an explanation of why teachers will need to consider ethics, and then presents the two ethical perspectives used throughout the book. The remainder of the book is dedicated to several topics such as multiculturalism and freedom of speech, with brief introductions that are followed by several case studies that are used to illustrate the complexities of each topic under discussion.

Strike is a professor of cultural foundations of education and of philosophy. His principal interests are professional ethics and political philosophy as they apply to matters of educational practice and policy. Soltis was a primary proponent of relevance in the field of educational theory. He pushed for a connection between the works of academic scholars and teachers/practitioners.

Strike and Soltis (2004) offered two decision making processes to aid teachers in making ethical decisions – the consequentialist and nonconsequentialist theories. Strike and Soltis argued for "a kind of rational ethical thinking that goes beyond personal beliefs and values" (p. 5). Strike and Soltis' only reference to the ethic of care occurred in the postscript of the book. Strike argued that we do not live in an ideal world "governed by friendship, love, or caring," nor do we operate within an ethic of care; consequently, according to Strike, "justice tells us how we must relate to people … regardless of whether we care for them" and should, therefore, be our motivating principle (p. 124).

While Strike and Soltis (2004) did not present the ethic of care as one of the main perspectives for their ethical framework, unlike two of the other books, they did at least delve into some of the details of how they perceive an ethic of care. As far as intentionality, we can conclude two things. First, their omission of the ethic of care from the main framework shows a delegitimation of the theory compared to the rational choices of consequentialism and nonconsequentialism. Second, it is clear from the previous paragraph that Strike and Soltis do not see the ethic of care as "a bridge between self and other" (Schoenhofer, 2002, p. 38). Therefore, we can assume that even if they had included the ethic of care in their framework, their understanding of intentionality would not have met with our understandings of the ethic of care.

It is easy to see that this book is first and foremost written by two men. Given their backgrounds in theory and philosophy, it is no surprise that Strike and Soltis (2004) distinguished a consequentialist ethical theory from a nonconsequentialist ethical theory in a manner that is easily understandable to undergraduate students. However, their focus on justice at the exclusion of other factors is limiting as it prevents students from fully understanding the various factors that should play a role in ethical decision making. This approach tends to simplify a number of rather complex issues, making it appear that decision making is solely in the realm of rationality and that emotionality is of little consequence. Finally, presenting the ethic of care as a conversation in an appendix illuminates the value, or lack thereof, that the authors place on caring, an implicit association that would likely flavor any attempt to meaningfully engage with intentionality.

Crook and Truscott (2007). Crook and Truscott (2007) presented their book as a way to fill a gap in pre-service teacher education. Their concern before writing was that no book existed that was aimed specifically at Canadian preservice teachers dealing with both ethics and law from the pre-service teacher or future teacher perspective. Most books are focused on the United States context, like Strike and Soltis (2004), and Starratt (1994). Of those books written in Canada, most are either written for lawyers or for educational theorists. The Crook and Truscott book is organized in three parts, three introductory chapters, eight chapters that focus on various topics of concern for new teachers including negligence, creating boundaries, and controversy, with one final chapter that presents Crook and Truscott's ethical framework.

Both of the authors of this book are men, like most of the books used for this course. Truscott's background is in educational psychology and ethics and Crook was a lawyer before his passing in 2008. Neither author was trained as a K-12 classroom teacher, so while they have extensive knowledge of the law and ethics for psychologists, are they able to choose topics of interest and importance for preservice teachers.

The two ethical perspectives that are used in Crook and Truscott (2007) are teleological and deontological. Although these are the only two perspectives, or systems as they refer to them, that are directly addressed and explained in depth in the book, they do at least acknowledge the existence of alternative perspectives. In a footnote on page 6 they do mention that the reader can explore an alternative perspective by reading an article by Nel Noddings. Also, while the authors suggest that the Canadian system is built strictly on the two perspectives presented in the text, this limits the abilities of preservice teachers to acknowledge that other systems exist.

Similar to the analysis from the MacKay (2013) text, because Crook and Truscott (2007) do not present the ethic of care as an ethical perspective for students to consider in their book there is no potential for us to discuss their use of the ethic of care in relation to other ways it has been theorized or used in practice. However, in considering the intentionality we think this provides us with the opportunity to consider why the ethic of care was not considered a legitimate perspective for teachers to use in their analyses of ethical decisions.

Overall, Crook and Truscott (2007) seemed to follow suit with the other books used for this course by not dealing with the ethic of care as a legitimate perspective for teachers. It is unique in its task of presenting both ethics and legal issues to preservice teachers from the Canadian perspective, and possibly in presenting a model for teachers to use when making decisions. It is still written by two men though, and ignores the so-called feminine ethical perspective.

Starratt (1994). Starratt (1994) presented his book as a way to convince the educational community that learning, teaching and talking about ethical decision making is important for a properly functioning school. He starts the book by describing why an ethical school is needed. He, then, presents his beliefs about foundational ethical values that should be found in a school. From there he presents his ethical framework, and ends the book with ideas for administrators on how to set his plan of creating an ethical school into motion.

This is a sole authored text. Starratt's (1994) background is in education; he has been a professor of educational administration and leadership at several universities and is considered one of the main authorities on ethical education topics.

Starratt (1994) focused on three ethical systems used together to create a multidimensional ethical framework that schools can use to create their ethical school. The three systems he relied on are the ethic of critique, the ethic of justice, and the ethics of caring. For the ethic of critique, he relied on critical theory presented by the Frankfurt school. To that end, the goal of the ethic of critique in the framework is to look at the way in which the school or institution is structured to determine if one group is being advantaged to the detriment of another group. For the ethic of justice, Starratt presented both Rawls and Kohlberg as examples, but focuses most of the discussion around Kohlberg. As such, his idea of justice is based in Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning and communitarianism, with heavy reliance on discussion. His final ethic, caring, used both Noddings and Gilligan's work as a reference point, where the objective is to not think of students as a means to an end, but as individuals with integrity.

Of the four books reviewed for this study, this is the only book to place precedence on the ethic of care in any way, and make formal attempts at inclusion within the everyday functioning of a school. The way in which Starratt (1994) initially presents the ethic of care, is based in the work of Gilligan and Noddings. He suggests that caring is not treating students as means to an end, but as treating them as their own ends, as individuals with their own purpose and desires. He goes on to present an example of a caring school as one that displays student work in the hallways, encourages awards and ceremonies not just for academic competition, laughter, and greeting students by name.

However, presenting the ethics of care in this way is problematic as intentionality is, then, lost. Given that "the intentionality for living as a caring individual is a mind-set, an attitude, and a choice that changes one's perspective, and ultimately, one's behavior" (Black, 2005), Starratt's (1994) picturesque school does not seem to fit into our understanding of intentionality. Following through with the type of actions that Starratt suggests may merely be part of the policy objectives for a school, as a way of making the school look more inviting, while teachers and administrators still do not have intention, hope or commitment to their caring. While looking at students as ends in themselves, and not a means to an end, is a good beginning, in order to reach the full potential of intentionality in a caring relationship, teachers and administrators need to be encouraged to consider the motives for their actions, and not only depict a superficial outward portrayal that mimics caring.

Given that there is no intentionality in Starratt's (1994) presentation of the ethics of care, this book is not drastically different than the rest in accomplishing the goals of the third space as described earlier in the article. While Starratt does, however, discuss the importance of including the ethic of care in ethical decision making, his presentation seems to be another example of educational administration working in parallel to the rest of the field of education (Campbell, 2008).

Gaps from All Four Texts

The first major gap is that only one of the eight authors is a woman. Second, of the four books, only one deals with the ethics of care as a separate and legitimate option for ethical

consideration. While both Crook and Truscott (2007) and Strike and Soltis (2004) acknowledged the existence of alternative ethical perspectives, they also only mention the ethic of care in a footnote and appendix, respectively. This illustrates a definite privileging of particular types of thinking about ethics, supporting ideas of the gender binary and the rational/emotional divide that often goes with it. The third gap is arguably the most important for this paper—intentionality. Intentionality with regards to the presentations of the ethic of care is missing from all four texts. MacKay et al. (2013) did not include any discussion around ethics, much less around an ethic of care. Two of the books only acknowledged the ethic of care as afterthoughts. And the fourth book does little to show real intention but pointed to outward signs of what could be caring, but what could also be a superficial policy without teeth that attempts to make a space look more inviting, without addressing the real need for change.

We would contend that there exists a relatively obvious gender gap based on who is writing the main texts used for this class and which ethical perspectives they have chosen to focus on as legitimate. Furthermore, none of the texts consider the ethic of care as a perspective which has the capacity to alter relationships between educators and learners while also addressing the hegemonic nature of traditional education and schooling. We would contend that the importance of the intentionality of an ethic of care is foregrounded on multiple perspectives that intersect in order to ensure that educators and students are transformed by their encounters with difference and multiplicity (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson, 2002). After all, factors such as equity, care, justice and respect should not operate independently of one another when making ethical decisions.

Implementation and Institutionalization

For the second part of the analysis, we turn our attention to the potential for an ethic of care to be implemented and institutionalized as policy. Using Foss (2015) as well as Wilson and Lewiecki-Wilson's (2002) third-space concept wherein the third space is conceptualized as "a political contestation and a remaking of subjectivity" (p. 306), we would like to examine our own pedagogies as instructors of this Ethics and Law class. Our decision to examine this issue through a case study of our personal pedagogies is based on Wilson and Lewiecki-Wilson's (2002) articulation that a pedagogical approach would "encourag[e] the transformation of knowledges including those of the teacher and the academy as well as those of the students," and "preserve a process that is dynamic and open" (p. 306). We therefore decided to focus on a case study which we have both used in our teaching of this course.

The Toronto School Board released an ad stating that, "The first round of TDSB interviews will be granted to teacher candidates that meet one or more of the following criteria in addition to being an outstanding teacher: Male, racial minority, French, Music, Aboriginal" (Hammer & Alphonso, 2013). Our decision to use this case study is based on our desire to attempt to teach about the ethic of care, not just in terms of a theory divorced from the reality of life but in terms of praxis wherein as instructors we hoped to incorporate ethic of care as a decision-making framework, pedagogy and as part of the theoretical underpinnings of the course. We also grounded our teaching in our understanding of the third space being where educators must embark on transforming their teaching in ways that

compel them to engage with issues of difference and multiplicity. We hoped that this case study would allow us to do this.

Students' responses indicated their recognition of the importance behind the impetus to have the ad and to ensure that there were an adequate number of subject/curriculum teachers such as for Music or French. However, they did not share similar sentiments with regards to hiring based on race and gender. In fact, students argued that such job postings were actually a charter offense, citing Section 15 of the *Charter*. They claimed that the TDSB is violating Section 15 (1) of the *Charter*, which reads "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability." They also portrayed concern that such job requirements would mean that the best person for the job would not be hired if hiring was based on race and gender.

Students appeared unwilling to consider the systemic and structural barriers that prevent certain groups from employment equity or as to why there would be an assumption that to hire an Indigenous or racialized person would mean "not the best person for the job" or the structural and systemic issues which may lead to a situation where on paper a female Caucasian is considered the best candidate. It is important to note that throughout the course, students indicated their support for education systems that valued diverse knowledges and critical thinking. However, for a large number of students, this understanding of creating equity in schools appeared to be antithetical once it could possibly impact their capacity to find jobs and if it became formalized policy. Our experiences teaching this course, and particularly through this specific case study, highlighted an interesting phenomenon to us as instructors: that while we may celebrate the successes of individual teachers, in some cases there is very little change that can be brought from individuals in classrooms if there is not the institutional support behind what educators may be attempting to accomplish.

Our attempts to counter the single narrative in the required texts were met with resistance from many of the students once it became clear that they may need to recognize their own positions of power and privilege and that at the center of an ethic of care lies a responsibility to see how we are all complicit in reinforcing "hegemonic ways of being and seeing" and that a commitment to equity and an ethic of care calls for us to also recognize that in allowing for multiplicity of knowledges and ways of being and seeing we may need to introduce new processes such as for hiring that will both complicate but hopefully also transform social practices (Wilson & Lewiecki-Wilson's, 2002, p. 303).

Conclusions: Institutionalizing an Ethic of Care

Our experiences with the course appear to reinforce Schoenhofer's (2002) call for a "structure which gives meaning to experience" (p. 37) and leads us to consider the need to institutionalize the concept of the ethic of care. Cohall (2012) contended that an education that emphasizes an ethic of care (self-care as well as the care of others):

> results in the transformation of unjust societies, the liberation of the oppressed, and the redistribution of resources so that groups historically marginalized have an equal place

at the table. An ethic of care takes on renewed meaning in cultures that are deeply ingrained in prejudice, hate, and the perpetuation of the status quo. (p. 15)

As can be seen from the responses of the pre-service teachers whom we taught, there exists the false perception that prejudice and injustice can be changed without individuals understanding how our actions are implicit in the perpetuation of social injustice and the ways in which our various identities due to race, gender, class, sexual orientation, citizenship (to name a few) privilege some and disadvantage others.

This inability to recognize that institutional and structural change requires us to recognize our own complicitness in perpetuating injustice is in our contention a rallying call for the need to institutionalize the ethic of care (as we have discussed it) into the teaching of ethics for pre-service teachers. Furthermore, this understanding of the ethic of care allows for student success and in student development as "whole people" (Keeling, 2014, p. 144), whereby this whole person is the result of the institutionalization of the concept of ethic of care (Keeling, 2014). Tronto (1993) and Zembylas (2010) concurred with Keeling, arguing that the ethic of care must be institutionalized as it is linked not only to individual duty but also to social responsibility. After all, an ethic of care, as conceptualized in this manner, will permit the maintaining, continuing and repairing of "our world so that we can live in it as well as possible" (Tronto, 1993, p. 103).

The call for the institutionalization of an ethic of care is echoed by Fletcher (1999) and Simola (2015) who demand that an ethic of care is intentionally embedded in "organizational policies or procedures and supported throughout the organization by the use of care-related practices involving naming, norming and networking" (Simola, 2015, p. 40). It is only through the institutionalization of an ethic of care wherein it is deeply embedded in programs and enacted in the operational curriculum on a daily basis that education can meet its true purpose of transforming culture, society, and people (Cohall, 2012). As such, we would argue that an ethics and law course which is educating pre-service teachers in making sound ethical decisions must be intentional with regards to the ways in which ethical decision-making processes are conceptualized and taught in order to ensure that classrooms are transformative spaces that can meet the multiple learning and societal needs of educators and learners.

Author Notes

Michelle Hawks is a doctoral student at the University of Alberta in the Department of Educational Policy Studies. She trained as a math teacher in the US, has experience working with K-12 students in both the US and Canada, and enjoys teaching ethics to pre-service teachers. Her research interests include ethics and equity in mathematics education. Michelle uses critical race theory and other critical frameworks to explore alternative conceptualizations of education and mathematics education research and policy.

Thashika Pillay is a doctoral candidate at the University of Alberta. She has extensive teaching experience in K-12 and higher education, having taught in Canada, Australia, and Ethiopia. Her scholarship focuses on issues related to educational policy, migration studies, critical and anticolonial feminisms, and community engagement. In her doctoral research, Thashika uses critical, anticolonial and radical feminisms to examine political and

community engagement among African-Canadian women. Her work engages issues of social justice, critical global citizenship and Indigenous knowledge systems and aims to re-center marginalized onto-epistemological perspectives.

References

Ball, S. J. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education: Explorations in policy sociology*. London, UK: Routledge.

Barrett, M. & Phillips, A. (Eds.), (1992). *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bartlett, K. T. (1990). Feminist legal methods. *Harvard Law Review*, *103*(4), 829–88.

Bensimon, E. (1989). A feminist reinterpretation of president's definitions of leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 143–156.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bickenbach, J. E. (2012). *Ethics, law and policy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Black, R. M. (2005). Intersections of care: An analysis of culturally competent care, client centered care, and the feminist ethic of care. *Work*, *24*(4), 409–422.

Blackmore, J. (2011). The gendering of educational work. In J. Martin & J. Goodman (Eds.), *Women and education: Major these in Education* (Vol. 4, pp. 40-61). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bowden, P. (1997). *Caring: Gender-sensitive ethics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brandwein, R. A. (1986). A feminist approach to social policy. In N. Van Den Bergh & L. B. Copper (Eds.), *Feminist visions for social work* (pp. 250-261). Silver Springs, MD: NASW Press.

Brandwein, R. A. (1995). Women in social policy. *Encyclopedia of social work* (pp. 2552-2560). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Campbell, E. (1997). Connecting the ethics of teaching and moral education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(4), 255-263.

Campbell, E. (2008). The ethics of teaching as a moral profession. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(4), 357-385.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s 2(a), 23 Part 1 of the *Constitution Act*, 1982, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act* 1982 (UK), 1982, c 11.

Cohall, K. G. (2012). Developing an ethic of care: An educational response. *The Living Pulpit*, *21*(3), 15-19.

Connell, R. W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Crook, K. & Truscott, D. (2007). *Ethics and law: For teachers.* Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.

Cushman, P. (2012). "You're not a teacher, you're a man": The need for a greater focus on gender studies in teacher education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(8), 775-790.

Drudy, S. (2008). Gender balance/gender bias: The teaching profession and the impact of feminization. *Gender and Education, 20*(4), 309-323.

Fletcher, J. K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power and relational practice at work*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Foss, C. (2015). Individual redemption through universal design; or, how IEP meetings have infused my pedagogy with an ethic of care(taking). *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, *15*(3), 477 – 491.

Hammer, K. & Alphonso, C. (2013, February 19). Hiring should favour male, minority teachers: Toronto school board. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/hiring-should-favour-male-minority-teachers-toronto-school-board/article8797933/

Hasinoff, S., & Mandzuk, D. (2015). *Case studies in educational foundations: Canadian perspectives*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Hawkesworth, M. E. (1988). *Theoretical issues in policy analysis*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Irigaray, L. (1993). *Je, Tu, Nours: Toward a Culture of Difference*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Keeling, R. P. (2014). An ethic of care in higher education: Well-being and learning. *Journal of College and Character*, *15*(3), 141-148.

Kelleher, F., Severin, F. O., Khaahloe, M. B., Samson, M., De, A., Afamasaga-Wright, T., & Sedere, U. M. (2011). *Women and the teaching profession: Exploring the feminization debate*. UNESCO, Paris/Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *The gendered society* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kretz, L. (2014). Emotional responsibility and teaching ethics: Student empowerment. *Ethics & Education, 9*(3), 340-355.

Lorde, A. (2007/1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. New York: Ten Speed Press.

MacKay, A. W., Sutherland, L., & Pochini, K. D. (2013). *Teachers and the Law: Diverse Roles and new challenges* (3rd ed.). Toronto, ON: Emond Montgomery Publications.

Marshall, C. (1997). *Feminist critical policy analysis*. London: Falmer Press.

McGraw, D. K., Thomas-Saunders, D., Benton, M., Tang, J., & Biesecker, A. (2012). Who teaches ethics? An inquiry into the nature of ethics as an academic discipline. *Teaching Ethics, 13*(1), 129-140.

McPhail, B. (2003). A feminist policy analysis framework. *The Social Policy Journal*, *2*(2-3), 39-61.

Miller, J. (2011). The feminization of schooling in two countries. In J. Martin & J. Goodman (Eds.), *Women and education: Major themes in education* (Vol. 3, pp. 172-199). New York: Routledge.

Noddings, N. (2010a). Moral education and caring. *Theory and Research in Education, 8*(2), 145-151.

Noddings, N. (2010b). Moral education in an age of globalization. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 42*(4), 390-396.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed., updated). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

O'Neill, J. & Bourke, R. (2010). Educating teachers about a code of ethical conduct. *Ethics & Education, 5*(2), 159-172.

Pascall, G. (1997). *Social policy: A new feminist analysis*. London: Routledge.

Pateman, C. (1986). The theoretical subversiveness of feminism. In C. Pateman & E. Gross (Eds.), *Feminist challenges: Social and political theory* (pp. 1-10), Boston, MA: Northeastern.

Ranson, G. & Dryburgh, H. (2011). Firms as "gender regimes": The experiences of women in IT workplaces. In J. A. McMullin [Ed.] *Age, gender and work: Small information technology firms in the new economy* (pp. 35-58). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Richards, E. & Acker, S. (2006). Collegiality and gender in elementary school teachers' workplace cultures: A tale of two projects. In R. Cortina & S. San Román [Eds.] *Women and teaching: Global perspectives on the feminization of a profession* (pp. 51-79). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rowe, S. (2015). Ethics, transformation, and practice: A perspective on liberal education in the Global Age. *Teaching Ethics, 15*(1), 191-199.

Scheurich, J. (1994). Policy archeology: A new policy studies methodology. *Journal of Education Policy, 9*(4), 297-316.

Schoenhofer, S. O. (2002). Choosing personhood: Intentionality and the theory of nursing as caring. *Holistic Nurse Practitioner 16*(4), 36–40.

Simola, S. (2015). Understanding moral courage through a feminist and developmental ethic of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *130*(1), 29-44.

Smith, K., Satris, S., Starkey, C., & Fishman, T. (2014). *Getting it right: A "toolbox" approach to ethical reasoning*. Clemson, SC: The Robert J. Rutland Institute for Ethics.

Starratt, R. J. (1994). *Building an ethical school. A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Statistics Canada (2011). *2011 National Household Survey: Data tables*. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/dt-td/Rp-eng.cfm?LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GID=0&GK=0&GRP=0&PID=105897&PRID=0&PTYPE=105277&S=0&SHOWALL=1&SUB=0&Temporal=2013&THEME=96&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=

Statistics Canada (2015a). *Back to school... by the numbers*. Retrieved from: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/dai/smr08/2014/smr08_190_2014#a5

Statistics Canada (2015b). *Table 2: The 20 most common occupations among women aged 15 years and over and the share of women in the total workforce, May 2011*. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-012-x/2011002/tbl/tbl02-eng.cfm

Strike, K. & Soltis, J. F. (2004). *The ethics of teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Theobald, M. (2006). And gladly teach? The making of a women's profession. In E. M. Smyth & P. Bourne (Eds.), *Women teaching women learning: Historical perspectives* (pp. 65-84). Toronto: Inanna Publications and Education Inc.

Tronto, J. 1993. *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. London, UK: Routledge.

Wallace, J. (2007). Inclusive schooling and gender. *Just in Time: News from the Diversity, Equity and Human Rights (DEHR) Committee, 4*(3), 1-2.

Wilson, J. C., & Lewiecki-Wilson, C. (2002). Constructing a Third Space: Disability Studies, the Teaching of English, and Institutional Transformation. In S. L. Snyder, B. J. Brueggemann, & R. Garland-Thomson (Eds.), *Disability Studies: Enabling the Humanities* (pp. 296-307). New York, NY: Modern Language Association.

Wood, J. T. (2011). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender, and culture,* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Wotherspoon, T. (2009). *The sociology of education in Canada,* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Zembylas, M. (2008). Trauma, justice and the politics of emotion: The violence of sentimentality in education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *29*(1), 1–17.

Zembylas, M. (2010). The ethic of care in globalized societies: Implications for citizenship education. *Ethics and Education*, *5*(3), 233–245.