The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/21870 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Kan, Carlos van  
**Title:** Teachers’ interpretations of their classroom interactions in terms of their pupils’ best interest : a perspective from continental European pedagogy  
**Issue Date:** 2013-10-10
How do teachers legitimise their classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals?
Chapter 4

How do teachers legitimise their classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals?¹

Abstract
An important dimension of teachers’ classroom interactions is connected to their educational values and ideals. Teachers’ classroom interactions are not only informed by instrumental considerations but are also affected by what they consider to be educationally worthwhile, i.e. what teachers consider to be in their pupils’ best interest. This study explores the substance of teachers’ educational values and beliefs that underlie teachers’ interpretations of their daily classroom interactions. The guiding research question is ‘How do teachers legitimise their daily classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals?’ A structured interview procedure was conducted with thirty-seven teachers. With the help of a conceptual framework based on the compound question ‘Who should be taught what, how, when, and why?’, a systematic analysis of the interview data was conducted. This resulted in a typology of six legitimisation types. This study found that teachers used the following legitimisation types when interpreting their classroom interactions in terms of their pupils’ best interest: (1) a caring legitimisation type, (2) a personal legitimisation type, (3) a contextual legitimisation type, (4) a critical legitimisation type, (5) a functional legitimisation type, and (6) a psychological legitimisation type. A legitimisation type entails a systematic description of what teachers consider to be educationally worthwhile. The typology of legitimisations could contribute to the development of an educational vocabulary, which enables teachers to inquire, articulate and discuss their educational values and ideals in a deliberate manner.

4.1 Introduction

Teachers’ professional judgments will always be informed by what third parties expect them to do and their own understanding of what is needed in their daily classroom practices. Teachers have to work within general frameworks that are laid down by the government, school boards, management teams and so forth. At the same time they have certain degrees of freedom to make their own choices with regard to what they consider to be adequate teaching for particular pupils at a particular moment in a particular situation. Ponte (2009) argues that professionalism requires teachers to keep seeking a balance between formulating their goals themselves and determining how to achieve those goals, and fitting in with procedures set by others, in order to achieve goals set by others. Seeking this balance requires balancing different interests. It could, for example, be in the school’s best interest to thoroughly prepare four- to five-year-old pupils for compulsory standardized tests in order to get good test scores; however, this interest may not be compatible with a particular pupil’s interest whose developmental stage does not meet the test requirements (cf. Gleeson, Davis & Wheeler, 2005).

This example suggests that teachers’ professional judgments are not only connected to the instrumental aspects of their classroom practices, such as how to prepare pupils for their exams or how to teach pupils particular subject matter, but also touch upon teachers’ values and ideals that guide their interpretations of what constitutes good teaching. These value-based aspects of teachers’ professional conduct have been for the most part disregarded in a model of teachers’ professionalism that stems from an ‘evidence-based’ rationality, and have, therefore, been criticized by several scholars (Atkinson, 2000; Blackmore, 2002; Evetts, 2009). Following an evidence-based model of teachers’ professionalism implies that teachers’ judgments should focus on selecting those teaching strategies and protocols that research has proven to be effective. In reaction to this evidence-based model, Biesta (2010a) proposes a ‘value-based’ model of teachers’ professionalism and argues that teachers’ judgments are not simply about finding the most effective means to achieve certain ends, but always involve an evaluation of the desirability of the goals that are intentionally or unintentionally produced by those means.

The issue of single-sex education provides a good illustration. From recent brain research we know that the brains of girls are more developed than the brains of boys when they reach puberty. This could justify teaching girls and boys in separate classrooms. Instruction and teaching methods could be adjusted to the needs of both groups, which in turn could optimize pupils’ learning outcomes. Generally speaking this idea might seem defendable, if not desirable. However, from an educational point of view this idea could be regarded as undesirable, because teachers might consider single-sex education an inadequate preparation for living in a diverse society.

The essence of this example is that the means in education are not only judged in terms of predefined ends but also in terms of their qualitative contribution to educational goals, which initially might be overlooked (Biesta, 2009). Dottin (2009) argues that, in an educational context, professional judgment links means and ends reciprocally. This point is also made by Golami & Husu (2010), who coined the
term praxial knowledge, referring to teachers’ reasoning in which the means are not technically isolated from the ends. Several scholars have argued that because means and ends are reciprocally linked, education is at heart a moral endeavour (Pendleburry, 1990; Van Manen, 1994; Carr, 1992; Phelan, 2005; Biesta, 2010b). From this it follows that teachers always have to consider whether means and ends are educationally desirable when making professional judgments, or as Biesta (2009, p. 186) puts it:

In order to make such judgments teachers not only need to have general ideas about what is acceptable in human interaction. They also need to have ideas about what it means to be an educated person; they need to have ideas about the good society and the good life. What they need, in other words, are educational values and ideals.

The question ‘what is educationally desirable’ will always be posed against the background of the situation as it is. In their daily classroom practices teacher’s interactions with their pupils are principally concerned with both the empirical question ‘what is the case?’ and the normative question ‘what ought to be the case?’ (cf. Biesta, 2010a). Ponte (2012) argues that ‘what ought to be the case cannot logically be derived from ‘what is’. If teachers formed the opinion that it would be a good idea for their pupils to wear a school uniform, this cannot be logically derived from the empirically established absence of school uniforms. What is educationally desirable can only be established through critical collegial and public deliberation. The ‘is-ought problem’ has a longstanding tradition in educational philosophy and theory (Carr, 1995; Mahony, 2009; Biesta 2010b; Ponte, 2012).

In continental Europe, there has been much educational theorizing with regard to the is-ought problem in the field of pedagogy (e.g. Benner, 1993; Van Manen, 1994; Smeyers & Levering 2005). Continental European pedagogy studies the means and ends of a child’s upbringing in different domains, such as education, social work, child welfare and law (Ponte & Ax, 2009). In this article we focus on education as one of its central domains. One cannot, however, speak of continental European pedagogy as if it were one coherent meta-theory; it consists of a diversity of theoretical positions, which are reflected in the on-going philosophical and theoretical discourses about what is educationally worthwhile. Despite these different theoretical positions, Imelman (1995, p. 60) suggests that it is still possible to formulate one overarching question which could be considered the central object of study in continental European pedagogy: ‘Who should be taught what, when, how, and why?’ This fundamental question has for the most part been played out at the level of ‘grand theories’ (such as the positivist, phenomenological and critical theories), which are mainly of a philosophical nature and often not based on comprehensive empirical accounts of classroom practices (cf. Lingard, 2009).

The question formulated by Imelman, however, does not lose any of its relevance if posed at the level of teachers’ everyday classroom practices, for example: ‘What do teachers consider important for their pupils to learn and why?’, ‘What do teachers consider important for their pupils when it comes to how they are
being taught and why?’ It seems evident that teachers will respond to these questions in a different way. Some teachers might see the goal of teaching as preparing pupils for a harsh and demanding world, and therefore promote their pupils’ physical and mental development. Other teachers might see it as their main task to help pupils to become happy and balanced people, and want them to collaborate with their classmates as much as possible in order to acquire good social and communicative skills (cf. Hansen, 2000).

This study focuses on what kind of values and ideals teachers draw upon when they interpret their daily classroom practice (what is) in terms of what they consider to be educationally desirable (what ought to be). In their study on teachers’ reflection about educational ideals of teaching, de Ruyter & Kole (2010) draw the conclusion that teachers’ professional ideals have received little attention in literature (cf. Biesta, 2009). They put this conclusion into perspective by stating that: ‘Hansen (2000, 2001) is the clearest exception to this and there are authors who pay attention to ideals of teachers in the overall framework of their theory of professional morality (Day, 2004; Husu & Tirri, 2007; Sacket, 1993).’ One might add that scholars such as Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik (1990), van Manen (1991), Buzzelli & Johnston (2002), Campbell (2003), Kemmis & Smith, (2008), Ax & Ponte (2008), and Gewertz, Mahony, Hextall & Cribb, (2009) incorporate teachers’ educational values and ideals in their overall framework of the nature of teaching. Revisiting this literature, it seems safe to say that the greater part is theoretical and philosophical, rather than empirical. In this regard Campbell (2008a) suggests that there should be more empirical studies devoted to exemplifying the moral and ethical realities of teaching, in the spirit of studies undertaken by Buzzelli & Johnston (2002), Campbell (2003), Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen (1993) and Richardson & Fenstermacher (2001). Biesta (2009) provides a recent example of an empirical study on teachers’ values and ideals but this study primarily focused on the conditions under which teachers were able to make value judgments, rather than the substance of the educational values and ideals themselves.

In line with Imelman’s question mentioned above, this study aimed to systematically explore what teachers consider to be educationally worthwhile, because educational values and ideals are important constituents of teachers’ professional judgment. In the introductory section we stressed that Imelman’s question stands in reciprocal relation with the situation as it is. Connecting ‘the desirable but not yet existing’ to ‘what is’, requires teachers to make the educational values and ideals behind their teaching explicit. In other words, teachers need to be able to legitimise their classroom interactions in terms of what they consider to be in their pupils’ best interest. Our guiding research question is therefore: ‘How do teachers legitimise their daily classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals?’

4.2 A conceptual framework

Departing from Imelman’s overarching and compound question: ‘Who should be taught what, when, how, and why?’, we developed a conceptual framework (Van Kan, Ponte & Verloop, 2010b). The main purpose of this framework was to
enable a systematic and in-depth analysis of interview data (this will be further explained in the method section), in subsequent stages of the study. The different aspects (‘who’, ‘what’, ‘when’, ‘how’) of this question were used as the components of the conceptual framework. Subsequently, the ‘where’ and ‘for what purpose’ components were added to have a more complete range of components suitable for examining the way teachers legitimise their classroom interactions. The components have a descriptive and formal character; they refer to the types of educational aspects teachers take into consideration when they legitimise their classroom interactions. Each component was operationalized into several categories. The categories served the purpose of connecting the components to the interview data.

Table 4.1 Components of the conceptual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Who        | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teacher-pupil relationship, and why? | · Child concept  
· Professional self-concept  
· Relationship |
| What (content) | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teaching content, and why? | · Acquisition of subject matter  
· Acquisition of skills  
· Acquisition of virtues |
| When       | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning human development, and why? | · Opening up subject matter acquisition  
· Opening up skill acquisition  
· Opening up virtue acquisition |
| Where      | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning work and living environment, and why? | · Classroom context  
· School context  
· External school context |
| How        | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teaching and learning, and why? | · Teaching methods  
· Pupils’ learning  
· Classroom organization |
| For what purpose | What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teaching goals, and why? | · Internal school goals  
· Goals outside school |

The ‘why aspect’ of Imelman’s question is not to be considered a separate component, but rather a recursive follow-up question connected to each of the six components. For example, when connecting the ‘why question’ to the ‘what component’
the question is not merely: ‘What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning particular teaching content?’, it also concerns the legitimizing question: ‘Why do teachers consider particular teaching content to be in their pupils’ best interest?’ The why questioning directly touches upon teachers’ reasoning with regard to what they think is educationally worthwhile. Consequently, the why questioning is linked to reasons that concern issues of principle (e.g. Hinkle, 1965; Jankowicz, 2004). Within this conceptual framework the why questioning serves the purpose of connecting the aforementioned components to teachers’ educational values and ideals.

The idea underlying the present study is that teachers will use different kinds of legitimisations, that consist of particular educational values and ideals, when interpreting their everyday classroom interactions in terms of what they consider to be in their pupils’ best interest. The next section explains how the search for different legitimisation types was conducted.

### 4.3 Method

#### 4.3.1 Context and participants

In order to get a thorough insight into the substance of the legitimisation types that teachers draw upon when interpreting their classroom interactions, a maximum variation sample was created (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Marshall, 1996; Devers & Frankel, 2000). Presentations about the research project were held at thirteen schools. Two or three teachers from each school decided to join the research project on a voluntary basis. A total of thirty-seven teachers, more or less equally divided among elementary and secondary schools in both regular and special education, entered the project. All participating teachers had to have a minimum of three years of teaching experience in order to maximize the chance that they were past the ‘survival’ stage and able to draw on substantial experience when interpreting their classroom interactions.

#### 4.3.2 Data collection

To find an answer to the research question (How do teachers legitimise their daily classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals?), we developed a repertory interview procedure (Van Kan, Ponte & Verloop, 2010a), which was a qualitative adaption of Kelly’s (1955) standard repertory grid technique. At the first meeting teachers watched video footage from their own lesson and were requested to construct mini dilemmas connected to classroom interactions that took place in that lesson, under the guidance of a researcher. A mini dilemma was defined as a moment in which teachers considered their course of action in an interaction situation as legitimate, and at the same time saw a legitimate alternative course of action with regard to that particular interaction situation. At the second
meeting these mini dilemmas (about eight) were presented to the teachers using storyboards (see Figure 2.1. Chapter 2).

Subsequently, the teachers were interviewed about these mini dilemmas and asked what they considered to be in their pupils’ best interest. A sentence completion assignment was used for this (Grice, Burkley, Burkley, Wright, & Slaby, 2004): ‘On the one hand I think it could be in the pupil’s best interest to...; on the other hand I think it could be in the pupil’s best interest to...’. This particular teacher responded to this question as follows: ‘On the one hand I think it could be in the pupil’s best interest to really listen to his reasons why he brought his mobile phone with him; on the other hand I think it could be in the pupil’s best interest to learn that rules need to be followed’. In addition, teachers were subjected to recursive why questioning (cf. section 4.2), in order to provoke them to really think through the educational values and ideals that underlie different possible ways of interpreting their pupils’ best interest. After several why questions, this teacher responded that if pupils experience that they are taken seriously ‘...they will gain self confidence, which will help them to become independent grownups’, and that pupils need to learn to follow rules because: ‘...this will help them to adequately function in their future working environment.’ In a following stage of the study the interview data was subjected to an in-depth content analysis, which is explained in the next subsection.

4.3.3 Qualitative analysis

We used the conceptual framework to analyse our interview data (see Table 4.1). The categories connected to each component were used as first order (Schutz, 1962) labels in Atlas-ti, a software program for qualitative analysis (Muhr, 1997), to categorize all the 37 fully transcribed interviews with the teachers. In the following subsections we explain in five steps how we got from the interview data to six legitimisation types.

4.3.3.1 Step 1: Demarcating the interview fragments

In the process of labelling the interview transcripts we chose to work with interview fragments that were long enough to be understood and interpreted when disconnected from the specific context of the interview (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). In our particular case, most of the quotations were a response or part of a response to a ‘why question’ as mentioned in section 4.3.2. The following interview fragment from a teacher in special elementary education is a typical example of the kind of interview fragments we used for labelling in Atlas-ti: ‘First and foremost our pupils need to learn to deal with their complex and at times negative emotions. We have a more succinct focus establishing a caring and peaceful environment for our pupils than schools that primarily focus on learning outcomes. We do value learning outcomes, but all of our pupils have some kind of behavioural or learning disorder. Consequently our pupils have a slower work pace.’ In total we demarcated 1,937 interview fragments.
4.3.3.2 Step 2: Coding interview fragments

We coded the interview fragments on the basis of the categories of components. The categories (see third column Table 4.1) complemented with compressed definitions and demarcation rules operated as labels that helped us to adequately assign the components to the interview fragments. Coding the interview fragment in the former subsection using the categories as labels, for example, helped us to assign several components to particular parts of the interview fragment (see Table 4.2). In the last column of the table we included a brief account of why we assigned a component to a specific part of an interview fragment.

Table 4.2 Example of the distribution of one quotation over several components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Specific part of the interview fragment</th>
<th>Attribution rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teacher-pupil relationship?</td>
<td>Child concept</td>
<td>…all of our pupils have some kind of behavior or learning disorder. Consequently our pupils have a slower work pace…</td>
<td>This part of the quotation says something about how the teacher sees her pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning teaching content?</td>
<td>Acquisition of skills</td>
<td>First and foremost our pupils need to learn to deal with their complex and at times negative emotions…</td>
<td>This part of the quotation says something about what kind of emotional skills pupils need to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning work and living environment?</td>
<td>School context</td>
<td>…We have a more succinct focus establishing a caring and peaceful environment for our pupils than schools that primarily focus on learning outcomes…</td>
<td>This part of the quotation says something about what kind of environment pupils need to be in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An external researcher was involved during this step to verify whether a person not familiar with the data could apply the coding scheme, i.e. the categories complemented with compressed definitions and demarcation rules. The external researcher (rater 1) coded a substantial part of the data independently from the author (rater 2). The inter-rater reliability with two raters was 0.81 (Cohen’s kappa), which we considered good. In total we coded 3,794 interview fragments because we assigned a substantial number of interview fragments to more than one component.
4.3.3.3 Step 3: Composing teacher profiles

Our main aim after coding all the 37 interview transcripts was to find legitimisation types within the coded interview fragments. In order to find these legitimisation types we composed several (initially four) teacher profiles. A teacher profile consisted of summarized descriptions of each component’s categories, and a substantive interpretation of the summarized descriptions per component. As an example, the elaboration of the ‘where component’ of a teacher working in special secondary education is provided in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Example of a ‘where component’ of a teacher’s profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Summarized descriptions</th>
<th>Interpretation of the summarized description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>What do teachers find in their pupils’ best interest concerning work and living environment?</td>
<td>Classroom context</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest that they feel appreciated and accepted in the classroom especially because of former negative experiences.</td>
<td>This teacher feels that her classroom should be a safe haven for pupils. The school should offer pupils a secure connection to the world outside. The home environment could possibly be harmful for the wellbeing of the pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School context</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest that the school is a gateway towards further education or a job. The school forms a safe place for practice.</td>
<td>School context</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest that the school is a gateway towards further education or a job. The school forms a safe place for practice.</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest that the school is a gateway towards further education or a job. The school forms a safe place for practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External school context</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest to protect the pupils from unrealistic high expectations coming from their home.</td>
<td>External school context</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest to protect the pupils from unrealistic high expectations coming from their home.</td>
<td>The teacher feels that it is in her pupils’ best interest to protect the pupils from unrealistic high expectations coming from their home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We considered the elaboration of all six components (who, what, when, where, how, for what purpose) per interview to be constituents of a teacher’s profile. Composing the teacher profiles helped us to reduce the volume of data to a manageable size and to analyse the different components in a cohesive way. A total of sixteen teacher profiles proved to be sufficient to reach the point of theoretical saturation, which will be further explained in the next step.
4.3.3.4 Step 4: Indicating legitimisation types

We started searching for cross-sectional legitimisation types on the basis of four teacher profiles. Together with a co-researcher we worked up from the data in the teacher profiles and touched upon sensitizing concepts, which guided our search for legitimisations types. Following this inductive process we initially found three legitimisation types within the four teacher profiles: (1) a caring legitimisation type, (2) a contextual legitimisation type, and (3) a functional legitimisation type. These legitimisations were found across the four teacher profiles. A legitimisation type, here, entails a systematic description of a particular pattern of educational values and ideals that teachers draw upon when they interpret their classroom interactions in terms of their pupils' best interest. The substance of the legitimisation types will be presented in the result section. Each individual teacher can make use of different legitimisation types; consequently the legitimisation types do not represent a specific kind of teacher but a specific kind of legitimisation.

In order to reach the point of theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), we selected another four teachers at random to compose four teacher profiles and used the three legitimisation types as a starting point. Besides looking for confirmation of the legitimisation types found earlier, we looked for possible new legitimisation types. This led to us to indicate another two types: (4) a personal legitimisation type, and (5) a critical legitimisation type. Because the newly composed teacher profiles led to finding new legitimisation types, we decided to select another four teachers at random to compose four new teacher profiles. This led to a final legitimisation type, referred to as (6) a psychological legitimisation type. Finally we composed another four teacher profiles and concluded that we could not distinguish another legitimisation type.

4.3.3.5 Step 5: Describing the six legitimisation types

In order to get to a systematic description of the six legitimisation types, we used the six components of the descriptive framework as the constituents of each legitimisation type. This resulted in a table with the six types displayed on the horizontal axis and the six components of the descriptive framework displayed on the vertical axis. We tried to fill out each of the 36 cells of the table on the basis of the teacher profiles. First we collated all the data per component coming from the sixteen teacher profiles. Second we described each of the six components in terms of the six legitimisation types. Although some cells were easier to fill than others, we managed to provide each cell with distinctive information about one of the six legitimisation types. Finally we checked our description of the cells with the rest of the data, which resulted in some minor refinements of the descriptions of several cells.
4.3.4 Audit procedure\(^1\)

The quality of the data analysis in this study was assessed using an audit procedure (Akkerman, Admiraal, Brekelmans & Oost 2008). An independent auditor audited each analytical step in order to scrutinize the underlying decisions. Two meetings took place during the audit trail to provide all data sources necessary to retrace each analytical step. Based on all the information provided and a thorough examination of each step in the data analysis, the auditor concluded that this qualitative research study met criteria for visibility, comprehensibility and acceptability (reliability and validity).

4.4 Results

4.4.1 A typology of legitimisations

We found six distinct legitimisation types in the interview data: (1) a caring legitimisation type, (2) a personal legitimisation type, (3) a contextual-pragmatic legitimisation type, (4) a critical legitimisation type, (5) a functional legitimisation type, and (6) a psychological legitimisation type. These legitimisation types reflected what teachers considered to be in their pupils’ best interest. In the following subsections each legitimisation type is briefly described. Each description is accompanied by a detailed table, in which the legitimisation type is described in terms of the six educational components. In addition, each component is illustrated by a quotation from a teacher’s interview.

4.4.1.1 Caring legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a caring orientation towards the pupils’ best interest, in the sense that pupils are seen as vulnerable and very dependent on grownups to survive in a demanding world. One of the main characteristics of this legitimisation type is that pupils need to be handled with great care and patience. According to this legitimisation type, pupils need to be shielded from possibly harmful environments. Furthermore pupils need to develop qualities that will protect them from undesirable situations and predicaments. The school needs to provide a peaceful and healing environment in order for pupils to flourish.

---

\(^1\) See appendix for the audit report written by the auditor about the specifics concerning the trustworthiness of this study.
### Table 4.4 Caring legitimisation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Caring legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
<td>In terms of damaged and vulnerable pupils in need of protection. Emphasis is on: (1) the pupils’ susceptibility and vulnerability, (2) pupils’ dependency on others, and (3) the pupil as a troubled and complex human being.</td>
<td>Our pupils have dealt with a number of negative past experiences; they always were the low achievers. One girl entered this school as a ‘mental wreck’, but after a specific support program she blossomed into a happy girl. <em>(teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What</strong></td>
<td>In terms of focusing on capabilities that will protect them from harm. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ self-esteem, self-concept and self-acceptance, (2) learning to ask others for help and assistance, (3) learning to detect possibly harmful situations, and (4) learning to regulate their own emotions.</td>
<td>The girls in our school are the targets of lover boys because they are very naïve and vulnerable. I try to educate them about possibly harmful situations in a practical way. They need to learn to detect these situations, so that they can develop a ‘protective layer’. <em>(teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When</strong></td>
<td>In terms of having modest expectations regarding pupils’ development. Emphasis is on: (1) moderating pupils’ motivation to make progress, (2) small steps/ fits and starts in pupils’ development, and (3) pupils’ unique developmental progress.</td>
<td>This boy always wants to be the centre of attention. At the same time he displays very dependent behavior, not fitting his age. I need to remind myself that although this boy seems quite mature, he is often not ready for new experiences or subject matter. <em>(teacher of 3rd year pupils: special elementary school)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where</strong></td>
<td>In terms of a safe and protective living and learning environment. Emphasis is on: (1) the school as a shelter from the world outside, (2) the school as a place of recovery and support, and (3) the classroom as a caring and nurturing environment.</td>
<td>In our school the pupils are in a relatively safe environment. We work with mixed groups no matter what kind of problems pupils have to deal with; low and high IQs, behavioral and learning problems. Of course the world outside is not as appreciative as we tend to be. <em>(teacher of 4th year pupils: special elementary school)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How</strong></td>
<td>In terms of handling pupils with care and consideration. Emphasis is on: (1) patience towards pupils’ instructional needs, (2) affirming pupils’ abilities and achievements, (3) supporting pupils’ comprehension, and (4) pupils’ feelings and emotional state.</td>
<td>I want this pupil to know that I will support her in completing the assignment successfully. But before helping her out, I think it’s important to acknowledge this pupil’s own attempts in order to give her a sense of control and accomplishment. <em>(teacher of 8th year pupils: regular elementary school)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For what purpose</strong></td>
<td>In terms of preparing pupils to be able to survive in a demanding world. Emphasis is on: (1) fitting in/ conforming to their surrounding world, (2) being able to take care of themselves in the future, and (3) pupils’ having realistic future perspectives.</td>
<td>My pupils are not very well equipped to articulate their needs. Consequently, these pupils need to learn to ask for help if something is too difficult to handle. They need to learn this anyway for their later lives. <em>(teacher of 4th year pupils: special elementary school)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.2 Personal legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a personal orientation towards the pupils’ best interest in the sense that pupils need to be understood as unique social beings that have a personal relationship with teachers. In this legitimisation type, the pupils’ personal development is of the utmost importance. It is imperative to their personal development that pupils are trusted to articulate their own needs and desires with regard to the educational environment they find themselves in. According to this legitimisation type, it is important to really know the pupils in order to understand their needs. The ultimate goal of education is that pupils grow up to be balanced and happy human beings.

Table 4.5 Personal legitimisation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Personal legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>In terms of pupils as unique persons with unique aspirations. Emphasis is on: (1) the pupil as a human being to relate to in a personal way, (2) the pupil as a unique human being in his/her own right, and (3) the interdependent position of the pupil.</td>
<td>I show the pupils my personal side. It is important when communicating with pupils to know them on a personal level and vice versa. I do tell pupils about my personal life and pupils like to share their personal stories as well. (teacher of 4th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>In terms of what connects to pupils’ life worlds and aspirations. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ acquisition of social literacy, (2) pupils’ acquisition of self-knowledge, (3) pupils’ moral development and education, and (4) pupils’ acquisition of a personal way of doing things.</td>
<td>We talk about the essential things in life; for example, a colleague of mine has cancer. Of course I take into account that they’re still children, but at the same time these topics are part of life. Talking about these things helps pupils to express their personal feelings. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular elementary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>In terms of knowing what certain pupils need in specific situations. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ willingness to make progress, (2) acknowledging and knowing pupils’ specific needs, and (3) pupils’ self-regulatory development.</td>
<td>We have several pupils who started their internship in their second year; officially the internship starts in the third year. These pupils couldn’t cope with theoretical courses and they wanted to start their internship so badly, that we allowed them to do so. (teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>In terms of a social communicative environment for pupils. Emphasis is on: (1) the classroom as a social community, (2) the school as an impermanent living structure, and (3) the availability of appropriate resources.</td>
<td>If you ask children what they like about school they often refer to social contacts. Meeting up with friends is what they appreciate the most. School is not only about subject matter, but also about a social context in which pupils interact with each other. (teacher of 4th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How In terms of tailor-made learning arrangements. Emphasis is on: (1) a personal relationship with the pupils, (2) pupils’ learning from their classmates, (3) pupils’ intrinsic aspirations and motivation, and (4) pupils’ initiatives and responsibilities.

I feel it’s important that pupils get the chance and freedom to explore certain subject matter themselves. When pupils can make use of their own learning strategies they will be intrinsically motivated and driven to complete a certain assignment. (teacher of 8th year pupils: regular elementary school)

For what purpose In terms of the pupils’ development into a happy and whole person. Emphasis is on: (1) the pupils’ growth towards becoming self-confident human beings, (2) pupils’ search for a meaningful passion, (3) pupils’ membership of a social community.

I feel it’s important when pupils leave our school that they have an idea of who they are. If pupils have developed a positive self-concept, they will probably become more successful in their future lives than pupils with a lot of knowledge but a lack of self-confidence. (teacher of 8th year pupils: regular elementary school)

4.4.1.3 Contextual legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a contextual orientation towards the pupils’ best interest in the sense that pupils’ living conditions, life histories and practical lives need to be taken into account in teaching situations. According to this legitimisation type pupils will find themselves in all kinds of social situations. The main qualities they need to develop concern practical living skills that will help them to act adequately in these situations. The school curriculum should include learning arrangements that are situated both inside and outside the school. Consequently the school is considered a training place for the world outside the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Contextual legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>In terms of seeing pupils as a product of their histories and living environment. Emphasis is on: (1) the pupils as part of a broad social network, (2) the pupils as historical human beings, and (3) the pupils as participants in the real world.</td>
<td>We have a lot pupils from deprived neighborhoods and home situations. Furthermore, most of them have some kind of disorder or disability. Our pupils do not have very well-educated parents and we have to deal with the consequences in our school. (teacher of 3rd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>In terms of what pupils need to learn to live in the modern world. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ practical living skills, (2) pupils’ understanding of the grownup world, (3) real-life knowledge application, and (4) pupils’ acquisition of family life skills.</td>
<td>When it comes to sex education many pupils already know a lot about the subject matter. However, at the same time they do not know essential aspects of a sexual relationship, for example how to treat it with respect. But they also need to learn how to use a condom. (teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>In terms of linking pupils’ context and history to their developmental outlook. Emphasis is on: (1) the interplay between pupils’ needs and societal demands, (2) what is needed in pupils’ contemporary living situation, (3) linking pupils’ life histories to their current potential.</td>
<td>Because of behavioral or emotional problems some pupils are not ready yet to go on an internship. One pupil runs away from school when he can’t cope with a certain situation. That kind of behavior will not be tolerated in any working context. (teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>In terms of a real world learning environment. Emphasis is on: (1) the school as a training place for the real world, (2) the interplay between pupils’ home situation and school life, and (3) extending the learning environment beyond the school.</td>
<td>We organize a school camp to introduce pupils to several real world situations. On the one hand we create a safe place to practice, on the other hand pupils are being faced with situations they will meet in everyday life. Pupils can handle these situations quite well especially when parents are supportive. (teacher of 4th year pupils: special primary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>In terms of transfer of teaching content to several areas of application. Emphasis is on: (1) taking the pupils’ social and economic status into account, (2) connecting new concepts to life world situations, (3) organizing authentic learning situations, and (4) teaching as interactive storytelling.</td>
<td>When I teach I try to bring the outside world into my lessons. I do this for two reasons: first pupils are much more motivated when they work on assignments that are realistic, and second to systematically integrate the official school curriculum into everyday practical life. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular elementary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what purpose</td>
<td>In terms of preparing pupils to participate in civil society. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ functioning in private and public spaces, (2) preparing pupils for practical daily life, and (3) preparing pupils for their adult working lives.</td>
<td>Even if bad things happened in the past, pupils need to go on with their lives. It is important that pupils learn a trade, instead of growing up to become unemployable. Under new legislation, pupils who have no qualifications for work will not receive social security. (teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.4 Critical legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a critical orientation towards the pupils’ best interest in the sense that pupils need to be freed from constraining ideas about themselves and living conditions that imprint these ideas. According to this legitimisation type, pupils should be prepared to become equal and qualified participants in conversations. Consequently they should develop qualities that will help them to make informed and independent judgments. Schools should encourage pupils to adopt a critical stance towards constraining social structures. This legitimisation type perceives the school curriculum as a construct that is influenced by both social and political claims.

Table 4.7 Critical legitimisation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Critical legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>In terms of pupils being capable of standing up for their rights. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils being constrained by social structures, (2) pupils as the promising future generation, and (3) pupils as equal participants in conversation.</td>
<td>Often our pupils are lame ducks waiting until something gets arranged for them. I don’t want my pupils to live their lives waiting for assistance or permission from others. I do believe that they can do something meaningful with their lives. (teacher of 2nd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>In terms of pupils’ acquisition of autonomy and a critical mindset. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils learning to appreciate democratic achievements, (2) pupils’ acquisition of a non-prejudiced mindset, (3) pupils learning to stand up for themselves, and (4) pupils forming their own substantiated opinions.</td>
<td>For example, pupils need to learn to compare election programs and analyze messages in the media. It is important that pupils don’t just believe anything, they need to be able to form their own opinions based on trustworthy information. They need to be able to ask critical questions. (teacher of 4th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>In terms of growing towards becoming independent human beings. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ timely awakening of their autonomy, (2) scrutinizing political claims regarding pupils’ development, and (3) pupils’ involvement in the unfolding of the curriculum.</td>
<td>A recent school reform, instigated by the government, turned out to be quite problematic. A lot of questions with regard to pupils’ abilities to steer their own learning processes at a particular age are left unanswered. Although I see several upsides to the recent reform, I still have my doubts. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4.1.5 Functional legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a functional orientation towards the pupil's best interest in the sense that pupils need to be raised towards adulthood along the lines of preconceived favourable outcomes. Pupils' learning achievements are of the utmost importance. Great value is attached to evidence-based teaching methods in order to maximize pupils’ potential. In accordance with this legitimisation type, pupils are primarily perceived as institutionalized learners. Consequently they should learn to acquire adequate study skills and a good work ethos to master curriculum content that is going to be examined.
### Table 4.8 Functional legitimisation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Functional legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>In terms of pupils as clients with specific learning needs. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils as institutionalized learners, (2) pupils as clients in the formal school system, and (3) safeguarding a functional relationship with pupils.</td>
<td>I encourage pupils to think beyond their initial reaction. From my experience pupils tend to pick the first answer that comes to mind instead of thinking things through. Yet they are expected to be thorough when they take their final examination next year. (teacher of 4th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>In terms of pupils’ acquisition of learning skills and official curriculum content. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ acquisition of adequate study skills, (2) pupils’ acquisition of content that is going to be examined, (3) pupils’ acquisition of a good work ethos, and (4) pupils’ acquisition of basic planning skills.</td>
<td>Sometimes I let a pupil know that I think his achievements are very disappointing. I warn those pupils that they will get a C on their final exams and that will diminish their chances when it comes to further education. Of course this all has to do with study skills and perseverance. (teacher 3rd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>In terms of closely following the official order of the curriculum plan. Emphasis is on: (1) the importance of the content for pupils’ future lives, (2) completing the official curriculum schedule, (3) pushing pupils’ development.</td>
<td>The planning capacities of our pupils are quite poor. I’ve just finished this year’s curriculum to prepare them for their tests and exams. I need to encourage pupils to comply with the program so that they are well prepared when they have to take their tests and exams. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>In terms of an environment that boosts pupils’ performance. Emphasis is on: (1) school as a means to accomplish success in later life, (2) the classroom as a place of achievement, and (3) the classroom as a place to foster pupils’ learning.</td>
<td>A quiet and orderly classroom fosters a good working and learning ethos. It is important that I can have a conversation with a pupil without being disrupted by background noise. A noisy classroom will have a negative effect on pupils’ learning. (teacher of 8th year pupils: regular elementary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>In terms of optimizing the teaching and learning effectiveness. Emphasis is on: (1) smooth running of the classroom, (2) structured instruction and assignments, (3) working towards predefined curriculum goals, and (4) the rationale of the official teaching methods.</td>
<td>If we work on a week assignment often a kind of ‘interval training’ occurs. Pupils start working and after 10 minutes they start wandering around. The productivity of these lessons is much lower than in a more structured lesson with set instructions and a set assignment. (teacher of 4th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what purpose</td>
<td>In terms of preparing/ training pupils for future achievements. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ short- and long-term school career, (2) pupils’ future employment opportunities, and (3) maximizing pupils’ potential.</td>
<td>If pupils primarily focus on having fun they can probably forget a school career in higher education. I think it’s important that pupils learn to strive for the best results possible. It is a waste of talent if they settle for less. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.6 Psychological legitimisation type

This legitimisation type expresses a psychological orientation towards the pupils’ best interest in the sense that their conduct needs to be labelled in mental or emotional terms in order for adequate teaching and learning to take place. According to this legitimisation type, pupils are not primarily looked on as individuals but rather as exponents of a larger group. Emphasis is put on pupils’ learning and behavioural difficulties. According to this legitimisation type, pupils’ diagnostic profiles to a large extent inform how they should be taught. School is considered a place that needs to be equipped to deal with pupil conduct that deviates from the norm.

Table 4.9 Psychological legitimisation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Psychological legitimisation</th>
<th>Illustrative interview fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>In terms of an individual pupil being an example of a larger group of pupils. Emphasis is on: (1) attributing specific characteristics to pupils, (2) pupils’ learning and behavioral difficulties, and (3) perceiving pupils in terms of their diagnostic labels.</td>
<td>It is no use trying to educate pupils about the endangered environment we live in; they could not care less. Still I think it is really important to keep on trying even though these kids seem not very susceptible to this kind of content. (teacher of 5th year pupils: regular secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>In terms of pupils’ acquisition of skills that counteract their natural inclinations. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ internalization of basic social conduct, (2) pupils’ abilities to open up their inner worlds, (3) skills that counteract pupils’ undesirable behavior, and (4) what is within pupils’ cognitive comprehension.</td>
<td>There is evidence that pupils with autism like to do repetitive actions. But if I don’t intervene, there is a chance that this pupil will spool knit the whole year long. I don’t think it’s a big problem but I try to help him to be more creative by encouraging him to make a bag or a flower instead of just spool knitting for the sake of it. (teacher of 1st year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>In terms of pupils’ natural developmental phases. Emphasis is on: (1) pupils’ deviation from normal development, (2) phases when pupils are best able to learn specific skills or content, and (3) closely monitoring pupils’ cognitive progress.</td>
<td>I believe some things need to be learned in elementary school; otherwise it is too late. For example, pupils need to have developed some self-confidence and a good working ethos in the first 8 years of their education. They are not likely to learn these things when they’re 15. (teacher of 8th year pupils: regular elementary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>In terms of an environment that compensates for pupils’ learning and behavioral disorders. Emphasis is on: (1) adjusting the learning environment to pupils’ specific needs, (2) ready access to specialist provision, and (3) special schools for pupils with specific needs.</td>
<td>This boy has a very loud mouth, is very rude and in general is a low achiever. Unfortunately our school is not yet properly equipped to adequately deal with this boy’s disruptive behavior. I do my best but I can’t be a teacher, psychiatrist and social worker at the same time. (teacher of 3rd year pupils: special secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW DO TEACHERS LEGITIMISE THEIR CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS IN TERMS OF EDUCATIONAL VALUES AND IDEALS?

How

Emphasis on pupils’ psychological parameters as the starting point for teaching. Emphasis is on: (1) connecting to pupils’ internal life worlds, (2) drilling pupils to memorize specific content, (3) pre-structured instructional steps, and (4) taking pupils’ specific diagnostic profiles into account.

‘Normal’ people save their experiences somewhere in their head and at a later point in time they can draw on these experiences. Because of their disorders these pupils are not capable of doing this. I try to help these pupils by offering them a structured environment and thinking steps to make sense of their world. (teacher of 3rd year pupils: special elementary education)

For what purpose

In terms of predictions of what will become of the pupils. Emphasis is on: (1) fixed ideas about what pupils are able to achieve, (2) the impact of pupils’ disorders on their later life, and (3) what the pupils’ future environment allows them to be.

A lot of the pupils in this group are bound to be working in subsidized establishments in their later lives. Although this one pupil with ADHD is somewhat more intelligent than the others, he still won’t make it in a regular workplace because he is too sensitive. (teacher of 3rd year pupils: special secondary school)

4.5 Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to distinguish and substantiate ways in which teachers legitimise their classroom interactions in terms of educational values and ideals. Our findings allow us to conclude that teachers make use of different legitimisation types when interpreting their classroom interactions in terms of what they consider to be in their pupils’ best interest. The in-depth analysis of the interview transcripts distinguished six different types: (1) a caring legitimisation type, (2) a personal legitimisation type, (3) a contextual legitimisation type, (4) a critical legitimisation type, (5) a functional legitimisation type, and finally (6) a psychological legitimisation type. The legitimisation types were systematically described along the lines of the six components of the conceptual framework. These legitimisation types could (a) contribute to the development of an educational vocabulary, (b) foster collegial and public deliberation, and (c) help teachers to connect their educational outlooks to grand theories. These three claims will be elaborated on in the discussion section.

4.6 Discussion

4.6.1 An educational vocabulary

We have argued in this article that professional judgment implies judging the desirability of particular means and ends in terms of what is to be considered in pupils’ best interest. In order to articulate their pupils’ best interest, teachers should have a vocabulary that enables them to address and express educational values and ideals that form part of their everyday professional judgments. Several scholars, however, have argued that the conditions teachers are working in do not
encourage teachers to talk about their teaching practice in educational terms (e.g. Lipman, 2009; Kemmis & Smith, 2008; Van de Ven & Oolbekkink, 2008; Zeichner, 2010). Moreover, Biesta (2010b, p. vii-viii) remarks: ‘... that many of those working in education lack a vocabulary to raise questions about the aims and ends of education, and in relation to this, often also lack real opportunities for asking such questions.’ Biesta gives an extensive account of the reasons for the dissolution of educational language in educational practices. One reason is the great emphasis on measurement in contemporary educational policy, which gives the false impression that answers to the question ‘what is good education’, can be solely based on factual information. This line of reasoning leaves no room to address the value-laden character of this question. In concurrence with this argument, Mahony (2009) sees few opportunities for teachers and other education professionals to develop greater ethical literacy. He claims that (p. 985): ‘...something is missing from the professional preparation of teachers, given that teaching is an activity which is grounded in values and expressive of them’. According to Mahony, teacher preparation has become predominantly focused on the technical and instrumental, and current policies decrease the opportunities for teachers to sharpen their capacities in valuing values (cf. Gewirtz, Mahony, Hextall, & Cribb, 2009).

In this study a structured interview procedure served as an intervention to help teachers to express their educational values and ideals that are embedded in their classroom practice. Several studies have shown that teachers and student teachers are not naturally inclined to think about their practice in educational terms and not sufficiently capable of articulating their ideas about good education in a profound manner without an intervention of some sort (Mansvelder-Longayroux, Beijaard & Verloop, 2007; Shapira-Lishshinsky, 2011; Sanger & Osguthorpe, 2011). In this regard, Gholami & Husu (2010) argue that teachers are inclined to use practical knowledge (means to an end reasoning), rather than praxial knowledge (reasoning in which the means constitute the ends) when they interpret their pedagogical actions. Gholami & Husu, as we stated in the introduction section, argue that teachers should develop their practical knowledge and their pedagogical thinking in line with praxial knowledge, by engaging in discourses that motivate them to reflect on the reasoning that lies behind their actions and educational beliefs. In line with this argument, Socket & LePage (2002) urge teachers to use a moral vocabulary to interpret their work, which is missing in classrooms, staff lounges and lecture halls of teacher education. They are hesitant to claim that teachers are able to draw on a corpus of morally informed action when making classroom judgments, as they state (p. 170): ‘We are not confident that teachers’ use of judgment goes much beyond the intuitive.’

Whether reasons for the lack of an educational vocabulary are to be sought in the conditions under which teaching takes place, or teachers’ capabilities or a combination of both, is not the issue here. The main point is the importance of teachers having the professional autonomy and ability to draw on a vocabulary that helps them address and express the value-laden dimensions of their everyday classroom practices (cf. Van Manen, 2000; Campbell, 2008a).

The outcomes of this study could contribute to developing such an educational vocabulary.
4.6.2 Collegial and public deliberation

Teachers could inquire their own classroom interactions in terms of what they consider to be in their pupil’s best interest and relate their educational outlooks to the typology of legitimisations. They might find that particular classroom interactions trigger particular legitimisation types to be more in the foreground and other legitimisation types to be more in the background of their considerations. Subsequently, teachers could inquire why that is the case, if this is consistent across different classroom interactions, and if they see any reason to sustain, dispute, constrict or expand the legitimisation types they draw upon. It may be suggested that teachers engage in this kind of critical reflection together with colleagues (cf. Vasquez-Levy, 1998). Inter-subjective interpretations of classroom interactions in terms of pupils’ best interest by teachers could help them to go beyond the personal, and weigh new and unanticipated perspectives on what’s educationally desirable (cf. Bleakley, 2006). Moreover, articulating, understanding and justifying different ways of seeing what’s educationally desirable requires public deliberation. This claim connects to the programs of discourse ethics, presupposing a conception of practical reasoning, which Gilabert (2005) refers to as ‘deliberative practical rationality’. He describes this kind of practical reasoning as follows (cf. Ponte, 2012):

...when we are about to decide what we ought to do, we should follow only those norms which we are confident could be reasonably accepted by all those possibly affected. The way to gain that confidence on the reasonability, or normative validity, of our moral grounds for choice, is to actually engage with others in public argumentation or deliberation. (p. 186).

Deliberations about what is educationally worthwhile, thus, should be connected to what actually goes on in the teaching practice, and should be part of intercollegiate reflection within school, discussions within the professional community as a whole, and debates with organizations within the civil society and the government (Ruyter & Kole, 2010).

4.6.3 Connection to grand theories

From the results of our study we learned that teachers, when they are being asked what they consider to be in their pupils’ best interest in a pre-structured manner, are fairly able to articulate their educational values and ideals. Van Manen (1995) observes that teachers tend to do this by telling stories and reporting anecdotes, observations and practical examples. This observation concurs with the experience in this study; the teachers involved were not likely to talk about their practice in terms of grand theories (e.g. the positivist, phenomenological and critical theories). Teachers did not say, for instance, that they see their pupils in a Rousseauian way and that therefore they will approach them in a naturalistic manner, or that they want their pupils to be freed from a false consciousness in order for them to bring about social change. The observation that teachers do not tend to draw on
an external corpus of predefined values when interpreting their classroom interactions is consistent with Hansen’s powerful argument that the moral is embedded in the practice itself (Hansen, 1998):

Teachers need not grop elsewhere first, outside the practice, to find their moral bearings in their work with the young. Teaching means attending to students, listening to them, speaking with them in intellectually serious ways, identifying their strengths and weaknesses with an eye on supporting the former and overcoming the latter, and more. (p. 653).

Similarly, the legitimisation types are not derived from any source external to the work of teachers, e.g. moral theories, political ideologies, societal or cultural values, but based on teachers’ interpretations of the educational significance of their daily classroom interactions. In other words, the legitimisation types are the result of a deliberate attempt to make educational values that are embedded in teachers’ everyday practices more explicit (cf. Biesta, 2009).

Hansen’s claim that ‘the moral is in the practice’ does not suggest that external sources have no significance for understanding the nature of teaching. External sources serve the purpose of bringing in new perspectives, which can illuminate the practice of teaching in altered ways and might lead to a deeper or different understanding of what teaching practice entails. In this regard Hansen argues (1998, p. 647): ‘Moral philosophy especially can illuminate both the idea of the moral and the moral aspects of teaching. However it does not create or define those aspects.’ In this regard the legitimisation types illuminate teachers’ educational values and ideals by representing them in a refined and schematic manner.

In the context of teacher education, the typology of legitimisations could be further elaborated by connecting it to grand theories, such as the positivist, phenomenological and critical theories. In this sense the typology of legitimisations could function as a framework that mediates between student teachers’ personal educational values and philosophical discourses about what is educationally worthwhile. In other words, the typology can be perceived as a heuristic framework that enables student teachers to further explore their educational values and beliefs. They could look for particular connections between their educational values and ideals and the typology of legitimisations. A student teacher might find, for example, that his or her own educational values especially connect to the critical and contextual legitimisation types. Subsequently, student teachers could explore theoretical and philosophical positions that are informed by critical theory. In other words, the legitimisation types could give theoretical and philosophical discourses with regard to what is educationally desirable, e.g. theoretical positions in continental European pedagogy, a meaningful reference to their representation in teaching (cf. Oosterheert & Vermunt, 2001). This kind of inquiry could be part of teacher education programs, which aim to broaden teachers’ perspectives with regard to the educational significance of their daily classroom interactions.

The back and forth process between student teachers’ own educational values, the typology of legitimisations and grand theories, could warrant its heuristic purpose. In other words, the six legitimisation types are not meant to function
as a prescriptive list, which student teachers should subscribe to. A checklist of educational legitimisations would cut off every possibility for student teachers to deliberately inquire, articulate and expand their educational outlooks.

4.6.4 Future research

Further research could help explore whether the legitimisation types could be transferable to other teachers in other contexts. Teachers within other cultural, religious, or ethnic contexts will have other frames of reference, which might lead to different educational outlooks. The data for this study were collected in a Western culture, which is usually classified as individualist. The nature and the interpretation of the data could have been different if it was collected in more collectivist cultures, as would be the case, for example, in an Asian context (cf. Hofstede, 2007).

Another line of research could focus on the way teachers make use of the different legitimisation types. It could be the case that teachers draw on one or two legitimisation types in particular, while the other legitimisation types play a relatively minor role at the back of their minds when they legitimise their classroom interactions. It could also be the case that teachers draw equally on all six legitimisation types when legitimizing their classroom interactions. This kind of study could explore qualitative differences between teachers in their understanding of the educational significance of their classroom interactions.