

Chapter 15

Relational pedagogy and democratic education

ACCEPTED VERSION

Andrew Hickey, *University of Southern Queensland*
Stewart Riddle, *University of Southern Queensland*
Janean Robinson, *Murdoch University*
Robert Hattam, *University of South Australia*
Barry Down, *Murdoch University*
Alison Wrench, *University of South Australia*

Abstract

Approaches to learning and teaching cast under the designation of ‘relational pedagogy’ provide the focus of this chapter. We argue that democratic education is most apparent in the moment of encounter between students and teachers. When deliberative negotiation of learning occurs and recognition is given to the mutuality of the pedagogical encounter, moves towards a democratic education are established. For this pedagogic deliberation to occur, the formation of meaningful relationships between students and teachers is fundamental. By meaningfully coming *into* relation and setting about the task of negotiating how learning should proceed, teachers and students give credence to the immediacy of the moment—to the immediacy of the pedagogical *encounter*—and the effects exerted by the context within which this relationship is activated. This chapter asserts that it is in these terms that relational pedagogies actively resist the normalising effects of dominant expressions of schooling typical of this present moment—approaches to schooling that preface reductive, decontextualized, ‘one size fits all’ logics—to instead provoke recognition of the idiosyncratic, *in-the-moment* character of learning. It is in these moments that deliberation and negotiation become crucial to learning and expose formations of a democratic education that positions the relational at its core.

Introduction: The possibility of a democratic education

There is a standing danger that education will perpetuate the older traditions for a select few. ... Education would then become an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing order of society instead of operating as a means of its transformation. (Dewey, 1916, p. 316)

Reflecting on Rancière's conceptualisations of liberatory pedagogy, Biesta (2010) observed that 'what is carried out under and in the name of equality, democracy and emancipation often results in its opposite in that it reproduces inequality and keeps people in their place' (p. 55). The challenge for Biesta (2010) was in recognising 'not *that* we are committed to equality, democracy and emancipation, but *how* we are committed to these concepts and *how* we express and articulate this commitment' (p. 57; emphasis in original). As Biesta (2010) implied, the best intentions often run short in amounting to anything meaningful; with the reconfiguration he has in mind requiring more than just the 'good intent' of emancipatory sentiment. Genuine progression towards democracy in education requires a commitment to creating the necessary conditions for enactments of teaching and learning that hold equality and emancipation at their core (Biesta, 2013; Rancière, 1991).

This chapter further examines this responsibility for the creation of the necessary conditions for democratic education. We contend that when students and teachers are equipped with the capacity to meaningfully come *into* relation and to co-negotiate the enactment of learning and teaching together (Hickey et al., 2021; Hickey & Riddle, 2021), a democratic character of education is enabled. How students and teachers come into relation is important in this formulation. The relationship that emerges between teachers and students configures the 'shape' of the pedagogical encounter and provides the primary context upon which education and learning proceed. When teachers and students are afforded meaningful capacity to negotiate the conduct of education—including how these negotiations are worked-through *in-relation*—the defining characteristics of a democratic education are established.

Approaches to learning and teaching cast under the designation of 'relational pedagogy' (e.g., Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004; Edwards-Groves et al., 2010; Hickey et al., 2021; Hickey & Riddle, 2021; Ljungblad, 2019) provide the conceptual frame for these deliberations. A democratic education is activated when possibilities for the *negotiation* of the pedagogical encounter emerge between students and teachers. We argue that this capacity for negotiation defines the tenor of democratic education and gives purpose and meaning to what is 'emancipatory' within its reach. This is to say that emancipation and democracy are intimately associated and that under this formulation the capacity for negotiation and the deliberative

mediation of how learning should proceed represent marked demonstrations of pedagogical emancipation.

For these negotiations to occur, the formation of a meaningful relationship between student and teacher is fundamental. By meaningfully coming *into* relation and setting about the task of negotiating how learning should proceed, teachers and students give credence to the immediacy of the moment—to the immediacy of the pedagogical *encounter*—and the context within which this relationship is activated (Hickey & Riddle, 2021). Such a pedagogy places emphasis on the formation of relationships that enable deliberative negotiation of learning to occur. A relational pedagogy, as a pedagogy that recognises the centrality of the relationship between teachers and students to learning, remains responsive to the dynamics of the encounter and provides the conditions necessary for an emancipatory possibility in education.

Within systems of education that are increasingly defined by ‘hyper-rationalised policies, over-elaborated administrative systems and highly regimented teaching programmes’ (Edwards-Groves et al., 2010, p. 46), a particular challenge for democratic education rests in determining how opportunities for deliberative engagement between students and teachers might be activated. An outcome of the stark systemic changes that have characterised schooling in recent decades has been the rationalisation (and reduction) of what is *possible* in the relationship between teachers and students. Narrowed (and narrowing) measures of what counts as ‘effectiveness’ in student learning and teacher performance now define the pedagogical encounter. Mediated via sets of ‘performative truths’ that establish the ‘ordinary everyday life and work’ (Ball, 2015, p. 1129) of teachers and the educational experience of students, what ‘counts’ as learning and teaching is increasingly ‘only what can be counted’ (Kamler & Comber, 2005, p. 121). In this situation, ideals of success are reduced to prescriptively defined performativities, which are mediated by ‘increasing levels of managerialism, bureaucracy [and] standardization [in] assessment and performance’ (Evetts, in Brass & Holloway, 2019, p. 2). Teaching and learning under this dynamic function *transactionally*, defined by prescribed curricula and regimented pedagogical enactments that order rigid modalities of encounter.

By contrast, we take a view of schooling that prefigures educational democracy as an *always unfolding* work-in-progress. Democratic education is enacted when the minutiae of everyday encounters and the positionality of students and teachers are recognised as fundamental to the pedagogical dynamic. A democratic education situates ‘micro decisions made in the classroom, especially around curricular content and classroom arrangements and values’ (Hyttén, 2015, p.

4) as foundational to its purpose. Following Hytten (2015), we take the position that although a ‘macro vision of an inclusive, supportive, harmonious, communal and antioppressive world’ (p. 4) is important and provides a crucial point of perspective for educators committed to democratic engagement in their classrooms, it remains that a necessary locus for the task of meeting this vision resides in quotidian and routine moments of encounter between students and teachers. These moments provide scope for the deliberative negotiation of what might be learned and provoke the enactment of pedagogies and ways of learning that recognise the contextual dynamics of the encounter *as it is* in that moment (Thrupp & Lupton, 2010). This is where democracy is realised in education: within spaces opened for imaginative inquiry and the negotiation of how learning should proceed in context of the moment (Smyth et al., 2014).

Taking as our provocation Hytten’s (2015) observation that ‘little attention has been paid to the practices, virtues and ethics’ (p. 4) of such encounters, we consider in this chapter how an approach to democratic education might be activated through modalities of pedagogy that emphasise the relational dynamics at play between students and teachers. A relational approach to teaching and learning requires teachers and students to recognise and respond to the ‘moment’ and the contextualisation that prescribes the pedagogical encounter (Aspelin, 2011; Thrupp & Lupton, 2010). Such an approach to teaching and learning makes explicit the interpersonal nature of the relationship between students and teachers and how learning proceeds as an outcome of the ‘ordinary’, day-to-day encounters that students and teachers have with schooling.

Following Van Manen (2015), we contend that ‘the pedagogical relation is complex, [signifying] a process of self-development and self-understanding’ (p. 17) and that any approach to teaching and learning that ignores the intra- and inter-personal experience of education risks becoming prescriptive and removed from the immediate concerns of learners. In these terms, a relational pedagogy draws as its primary bearing the requisite recognition of the relation established between students and teachers and the ways in which they countenance certain expressions of teaching and learning as responses to the pedagogical encounter. To teach and learn relationally—*in-relation*—means to countenance the complex ontologies that define how the encounter between students and teachers proceeds and how learning is negotiated as a personal/ised enactment in context of the moment.

It is in these terms that relational pedagogies actively resist the normalising effects of hegemonic pedagogies to instead provoke recognition of the idiosyncratic, *in-the-moment*

character of the pedagogic relationship (Hickey et al., 2021; Hickey & Riddle, 2021). The imperative underpinning relational pedagogy corresponds with the recognition of the positionality of the learner and teacher and the inter-relationships that form in the moment of the pedagogical encounter. The possibilities for learning implied in these moments must be understood in terms of the conditions of the moment and how learning proceeds as a negotiated outcome of this relationality.

Beyond nostalgic imagery of relationality

While we argue that there is significant amenity in considering the ‘micro-practices’ that constitute and define the pedagogical encounter and that relational pedagogies offer particular value as modalities of practice that take account of this contextualisation, we are far from taking a rose-coloured view of such things. For example, we do not wish to suggest that relational pedagogies *necessarily* provide a panacea for systems of education that exemplify what Perryman et al. (2011) described as ‘one size fits all’ approaches to schooling. Indeed, finding the ‘space’ to enact an approach to teaching and learning that emphasises the formation and maintenance of meaningful relationships presents as a first challenge; one complicated by schooling systems that are increasingly rationalised and defined in terms of the deliberate ordering of the types of encounter students and teachers might share (Smyth et al., 2010, 2014). A further challenge emerges in that relationality in and of itself does not guarantee learning. As Boyd et al. (2006) cautioned, ‘building relationships without improved student learning across all of the dimensions of education does not constitute good pedagogy’ (np).

A relational pedagogy that effectively nurtures relationships that enable students and teachers to negotiate the conduct of teaching and learning represents a move toward a democratic education. Such a pedagogy also recognises the conditions that define predominant formulations of schooling and the minutiae of influences that shape how students and teachers come into relation. This includes taking account of the effects exerted by the structural transformation of schooling in recent decades (Fuller & Stevenson, 2019; Lingard, Rezai-Rashti & Martino, 2017; Ball, 2015), the ordered ‘formality’ of teaching-learning exchanges (Hickey, Pauli-Myler & Smith 2020) and the accompanying performativity required of students and teachers therein.

The challenge provoked by systems of schooling that prescribe limited demonstrations of what counts as learning (and how this learning should proceed) centres on how students and teachers

might find the space to not only build meaningful interpersonal relationships but also activate a pedagogy that responds to this moment of encounter. As Edwards-Groves et al. (2010) identified:

Life in education is becoming highly constrained, controlled and restricted by the meta-practices of educational policy and administration that commodify and regulate education at every level and to an unprecedented extent. What is being challenged ... is the scope of action which enables educators to act and interact with freedom, agency and integrity in their professional relationships. (p. 46)

The challenge is to find the spaces in which to enact modalities of practice that enable students and teachers to come *into* relation in ways that support imaginative inquiry and the development of learning as contextually relevant. We argue that approaches to schooling that take account of these things can accurately be defined as ‘emancipatory’ and that by recognising the context of learning, the positionality maintained by students and teachers and the ‘dynamic’ inherent to the relational encounter, that something approaching a democratic education is achieved.

Democracy and education

A useful starting point for the consideration of education and democracy is Dewey’s catalogue of material on schooling and the place of education in democratic society. For Dewey (1900, 1916, 1937), the particular significance of education rests in its potential for the enactment of democracy, wherein education provides space for the imaginative investigation of (and critical inquiry into) the world-at-large. Education must expose students to the ‘instrumentalities through which the school itself shall be made a genuine form of active community life’ (Dewey, 1908, p. 11).

Two elements are crucial to this formulation. First, Dewey identified the *responsibility* of schooling as the education of the citizenry. Democratic participation in society requires a citizenry that is cognisant of the workings of the world-at-large, with education assuming the responsibility to ensure that individuals are ‘equipped’ with the means to participate in the societies of which they are part:

A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in

social relationships and control and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder. (Dewey, 1916, p. 115)

Equally, democracy plays a guiding role in orienting formations of education that enable such demonstrations of emancipation. This opens to view the second feature of Dewey's formulation of democratic education:

Unless education has some frame of reference it is bound to be aimless, lacking a unified objective. The necessity for a frame of reference must be admitted. There exists in this country such a unified frame. It is called democracy. (Dewey, 1937, p. 415)

For Dewey, democracy provides education its guiding rationale, but notably, it is through education that democracy is mobilised into practice. This relationship is mutually constitutive, achieving 'concrete' enactment *via* this conflation of education and democracy and the possibilities that education provides for the realisation of 'intellectual vistas unobscured by the accidents of personal habit and predilection' (Dewey, 1916, pp. 269–270).

This positioning of education as a point of mobilisation for democracy brings to view the relational nature of education. To realise democracy, education must provide the individual with the skills necessary to make *sense* of the positionality they hold, with this in turn predisposing the realisation of the relationship the individual maintains with the world-at-large. Education provides the means through which this cognition of the 'relationship of the individual to the world' (Dewey, 1916, p. 356) might be opened to scrutiny and where explication of the individual's relationship to others will commence. Fielding and Moss (2011) described this 'responsibility' of education in the following terms:

The school [functions] as a public responsibility, a public institution and a public space; as a forum or place of encounter between citizens young and old, a space where all citizens for an important part of their lives come together; and as a collaborative workshop full of potential and possibilities, which is capable of many collective purposes and projects of common interest and benefit. (p. 53)

In these terms, the relational dynamic of education—and the provocation *towards* relationality that education provides—is crucial for the emancipation of the learner and the realisation of democracy. But how these relations come to form and find enactment requires further consideration.

Dewey (1916) highlighted that ‘in such shared activity the teacher is a learner and the learner is, without knowing it, a teacher’ (p. 167). Pre-empting a similar logic found in later work by Freire (1970), Rancière (1991) and Biesta (2013), Dewey (1916) emphasised the varying inflections of relationality that function as core to education *and* the possibilities for emancipation that come from the enactment of these ‘collective purposes and projects’. Education, as a democratic project, draws the world into view of the individual, but equally, the student into view of the teacher. In turn, students and teachers, enacting learning via the negotiation of curricula and content are drawn *into* relation; into relation with the practice of learning, the pedagogic modalities used in this encounter and the context in which these enactments occur. Multiple layers of relationality are at work in any given pedagogic moment, making complex the consideration of the encounter and the prospect for emancipation that exists within.

It is in these terms that a crucial dynamic is implied: that education, as a relational undertaking, must provide space for these multiple relationships to form and space for these to be interrogated. In setting out a pedagogical orientation for this complexity, Dewey (1937) argued:

The problem of education in its relation to direction of social change is all one with the problem of finding out what democracy means in its *total range of concrete applications*; economic, domestic, international, religious, cultural and political. (p. 416; emphasis added)

Martin (1984) also alluded to this challenge when noting that a democratically oriented education must ‘integrate thought and action, reason and emotion’ while resisting a temptation to ‘divorce persons from their social and natural contexts’ (p. 179). Inferring the multiplicities of context and experience that define how individuals go about the living of lives, the challenge for teaching relationally rests in the determination of how education might best acknowledge this complexity to take account of the positionality of the learner.

Dewey’s (1937) insight that ‘the greatest mistake that we can make about democracy is to conceive of it as something fixed’ (p. 183) offers an initial perspective in response to this challenge. For Dewey, democracy takes form in response to the *context* of its enactment, to accordingly respond to the intricacies of the moment of its activation. Democracy, when activated through education, must in turn function in terms of the complex web of relations that students and teachers exist ‘within’ and as part of. Relations between teachers, students, learning and the world-at-large, provide some initial cues towards the contextualisation upon

which activations of democratic education proceed. A democratic approach to education works to countenance this complexity by drawing into view, via cognisant appraisal, the positionality that students and teachers hold in the moment of pedagogical encounter.

Relational pedagogy and being-in-relation

With this account of the centrality of relationality to the activation of democratic education in mind, we summarise the argument to this point in the following way: effective relationships between educators and students remain central to learning and, specifically, democratic expressions of education. The challenge rests however in accounting for the complex web of relations that position students and teachers in multiple ways. A relational pedagogy seeks to give attention to the formation of meaningful interpersonal encounters that recognise the positionality of students and teachers and that take account of the various relations that configure how students and teachers come to the pedagogical encounter (Hickey et al., 2021; Hickey & Riddle, 2021).

In systems of schooling that are increasingly geared away from such concerns, provoking this sort of democratic encounter represents a challenge. As Van Manen (2015) argued, ‘in our increasingly technologically mediated worlds, the personal and relational dimensions of teaching-learning and interacting are at risk’ (p. 12). Developing strategies for the enactment of relational approaches to teaching and learning constitutes a significant undertaking, but one that must be considered as crucial for the enactment of a democratic education. Understanding how students and teachers are set in-relation to a world-at-large and how teachers and students come into relation as participants in learning provide two crucial points of focus for enactments of democratic education. This involves recognising, in deliberate terms, the ‘conditions’ within which learning is activated in the school and the contextual bearings that frame what can be learned. We suggest that such recognition provokes a number of questions, characterised in the following way:

A democratic education ‘is framed around questions, rather than prescriptions or answers’ (Smyth 2020, p. 690) and that these questions are always contextually bound to the moment. To proceed, the relationship between educator and student must:

- Recognise that students and teachers have agency to question and mutually negotiate learning.

- Acknowledge that students bring with them the capacity to generate complex understandings of the worlds they inhabit (Freire, 1970; Hickey, 2020).
- Recognise difference, not only in terms of the visible diversity inherent to the classroom, but also in the multiple ways of knowing and doing that emerge in the classroom and from which the positionality of students and teachers becomes apparent.
- Acknowledge that the outcomes of learning emerge from the perspective of the classroom and the relational dynamic between teacher and student (and not via renderings of decontextualised curricula, benchmarks and measures imposed externally).

Recent accounts of teacher–student relationships (e.g., Comber & Kamler, 2004; McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015; Yunus et al., 2011) indicate how these principles might be enacted in practice. A relational pedagogy recognises that the ‘relationships with school staff are among the most salient and influential relationships in students’ lives’ (Anderson et al., 2004, p. 96) and that ‘children’s positive development depends, to a considerable degree, on whether the contexts in which they develop, including schools, are reliable sources of supportive relationships’ (Reeves & Le Mare, 2017, p. 86). A relational pedagogy consequently ‘recognizes, acknowledges and taps into a child’s rich background’ (Comber & Kamler, 2004, p. 1) but importantly seeks to extend this expertise and knowing to enhance the opportunity for learning. *Being-in-relation* is crucial to this dynamic and functions as the locus of a deliberative and negotiated practice that is cognisant of the positionality of students and teachers and the contextualisation of the learning experience.

In these terms, a pedagogy of being-in-relation should work to:

- 1) Make explicit the relationships teachers and students enact in the ‘ordinary’, day-to-day practice of schooling. Students and teachers bring with them a complex set of relations that have bearing on how the pedagogical encounter will proceed. It follows that giving recognition to these relations, manifold and multifaceted as these are, provides a first step in an approach towards a more democratic education.
- 2) While reframing the focus of learning on the formation of ‘positive relationships rather than punitive behaviour management’ (Morgan et al., 2015, p. 1041), practical enactments of a relational pedagogy seek to identify bespoke and contextually relevant methods for nurturing meaningful relationality. Further, such methods work towards tendering proactive, rather than reactive, engagements with students.

3) There remains a recognition that the pedagogical relation is complex, thus challenging existing views of hierarchical pedagogical relationships that focus on the transformation of the student solely (Brinkworth et al., 2018; Reimer, 2019). With an ethics of mutuality in view, relational pedagogies reveal as much of teachers as they do of students, with the pragmatic enactment of this sentiment developing as a negotiation of the inter-personal dynamic that exists between students and teachers.

4) Finally, such pedagogies actively resist the normalising effects of what Lingard (2007) framed as ‘dominant actually occurring pedagogies’, which lead to ‘indifference’ (p. 246) and ‘one size fits all’ (Perryman et al., 2011) enactments of learning. Relational pedagogies—as representative of the complexities of the encounters shared by students and teachers—provoke and recognise the idiosyncratic and in-the-moment dynamics of the encounter. Relational pedagogies are responsive to these conditions of the encounter. A relational pedagogy recognises that teachers and students—in the moment of the pedagogical encounter—are well-placed to determine the pedagogical responses required in these moments.

The ethic implied within these points works towards the realisation of a democratic education that takes account of the positionality of the student and teacher and the dynamics of the pedagogical encounter. Democracy under this formulation provides both the orienting rationale against which the pedagogical relationship is framed, and also its *objective*. Crucial to the enactment of a relational pedagogy is an ethic of encounter that prefaces the emancipatory engagement of students and teachers, at the same time that this orientation provides relational pedagogy its driving purpose. In opening capacity for the negotiation of what counts as learning and how learners and teachers might come to negotiate what should be learned, a pedagogical modality for being-in-relation is determined and a purpose for the pedagogical encounter defined.

Conclusion

This chapter commenced from the perspective that any move towards a democratic education should countenance the ways in which students and teachers come to the pedagogical encounter. It is from this perspective and with conviction towards the explication of the positionality of students and teachers that a democratic education is prefaced. Thrupp and Lupton’s (2010) observation that current accounts of schooling predominantly ‘take a generic perspective on schools, discussing them as if they were much the same and downplaying their

distinctiveness’ (p. 311) points to the problems that ignoring the positionality of students and teachers provokes. As Thrupp and Lupton (2010) urged, the development of a ‘less “neutral” discourse on schooling that gives greater recognition to the importance of social injustices in reproducing educational inequalities’ (p. 311) must be enacted if moves towards systems of education that recognise the ways that students and teachers come to education are to materialise in practice. Such an approach to education requires ‘a more serious recognition of context’ (Thrupp & Lupton, 2010, p. 311).

We contend that a first move towards educational democracy presents in the acknowledgement of the positionality of students and teachers. When the positionality of students and teachers is understood in terms of how this positionality prescribes the ways in which students and teachers come to the pedagogical encounter, the implications of contextualisation become discoverable and prone to meaningful mediation. To *be* in the moment of the encounter is crucial to the relationship and forms a vital condition of democratic education. However, the challenge rests in finding space to develop and nurture these relationships within systems of education that are predominantly geared towards the production of ‘high-performing, autonomous and rational individuals’, and which take as a prevailing concern the enactment of standardised curricula and pedagogy, monitored via ‘tests, evaluations, assessments and inspections’ (Aspelin, 2011, p. 6).

The task for democratic education emerges at this juncture. As Dewey (1916) argued, ‘democracy cannot flourish where the chief influences in selecting subject matter of instruction are utilitarian ends narrowly conceived’ (p. 226). In these terms, a democratic education is one that affords time for students and teachers to negotiate the curriculum and to define approaches to education that take account of how students and teachers come to the educational encounter. A democratic education *is* relational and by design takes account of how teachers and students, in the moment of the encounter, come *into* relation. A relational pedagogy subsequently understands that learning is enacted ‘in the moment’ and is always contextually grounded, but that the positionality that teachers and students maintain inflect how the pedagogical relation commences. Accounting for the dynamic inherent to the pedagogical relation hence requires a cognisance and responsiveness to the moment of the encounter.

A pedagogy of being-in-relation requires reflexive scrutiny of teacher and student practice to account for the ways that relationships come to be built and nurtured. For educators this ‘requires teachers to be more fully themselves in order to break down hierarchical relationships

with young people' (Morgan et al., 2015, p. 1041; see also Nabavi & Lund, 2010). For students, this requires moving beyond positionalities of submission and compliance to take up the responsibility for formulating 'personally relevant questions ... and create unique ways of sharing what they have learned' (Kuhlthau et al., 2015, p. 4). But perhaps most significantly, a relational pedagogy provides the means by which a democratic enactment of education might be activated. By opening space for the relationship between students and teachers to develop, possibilities for a more democratic education are afforded.

References

- Aspelin, J. (2011). Co-existence and co-operation: The two-dimensional conception of education. *Education*, 1(1), 6–11. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.edu.20110101.02>
- Anderson, A. R., Christenson, S. L., Sinclair, M. F. & Lehr, C. A. (2004). Check & connect: The importance of relationships for promoting engagement with school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42(2), 95–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2004.01.002>
- Ball, S. J. (2015). Education, governance and the tyranny of numbers. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(3), 299–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1013271>
- Biesta, G. J. (2010). A new logic of emancipation: The methodology of Jacques Rancière. *Educational Theory*, 60(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2009.00345.x>
- Biesta, G. J. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Routledge.
- Bingham, C. & Sidorkin, A. M. (Eds.). (2004). *No education without relation*. Peter Lang.
- Boyd, R., MacNeill, N. & Sullivan, G. (2006). Relational pedagogy: Putting balance back into students' learning. *Curriculum & Leadership Journal*, 4(13). http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/relational_pedagogy:_putting_balance_back_into_students,13944.html
- Brass, J. & Holloway, J. (2019). Re-professionalizing teaching: The new professionalism in the United States. *Critical Studies in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2019.1579743>
- Brinkworth, M. E., McIntyre, J., Juraschek, A. D. & Gehlbach, H. (2018). Teacher–student relationships: The positives and negatives of assessing both perspectives. *Journal of*

Applied Developmental Psychology, 55, 24–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2017.09.002>

Comber, B. & Kamler, B. (2004). Getting out of deficit: Pedagogies of reconnection. *Teaching Education*, 15(3), 293–310.

Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society*. University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1908). The bearings of pragmatism upon education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The collected works of John Dewey: The middle works, 1899–1924* (pp. 178–191). Southern Illinois University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Simon and Schuster.

Dewey, J. (1937). The challenge of democracy to education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The collected works of John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953* (pp. 182–191). Southern Illinois University Press.

Edwards-Groves, C., Kemmis, R. B., Hardy, I. & Ponte, P. (2010). Relational architectures: Recovering solidarity and agency as living practices in education, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 18(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681360903556814>

Fielding, M. & Moss, P. (2011). *Radical education and the common school: A democratic alternative*. Routledge.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth.

Fuller, K. & Stevenson, H. (2019) Global education reform: Understanding the movement, *Educational Review*, 71(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1532718>

Hickey, A., Pauli-Myler, T. & Smith, C. (2020). Bicycles, ‘informality’ and the alternative learning space as a site for re-engagement: A risky (pedagogical) proposition? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2018.1504281>

- Hickey, A. & Riddle, S. (2021). Relational pedagogy and the role of informality in renegotiating learning and teaching encounters. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1875261>
- Hickey, A., Riddle, S., Robinson, J., Down, B., Hattam, R. & Wrench, A. (2021). Relational pedagogy and the policy failure of contemporary Australian schooling: Activist teaching and pedagogically driven reform. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2021.1872508>
- Hytten, K. (2015). Ethics in teaching for democracy and social justice. *Democracy & Education*, 23(2), 1-10. <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1209>
- Kamler, B. & Comber, B. (2005). Turn-around pedagogies: Improving the education of at-risk students. *Improving Schools*, 8(2), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480205057702>
- Kuhlthau, C. C., Maniotes, L. K. & Caspari, A. K. (2015). *Guided inquiry: Learning in the 21st century*. ABC-CLIO.
- Lingard, B. (2007). Pedagogies of indifference. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3), 245–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701237498>
- Lingard, B., Rezai-Rashti, G. & Martino, W. (2017). *Testing regimes, accountabilities and education policy*. Routledge.
- Ljungblad, A. L. (2019). Pedagogical relational teachership (PeRT): A multi-relational perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1581280>
- Martin, J. R. (1984). *Changing the educational landscape: Philosophy, women and the curriculum*. Routledge.
- McGrath, K. F. & Van Bergen, P. (2015). Who, when, why and to what end? Students at risk of negative student–teacher relationships and their outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.12.001>
- Morgan, A., Pendergast, D., Brown, R. & Heck, D. (2015). Relational ways of being an educator: Trauma-informed practice supporting disenfranchised young people.

- International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(10), 1037–1051.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2015.1035344>
- Nabavi, M. & Lund, D. (2010). Youth and social justice: A conversation on collaborative activism. In W. Linds, L. Goulet & A. Sammel (Eds.), *Emancipatory practices: Adult/youth engagement for social and environmental justice* (pp. 3–13). Brill Sense.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789460911538_001
- Perryman, J. Ball, S. Maguire, M. & Braun, A. (2011). Life in the pressure cooker: School league tables and English and Mathematics teachers' responses to accountability in a results driven era. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 59(2), 179–195.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2011.578568>
- Rancière, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation* (K. Ross, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Reeves, J. & Le Mare, L. (2017). Supporting teachers in relational pedagogy and social emotional education: A qualitative exploration. *International Journal of Emotional Education*, 9(1), 85–98.
- Reimer, K. (2019). 'The kids do a better job of it than we do': A Canadian case study of teachers addressing the hypocritical application of restorative justice in their school. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 46, 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0286-7>
- Smyth, J. (2020). A Critical Pedagogy of Working Class Schooling: A Call to Activist Theory and Practice (pp. 688–701). In S. Steinberg & B. Down (eds). Sage Handbook of Critical Pedagogies. Sage.
- Smyth, J., Down, B. & McInerney, P. (2010). *'Hanging in with kids' in tough times: Engagement in contexts of educational disadvantage in the relational school*. Peter Lang.
- Smyth, J., Down, B. & McInerney, P. (2014). *The socially just school: Making space for youth to speak back*. Springer.
- Thrupp, M. & Lupton, R. (2010). Taking school contexts more seriously: The social justice challenge. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3), 308–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2006.00348.x>

Van Manen, M. (2015). *Pedagogical tact: Knowing what to do when you don't know what to do*. Routledge.

Yunus, M. M., Osman, W. S. W. & Ishak, N. M. (2011). Teacher–student relationship factor affecting motivation and academic achievement in ESL classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2637–2641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.161>