

Dissertation/Report Submission Form

Do **NOT** put your name anywhere on this sheet or in your assignment

Student Number	19097556
Module Code	LCLL0055
Module Name	Dissertation (Leadership)
Assignment Title	Pretending for self-preservation (and survival): queer teachers navigating their sexual identities in British and Peruvian schools and Teach For All organisations
Word Count	21,164
Date of Submission	3 October 2020

Declaration

By submitting your work, you are confirming that you have read and understood the guidelines on submissions, plagiarism, and late submission / word count penalties in the programme handbook and UCL Academic Handbook.

I confirm I have received Ethical Approval for this work [X]

Signed (Student Number): 19097556

Date: 3 October 2020

ABSTRACT	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
INTRODUCTION	6
LITERATURE REVIEW	10
I. School Cultures and Leaders in Today’s Teach for All Globalised Education	10
I. i. The current global education reform movement and Teach for All.....	10
I. ii. School Leaders and School Cultures	14
II. Professional and Sexual Identities of Queer Teachers.....	18
II. i. Brief overview about Identity	18
II. ii. Professional / Teaching Identity	18
II. iii. Sexual Identity (or Sexuality).....	21
II. iv. Queer Teachers and their juggling of their Teaching and Sexual Identities.....	23
III. Related Studies	27
IV. Summary	32
METHODOLOGY	35
I. Research Questions	35
II. Philosophical Underpinnings & Reflexivity	36
III. Instrument.....	38
IV. Sampling & Participants.....	39
V. Data Collection	43
VI. Data Analysis	43
VII. Ethics.....	44
VIII. Limitations.....	46
FINDINGS	47
I. TFA Cultures and Their Leaders.....	47
I. i. Overall.....	47
I. ii. Towards Queer Issues and People	50
II. School Cultures and their Leaders	52
II. i. Overall	52
II. ii. Towards Queer Issues and People	56
III. Navigating Queer Identities as TFA Teachers	58
ANALYSIS	64
I. Overall School and TFA Cultures and their Leaders	64
II. Navigating Queer Identities as TFA Teachers in Schools and TFA organisations	67
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	73
REFERENCES	81

APPENDICES 93

 APPENDIX 1: Approach / Recruitment Email 93

 APPENDIX 2: Informed Consent Form..... 95

 APPENDIX 3: Interview Questions 97

ABSTRACT

A qualitative study based on a narrative, phenomenological, and interpretive approach grounded on social constructivism and post-positivism was designed to explore the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers, discover how their sexual identities impacted their relations with their educational leaders, and identify comparisons between both contexts. The answers provided by eight participants show that, regardless of their context - Peru/U.K., rural/urban - they all had to carefully navigate their sexual identities in their schools, with most opting to conceal their sexuality but for differing reasons, while feeling more at ease to disclose it within their respective Teach for All (TFA) cohorts and organisations; their sexual identities seem to have had a greater impact on their approaches to teaching and how they performed their roles as teachers - presenting themselves to their students mostly as straight - than their relations with their educational leaders both at school and their TFA organisations; and while most encountered negative school cultures overall, highlighted by various external pressures and demands, Teach First participants taught in schools where queer identities were acknowledged, recognised, and even celebrated, while Enseña Peru participants did so in schools where queer identities were non-existent or viewed negatively. These findings show that school leaders play a role in setting the school cultures encountered by queer teachers, impacting their levels of comfort and support. Further research into the intersecting themes of queer teachers, school cultures, and school leaders in British and Peruvian contexts and beyond is necessary to have a fuller understanding of their connections in order to provide queer teachers the support and recognition they deserve, from the greater education sector as a whole and from school leaders in particular, so they may contribute as best as possible to meet the socioemotional and academic needs of their students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I did not envision completing this dissertation in the midst of a global pandemic, living under lockdown in London for many months. Fortunately, many people made it better through constant Zoom calls and text messages, including my extended families, Veronica Sifuentes, Mariela Vasquez, Heidi Uchiyama, Elba Zapata, Rudy Bezir, Barbara David, Daniella Touzett, Silvia Schang, Lorenzo Yori, Katie Bangs, Mary Nakada, Nick Gerard, Rae Merrigan, Jamie McTavish, Maria Paola Rest, and Alicia Zegarra. Monica Morriberón, Diana Prudencio, Eduardo Salazar, Liz Pasco, Roxana Rodriguez, and Jorge Aliaga were the ideal sounding board for the initial research idea, while Claudia Aréstegui was the best practice interviewee a novel researcher like myself could have asked for. Monica Prado has helped me get to this point in my life in countless ways, and for that I am eternally grateful. The calls I received throughout this process from my brother, sister-in-law, and god-daughter brightened my days, and I'm incredibly thankful for the support my parents gave me in order to pursue and complete this MA programme. While they would have preferred that I research something not queer-related, I hope they will see the value in this study, which would not have been possible without the guidance, advice, and belief from my supervisor Ruth McGinity. Thanks also to Loic Menzies who aided in finding half of my participants. Finally, my heartfelt thanks to the eight individuals who agreed to participate in this study. They are all living proof that queer educators deserve equal and just treatment and support, both in legal terms and social attitudes, in order to achieve our calling: impact positively and as best as possible in the lives of all our students, especially those who, like ourselves, must navigate a still unfriendly world simply because of who they, and we, love and/or how they, and us, express ourselves.

INTRODUCTION

Gay rights have improved in many countries around the world including the U.K. where in 2003 the Employment Equality Regulations made discrimination at work on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity unlawful (Colgan, 2011) and furthermore in 2013 when same-sex marriage became law (Government Equalities Office, 2014). Social attitudes towards gays and lesbians have also improved in the U.K., with two thirds of respondents today believing sexual relations between same-sex adults is not wrong, an increase of almost 50% since 1983 when the question was first asked (The National Centre for Social Research, 2019). However, homophobia, discrimination, marginalisation, and hostility towards the gay community still exists (Richardson, 2004) and many gay people continue to live in countries where they lack equal rights and face an unfriendly populace. Peru, for example, has no civil union for same-sex couples nor a law that prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity overall, let alone in employment, though some regional and local governments have approved non-discrimination ordinances on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in their jurisdictions (Defensoría del Pueblo, 2016). Meanwhile, only 29% of Peruvians think gay people should have the right to marry (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2013) and 45% of adult Peruvians over 40 years of age and in rural areas believe people become gay due to trauma experienced in their childhood or bad experiences (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2020).

Likewise, while there has been legal progress for gay people in the education sector in some countries like the U.K., in others, like Peru, gay educators continue to face an uphill battle. Though Section 28 of the Local Government Act in the U.K., which prohibited the promotion

of homosexuality in general and the acceptability of homosexuality in schools specifically, was repealed in 2003 (Lee, 2019), some parents and religious communities were outraged when the British government announced that same-sex couples and families would be recognised in compulsory relationships and sex education courses in schools beginning in 2020 (Lee, 2020). In Peru, 45% of the population believe homosexuals should not be teachers in schools (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2013). These situations and statistics demonstrate that the normalisation of gay people in certain parts of the world have expanded the contexts and locations where it is acceptable to be gay, for example marriage and the market in countries like the U.K. but not education (Richardson, 2004) in countries like Peru.

Unfortunately for those 45% of Peruvians, I was a gay teacher in two different schools on the outskirts of Lima for two years, though I did not disclose my sexuality to my students nor my work colleagues at the time. And like me, many more gay people exist in this world who happen to be teachers. My personal experience as a closeted gay teacher and the process that led me to openly and confidently identify as both a gay man and an educator instilled in me a desire to explore the experiences of other queer teachers, which is the focus of this study. I use the term “queer” as opposed to “gay” in this research because according to Kumashiro (2002), “queer” signifies a performance or identification - what we do - and an identity - who we are - as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, intersexed, and questioning individuals; a term for non-normative identities with a history of bigotry and hatred which is now being infused with a feeling of self-empowerment. Therefore, following Gray and Harris (2014), “queer teachers” is used in this study as a theoretical lens through which to examine the professional lives and experiences of my research participants who self-identify as one or more categories within and beyond the LGBTQI umbrella.

As a concerned Peruvian citizen, I wanted to explore the experiences of queer Peruvian teachers. Completing a Masters programme in the U.K., albeit in the midst of a global pandemic, the idea of comparing the experiences of queer teachers in Peru with queer teachers in the U.K. was suggested and accepted. Though both countries are very different in many aspects, they do share one commonality in the education sector in which I participated in: the Teach for All network. I was a member of the second cohort of Enseña Peru teachers and actually attended a global Teach for All conference hosted by Teach First in London back in 2012. I have long-standing connections to Enseña Peru and fellow graduates of the programme and could fairly easily be connected to the Teach First graduate community in the U.K. The possibility of comparing the experiences of queer former teachers from these two countries who happened to share a common membership with me in the same global network, which trained us to be teachers along similar lines, piqued my interest since it would be another step in my personal development process as a queer educator. Therefore, the three main research questions that served as the starting point for this research were:

1. What were the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers?
2. How did the sexual identities of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers impact their relations with their educational leaders?
3. What comparisons can be made between the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers?

In order to attempt to answer these questions, I designed a qualitative study based on a narrative, phenomenological, and interpretive approach grounded on social constructivism and post-positivism. The details of the methodology of this study are explained in Chapter Two. Chapter One reviews the literature that helped frame this investigation: the current global

education movement, of which Teach for All is a key player; the school leaders and school cultures that inhabit that movement; and the queer teachers navigating those school cultures and interacting with those school leaders. Besides describing the details of the methodology of this research, Chapter Two also presents my philosophical underpinnings and my reflexivity as a queer educator who completed the Enseña Peru teacher training and placement programme. This chapter also briefly presents the eight queer teachers who volunteered to participate in this study. Chapter Three presents the findings of this study; Chapter Four analyses the findings based on the literature reviewed in Chapter Two. Chapter Five presents the conclusions of this research by answering the three main research questions as well as providing recommendations for future research and policy implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Schools embody complex arrays of understandings, beliefs, and values encoded in structures, cultures, and everyday routines which are legitimised and sanctioned by their surrounding environment (Portela, 2013). This proves that they are part of their social environment like any other organisation (Jenkins, 2014), being greatly shaped by explicit and covert pressures and local and global issues including social, cultural, religious, economic, and political interests. This review begins by exploring some of those pressures inherent in the current global education movement, of which Teach for All is a key player. It then considers how school leaders fit into it and how they influence the school cultures in their institutions. The focus then shifts to queer teachers, beginning with a very brief overview of the concept of identity, followed by an exploration of the professional and personal identities embodied by them that are of interest to this research: their teaching and sexual identities. Selected studies that have looked at these intersecting themes of queer teachers, school cultures, and the school leaders who oversee them follows, and the review ends with a summary that brings all these issues together in preparation for the subsequent chapters.

I. School Cultures and Leaders in Today's Teach for All Globalised Education

I. i. The current global education reform movement and Teach for All

The current global education reform movement is a complex network of various actors including governments, international governmental organisations, businesses, think tanks, and

third sector groups - both for profit and not - influencing education policies in countries around the world (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016). The solutions and alternatives promoted by them - based on neoliberal principles of the market, competition, efficiency, and efficacy - have been reorganising power relations and transforming the meanings and practices of education and the educator (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013) while establishing new forms of control and regulations in the sector (Ball, 2003). This trend has been evident in the U.K. since 1979 when a new era ushered in market reforms, the deregulation of teacher education, a focus on 'what works', and the use of performance management, practices used by successive governments on both sides of the political spectrum which demonstrate a common view of education in relation to global economic competitiveness (Ball, 2017). Two key elements of the 1988 Education Reform Act, for example, were the need for systems of control and accountability and evaluations and assessments to identify 'poor' schools and 'failing' teachers, with one tangible result being the creation of the Office for Standards in Education - OFSTED - in 1992, while New Labour in the late '90s doubled-down on standards, targets, and performance monitoring; pushed through further reforms of the teaching profession; and promoted greater participation of the business and voluntary communities in the delivery of services in parallel with supporting schools to deliver change and encouraging innovation in the sector (ibid).

The developing countries of Latin America were not too late in joining this marketised notion of education. Beset by weak institutions unable to create stable policy environments, they opened their doors to international organisations who stepped in and promoted greater private influence over the delivery of education services and placed a strong emphasis on control measures including standard-setting and assessments (Balarin, 2008). Peru in particular began this type of education reform in 1994 as part of various agreements signed with the World Bank in order to receive loans to develop social policies as a condition for the country to rejoin the

international financial system after a decade-long war between the state and the Shining Path terrorist group and a dire economic crisis (Oliart, 2011) which had plunged the country into hyperinflation. This reform pushed for decentralisation, meant to transfer the management of schools from the central Ministry of Education office to regional and local ministry offices in the hopes of improving local services; teacher training for current teachers in pedagogic innovation based on constructivism; the application of standardised tests; the improvement in statistical information; and an accreditation system for the teaching career (ibid). However, winds of change had been evident before: in 1990, Peru's Education Minister quit after five months on the job claiming she had been asked to exploit teachers within a system based on threats and sanctions (ibid). Five years later, the new Minister embraced the World Bank reforms with the focus of a pragmatic manager, viewing each school he visited around the country as a small company (ibid). Though the reforms failed according to indicators established by the World Bank itself - they faced a centralised state with a profound distrust towards any organised sector of society, including the teachers' union, and corruption was still present, preventing principals from selecting teachers for their schools since this practice was a main source of power for local ministry officials throughout the country, among other reasons - they did find support in third sector groups, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and universities, and allowed an unorganised growth in private education institutions including teacher training schools, with half of the total amount in the country being created after 1995 (ibid).

As a result of these changes in education around the world, a new player inserted itself and gained a prominent role in the global education reform movement: the Teach for All (TFA) network. The brainchild of Teach for America in the U.S. and Teach First in the U.K., its mission is to combat educational inequality around the world through the development of

country-specific non-profits that implement the education reform ideals and organisational model popularised by Teach for America, acting as the umbrella network that provides strategic support to the social entrepreneurs that lead those country-specific ventures (Straubhaar & Friedrich, 2015). Since 2007, it has exported the teacher-training model of Teach for America to nearly 40 countries around the world (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016), including Peru. The model entails recruiting recent university graduates, many of whom did not study education-related careers, to teach for two years in challenging schools with the aim of improving educational outcomes and opportunities of disadvantaged students in those schools (Bailey, 2015). Participants are trained in a six week-long Summer Institute that combines theoretical and practical knowledge including the basics of pedagogy, classroom management skills, leadership abilities, and content mastery (Cumsille & Fiszbein, 2015). Teach First places participants in schools for a week to observe and familiarise themselves with a school environment and context before the start of the Summer Institute and works closely with universities for their training; Enseña Peru participants teach in the mornings of their Summer Institute and receive feedback and analyse their classroom practices in the afternoon and evening (ibid). Though participants are not expected to be completely prepared to face every possible challenge in the classroom on day one, the Summer Institute is meant to develop and strengthen the attitudes and skills that will allow them to improve their performance more independently during their placements, a performance which is appraised through their students' achievement throughout their two years of teaching (ibid).

This constant appraisal of the performance of TFA teachers demonstrates that these teachers are forged and produced in the image of performativity, acting as hyper-performative teaching subjects (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013). By valuing a narrowed conception of teaching focused on performative and managerial aspects, TFA is contributing to the reshaping of the meaning of

teaching around the world and effectively governing the conduct of its participants through specific forms of guidance (ibid). The result of this can be seen in the media portrayals of TFA teachers in various countries, including the U.K. and Peru, where they are presented as entrepreneurial, innovative, outcomes-focused, business-minded individuals (ibid; Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016). Placing the role of teaching within the logic of a constant performance results in teachers, students, and schools being constantly under surveillance and judgement, which can increase stress and anxiety in teachers since they have to perform at all times (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016). This terror of performativity has clear implications on teaching identity: a teacher who is inspected and evaluated may simply be performing the role of a teacher that they know the inspector wants to see, specifically a teacher who is celebrated and rewarded by the current global education reform movement (Ball, 2003). Within this performative regime, the choice of teacher representations that are privileged and promoted are greatly constrained, with effectiveness being valued much more than honesty (ibid). This, in turn, influences how school leaders value their teachers and interact with them and, consequently, the types of school cultures that they nurture and promote.

I. ii. School Leaders and School Cultures

Today, the school leader - commonly referred to as the principal or headteacher - must do more than provide direction and support to their staff, set standards, raise high expectations, and clarify what is expected of teachers (Devos & Bouckenooghe, 2009). Conceptualised as a manager, the school leader is considered the new hero in the global education reform movement, tasked with instilling an attitude and culture that will make workers feel accountable, committed, and personally invested in an organisation, thus becoming in Foucaultian terms ‘technicians of behaviour’ (Ball, 2003). This view of the school leader leads

to the ‘opening up’ of more people to control through the management of their performance using new forms of surveillance and self-monitoring such as appraisal systems, target-setting, and output comparisons (ibid). But while governments demand a management of schools based on results, they also require school leaders to ensure a welcoming school climate based on respect, mutual collaboration, and the recognition of diversity (Ministerio de Educación, 2014). Peru has enshrined this responsibility into law: Article 120 of the General Education Law states that school leaders must ensure institutional climates that favour learning (Ministerio de Educación, 2012). This proves that school leaders are faced with conflicting roles (Devos & Bouckennooghe, 2009), a reality which undoubtedly influences their actions in shaping their school cultures or climates (Price, 2012), which in return shapes them (Deal & Peterson, 2016). Thus while they may want to create a school culture that allows both students and staff to learn, grow, and develop their multiple talents (Earley, 2017), they find themselves under constant pressure to ensure their schools produce positive statistic results since policymakers favour measurable results for very specific educational achievements (Oliart, 2011).

These conflicting pressures felt by school leaders also impact the relationships they establish with their teachers, strongly and directly affecting their attitudes and behaviours which, in turn, impact school cultures. Relationships between workers that have a positive affective dimension increases their personal health, happiness, and job devotion while strong interpersonal ties and group cohesion help integrate new employees to a work environment, thus increasing their job satisfaction (Price, 2012). However, if school leaders are solely focusing on measurable outcomes from their students and neglecting their individual needs and processes and those of their teachers, teacher motivation will decrease, affecting their job satisfaction (Oliart, 2011) and, consequently, the overall school culture. As figures of institutional authority, school leaders also run the risk of imposing their moral views, values or prejudices in such a way that

could negatively impact student learning by not allowing certain issues to be taught or discussed in classrooms, thus regulating and limiting the teaching and learning that takes place in their schools (Ferfolja, 2007), which also impacts the school culture.

School culture in itself is defined by Deal and Peterson (2016) as the unwritten rules and traditions, customs, and expectations that permeate everything in a school: the way people act, dress, talk about or consider taboo, and how teachers feel about their work and students. It can be seen in the ways different groups of people treat and feel about each other within the school community, the extent to which they feel included in the school community, and the forms of collaboration or participation that exist within the school (Dorcak, 2013). It can be stable but not static (Deal & Peterson, 2016), is context-specific and can be considered positive or negative (Dorcak, 2013), though this assessment will depend on who is evaluating the school culture and according to what standards. For example, religion or religious belief tend to weigh heavily in religious schools to the point that it might be an occupational requirement of teachers seeking to work in them (Neary, 2017) and parents wanting their children to attend them, thus greatly setting the tone for the types of culture that emerge in them. In this way, school culture defines what is normal, acceptable, and legitimate in terms of acting and thinking in a school (Schempp *et al.*, 1999), proving that schools also serve a cultural function as sites for the promulgation of rules for being a 'good citizen' by establishing what they consider proper behaviour for children and young adults through rules and procedures that regulate the bodies and minds of students and teachers alike (Alsup, 2006). This demonstrates that a certain level of submission from both students and teachers is required in order for them to abide by the collective routines of schools, while the hierarchical structures of schools create relations of authority and power, domination and subordination, such as teacher/student, adult/child, and school leader/classroom teacher (Kehily, 2002), which feed back into the school culture.

In this way, school cultures are not neutral, and schools themselves, like most organisations, are not race, class, gender, or sexually neutral entities, though they are commonly assumed to be (Connell, 2015). Schools institutionalise binary gender practices and heteronormativity (ibid), assuming heterosexuality as the norm (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) and organising school relations around this assumption (Kehily, 2002). By doing so they reinforce narrow understandings of gender and sexuality, regulating both through curriculum, pedagogy, practice, and policy (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) since they exist within a highly rigid, regulatory frame of compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1990). This framework results in the normalisation of heteronormativity, operating implicitly by shaping the lenses through which we see the world, thus we are socialized to expect cisgender heterosexuality in schools (Rosick, 2016) and most work environments. If people working in these environments, specifically teachers, are not cisgender heterosexual, they may be viewed as ‘unprofessional’ by school administrators, staff, and community members who might consider their non-heterosexual sexuality or non-gender binary expressions as perverse or wrong (Mizzi, 2016), notably in faith-based schools where homosexuality and gender variant expressions are usually viewed as immoral behaviours (Callaghan, 2016). Therefore, queer teachers might not be welcomed or accepted in certain schools. If they are, they are forced to navigate a delicate balance between their personal and professional identities, a pressure not experienced by heterosexual teachers, which the following section explores.

II. Professional and Sexual Identities of Queer Teachers

II. i. Brief overview about Identity

Identity is a unique, personal phenomenon that varies from person to person (Schempp *et al.*, 1999). Though some view it as a ‘core aspect’ different from superficial or contingent characteristics (Portela, 2013), we as individuals have many identities because we are multidimensional beings - singular and plural - and thus our identities are never final or settled but, in principle, always negotiable (Jenkins, 2014). These multiple or ‘situated’ identities exist simultaneously and can shift over time (Alsup, 2019). They can lead to contradictory relationships within our various communities (Kumashiro, 2002) and some might enhance or diminish the opportunities available to us in a particular context (Jenkins, 2014). The notion of identity involves the criteria of comparison between persons and things, of similarities and differences, signalling that identity must always be established since it is something we do to classify things and other people and to associate or attach ourselves with or to something or someone else (*ibid*). This process of identification involves interaction (*ibid*), demonstrating that identity is a relational process (Gray, 2014) and thus, identity development is not a completely internalized process since we interact with other individuals in the social world (Alsup, 2019). In this way, identity is both a property of the individual body and mind while at the same time a collective property involving interactions with others (Fausto-Sterling, 2019).

II. ii. Professional / Teaching Identity

The development of a professional identity is complex and multifaceted, more a perpetual state of development (Lee, 2020) than a process with a definite beginning and end. So is the development of a teaching identity: a continuous process of becoming that does not culminate

in a singular identity construction (Alsup, 2006). It involves the weaving of various subjectivities and understandings of the self as expressed through genres of discourse, influenced by multiple life experiences (ibid). Personal and interpersonal dynamics - heavily contextualized in terms of the teacher's past and present, as well as the past and present of the institutional context of the educational programme where the teacher trained, not to mention where the teacher teaches, and of the wider sociocultural and political contexts - are at play in this process (McLean, 1999). The role of teachers has historically been informed by societal expectations defined by religious and hegemonic institutions (McAdoo, 2015), which have no doubt been greatly influenced by the regulatory framework of compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1990). Constructing their identities within these historical and cultural discourses, it should not be surprising that teachers have tended to reproduce conservative, gendered roles - female teachers as nurturing, caring, virtuous, altruistic, selfless, and subservient, compared to male teachers who are viewed as intellectuals (Smulyan, 2012) - that remain within the codes of behaviour, appearance, and attitude of schools (Schempp *et al.*, 1999).

These personal and interpersonal dynamics, heavily influenced by historical and societal pressures, are manifest in the search for teacher identity through a dialectical tension between external factors unique to the school in which teachers find themselves - work conditions, students, expectations of the teaching position - and the internal factors unique to them: their background experiences, education, beliefs, and motives (Schempp *et al.*, 1999). Teachers must assimilate key aspects of their work environment while at the same time attempt to make that environment accommodate to their own needs (Lipka & Brinthaupt, 1999), carving out their own identity space to avoid the tensions and frustrations of assuming a teaching persona that does not align with them (Alsup, 2006). Schempp *et al.* (1999) posit that new teachers, in particular, establish their identities in schools through biography, including their teacher

histories which provide their foundational beliefs, knowledges, perspectives, and skills; the establishment of the self in teaching, in which they define themselves in terms of the ability to know, understand, and help their students, measure their success through their students' success, assume multiple roles in the classroom, and consider how they dress, what they say and to whom; and the establishment of the self in schools, where they must accommodate the dimensions of other established school members. In this way, their teacher identity emerges from the conflict in and with authority, imagination, and autobiographies (Britzman, 2003).

It could be argued, therefore, that teachers do not necessarily mimic what has occurred before (Middleton, 1998) but create something new, though this creation is heavily influenced by an array of factors such as the institutional discourses of the school administration, their teaching colleagues and even their families (Alsup, 2006), and by a lifetime of personal experiences and knowledges that have shaped their understandings of how teachers should - and should not - act, behave, and look (McLean, 1999). Moreover, their expressions of individuality and assertions of the self have to fall within the pre-established boundaries of schools for them to be accepted by the larger school community (Schempp *et al.*, 1999), which have been historically shaped by the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990). This suggests that developing a teacher identity involves embodying the discourse of a teacher, visualizing oneself as a teacher, and performing as a teacher (Alsup, 2006) within a very tight range that dictates how one should present oneself, talk, and dress. In a way, a teacher identity could be argued to be 'performed' like gender according to Butler (1990), which is described in the following section. However, despite these external pressures, it also seems teacher identity develops as one begins to truly understand oneself, thus knowing who one is becomes part of one's personal and professional identity (Evans-Santiago, 2015). In this regard, the professional self cannot exist in isolation from the personal self (Alsup, 2006), and so the next section explores one of the

most intimate aspects of the personal self, which unfortunately continues to be taboo in much of the education world: sexuality or sexual identity.

II. iii. Sexual Identity (or Sexuality)

From a sociological perspective, sexuality is not considered the property of an individual nor a hormonally or biologically given, inherent quality of an individual (Epstein *et al.*, 2003). It is neither viewed as a natural drive or orientation but a socially constructed phenomenon, a cultural artefact that reflects the social conditions of any given historical moment (Connell, 2015). Foucault considered it a historical construct brought into being by and through discourses which actively create specific sexualities by turning subjects into objects of knowledge, while Weeks argues that the delineation of sexual behaviour or sexual identity create sexual categories defined in relation to each other (Kehily, 2002). In this way, sexual cultures and meanings are constructed through a range of discursive practices across social institutions, including schools (Epstein *et al.*, 2003). Psychoanalytic approaches to sexuality, on the other hand, assume the existence of an active, insistent unconscious in the individual in which repressed desires speak through the individual regardless of taboo or prohibitions, for example against homosexuality, suggesting that a gendered subjectivity is central to identity (Kehily, 2002). This is a precarious process which is not easily achieved and never complete, though Freud argued that knowledge of one's sexuality could be empowering for the individual (ibid).

Regarding the idea of a gendered subjectivity being central to identity, Butler (1990) suggests gender is instituted through the stylized repetitions of acts - bodily gestures, movements, and enactments - that together give an illusion of a gendered self or an appearance of substance

achieved through a performative act. The actors carrying out the performance end up believing that illusion and perform accordingly to the mode of the belief, while the social audience also believes the illusion (ibid). If gender is performativity, no real or essential gender identity can exist since gender identities are simply constructed and constituted by language (Salih, 2002). These performative acts are carried out within the highly rigid, regulatory frame of compulsory heterosexuality which needs and regulates gender as a binary relation with marked differences between ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ in order to exist, thus restricting the relative meanings of “heterosexuality”, “homosexuality” and “bisexuality” (Butler, 1990; Salih, 2002). In this way, those who fail to do their gender ‘right’ are punished and those with gender identities that do not conform to the norms of cultural clarity - ie heterosexuality - considered developmental failures or logical impossibilities (Butler, 1990). The disciplinary production of gender, then, gives a false sense of gender stabilization that serves the heterosexual construction and regulation of sexuality within a reproductive domain: the acts, gestures, and desires manifested by an individual merely produce an effect of an internal core or substance on the surface of the body, thus creating an illusion of an interior organized gender core adhering to the mandatory frame of reproductive heterosexuality while upholding the binary polar gender frame (ibid). Following this argument, identity is also claimed to be produced or generated, not determined nor fully artificial and arbitrary, thus giving humans agency to shape it as they wish.

Regardless of Butler’s theory, many lesbian and gay people do claim a sexual identity based on a self-perception of a stable self attracted to somebody of the same gender/sex, while bisexuals do so on particular human characteristics rather than gender/sex (Eliason, 1996). Therefore, sexual orientation can be defined as the embodied emotional and physical response, or lack thereof, towards another human regardless of gender/sex (Fausto-Sterling, 2019). However, gender and sexual identities are multiple and fragmented and, drawing on

sociological perspectives, constructed in relations to others within systems of power and knowledge (Lee, 2020). According to two-spirit identity, an Indigenous American view, sexuality cannot be considered separate from the rest of an individual's identity, which includes gender, culture, community, and spirituality (Wilson, 1996). Thus, sexuality and gender transcend the private realm and become entwined with social and political discourses of power (Lee, 2020). By doing so, they also enter the professional working environment, including schools. How this is managed by queer teachers is the focus of the following section.

II. iv. Queer Teachers and their juggling of their Teaching and Sexual Identities

Queer sexual identity and teacher identity merge with other identities within an individual to make up a whole identity (Jinright, 2019). Though public perceptions about queer people in general have improved around the world - two-thirds of British people now say sex between two same-sex adults is "not wrong at all", up almost 50% since the question was first asked in 1983 (The National Centre for Social Research, 2019) - they still face hurdles and misperceptions in many aspects of society. In Peru, for instance, 30% of adults claim they would not be willing to hire a homosexual if they owned a company (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2020) while 45% believe they should not be teachers in schools (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2013), a statistic partly explained by the finding that in rural areas and among adults over the age of 40 in the country, 36% believe it is dangerous to leave a child with a homosexual (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2020). This shows that queer teachers find themselves at the intersection of two moral sex panics which are based on the notion of childhood sexual innocence and infused with anxieties about social change: children and homosexuality (Connell, 2015).

In the UK, this resulted in the creation of Section 28 of the Local Government Act in 1988 by the then-Conservative government, which prohibited both the promotion of homosexuality and the acceptability of homosexuality in education (Lee, 2019). Sixteen years after its repeal, the Conservative government - once again in power albeit under new leadership - announced that starting in 2020, compulsory relationships and sex education courses in schools would recognise same-sex couples and families for the first time, angering some parents and religious communities who claimed it went against their religious beliefs (Lee, 2020). In Peru towards the end of 2016, another set of worried parents and religious groups set up the campaign movement #Don'tMessWithMyChildren (*#ConMisHijosNoTeMetas*), denouncing that a so-called 'gender ideology' was embedded in the new national education curriculum and would induce their children to homosexuality (Meneses, 2019), which they clearly feared. However, the curriculum merely supports gender equality, does not define sexual orientation as the attraction to someone from the opposite gender/sex, and claims that identity is not fixed but constructed (Ministerio de Educación del Perú, 2017), while 'gender ideology' is an epistemological response to emancipatory claims around sex, gender, and sexuality and a political tool trying to contain policies associated with feminist and queer agendas (Corredor, 2019).

These examples show that the moral panics of children and homosexuality continue to exist to this day in countries around the world, demonstrating that the view of childhood sexual innocence is deeply ingrained in many societies where significant amounts of people are anxious about changes that threaten to disrupt established norms of appropriate sexual behaviour and the hegemonic social order (Connell, 2015). But as Epstein *et al.* (2003) affirm, this is a call for ignorance since sexuality can be found everywhere in classrooms and playgrounds, acting as a resource for identity making among children at an early age with their

previous experiences and local cultures strongly influencing what they know and believe about sexuality, learning from each other forms of policing, as well as strategies for understanding and finding out about, sexualities. However, DePalma and Atkinson (2006) argue that because queer teachers transgress the (hetero)sexual norms expected of teachers - and the act of simply making their sexuality visible tends to be seen as excessive, a trait identified with their sexual deviance - they are viewed by some as dangerous for their children, evidenced in the Peruvian statistics previously shared. This is why queer teachers may be expected and even demanded in some cases to keep their hyper-visible bodies outside of schools (ibid) or simply prevented from entering them since they are marked as illegitimate or unsuitable for teaching, particularly in religious schools (Neary, 2017).

By now it should come as no surprise that many queer teachers work in settings of explicit, endemic homophobia (Connell, 2015; Epstein *et al.*, 2003), worrying that their schools - their working environments - will not support their identities (Dunnell, 2017). This is why in order to maintain a certain level of security in the teaching profession, they are forced to negotiate the visibility of their sexual orientation, attempting to reach and preserve a delicate balance between their personal and professional lives (Richard, 2016), something heterosexual teachers need not worry about. Unfortunately, for some queer teachers, their sexual and professional identities are not compatible (Jinright, 2019). Connell (2015) labels them quitters since they are unable to split or knit together their sexual and professional identities in a comfortable way, with most of them quitting the teaching profession or moving to administrative posts in search of more supportive working conditions. The other two pathways to identity making for queer teachers categorised by Connell (ibid) are splitters and knitters. Splitters separate their sexual identities from their classrooms for various reasons, motivations, and feelings, believing that sexual identities are incompatible with their teaching contexts (ibid). Knitters, on the other

hand, are able to weave together their sexual and professional identities, feeling strongly that doing so is a responsibility they must assume as queer role models though it does not necessarily resolve their tensions of being queer teachers (ibid).

While all teachers are subject to close examination by students and colleagues in all areas of their individual conduct and identity (Dunnell, 2017), it is clear that queer teachers are subject to even closer, and sometimes unfair, examination pressures. The rigid binary gender relations demanded by the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990) tightly controls the kinds of queer representations allowed to emerge in schools. Queer teachers themselves comment that other queer teachers should look, act, and work like everyone else - ie conventional, heterosexual men and women - in order to secure rights and avoid behaviour that might show them as deviants since visibility does not conform easily to the ideal of teaching professionalism when they look, speak, dress, or present as queer (Connell, 2015). This self-regulation of their verbal and non-verbal behaviours may deplete their regulatory resources needed for work since research shows that self-regulation is a limited resource and its use in one task may undermine subsequent tasks that also require regulation, for example those involving concentration or the recalling of information (Madera, 2010). In this way, the performance of queer teachers may be impaired when their cognition is undermined by the cognitive energy demanded to conceal their sexuality or their fear of their sexuality being discovered by others at work (ibid).

The pressures experienced by queer teachers and queer professionals in general demonstrate that support at work is very important for their well-being. Huffman *et al.* (2008) differentiate three types of support in this area: organisational support, which is directed at an entire identity group, includes formal and informal practices and procedures, and may be necessary for mitigating global stressors related to queer identity at work; and supervisor and coworker

support, which are closer to the queer employee and involve emotional, instrumental, and structural assistance to them mainly through informal practices which may alleviate personal stressors. In a study of 99 lesbian, bisexual, and gay professionals in the southwest U.S., they found supervisor support was more strongly related to job satisfaction while coworker support to life satisfaction (ibid). One example of organisational support for queer professionals are queer networks, a subset of diversity networks which have become prevalent in the corporate world and are viewed as a means of bringing members together to reduce isolation within majority groups and as an effective instrument in promoting organisational equality (Dennissen *et al.*, 2019). However, their mere establishment does not create substantial change towards equality within an organisation (ibid) nor does it necessarily result in an improved organisational culture for queer professionals (Köllen, 2016); to do so, these networks must have the ability to actively initiate organisational change processes (ibid) that challenge inequalities within the organisation, helping minorities be visible within organisations, and ensuring the unique contributions of all are valued within the organisation (Dennissen *et al.*, 2019).

III. Related Studies

Queer teachers have always existed, though they might not have always been recognised as such nor studied extensively in academic circles. This section briefly reviews studies found to have examined the relations between some, if not all, of the themes outlined thus far: queer teachers, school cultures, and the school leaders who impact them both.

Dunnell (2017) identified three themes that impacted 12 queer out independent school teachers from New England and the Mid-Atlantic regions in the U.S. Personal identity involved coming

out personally as a constant process and staying true to oneself while professional identity involved how they became teachers, coming out at work, being authentic in order to connect with students, and feeling the need to provide a successful image of queer individuals (ibid). The last theme, school culture, was marked by heteronormativity, a consideration of cultural diversity as more important than sexual or gender diversity and thus a tacit acceptance of intolerance by schools and leaders regarding these issues existed, as well as misperceptions about queer teachers as predators (ibid). The 17 gay and lesbian educational leaders from the U.S. interviewed by deLeon and Brunner (2013) also viewed sexuality as a part of who they were but it did not define them since they claimed to have integrated identities. However, many of them feared not being promoted due to their sexual orientation (ibid). Jinright (2019) interviewed ten teachers working in the Deep South of the U.S. who were not necessarily out in their work environments and most felt the opposing components of their identities at work were being a teacher and gay or lesbian. Though they felt they had agency to come out in their schools, there were structural factors governing that agency, thus limiting their choices to do so (ibid). One important element of these structures was the culture of their schools, with the factors affecting it including the school and community diversity, the socio-political climate, and administrative and collegial support (ibid). Those teachers from more socio-politically conservative areas, primarily rural areas, tended to be more guarded about their personal lives, while for those teachers out at work the support shown by their administrators and colleagues was instrumental to their comfort level, happiness, and sense of protection at work, thus supportive administrators were the most important form of support for these gay and lesbian teachers (ibid).

Hooker (2010), using interviews and focus groups, also found gay and lesbian teachers from urban schools in the U.S. were more at ease being out at work than those from suburban and

rural areas. In the U.K., through an anonymous online questionnaire completed by 105 LGBT teachers, Lee (2019) found similar results with a slight caveat: LGBT teachers in urban and suburban schools opted to partially reveal their sexuality to their school community, coming out to colleagues but presenting as heterosexual in their classrooms, while those in rural schools faced complex relationships with their school communities which included a greater deal of surveillance, making a partial coming out less likely to succeed. This was partly attributed to more traditional and conservative norms and values being protected in their rural settings at the expense of the creation of safe, inclusive workplaces for them (ibid). A dilemma was also found in faith schools where LGBT teachers worked: a tension between promoting LGBT equality and providing an environment where individuals practice religion that may condemn LGBT relationships (ibid). Headteachers were frequently mentioned as placing fears of parental complaints above the teachers' right to equality in the workplace, with senior leadership not challenging homophobic name calling and ignoring homophobic language between children at schools (ibid).

Analysing 17 in-depth interviews with lesbian teachers and 30 questionnaires distributed across New South Wales, Australia, Ferfolja (2007) also uncovered language in schools to be anti-lesbian and anti-gay, with individuals who transgressed the dominant cultural values of gender and sexuality seen at times as deserving of the harassment they experienced. McAdoo (2015) interviewed 40 teachers in the U.S. who self-identified as openly gay or lesbian from various independent schools across the country and also found school culture to be one factor that influenced these teachers' identities as gay or lesbian teachers. These openly gay or lesbian teachers believed their sexual orientation informed their teacher identities by providing them with greater levels of empathy, awareness, and sensitivity, allowing them to better relate to the needs of their students (ibid). Authenticity and visibility were key components related to sexual

orientation that influenced their teacher identities, and being student-centred was critical to the way many of them identified as teachers (ibid).

Jackson (2004) also concluded that the more gay and lesbian teachers integrated their full selves into their teaching, the more student-centred their teaching became. Out of the nine U.S. school teachers interviewed who self-identified as gay or lesbian, those who were out at school reported being able to bring their whole selves into the classroom and thus transformed their teaching, students, and schools by creating a more open atmosphere that humanized gayness (ibid). Not surprisingly, the more a gay or lesbian teacher conformed to traditional gender norms, the less they were questioned about their sexual orientation. Support played a big role in the comfort these teachers felt in their schools, with the most important source of support being the school principal for most of them, though this tended to be a more tacit support since most principals offered only lukewarm support to their gay or lesbian teachers (ibid). Consequently, coming out in a school with an openly hostile principal was not an option for any of them (ibid). The four queer teachers interviewed by Tompkins *et al.* (2019) also mentioned feeling supported as educators when school leadership and climate were supportive. Six out of the ten gay and lesbian teachers from California that DeJean (2004) interviewed also considered administrative support a key factor in their ability to remain out in their classrooms. DeJean identified school leadership that actively values inclusion, honours diversity, and insists on a culture of respect can create a climate where gay and lesbian teachers are more able to teach from an authentic self-hood (ibid). Furthermore, supportive and encouraging administrators can alleviate some stress and isolation that teachers might feel when they are faced with negative responses (ibid).

Through interviews and focus groups of 14 teachers self-identifying as lesbian or gay in New

South Wales, Australia, and document analysis, Ferfolja and Hopkins (2013) also found that the experiences of these teachers largely depended on school micro-cultures: those schools with greater socio-cultural diversity and strong leadership against any form of discrimination offered a more supportive micro-culture, providing spaces for sexual diversity. Out teachers found themselves in these schools, where micro-cultures were open to diversity, supportive of sexual difference, and where other out teachers were happy to be open about their sexuality (ibid). Likewise, supportive and respectful straight colleagues were critical in creating positive work environments for these teachers (ibid). In contrast, in schools where the climate was intolerant, being out or visibly different was a risk (ibid). Moreover, teachers in religious-based schools feared dismissal or being overlooked for employment opportunities or promotions simply because of their sexuality; some were even threatened or suffered discrimination because of this (ibid).

This shows that not all school leaders or school climates are supportive or encouraging of queer teachers. Wright and Smith (2015) point out that homophobic comments from all school members - students, teachers, families - are still heard frequently in schools around the U.S., pointing to a lack of intervention by teachers and administrators when they are made. Similar results were found in Peru by PROMSEX (2016): all types of aggression - verbal, physical harassment, assault - in schools occur mostly due to discrimination based on LGBT students' sexual orientation; few cases of school staff intervening to stop homo or transphobic comments were reported by students; and few students feel comfortable talking to their principal or vice principal about LGBT issues. Examining the impact of school climate on LGB teachers in public schools in New Jersey through an online survey, Burns (2017) found a prevalence of negative school climate indicators, including a high frequency of homophobic issues, with reports of multiple examples of homophobic discrimination by school administrators. For two

participants, the extreme homophobic climate of their schools eventually led them to resign (ibid). The ten gay and lesbian teachers from across the U.S. that Dykes and Delpont (2018) interviewed also experienced implicit and explicit bullying from their school administrators and staff, with some administrators encouraging a ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy regarding their sexualities and others telling them directly not to talk about their sexuality or hide it (ibid). This situation was experienced by Gray (2014) who was instructed by her headteacher at the school she was working at in Birmingham to keep quiet about her sexuality and never mention it to her students.

IV. Summary

The current global education reform movement is a complex network of various actors influencing education policies around the world (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016), promoting market-based solutions and alternatives and, in the process, transforming the meanings and practices of education (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013) while establishing new forms of control and regulations (Ball, 2003). The TFA network has become a key player in this movement, exporting the teacher-training model of Teach for America to nearly 40 countries around the world (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016), including Peru, and contributing to the production of a new teacher persona anchored within the logic of performativity (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013). This is having profound implications on teaching identity, greatly limiting the type of teacher representations valued by the global education reform movement (Ball, 2003) and society. This global reform movement is also resulting in school leaders being viewed as managers responsible with instilling an attitude and culture that makes teachers feel accountable, committed, and personally invested in teaching, thus acting as ‘technicians of behaviour’ (Ball, 2003). Therefore, school leaders are faced with conflicting roles (Devos & Bouckenooghe,

2009): manage schools to produce tangible results and create school cultures based on respect, mutual collaboration, and diversity recognition (Ministerio de Educación, 2014) that also anchor teachers to them. These conflicting pressures influence how school leaders value and interact with their teachers and the types of school cultures that emerge under their leadership.

Schools themselves are not sexually neutral entities but actually institutionalise binary gender practices and heteronormativity (Connell, 2015; Dunnell, 2017), organising social relations around both (Kehily, 2002). This is not surprising since they function within a heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990), forcing queer teachers to carefully navigate the visibility of their sexual orientations (Richard, 2016) in these settings of explicit, endemic homophobia (Connell, 2015; Epstein *et al.*, 2003) while constructing at the same time their teaching identity, which involves weaving various subjectivities and understandings of the self (Alsup, 2006) together with external factors of the school (Schempp *et al.*, 1999); a balancing act between personal and interpersonal dynamics subject to wider sociocultural and political pressures (McLean, 1999). Queer teachers' sexuality cannot be separated from the rest of their identity (Wilson, 1996), including their emerging teacher identity, though some in society would prefer they keep their hyper-visible bodies outside of schools (DePalma & Atkinson, 2006) or not teach at all. Queer teachers are thus faced with three options: weave together their sexual and professional identities, split them, or quit the profession altogether (Connell, 2015). Though some in urban schools do come out to their colleagues, they continue to present as heterosexual in their classrooms (Lee, 2019). Those in rural areas are exposed to greater surveillance and thus do not disclose their sexuality to their communities (*ibid*) while those in religious-based schools live in constant fear of losing their jobs because of their sexualities (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013).

Studies show that supportive and respectful heterosexual colleagues are key in creating positive

work environments for queer teachers though their experiences are largely dependent on the school micro-cultures they encounter (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013), which in turn influence their teaching identities (McAdoo, 2015). Those school cultures led by supportive and encouraging administrators can alleviate some stress and isolation felt by queer teachers (DeJean, 2004), increasing their feelings of protection, comfort, and happiness at work (Jinright, 2019). This proves that the support of school leaders plays a big role in making queer teachers feel comfortable enough to disclose their sexualities in their schools, helping them create more open cultures in their classrooms and schools and empowering them to transform their teaching, their students, and their schools (Jackson, 2004) since they are able to teach from an authentic selfhood when they inhabit school cultures based on respect, inclusion, and diversity (DeJean, 2004).

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the questions that drove the research forward; the philosophical underpinnings that led me to a specific research design to answer those questions; a brief reflexivity about my positioning as a queer educator who completed the Enseña Peru programme; the instrument used to collect empirical data; the sampling methods used to identify potential participants and an introduction to the participants of the study; the data collection and analysis processes that were carried out; ethical considerations regarding the research process; and limitations of the study itself.

I. Research Questions

As the previous chapter demonstrated, the majority of studies investigating queer teachers, school cultures, and the school leaders who impact them have been carried out in the U.S. with a few in the U.K. and Australia. This concentration of research in the English-speaking global north validated my initial plan to study the experiences of queer Peruvian teachers. However, the opportunity emerged to compare their experiences to those of queer teachers in the U.K. who had completed the same teacher training programme and thus my research scope expanded. As such, the purpose of this research evolved to explore and compare the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers and their relations with their educational leaders, with the main research questions guiding the research being:

1. What were the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers?
2. How did the sexual identities of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers impact

their relations with their educational leaders?

3. What comparisons can be made between the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers?

II. Philosophical Underpinnings & Reflexivity

The desire to explore and compare the lived experiences of individuals - queer teachers in this case - led me to design a qualitative study based on a narrative, phenomenological, and interpretive approach, grounded on social constructivism and post-positivism. Social constructivism views reality as socially constructed and given meaning by people, thus research based on this view focuses on the ways people make sense of the world through shared experiences (Easterby-Smith *et al.*, 2008). Similarly, post-positivism views the world as multilayered, tolerating multiple interpretations since multiple external realities coexist together with an objective reality (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). This is closely related to phenomenological and interpretive research approaches: the former takes experience related by participants at face value and views behaviour as determined by experience, establishing the meaning of things through explanation, while the latter is concerned with investigating the individual and understanding that individual's subjective world of the human experience (*ibid*), ie how they think and perceive the world (Coleman, 2012). Narrative enquiry is also suited for studying the perceived, subjective experiences of individuals or groups of individuals (Floyd, 2012). These approaches are qualitative in their nature, helping give voice to participants and allowing a researcher to probe issues underneath the surface of human behaviour and actions (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). Though critics argue these studies result in low credibility due to the subjective opinions of participants (Easterby-Smith *et al.*, 2008), qualitative inquiry searches for understanding and interpretations rather than facts and measurements (Watling *et al.*, 2012)

about the lived experiences of individuals. However, since humans live in a social world, the power of external and structural forces that might influence their behaviours and events have to be taken into consideration; failing to do so is one of the limitations of a purely interpretive research (Cohen *et al.*, 2011).

One school of thought that enables a researcher to challenge structural forces, and which has informed my thinking as a researcher throughout this process, is queer theory, which views the production of normalisation efforts as a problem of culture and thought (Britzman, 1995). It argues networks of power, which are discursively embodied and disciplined by normative educational practices, depend on stable, predictable identities that can be contained (*ibid*), thus it seeks to explore gender and sexuality and their mediation by various forms of oppression (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). Queer inquiry, therefore, is not value-free; objectivity here is about specific embodied beliefs and values situating knowledge in cultural contexts with identified underlying structures and power relations (Gardner Honeychurch, 1996). Carrying out this study from the position of a queer educator, I understand that I cannot escape the implications of my own sexuality nor the heterosexual pressures of the educational institutions I attended and the cultures I grew up in (*ibid*); on the contrary, my sexuality and experiences as a queer student and educator are the driving force of this inquiry. As such, I cannot be fully detached from nor lie outside the research process (Kumashiro, 2002), especially since I myself am a graduate of the Enseña Peru programme and identify as a gay man. Therefore, the theories that apply to my participants also apply to me as the researcher (Easterby-Smith *et al.*, 2008), allowing me to expand my own personal understanding and identification as a queer educator. And while I recognise my own experience as an Enseña Peru teacher greatly impacted my personal development and set me on the professional path I find myself in now, I have no interest in portraying the organisation nor the Teach for All network in a particularly positive

or negative light: I simply want to transmit as best as possible the experiences of other queer individuals who also went through the same teacher training programme and placement as myself.

III. Instrument

In order to obtain the lived experiences of queer Enseña Peru and Teach First teachers, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were used. In-depth interviews explore issues and attitudes, opinions, and emotions of participants regarding issues, which is why they are useful in obtaining data from marginalised and stigmatised populations (Cohen *et al.*, 2011) such as queer individuals. Using open-ended questions, which allow the researcher to probe more and help establish rapport with participants, these interviews tend to be semi-structured in order for the answers given by participants to dictate the direction of the interview (*ibid*). In semi-structured interviews, prompts are used to clarify topics and questions respondents might have due to misunderstandings or lack of understanding, while probes are used by the researcher to ask respondents to elaborate or clarify answers (*ibid*). Some probes used throughout the interviews of this study were pausing for respondents to say more, repeating phrases or ideas said by them, and summarising their answers (*ibid*). Though the exact sequence and wording of questions do not need to be followed with each participant in semi-structured interviews (*ibid*) and answers may vary in detail and length, the same issues must be raised in each interview (Coleman, 2012), which I attempted to accomplish.

The sequence of questions used in the semi-structured interviews followed a funnel strategy, moving from general and non-specific questions to more specific questions as the interview progressed, as well as presenting easier, less personal questions earlier in the interview to ease

participants into the interview itself (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). Questions were arranged into the themes explored in the literature review: personal and sexual identity, teaching identity or experience, school or organisational cultures and their leaders, and the intersections of them all. Interview questions were developed after carefully reviewing the questions used in the following studies: Burns (2017), Chavez (2014), Dunnell (2017), Evans-Santiago (2015), Hooker (2010), Jinright (2019), Kootsikas (2011), and McAdoo (2015). The list of questions used in the interviews are found in the Appendices.

IV. Sampling & Participants

Since this study sought to explore and compare the experiences of queer teachers who completed the Teach First and Enseña Peru programmes in the UK and Peru, respectively, purposive sampling (Cohen *et al.*, 2011; Coleman, 2012) was used in order to identify participants. The queer Enseña Peru participants are either close friends or acquaintances of mine. Though this could be considered convenience sampling - argued to be the least satisfactory sampling technique (Coleman, 2012) - it granted me a stronger level of trust and rapport with them to discuss the questions even before interviews were conducted. The Teach First participants were identified through networking (Cohen *et al.*, 2011): I was introduced to a queer graduate from the Teach First programme by another Enseña Peru graduate while studying in London, and this queer Teach First graduate agreed to help me find queer Teach First participants for the study. I shared a short message about my study with him and he proceeded to post it on a Facebook group for queer Teach First alums, asking for people interested in participating in the study to contact him. He then put those interested people in touch with me through an introductory message via email. I sent the same Approach / Recruitment Email to all potential participants - in English to those from Teach First, in Spanish

to those from Enseña Peru - indicating the purpose of my study and what their participation in it would entail.

Four queer Enseña Peru graduates and four queer Teach First graduates were contacted and agreed to participate. All of them were teachers in the past but were not actively working as teachers at the time of their interviews in accordance with UCL guidance regarding empirical data collection in light of Covid-19. The Enseña Peru participants taught between 2012 and 2015 while the Teach First participants between 2014 and 2019. All participants were assigned pseudonyms to protect their identities. They are briefly introduced here:

Name	Age	Gender	Teaching History at EP	Sexuality and Disclosure
Graciela	31	Female	Taught Spanish, General Culture, and English to students from 1 st to 5 th years of Secondary (ages 11-17) in a school belonging to a Catholic School Network in Pachacutec, Callao. ¹	Bisexual but was “exclusively lesbian” between ages of 16 and 30. Discloses her sexuality with work colleagues and friends if asked and sufficient level of trust exists.
Marita	31	Female	Taught Math, English, and Person, Family and Human Relations to students in 2 nd , 4 th , and 5 th years of Secondary (ages 12-17) in a school belonging to a Catholic School Network in Ventanilla, Callao. ²	Bisexual. Can talk about her sexuality openly with people but is careful in some scenarios like her current job at a school: all the administrative team knows except for an older woman who is “super religious”, the same reason why she has not told teachers or families.

¹ Pachacutec is the largest squatter settlement in Peru, located in the Ventanilla district of the Callao region. It lies between the Pacific Ocean and the capital city of Lima.

² Graciela and Juan taught in different schools of the same Catholic School Network; Marita taught at a school belonging to a different Catholic School Network.

Jorge	28	Male	Taught all subjects to students from 3 rd and 4 th grade (Primary) together at the same time in one classroom at a rural school in Orcopampa, Arequipa. ³	“Fag”. ⁴ Believes everyone who interacts with him knows about his sexual identity, including at his current work in an education organisation. Does not disclose his sexuality in spaces where he needs protection from potential bullying.
Juan	30	Male	Taught Math and P.E. to students from 1 st to 3 rd years of Secondary in a school belonging to a Catholic School Network in Callao.	Homosexual. Is very open at work about his sexual identity: all his work colleagues know about his male partner.

Table 2: Teach First (TF) Participants

Name	Age	Gender	Teaching History at TF	Sexuality and Disclosure
Dianne	30	Female	Taught Arts, Crafts, Design, and Design and Technology to students in Years 7 to 13 in a comprehensive, female-only academy in London.	Uses gay, lesbian, or queer to describe her sexuality depending on who she is talking to and what will make sense to them. Is “consistently out” unless in physical danger.
Roxanne	26	Female	Taught Math to students in Years 7 to 10 at a comprehensive school in Northeast England.	Bisexual. Discloses her sexual identity with people if they ask but does not make a “big deal” out of it because she is married to a man.
Ibrahim	45	Male	Taught Spanish and French to students in Years 7 to 11 in an Academy in London.	Gay. Does not “go around” telling people about his sexual identity. If talking about his personal life to someone, he will mention his partner; five or ten years ago he would have “certainly” been more open.

³ Orcopampa is a district of the Arequipa region, located in the Southern Peruvian Andes.

⁴ Jorge self-identified as “marica” in Spanish, which I translated to “fag” in English. Like “fag”, “marica” has a derogatory history but it is being reclaimed by many queer individuals in the Spanish-speaking world.

Paul	26	Male	Taught Spanish and French to students in Years 7 to 11 at an Academy in London.	Gay. His Sexual identity is not a secret: all his friends and family know, as does everyone at his current job.
-------------	----	------	---	---

Table 3: All Participants

Name	Reason(s) for joining TFA organisation
Graciela	Was “brutally unhappy” at her previous company, where she related the limited professional opportunities in life of low-skill employees at the company to their schooling and thus wanted to see what could be done at that level.
Marita	Working at an investment fund, she realised she wanted to veer towards social issues with a specific education focus and needed to get immersed in the issue because she knew nothing about it. Talked to people who completed the programme, believed it aligned with her expectations of wanting to do something to change the reality of Peru and have the opportunity to change other people’s lives who were less fortunate than her in educational terms.
Jorge	Needed to leave his hometown, where “70%” of his body was in the closet and his family “represented figures” he did not like. Became interested in education at university: participated in volunteer projects interacting with children, visiting rural communities. EP seemed like the perfect combination: get as far away as possible from his hometown and learn about education and the rural side of Peru.
Juan	Was very antisocial, wanted to change that, and thought EP was a good opportunity; and wanted other kids to “avoid suffering bullying” like he had at school because of his cleft lip: teachers never paid attention to him or asked him how he was because he was calm and had passing grades, thus he was “made invisible” and did not want other students like him to go through a similar experience.
Dianne	Knew she wanted to work in education “long before” applying to TF, was going to be difficult being a queer teacher in Ireland in 2014 (was still legal to fire teachers for being gay); TF was “straight-forward, organised way” to begin teaching though in a different country but with a language she spoke fluently. Economic reasons were also a factor: work opportunities were “very slim” in Ireland after the 2008 recession. An activist in Dublin for social justice and equality, the values espoused by TF - educational equality, opportunities for all - were more appealing than other graduate programmes.
Roxanne	Originally wanted to work in politics but after completing an internship in Westminster, did not want to live in London. Attended a TF meeting, was really interested by social justice message which aligned with her values and working with underprivileged kids. Possibility of leaving after two years with “no hard feelings” and teaching qualification (paid for) sealed the deal.

Ibrahim	Worked several years in corporate learning and development, enjoyed graduate programmes he designed and delivered, felt they made a difference in young people's lives; volunteered teaching Math at friend's non-profit, enjoyed the feeling of teaching children, received positive feedback from experienced teachers who observed him. Explored different routes into teaching, TF was "quickest" to "get the ball rolling" compared to university programmes, seemed very well organised, gave him "very positive" initial impression.
Paul	Considered being a teacher, always wanted to explore it. Enjoyed Spanish degree at university, realised he really enjoyed teaching languages and was good at it. Wanted to make a difference, joined TF and not traditional PGCE route in part because if he no longer wanted to teach, it would be less challenging to transition out after two years than if doing a traditional professional qualification programme.

V. Data Collection

Due to the outbreak of Covid-19 and the social lockdowns imposed both in the U.K. and Peru, in-person interviews were not carried out. All interviews were conducted through Zoom between April and June 2020. Interviews were scheduled to last between 60 and 90 minutes. The shortest interview lasted approximately 45 minutes while the longest lasted almost 90; all other interviews lasted between 55 and 75 minutes. All interviews were audio recorded on the Zoom platform as well as on my mobile phone for backup precautions. All interviews began with my reading of a Protocol which reminded participants of the purpose of the study and of their voluntary agreement to participate in the study.

VI. Data Analysis

All interviews were transcribed in their original language by me. This was done because transcripts provide important detail and accurate verbatim responses of participants, though they also omit non-verbal cues (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). The transcripts of the four interviews conducted in Spanish were then translated to English by me as well. I strove to employ accurate

translation rather than literal or direct translation in order to convey the true meaning of the phrases exchanged with the participants. As such, the words presented in the findings of these four participants are reflective about the answers they offered. Verbatim quotes from all participants are prominently featured in the Findings chapter since they offer a direct contact between them and the reader (Watling *et al.*, 2012), adding a dimension of realism, authenticity, and emotion to the study (Cohen *et al.*, 2011).

Data analysis was initially carried out by groups and issues or themes and later by research question. Analysing data by groups is common in single-instrument approaches, like this study, allowing for themes, patterns, and similarities to be seen at a glance; this is also a feature of data analysis by issues or themes, which were selected by me before data collection began (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). However, both run the risk of losing the integrity and coherence of individual responses, while issue or theme data analysis may decontextualise data by fragmenting it into discrete chunks and locating it somewhere different in the overall content of the interview (*ibid*). Nevertheless, the Analysis chapter analyses the responses provided by the participants, drawing on the theories explored in the Literature Review in order to interpret and understand their experiences in relation to national, social, and political contexts (Floyd, 2012). Analysis by research question enables relevant data to be drawn together around a precise issue, preserving the coherence of the material and returning the reader to the driving concerns of the research by closing the loop on those questions presented earlier in the study (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). This is carried out in the Conclusions and Recommendations chapter.

VII. Ethics

I followed the British Educational Research Association's Ethical Guidelines for Educational

Research (BERA, 2018) throughout the research project and acknowledged that the sampling and recruitment of half of the participants could raise ethical concerns due to my close relations with them. This proximity could potentially jeopardize my objectivity in obtaining information from them and analysing it; lead me to coerce specific answers from them and fail to collect their true insights; and impact my personal relationships with them. Though valid concerns, I believe this proximity to these four participants was an asset because a good level of trust and confidence already existed between them and me, which are key elements in educational research. To ensure objectivity and professionalism during the data collection process, I recorded every interview in audio format, enabling me to verify that I was asking the same questions to all participants and behaving as an educational researcher at all times. The interview transcripts were also shared with all participants for them to ensure that they captured their comments and views accurately.

Due to the sensitive nature of the study, I acknowledged that participants could experience some discomfort when retelling negative experiences related to their personal or sexual identities. To minimize any potential discomfort, all participants received the list of questions in advance of their interviews and were reminded that they could refuse to answer any question at any moment of the interview for any reason as well as withdraw from participating in the study at any moment without penalty and without affecting their relationship with me. To ensure that participants did not feel coerced to participate in the study, especially if they did not want to talk about their sexual identities, the Approach / Recruitment email sent to them stated they should not feel obligated to participate and that a negative response from them would not influence their relationship with me in a negative way. All participants also received an electronic version of an Informed Consent Form which they had to read, sign, and return to me electronically before the start of their interview. This form outlined the purpose, procedures,

reporting and dissemination, potential risks and discomfort, and potential benefits of the study. Both the Approach / Recruitment Email and the Informed Consent Form can be found in the Appendices. All participants were also assigned pseudonyms in order to protect their identity, while the background information shared about them earlier in this section was done in such a way to protect their individual identities as much as possible, though complete anonymity and confidentiality cannot be guaranteed to all participants. These measures and documents were part of my ethical approach to this research, which received institutional approval from UCL's Institute of Education.

VIII. Limitations

While questions were shared with all participants prior to their interviews in order to reduce potential discomfort, this could have limited both the spontaneity and truthfulness of their answers since they may have prepared their answers in such a way to avoid uncomfortable feelings or emotions when interacting with me or by providing answers that could present them in a better light. They might have also prepared or offered answers that they thought I was hoping to hear as opposed to sharing their honest opinions and recollections. Like most qualitative studies, participants were asked to recollect experiences lived in the past. The recollection of past events is selective and produced from the present perspective of the respondent, thus the significance and meaning of an event described in the present by my participants may have differed from its effect on them at the original time of the experience (Polkinghorne, 1995). Furthermore, qualitative interviewing does not aim to generalise other than to the particular group interviewed (Coleman, 2012), and so generalisations cannot be made from the results that emerge in this study.

FINDINGS

The findings are presented along the three main themes explored in the Literature Review: the school and TFA cultures experienced by the eight participants first, together with the leaders they encountered, followed by the navigation of their sexual identities as queer TFA teachers. Though TFA organisations are not schools, they were the gateways to the schools where these eight participants taught and the teacher training centres for them, thus they acted as educational institutions in a similar vein to schools. Participants remained connected to their TFA organisations throughout their two year placements and therefore navigated the cultures of both their schools and TFA organisations, which is why the findings are presented separately between the TFA cultures and their leaders first and the school cultures and their leaders second.

I. TFA Cultures and Their Leaders

I. i. Overall

Roxanne and Paul described the overall culture of Teach First as “overwhelmingly positive” and “fantastic” because it made participants feel part of “some kind of social movement”, transforming “the way people think about education and the purpose of it”. It “felt like a very young environment” for Roxanne, where “similar outward confident, thoughtful groups of people” were hired. Paul also stated “you were surrounded by a specific type of person” at Teach First, where they “indoctrinated you” with “really strong values” at the Summer Institute and “you were definitely immersed in the culture and you believed it”, though “the culture that

the organisation pushes” is not how schools “work in practice”. Dianne felt Teach First was “a little bit culty [...] In terms of what they were trying to build and the kind of language that they used.” Ibrahim shared the following:

Ibrahim: I experienced quite significant amounts of racism and ageism [...] quite early on and when I brought it up I was told I need to go in a support plan, so that to me is institutional racism and actually enabling racism, so I find Teach First institutionally racist. And individuals within that as well.

Jorge described Enseña Peru’s culture as “nice” but also “a bit wrong” since “under the speech of adaptability and sense of possibility” it had “taken a lot of people to the limit many times”. Juan felt Enseña Peru’s culture was “open”, that “people weren’t judged” and “a sense of community” existed since the Summer Institute. Marita felt:

Marita: ... that I was in a sect where they wanted to brainwash me [...] I closed myself off and said, “this is not for me,” but [...] I didn’t [...] leave [...] there were things that were really cool that kept motivating me so I said, “the organisation is one thing, I am going to stick to my own thing.” I felt there was certain fanaticism by the participants and the heads [...] [a] religious issue [...] I think that at no moment, you sign on to [...] a religious organisation, it wasn’t part of what they had offered. To get there and immediately start talking about God [...] to me was like, “I can’t.”

Most participants believed their TFA leaders had significant roles in creating these cultures:

Paul: ... they were key [...] especially in the Summer Institute [...] you wouldn't speak to the CEO but he would [...] give a big speech about social justice, why it's important what you're doing.

Dianne: The leadership of Teach First [...] at [...] big group events [...] used very much a language of big social change and [...] movement.

Juan: ... the Summer Institute was key to generate that climate [...] [the Enseña Peru CEO] would always say that we had to have a sense of community [...] and [...] in his sessions [...] would challenge us and make us share negative experiences of our lives and while that [...] is a bit shocking, it made you empathize with the other person.

Marita: Definitely the head of Enseña at that moment was who gave this super religious touch [...] but it has remained over time [...] he made sure to have his little team and to this day, I meet with someone from Enseña and I see people with their scapular.

Graciela said the Enseña Peru leader was “super, ultra Christian” and “pulled” the organisation and its members towards his religious side; Jorge added the Enseña Peru CEO mentioned the “Holy Ghost” in his farewell speech.

I. ii. Towards Queer Issues and People

Paul considered Teach First's culture towards queer issues and people "hugely inclusive", pointing out "they march at Pride", which "makes you feel that you can be who you are and there are no issues" with that within the organisation. Roxanne "was aware that there was a support group" but felt it was not an issue "that was really mentioned." Dianne personally had "no issues" with Teach First as a queer person but "did know a trans teacher, further north" who "had an awful lot of trouble" getting support from Teach First. She believes:

Dianne: Teach First were pro-LGBT in the extent that the law requires them to, and in the extent that they would like to have good pictures to put on their social media at Pride but I didn't feel that they set themselves apart.

Ibrahim tried to attend a meeting for queer participants at the Summer Institute but was not let in:

Ibrahim: ... they assumed [...] somebody of my appearance must be lost [...] they had to change the room for some reason, and they went round and told everybody except me [...] They just completely ignored me [...] as an older man who isn't white, you get a certain reaction, particularly because [...] I'd grown a beard, people make lots of assumptions, and it doesn't even occur to an awful lot of people that I could actually be gay, people assume I'm homophobic.

Juan thought Enseña Peru was "apparently open" towards queer issues and people since there was "no attempt to impose the thinking of the heads". Marita thinks the issue was not talked

about. Jorge said “zero policies” existed at Enseña Peru regarding “sexual diversity and gender”, thus while it was a “correct climate, better than many other organisations,” it did not grant safety to those who “didn’t fit the standard of normality of the educational system.”

Graciela shared an experience at a leadership workshop midway through her second year that encapsulated her view regarding this issue. A close friend of hers, who was HIV+, had recently passed away:

Graciela: I was angry with the world [...] I said [...] “all of you are hypocrites because you [...] say you’re interested in the LGTBI issue but you do absolutely nothing about it” [...] two people came out of the closet, two men [...] that was beautiful, but [...] in a break [...] [Enseña Peru Colleague] approaches me [...] “Graciela, listen to me, God doesn’t like what you do”. Are you fucking kidding me? [...] I was livid [...] after that [...] a lot of things exploded, factions were also formed [...] of pro-LGTB people and really Catholic people, deeply believing in Catholicism that came up to me after saying, “Graciela, I believe in God profoundly, I am deeply Catholic but, I think God is love and if you are happy and you give love then I have no reason to say that God doesn’t like what you do because something interpreted in the Bible says so” [...] this was a key moment for me to understand in what space I found myself. I felt brutally safe [...] and then [...] not [...] I coexist with people who think that being lesbian, gay, bisexual is the worst.

II. School Cultures and their Leaders

II. i. Overall

Paul's school was "very chaotic" and people within management did not "get on very well", which did not benefit school cohesion. The vice principal was "largely" in charge of "driving the culture" but attempted to transpose a "quite liberal" culture onto the school rather than cultivating and growing it from within. Paul "had quite good relationships" with senior leadership - they listened to and respected him though he "didn't really suggest very much" - and shared the following regarding his boss:

Paul: ... she had a whole twitter account which was discovered where she had been criticizing Teach First [...] the school [...] staff [...] there were some personal comments about me [...] I needed to survive, so I [...] brushed it over [...] we had a positive, professional relationship ... from my end [...] as someone who is kind of underneath someone [...] you are in a vulnerable position [...] you have to be careful about what you say back.

Ibrahim encountered in-fighting in his department which did not involve him but was eventually dragged into it. He felt "completely ignored" by his school leader "most of the time" but had "positive relations" with other senior leaders, acknowledging "lots of great things" in his school including "some amazing teachers" though there was a "high turnover of staff". The school culture "came entirely from the head", and though he had minimal contact with the trust, he believed the culture "obviously" reflected on them.

Roxane's "difficult" school culture was the vision of her school leader, a former OFSTED inspector:

Roxanne: It felt like a very stressful place to work. We were kept an eye on a lot. I had to write an individualised lesson plan for every lesson that I ever taught [...] keep a big folder of information of all of my kids that was inspected monthly by my head of department. There was a very high turnover of staff because you felt like somebody was breathing down your neck all the time.

Dianne's school culture was "very high-pressured, very competitive" with "quite a lot of fear". It felt "like a more stressful working environment than was necessarily essential to deliver education." The source of this was:

Dianne: OFSTED? That sense that everybody from teachers to the Board of Governors are terrified of an inspection? But in a much more practical level, I think people were really stressed all the time that someone would come in, observe their lesson, decide they're a rubbish teacher, and then their lives would become hell, as part of the [...] corrective steps that go in when somebody decides your teaching isn't adequate based on a 20-minute visit to your classroom.

Dianne's school's leadership was new at her school, thus she believes they had "something to prove", especially since five principals had come and gone the previous year, and that the "attitude of the academy chain" managing her academy also influenced her school's culture.

Marita felt “super comfortable” at her school since her school leader and teachers “were very open to the proposals” she and her Enseña Peru colleague presented. She felt:

Marita: ... a special mystique [...] not that religious mystique [...] but [...] certain values, a [...] more ‘progressive’ view of education [...] all the time.

Her principal had a strong role in creating this culture since she did not try to “impose her religious view” on any school member.

Juan’s school culture was “neutral”. He proposed two ideas to benefit his students - teaching classes after school hours and organising a math project with students from a school for the blind - but his vice principal said both were “not possible” since they “would only” benefit one classroom and implied a lot of work from the school. Had they been accepted, he would have been stimulated to create more. His leadership team “were merely decorations on the wall, or I was to them”:

Juan: The principal didn’t know what to do [...] she was only present when she saw something that in her eyes was not right [...] she was absent, totally. The vice principal was much more present [...] more with the teachers of [the Catholic School Network] [...] when I was going to talk, she left [...] she would always cut me off.

Graciela’s school culture was “very aggressive” and “jail-like”: male students had to shave

their heads and female students forced to wear “an extremely tight hair bun”; students were forbidden from “running in the hallways”; teachers had to wear a uniform and “arrive at 7:45” even though they did not teach classes; there was “no respect” for other religions; “questioning” was not allowed. Her school leader “encouraged that space”, resulting in a “lack of motivation” in Graciela regarding her interactions with her school leader, which were “very tense”:

Graciela: They said [...] the previous principal did have a greater level of openness [...] there were more free spaces [...] students didn't necessarily have to shave their heads [...] a different world [...] it seems the reason why he left was because she [...] had another boss who was [the Priest Director of the Catholic School Network] who liked that stance. Much more vertical, who saw this previous principal as very flimsy [...] I don't know if she is naturally like that but she had the pressure to be that way [...] because of this other boss.

Graciela recognised her school leader had “few resources” and could benefit from “more training” and a “wider view of what school means”.

Jorge's school culture was “hostile” and his school leader was “totally” responsible for it:

Jorge: The principal didn't treat us well [...] I remember [...] presenting projects to him and [him] moving the project aside and telling me, “you all are not going to do more than us” [...] or pulling me out of the

classroom when people from the UGEL⁵ came so he could go into my classroom and they wouldn't be able to grade me [...] a person [...] from the UGEL [...] saw my class, liked it, and then we gathered with everyone from Enseña [...] she said, "they've told me that at your school this, this, and this happen", and I started to cry, and I couldn't tell her anything else.

Jorge identified his school leader's training as a possible reason for the way he treated him and his fellow Enseña Peru colleagues.

II. ii. Towards Queer Issues and People

Roxanne's school culture towards queer issues and people at first "seemed non-existent" mostly because she was "so overwhelmed with everything" she had to "learn how to do" in her first year. Her second year, she learned a member of the senior leadership team "was a lesbian" and "married to a woman", which staff members knew but not necessarily students. A queer allies group was set up by a straight student and she and the lesbian senior leader sat in on their meetings.

At Paul's school, "at least" five staff members were queer, including the deputy principal - a lesbian - and "another gay gentleman" on senior leadership. A Pride club existed but "it wasn't publicised"; during Pride Month, "LGBT flags" were painted and Stonewall posters saying "some people are gay, get over it" were put up; however, Paul felt "LGBT issues" overall were considered risky and it "didn't seem a highly safe environment" for queer people because:

⁵ *Unidad de Gestión Educativa Local*: Local Education Management Office of the Ministry of Education.

Paul: ... there was still a lot of casual homophobia, and it didn't help that staff members knew that certain members of staff were homophobic.

Ibrahim's school culture towards queer issues and people was "very positive". He "very rarely" heard negative comments about queer people in his classes which "surprised" him since he expected to hear "much more." One senior management member was gay and:

Ibrahim: ... when you walked in through the entrance [...] the first thing you saw [...] was this big [...] display board that said "LGBTQI+" [...] next to his office [...] he was in charge of that and he made sure it was regularly updated and always encouraged the kids to [...] provide information to put on that board.

This board gave Ibrahim "a little bit of confidence" every day.

Dianne's school "had quite a lot" of queer teachers but only four were out and they "protected" each other. Her school was "neutral" towards queer issues and people; she was not "sure that they loved it" but affirmed "no one was going to challenge" the out teachers because they "were all very good teachers" who would be "quite difficult to replace". The school leader "was probably strongly supportive" of them, which "defended" them "lower down", and allowed Dianne to take a day off her first year to fly to Ireland and vote on the Marriage Equality Referendum. However, she was told by one student that her mom did not think she should be allowed to teach in the school because she was a lesbian.

All four Enseña Peru participants stated their schools were not open to queer issues or people: they were never mentioned or simply non-existent. Juan believed this was due to a “super super conservative thinking” where “nothing” could lie outside “their standards, their mental scheme.” Two stories explain this:

Juan: ... it was recess, there were two little kids from 3rd or 4th grade [...] they were little boys, they were hugging each other. A scandalised teacher came and said, “no no no no no! Between you, you can’t hug! Men don’t hug!” [...] this same teacher said in a teachers’ meeting that he had found two girls in a toilet, together, and that we had to be very vigilant, that that could not happen, he never said they were in a relationship or that they could be lesbians, but he was referring to that.

III. Navigating Queer Identities as TFA Teachers

Ibrahim was not out to his students - he “didn’t talk” about his personal life to them - while “a few” of the teachers he socialised with knew since it “came up in conversation”. He believed his race or religion became his “overriding identity” for most people:

Ibrahim: ... it was often assumed that someone of my appearance [...] when we were talking about things [...] like LGBT History Month [...] would reject it somehow.

Roxanne did not disclose her bisexuality with her students: she did not want to expose herself

“to any added vulnerability” since “it was already difficult enough” being the new young teacher “without being the new young queer” teacher. Describing herself as “straight-passing”:

Roxanne: ... I was just going to go in and pretend to be straight unless it became an issue.

She did not disclose her sexuality to other colleagues either including the lesbian senior leader with whom she sat in on the queer allies group meetings; she was not “comfortable being vulnerable around her simply because of the way that she acted professionally.”

Paul’s sexuality “was never an issue” at his school and senior leadership made him feel “very comfortable” yet he was only out to his immediate colleagues in his department and other staff members depending on his relationship with them:

Paul: ... when you work in a school I think you protect yourself a lot more [...] certain members of staff [...] definitely didn’t know because I knew that they had prejudices, so [...] to protect myself and [...] be professional [...] I didn’t tell any of the children, it was a bit of managing the trust of, “who do I know that I can tell that will not really tell anyone” [...] and how do I [...] protect myself from any [...] leakage, because in my general life I’m very out but with children [...] you don’t want the children to perceive you in a specific way or treat you differently [...] as a teacher [...] a lot of the time you [...] want to separate your personality and who you are from the personality and who you are that you present to the children [...] a way of self-preservation.

His sexual identity impacted him in the following ways:

Paul: ... you didn't always feel like you could be yourself [...] But [...] if I were a straight teacher, would I talk about my family and my relationships with [my students]? Probably not. There's a professional boundary that comes into teaching [...] I would say it helped a lot [...] in terms of having a lot more empathy and a lot more open-mindedness.

Dianne was out to her entire school community but not by her own accord: she was asked by a student she did not teach if she was a lesbian, to which she answered yes:

Dianne: ... had I been intimidated by that, or had my responses been "oh that's very private, you shouldn't ask me, my personal life has nothing to do with teaching", they would have seen weakness and probably my life would have been hell. But I think because I was so, "oh yes, thank you for asking, [...] how does that relate to the lesson plan?" They just [...] didn't know what to do next [...] And it was demonstrably not a weakness so they gave up [...] then I increasingly became ... the kind of face of [...] LGBT stuff [...] it became a positive thing [...] students in my classroom could be out, and nobody was gonna say anything, because no one was gonna try and take me on.

Dianne included artists working with "trans and intersex identities" in her art curriculum to "model a world" through her "everyday job" to her students.

Jorge and Graciela both came out to their cohorts at their Summer Institute and experienced “wonderful” receptions; Juan did so midway through his second year at an Enseña Peru workshop; Marita was still processing her sexuality at the time and only disclosed it to the cohort members she lived with.

Graciela “said nothing” at her school regarding her sexual identity because “it was brutally Catholic”, being afraid she would be fired. This fear was exacerbated her first year by a situation with a female student:

Graciela: ... she had a super dire vulnerable situation [...] a brutal learning gap [...] at the beginning I gave her a lot of attention because she needed it [...] then [...] she started to send me letters [...] “you’re my angel, you’re the person I love the most in this world” [...] if I had been heterosexual, this would have been, “OK, we’ll see how we handle it”, but because I was homosexual at that time, I felt in danger [...] if I didn’t push her away completely [...] it could be misinterpreted [...] I felt completely in danger. I think if it would have been a boy, I would have handled it differently. [...] I felt, “they’re gonna start investigating my life and they’re going to realise that I have a girlfriend, so everything can be misinterpreted”, so I panicked.

She feared her principal would misinterpret the situation and claimed an “internalised homophobia” led her to protect and distance herself as much as possible from this female student. Her second year, she organised a debate about a Civil Union proposal for same-sex

couples introduced in the Peruvian Congress in three of her classes because she sensed a lot of homophobia among her students and felt empowered to tackle queer issues with them after attending a Teach for All conference in India, though the debate was “very tense” and emotionally “draining” for her.

Jorge and Juan never disclosed their sexual identities with their school principals or students. Juan had “no reason” to talk about his personal life but tried to transmit his position regarding queer issues and people to students and teachers at his school. However, being in the closet took a toll on him:

Juan: It didn’t allow me to be freer [...] when one is in the closet, you always feel that something is missing, that you can’t bond genuinely with people, because you’re not sharing something that is very important for you, and that happened to me at the school.

Had he disclosed his sexuality to his students, he believes he could have changed “their thinking” about queer people.

Though Jorge believes his sexual identity made him “be more attuned to students who might be feeling like” he did as a student, he “had to pretend” he was heterosexual at his school “with all” his strengths. This wore him out and he experienced “a lot of anxiety”:

Jorge: I have no doubt that if people knew I were gay, they would have thrown rocks at the house and they would have taken me out of the community [...] I lived with the person I dated at that moment, who was another

[Enseña Peru teacher] [...] we had to develop certain mechanisms for people not to realise [...] I had to be very careful [...] even [...] the way I touched the students.

Marita thinks some people at her school could have wondered about her sexuality since she stayed after hours playing football with the male teachers but was never asked about it. If she ever considered disclosing her sexuality with her students:

Marita: ... it's enough for one of them to share it in their homes and tell it like something anecdotal or [...] gossip [...] and parents are gonna eat me alive, so I said, "no way".

She told a "super close group" of students "right after" leaving the school "to avoid" negative repercussions. If she were teaching today and felt her school was a safe space, with a school leader who "talks openly about the issue and sees it as something normal" and would be on her side if any confrontation, particularly with parents, would emerge, she would "probably" disclose her sexuality with her students.

ANALYSIS

I. Overall School and TFA Cultures and their Leaders

The TFA and school leaders described by the participants acted as ‘technicians of behaviour’ (Ball, 2003) to various degrees and effects. Though none of the Teach First participants had close interactions with senior leaders of the organisation mostly due to the size of the organisation, the specific language used in “big speeches” by those leaders about “social justice” and “educational movement” was meant to instil an attitude and culture in all participants that would make them feel personally committed to and invested in the organisation, which the manager in the current global education reform movement is tasked with doing (ibid). This was emphasized by the indoctrination of “really strong values” at the Summer Institute aimed to transform the views the participants had about education, immerse them in the culture of the organisation and believe it. The Enseña Peru leader attempted to do the same by urging participants to create a “sense of community” within their cohorts, making them share negative life experiences in order to empathize with each other. However, one noticeable difference existed between both leaders: the Enseña Peru CEO infused his speech with a religious discourse and mentions of God and the Holy Ghost, greatly influencing the culture of the organisation “to this day”. This made Marita feel uncomfortable in the organisation. Graciela claimed this religious discourse, which spread beyond the administration and into the teacher cohorts, caused groups and factions to emerge within the organisation. By imposing his religious views and values - which had not been advertised to Marita when she applied - on the organisation and its members, the Enseña Peru CEO negatively regulated and limited the experience of the organisation’s culture for Graciela and Marita (Ferfolja, 2007).

Marita felt the opposite in her school. Though part of a Catholic School Network and led by a religious woman, her school culture had a “special mystique” of values, not religion, and a great deal of openness and warmth from the principal and teachers to her, her proposals, and other religions. By not imposing her religious views or values in an invasive way (Ferfolja, 2007), Marita’s principal allowed her to feel more comfortable at her school than at Enseña Peru. Graciela asserted her principal encouraged the jail-like culture at her school, promoting rules and procedures that were regulating the bodies and minds of teachers and students (Alsup, 2006), thus she was acting as a ‘technician of behaviour’ (Ball, 2003) and creating, in Graciela’s eyes, a negative school culture (Dorcak, 2013). However, Graciela wondered if her principal was acting in such a manner to adhere to her boss’ wishes, performing a specific type of school leadership valued and demanded by him (Ball, 2003) resulting in a more vertical, controlled environment. Three of the Teach First participants were convinced their school leaders were responding to pressures from higher up, which influenced the “very high-pressured” and “stressful” school cultures they experienced: Ibrahim’s school culture came “entirely from the head” but also reflected the trust running his school; Dianne’s school leadership team had “something to prove”, hinting at a terror of performativity (ibid) towards their Academy chain and OFSTED; Roxanne’s school leader, a former OFSTED inspector, created the “difficult” school culture she encountered in order to meet external demands. These school leaders were acting as hyper-performative teaching subjects (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013), finding themselves under permanent surveillance and judgement pressures (Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016) by both individual superiors and organisations.

While Jorge placed all the responsibility of his “hostile” school culture on his school leader, he believed the way his school leader acted was a reflection of his training, pointing to both the

type and quality of education received by him in the past. As a former Minister of Education commented, Peru's education system is, or was, based on threats and sanctions (Oliart, 2011), which could help explain the behaviours carried out by Jorge's school leader towards him and his Enseña Peru colleagues: he could have been performing a role he had learned and thought he needed to portray, which involved controlling his teachers through his own forms of surveillance marked by threats and sanctions. Graciela also acknowledged her school leader possessed "few resources" and could benefit from having a "wider view" of education, which could allude to the transformed, narrower meanings that education has been infused with by the current global education reform movement (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013; Gautreaux & Delgado, 2016). Both Jorge's and Graciela's school leaders were going against the mandate of the Peruvian Ministry of Education since they were not creating school cultures based on respect and mutual collaboration (Ministerio de Educación, 2014), thus they were failing in their duty of ensuring school cultures that favour learning (Ministerio de Educación, 2012); they were concentrating on regulating and controlling the bodies and minds of their teachers and students (Ball, 2003; Alsup, 2006) as a result of overriding structural pressures beyond their control.

The control by leaders and relations of authority and power, domination and subordination in schools (Kehily, 2002) were evidenced by many participants. Paul's boss was discovered to have a secret Twitter account where she criticised him and Teach First but because he "needed to survive", he had to overlook that fact and build "a positive, professional relationship" with her from his end, acknowledging his "vulnerable position" by being "underneath" his boss in the school hierarchy and being "careful" about what he said at all times. Jorge had no choice but to leave his classroom whenever his principal told him to because he wanted to be evaluated and recognised by officials from the Ministry of Education. Juan was also forced to accept his vice principal's negative response regarding his initiatives that would have benefitted his

students and students from a blind school, which negatively impacted his motivation at work. These three school leaders asserted their power and domination over these three classroom teachers (ibid), impacting the views Paul, Jorge, and Juan had of them and their schooling cultures together with how these three queer teachers interacted with them.

II. Navigating Queer Identities as TFA Teachers in Schools and TFA organisations

All participants demonstrated their identities are negotiable (Jenkins, 2014), especially their sexual identities, and that their professional selves - their teaching identity - did not exist in isolation from their personal selves (Alsup, 2006) or sexual identity; both could not be separated (Wilson, 1996), though all attempted to keep them apart. Paul claimed that “as a teacher”, this was done as “a way of self-preservation” but also to “be professional”, alluding to the desire of not wanting to be viewed as ‘unprofessional’ by members of his school community due to his non-heterosexuality (Mizzi, 2016). He was striving to establish and maintain a delicate balance between his personal and professional life (Richard, 2016), carefully evaluating the personal information he shared about himself and who he shared it with. This shows that for most participants, their sexual and teaching identities were incompatible (Jinright, 2019) and thus, they tried to split them (Connell, 2015). Though they were all not teaching when interviewed, they cannot be categorised as quitters since they did not mention that they no longer teach as a result of the unsupportive schooling cultures they encountered (ibid) and, despite their many challenges, the four Teach First participants were eager to return to the classroom. Most participants acted as hyper-performative teaching subjects at all times (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013) not just in terms of teaching in the classroom, but in

passing or attempting to pass as straight teachers in front of their students, though all of them did disclose their sexualities to at least some colleagues either at their schools or in their TFA cohorts, mirroring Lee's (2019) findings of urban teachers in the U.K.

In this way, the teaching roles they personified fell within the pre-established boundaries of their schools in order for them to be accepted by their school communities (Schempp *et al.*, 1999), which assumed heterosexuality as the norm (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) and thus expected, and in some cases demanded, that they be cisgender heterosexual (Rosick, 2016) regardless of their context - rural/urban, Peru/the U.K. - proving that the choice of teacher representations available to them all had already been greatly constrained (Ball, 2003) by external forces. Jorge and Roxanne transmitted this clearly when they both stated they had to "pretend" to be hetero or straight in their schools. It was not difficult for Roxanne since she is "straight-passing" and, according to Jackson (2004), the more a queer teacher conforms to traditional gender norms - 'performs' as "straight-passing" - the less they are questioned about their sexual orientation. Jorge did not describe himself as "straight-passing" and thus had to "pretend" to be hetero with "all" his "strengths", demonstrating he had to give the performance of his life to conform to traditional gender norms in order for his sexual orientation not to be questioned by his rural school community (*ibid*). Both were permanently acting as hyper-performative teaching subjects (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013) not to be celebrated or rewarded for their roles as effective teachers (Ball, 2003), but simply to be able to teach without exposing themselves to "any added vulnerability" as a result of their students finding out about their sexual identity, which could be used against them in negative ways, or to being seen as dangerous by their community because of their homosexuality (DePalma & Atkinson, 2006). This relates to the moral sex panic of children and homosexuality (Connell, 2015) which was mentioned by Graciela and Jorge: Graciela "felt in danger" by the possibility of her principal

finding out about the student who was sending her letters and misinterpreting the situation, while Jorge “had to be very careful” with the way he touched his students. Though Graciela claimed an “internalised homophobia” moved her to protect and distance herself as much as possible from the female student, it was actually an internalised fear common to her and Jorge, and many queer teachers and individuals, resulting from the moral sex panic of children and homosexuality (ibid) that led them to believe they could be seen as sexual predators by their school communities, a view that some people have of queer teachers (Dunnell, 2017) and which seems to be prevalent in Peru, especially in rural areas (Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2013; Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2020). As such, Graciela and Jorge did not act out of a strong hatred or fear towards their sexualities but merely to ensure their survivals by protecting their jobs, professional careers, and physical integrity.

Teaching in a rural school, Jorge felt he was under a greater deal of surveillance by his rural community, which Lee (2019) also found among queer teachers in rural British schools. However, unlike Lee’s (ibid) findings, traditional and conservative norms were also felt by the other three Enseña Peru teachers in their peri-urban schools. Therefore, it is not surprising that the schools where all Enseña Peru participants taught were completely closed off to queer issues and people or commented about them in negative terms, and furthermore that these four participants did not disclose their sexual identities within their school communities. The male teacher at Juan’s school transmitted the immoral view towards homosexuality that religious schools uphold (Callaghan, 2016) by stating that “two girls in a toilet, together” was unacceptable. This “scandalised” teacher also took it upon himself to police the rigid binary gender relations demanded by the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990) when he separated the two Primary-aged boys who were hugging during recess since they were not ‘doing’ their gender right and, therefore, had to be disciplined, defining in this way the ‘normal’ and

acceptable behaviours that students had to abide by in his school (Schempp *et al.*, 1999). This gender regulation, demanding marked differences between ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ and restricting the relative meanings of “heterosexuality”, “homosexuality” and “bisexuality” (Butler, 1990; Salih, 2002), caused Marita to think that her staying after school to play football with male teachers could have led some people at her school to question her sexuality. Graciela, meanwhile, feared she could be kicked out of her school because of her homosexuality, a feeling echoed by gay and lesbian teachers also working in religious schools in Australia (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) and a nod to the belief that queer teachers are unsuitable for teaching especially in religious schools (Neary, 2017).

The Teach First participants offered a drastic contrast to the schools in Peru: openly queer teachers, though not necessarily open to students; Pride or queer-allies groups for students; public displays of support for queer history, people, and events, notably during Pride Month. Describing their school’s cultures towards queer issues and people from initially seeming “non-existent” to “very positive”, Paul felt queer issues were considered risky at his school, where he acknowledged “a lot of casual homophobia” and identified some staff as homophobic, while Ibrahim was surprised to rarely hear negative queer comments in his classroom and felt confidence in seeing a public display of support towards queer issues and people upon entering his school, although most people assumed he would not be supportive of queer issues and might even be homophobic because of his appearance. Though Dianne was out to her entire school community after answering a student who questioned her about it, “increasingly became” the unofficial face of “LGBT stuff” at her school, and students in her classroom “could be out”, she did not set out to be a queer role model for her students, thus she would not be considered a knitter under Connell’s (2015) terms, nor would any other participant. However, the sexual identities of all participants did influence their teaching identities and teaching experiences in

various ways. It allowed Jorge to be “more attuned” to students similar to him and Paul to have “a lot more empathy” with students, mirroring McAdoo’s (2015) findings that sexual orientation informs teaching identities by providing queer teachers with greater levels of empathy, awareness, and sensitivity overall, which allows them to better relate to the needs of their students. Dianne began to include artists who worked with “trans and intersex identities” into her curriculum; Graciela, despite teaching in a religious, Catholic school, organised a debate about a queer issue close to her personally after attending a TFA conference in India which “empowered” her to do so. These two examples also point to the belief that teaching identity is influenced by life experiences and understandings of the self (Alsup, 2006), including one’s sexual identity and all the background experiences, beliefs, and motives related to it, which have influenced the queer teacher’s past and present self, which have also been heavily influenced by wider sociocultural and political contexts (Schempp *et al.*, 1999; McLean, 1999).

While the schooling cultures towards queer people and issues appear to have been highly context-dependent (Dorczak, 2013) at a macro-cultural country level, both TFA organisations initially seem to have been more open and welcoming, though this was not felt equally by all participants. For Marita, queer issues were not “talked about” at Enseña Peru, while Jorge felt an “openness” that allowed him to come out to his entire cohort at his Summer Institute. This “apparently open” culture also allowed Juan to come out to his cohort midway through his second year. Though Graciela came out at her Summer Institute as well, she considered Enseña Peru to be both an incredibly safe space for queer people and not at the same time since she received a “wonderful” response after disclosing her sexual identity but also negative comments from a very religious cohort member midway through her second year. Jorge also pointed out that Enseña Peru did not provide safety in the forms of policies for people who did

not fit the “normality of the educational system”. Therefore, Enseña Peru was a space where these participants found supportive and respectful straight colleagues, which helped create a positive and welcoming culture for them, but also where intolerance was present (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013). Teach First came across as a similarly contrasting space: “hugely inclusive” by Paul but viewed cynically by Dianne. Like Marita, Roxanne believed queer issues were not really mentioned in Teach First, while Ibrahim felt “completely ignored” by people in the organisation who assumed he was not gay or even a potential ally because of how he looked. Ibrahim’s experience proves that the mere existence of a queer network within an organisation does not necessarily result in an improved organisational culture for all queer members of that organisation (Köllen, 2016).

Most of the participants self-regulated their verbal and non-verbal behaviours (Madera, 2010) to conceal their sexualities while performing as TFA teachers in their schools. This constant self-regulation and, in some cases, fear of their sexuality being discovered had personal and professional effects on many of them, including Paul and Juan since they were not “free” to be their authentic selves in front of their students and drained Jorge of energy that could have been used to better serve his students. In closing, the remarks shared by Dianne, Marita, and Juan alluded to what DeJean (2004), Ferfolja and Hopkins (2013), Jackson (2004), Jinright (2019), and McAdoo (2015) all point to: supportive and encouraging school leaders can help queer teachers feel comfortable enough to disclose their sexuality within their school communities by creating school cultures where they feel protected and valued, such as in Dianne’s case, allowing them to transform their teaching for the benefit of their students and their entire school community since they will no longer be pretending to be teachers that they are not.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The experiences shared by the eight TFA participants demonstrate that they had to navigate the spaces of their placement schools and their respective TFA organisations while carefully balancing their sexual identities in a way that would not jeopardize them personally and professionally. After analysing their responses related to the themes of their sexual identities, school leaders, and school cultures they encountered, this chapter answers the three main questions that guided this research and offers recommendations for future research and policy implications.

1. What were the experiences of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers?

The majority of the queer Teach First and Enseña Peru participants had challenging experiences, facing constant pressures from their school leaders to fulfil administrative demands while teaching in mostly negative, heteronormative school cultures (Connell, 2015; Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) where they were forced to negotiate their sexual identities (Richard, 2016) through the self-regulation of their behaviours (Madero, 2010) and personal information that was shared. These cultures were created and promoted by their school leaders and were described by six of the participants in negative terms ranging from “difficult” to “very high-pressured” to “hostile”. One Enseña Peru participant, Juan, described his school culture as “neutral” while another, Marita, described it in positive terms since she felt a “special mystique” of values at the school and a lot of openness from both her school leader and other teachers. Three Teach First and two Enseña Peru participants acknowledged that structural forces were most likely influencing the way their school leaders acted and the cultures they promoted at their schools: the Academy Trusts and OFSTED in the U.K. and a specific boss in

Peru were pushing their school leaders to act as ‘technicians of behaviour’ through the impositions of controls and regulations (Ball, 2003) over their teachers and students, while an educational system based on threats and sanctions (Oliart, 2011) greatly shaped the way the rural Peruvian school leader behaved towards the Enseña Peru teachers at his school. Regardless of this variation and the various challenges they encountered, all participants enjoyed being in the classroom and interacting with their students. As a result, the four Teach First participants were looking to go back to the classroom at the moment of their interviews while the four Enseña Peru participants kept working in the education sector after finishing their programmes albeit in administrative positions in the private sector, government, and third sector.

Their experiences of their respective TFA organisations were also varied and at moments worrying. Though Teach First was described mostly in positive terms by Roxanne and Paul, Dianne had some reservations about the culture they were trying to push, while Ibrahim experienced racism and ageism. Unsurprisingly, Ibrahim would not recommend the programme to people over the age of 40 and non-whites. These comments show that the culture of a school and organisation can be experienced as positive and negative (Dorczak, 2013) by different people at the same time. Enseña Peru similarly was described mostly in positive terms by Jorge and Juan. However, Jorge believed participants were unnecessarily pushed to uncomfortable emotional limits, though Juan commented this was done in order to make participants empathise with others. Marita felt a strong Catholic religious discourse was being promoted by the organisation’s leader, which was also felt by Graciela and Jorge, leading Marita to distance herself from the organisation. All four participants identified the Enseña Peru CEO as the man responsible for creating the organisational culture they described, thus he was acting as a ‘technician of behaviour’ (Ball, 2003) not just to effectively govern them

through specific forms of guidance (Olmedo *et al.*, 2013), but in an attempt to impose his own religious views and values (Ferfolja, 2007) on all organisational members.

2. How did the sexual identities of queer Teach First and Enseña Peru teachers impact their relations with their educational leaders?

The sexual identities of the Teach First and Enseña Peru participants seem to have impacted more their approach to teaching and the way they presented themselves as teachers than their actual relations with their educational leaders, both at school and at their respective TFA organisations. Most did not disclose their sexuality to their school leaders except for Dianne, who was “totally” open with them, and Paul, who claimed most senior leaders in his school knew about his sexuality. Both of them claimed their sexual identities were not an issue when dealing with their school leaders. The same could be said of Roxanne since she described herself as “straight-passing” and thus was never questioned about her sexuality by her school leader or anyone at her school. However, she learned that a senior leadership member at her school was a lesbian but did not feel comfortable disclosing her sexuality with her since they did not align professionally. Ibrahim felt “completely ignored” by his school leader most of the time and so had a distant relation with him and never disclosed his sexuality to him. In Peru, Juan similarly had an “inexistent” relation with his school leader; he interacted more with the vice principal but did not feel supported or encouraged by her. Graciela had a very tense relation with her school leader while Jorge had a complicated one since his school leader was very hostile towards him but also protective of the Enseña Peru teachers at his school, at least to the outside world. Marita was coming to terms with her own sexuality while being an Enseña Peru teacher and so was still navigating who to share that information with, but this did not prevent her from having a close relation with her school leader. None of the Enseña Peru participants disclosed their sexualities with their school leaders and two of them, Graciela and

Jorge, lived in constant fear that their school leaders and communities would discover their sexualities, which would jeopardise their teaching post, professional career, and physical safety, alluding to the moral sex panic of children and homosexuality (Connell, 2015) and the belief by some in society that queer teachers are predators (Dunnell, 2017).

While all eight participants were out to colleagues - the Enseña Peru participants to members of their cohort and the organisation, the Teach First participants to fellow cohort members and some school colleagues - most were presenting themselves as straight in their classes to their students, mirroring Lee's (2019) findings of teachers in urban and suburban areas in the U.K. In this way they were constantly self-regulating their verbal and non-verbal behaviours (Madera, 2010) to prevent their sexualities from being discovered by their school communities, which had taxing emotional and psychological effects on them as mentioned by Paul, Graciela, Jorge, and Juan. Connell (2015) would label them all as splitters since they were trying to separate their sexual identities from their classrooms, but their sexual identities did influence their approach to teaching and interactions with students: several claimed their sexuality gave them greater levels of empathy, awareness, and sensitivity overall, which helped them to better relate with their students, an assertion also found in U.S. queer teachers by McAdoo (2015). This also relates to life experiences and understandings of the self influencing teaching identities (Alsup, 2006) since several participants channelled their personal experiences as queer or minoritised individuals into their teaching practices and interactions with students: Dianne included artists working with "trans and intersex identities" into her curriculum; Graciela attempted to challenge the homophobia she sensed in some of her students; Juan did not want his students to experience the same bullying he experienced as a student.

3. What comparisons can be made between the experiences of queer Teach First and

Enseña Peru teachers?

All Teach First teachers taught in schools where queer identities were at the very least acknowledged and recognised and in some cases celebrated: Dianne kept teaching at her school after being outed by a student and felt her school leader supported her and her fellow out colleagues mostly because they were good teachers; Paul and Ibrahim saw visual displays supporting queer identities at their schools, which gave Ibrahim some confidence on a daily basis though Paul acknowledged casual homophobia and identified certain staff members as being homophobic at his school; Roxanne sat in on meetings of a queer-allies student group at her school though she did not discuss her sexuality with the other queer school leader there because they did not align professionally. In contrast, the four Enseña Peru teachers taught at schools where queer identities were simply non-existent or viewed negatively. Three of them taught in religious Catholic schools where homosexuality was considered immoral (Callaghan, 2016) while one taught in a rural school where he felt he was exposed to a great level of surveillance by the entire community and thus feared his sexuality would be discovered. In all four schools, rigid binary gender relations - clearly differentiating what is 'masculine' from 'feminine', with individuals expected to 'do' their gender 'right' - were demanded, demonstrating the strong prevalence of the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990) in Peru, while the heightened level of surveillance in the rural area echoed the similar feeling by queer teachers in rural settings in the U.K. (Lee, 2019).

Regardless of their context or country, all eight participants encountered schooling cultures where heterosexuality was assumed as the norm (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) and thus they were expected to be cisgender heterosexual (Rosick, 2016), proving they had limited choices of teacher representations to choose from and enact (Ball, 2003). In this way, they had to carefully navigate their sexual identities as teachers, though they did so for differing reasons: the Enseña

Peru teachers feared negative reactions from the adults in their school communities, particularly their school leaders, teachers, and parents - with Graciela fearing being fired from her school, which is not uncommon among queer teachers working in religious schools (Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013) - while the Teach First teachers did not want their students to use the knowledge of their sexualities to treat them differently or be distracted in class by it. These differing reasons could be related to the differing legal framework regarding queer people in Peru and the U.K. - employment discrimination based on sexual orientation is outlawed in the U.K. (Colgan, 2011) but not in Peru (Defensoría del Pueblo, 2016) - as well as societal attitudes towards queer people in both countries, with the British public having more favourable views towards them than the Peruvian public (The National Centre for Social Research, 2019; Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos, 2013).

Implications for Future Research and Policy

In light of Ibrahim's experience, future research should be conducted to determine whether other minority Teach First participants also suffered racism in the organisation as well as if other older participants encountered ageism. Research could also compare the experiences of white and non-white Teach First participants to determine if white and non-white individuals have differing experiences of the same organisation. This could also be done along heterosexual and queer lines to determine if white and non-white heterosexual individuals have differing experiences of Teach First as an organisation compared to queer white and non-white individuals. These studies would provide Teach First with valuable information to make amends and ensure that no future participant undergoes a similar negative experience encountered by Ibrahim. In Peru, research could investigate differences between Catholic religious participants and non-Catholic religious participants of Enseña Peru to determine if the Catholic, religious discourse identified by the participants in this study is felt by others in

the organisation. This would help Enseña Peru determine if the discourse promoted by the organisation is truly being inclusive of all those seeking to participate in the programme regardless of religious affiliations. Research could also explore the attitudes and views of school leaders and teachers throughout Peru about queer people in general and queer teachers and students in particular. This would help Enseña Peru identify those schools where future queer participants would be better received and supported and also provide a valuable baseline measurement for the Peruvian education sector as a whole regarding this issue, which should serve as the starting point for the creation of action plans to better include and support queer teachers in schools.

The results of this study should be used by Teach First and Enseña Peru to question their actions and speeches regarding queer issues and people, specifically their queer members. If they are truly committed to social justice, then as organisations they have to ensure they are protecting their members in multiple ways: anti-discrimination policies, strong and effective support groups, placements in schools where their physical and psycho-emotional integrity will be upheld. Though local legal and cultural barriers might be used by Enseña Peru as excuses to not publicly support their queer members, the organisation should not allow the religious beliefs of one person to dictate their positioning on queer members since it will further marginalise them in a country where they already face a number of social and structural barriers in their daily life. Furthermore, school leaders should use the results of this study to question their own actions and behaviours towards queer teachers, whether they may be out in their schools or still in the closet. If school leaders want to ensure the best possible learning culture in their schools, they have to ensure all their teaching staff feel welcome, comfortable, protected, and supported by them, regardless of their sexual identity. Training programmes for school leaders must do the same: develop the skills and empathy necessary in current and future

school leaders to better support and interact with current and future queer teachers, which will help them become better educators and role models for their students.

REFERENCES

Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher Identity Discourses: Negotiating Personal and Professional Spaces*.

Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Alsup, J. (2019). *Millennial Teacher Identity Discourses: Balancing Self and Other (2nd ed)*.

New York: Routledge.

Bailey, P. (2015). 'Consultants of conduct: New actors, new knowledges and new 'resilient' subjectivities in the governing of the teacher'. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 47 (3), pp. 232-250.

Balarin, M. (2008). 'Promoting educational reforms in weak states: the case of radical policy discontinuity in Peru'. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6 (2), pp. 163-178.

Ball, S. (2003). 'The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18 (2), pp. 215-228.

Ball, S. (2017). 'Class, comprehensives and continuities: a short history of English education policy', in Ball, S. *The education debate (Third Edition)*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, Policy Press, pp. 63-116.

British Educational Research Association [BERA]. (2018). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. 4th ed., London: BERA.

Britzman, D. (1995). 'Is There a Queer Pedagogy? or, Stop Reading Straight'. *Educational Theory*, 45 (2), pp. 151-165.

Britzman, D., (2003). 'Introduction to Revised Edition', in Britzman, D. *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach (Revised Edition)*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 1-23.

Burns, L. (2017). *Examining the Impact of School Climate on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers in K-12 Public Schools in the State of New Jersey*. EdD. Dissertation. Saint Peter's University.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2006). 'Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory', in Arnot, M., and Mac an Ghaill, M. (ed.) *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Gender and Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 61-71.

Callaghan, T. (2016). 'Religiosity', in Rodriguez, N., Martino, W., Ingrey, J., and Brockenbrough, E. (eds.) *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education: An International Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 341-349.

Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos (PROMSEX). (2016). *Estudio Nacional sobre Clima Escolar en el Perú 2016*. Lima: PROMSEX.

Chavez, A. (2014). *Yet Another Closet Professional Experiences of Latina/o Queer Aspiring Educational Leaders A Multiple Case Study*. EdD. Dissertation. California Lutheran University.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education (7th ed)*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Coleman, M. (2012). 'Interviews', in Briggs, A., Coleman, M., and Morrison, M. (eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management (3rd ed)*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 250-265.

Colgan, F. (2011). 'Equality, diversity and corporate responsibility: Sexual orientation and diversity management in the UK private sector'. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 30 (8), pp. 719-734.

Connell, C. (2015). *School's Out: Gay & Lesbian Teachers in the Classroom*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Corredor, E. (2019). 'Unpacking "Gender Ideology" and the Global Right's Antigender Countermovement'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 44 (3), pp. 613-638.

Cumsille, B. and Fiszbein, A. (2015). 'Crème de la crème: The Teach for All Experience and Its Lessons for Policy-Making in Latin America'. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23 (46), pp. 1-26.

Deal, T., and Peterson, K. (2016). *Shaping School Culture (3rd ed)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Defensoría del Pueblo. (2016). *Derechos humanos de las personas LGBTI: Necesidad de una política pública para la igualdad en el Perú*. Lima.

DeJean, W. (2004). *Examining the Lived Experiences of Out Gay and Lesbian K-12 Educators*. EdD. Dissertation. San Diego State University.

deLeon, M., and Brunner, C. (2013). 'Cycles of Fear: A Model of Lesbian and Gay Educational Leaders' Lived Experiences'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49 (1), pp. 161-203.

Dennissen, M., Benschop, Y., van den Brink, M. (2019). 'Diversity Networks: Networking for Equality?'. *British Journal of Management*, 30 (4), pp. 966-980.

DePalma, R., and Atkinson, E. (2006). 'The sound of silence: Talking about sexual orientation and schooling'. *Sex Education*, 6 (4), pp. 333-349.

DeWitt, P. (2018). 'Principals' moral purpose in the context of LGBT inclusion'. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 3 (1), pp. 2-11.

Devos, G., and Bouckenooghe, D. (2009). 'An Exploratory Study on Principals' Conceptions about Their Role as School Leaders'. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8 (2), pp. 173-196.

Dorcak, R. (2013). 'Inclusion through the lens of school culture', in Ruairc, G., Ottesen, E.,

Precey, R. (ed.) *Leadership for Inclusive Education: Values, Vision and Voices*. Sense Publishers, pp. 47-57.

Dunnell, C. (2017). *Out and Queer: Independent School Teachers Navigating The Personal and Professional*. EdD. Dissertation. Rowan University.

Dykes, F., and Delpont, J. (2018). 'Our voices count: the lived experiences of LGBTQ educators and its impact on teacher education preparation programs'. *Teaching Education*, 29 (2), pp. 135-146.

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., and Jackson, P. (2008). 'The Philosophy of Management Research', in Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., and Jackson, P. (eds.) *Management research*. London: SAGE, pp. 55-79.

Eliason, M. (1996). 'Identity Formation for Lesbian, Bisexual, and Gay Persons: Beyond a "Minoritizing" View'. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 30 (3), pp. 31-58.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., and Telford, D. (2003). *Silenced Sexualities in Schools and Universities*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.

Evans-Santiago, B. (2015). *Sexual Minority Educators and Public Disclosure: How Identity and Culture Influence the Decisions to be Out in School Settings*. EdD. Dissertation. Illinois State University.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2019). 'Gender/Sex, Sexual Orientation, and Identity Are in the Body:

How Did They Get There?'. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 56 (4-5), pp. 529-555.

Ferfolja, T. (2007). 'Schooling cultures: Institutionalizing heteronormativity and heterosexism'. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11 (2), pp. 147-162.

Ferfolja, T., and Hopkins, L. (2013). 'The complexities of workplace experience for lesbian and gay teachers'. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54 (3), pp. 311-324.

Floyd, A. (2012). 'Narrative and Life History', in Briggs, A., Coleman, M., and Morrison, M. (eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management (3rd ed)*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 223-235.

Gardner Honeychurch, K. (1996). 'Researching Dissident Subjectivities: Queering the Grounds of Theory and Practice'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (2), pp. 339-355.

Gautreaux, M. and Delgado, S. (2016). 'Portrait of a Teach for All (TFA) teacher: Media Narratives of the Universal TFA Teacher in 12 Countries'. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24 (110), pp. 1-28.

Government Equalities Office (2014). *Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act: A factsheet*. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/306000/140423_M_SSC_Act_factsheet__web_version_.pdf (Accessed: 23 September 2020).

Gray, E., (2014). 'LGBTQ Teachers and the Location of Difference in English Schools', in Harris, A., and Gray, E. (eds.) *Queer Teachers, Identity and Performativity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 75-89.

Gray, E., and Harris, A. (2014). 'Introduction: Marked Presence/Unremarkable Absence: Queer Teachers, 'Identity' and Performativity', in Harris, A., and Gray, E. (eds.) *Queer Teachers, Identity and Performativity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-10.

Hooker, S. (2010). *Closeted or Out? Gay and Lesbian Educators Reveal Their Experiences about Their Sexual Identities in K-12 Schools*. EdD. Dissertation. University of Cincinnati.

Huffman, A., Watrous-Rodriguez, K., and King, E. (2008). 'Supporting a Diverse Workforce: What Type of Support is Most Meaningful for Lesbian and Gay Employees?'. *Human Resource Management*, 47 (2), pp. 237-253.

Jackson, J. (2004). *Unmasking Identities: A Qualitative Study of Gay and Lesbian Teachers*. PhD. Dissertation. Boston College.

Jenkins, R. (2014). *Social Identity (4th ed)*. New York: Routledge.

Jinright, D. (2019). *Breaking the Silence: Learning from the Experiences of Gay and Lesbian Educators in the Predominantly Heteronormative Space of K-12 Schools*. PhD. Dissertation. The University of Alabama.

Kehily, M. (2002). *Sexuality, Gender and Schooling: Shifting agendas in social learning*.

London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Köllén, T. (2016). 'Lessening the difference is more - the relationship between diversity management and the perceived organizational climate for gay men and lesbians'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27 (17), pp. 1967-1996.

Kootsikas, A. (2011). *"I had to lead a hidden life in some way": Identities of LGBT Elementary School Teachers*. PhD. Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling Education: Queer Activism and Antioppressive Pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lee, C. (2019). 'How do lesbian, gay and bisexual teachers experience UK rural school communities?'. *Social Sciences*, 8 (9), pp. 1-14.

Lee, C. (2020). 'How does Openness about Personal, Sexual and Gender Identities Influence Teacher Leaders' Self-Perceptions of Authenticity?'. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, XX (X), pp. 1-23.

Lipka, R., and Brinthaupt, T. (1999). 'Balancing the personal and professional development of teachers', in Lipka, R., Brinthaupt, T. (eds.) *The Role of Self in Teacher Development*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 1-8.

Madera, J. (2010). 'The Cognitive Effects of Hiding One's Homosexuality in the Workplace'. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3 (1), pp. 86-89.

McAdoo, P. (2015). *Out and Visible: A Study of Openly Gay and Lesbian Teachers in Independent Schools*. EdD. Dissertation. The University of Pennsylvania.

McLean, S. (1999). 'Becoming a Teacher: The Person in the Process', in Lipka, R., Brinthaupt, T. (eds.) *The Role of Self in Teacher Development*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 55-91.

Meneses, D. (2019). 'Con Mis Hijos No Te Metas: un estudio de discurso y poder en un grupo de Facebook peruano opuesto a la «ideología de género»'. *Anthropologica*, 37 (42), pp. 129-154.

Middleton, S. (1998). *Disciplining Sexuality: Foucault, Life Histories, and Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ministerio de Educación del Perú. (2012). *Aprueban el Reglamento de la Ley N° 28044 Ley General de Educación*. Lima.

Ministerio de Educación del Perú. (2014). *Resolución de Secretaría General N° 304-2014-MINEDU*. Lima.

Ministerio de Educación del Perú. (2017). *Currículo Nacional de la Educación Básica 2016*. Lima.

Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos del Perú. (2013). *Encuesta para medir la percepción de la población peruana en relación a los derechos humanos*. Lima.

Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos del Perú. (2020). *II Encuesta Nacional de Derechos Humanos: Población LGBT*. Lima.

Mizzi, R. (2016). 'Heteroprofessionalism', in Rodriguez, N., Martino, W., Ingrey, J., and Brockenbrough, E. (eds.) *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education: An International Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 137-147.

Neary, A. (2017). 'Schools and LGBTQ Identification', in Neary, A. *LGBT-Q Teachers, Civil Partnerships and Same-Sex Marriage: The Ambivalences of Legitimacy*. New York: Routledge, pp. 17-38.

Oliart, P. (2011). *Políticas educativas y la cultura del sistema escolar en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Olmedo, A., Bailey, P., and Ball, S. (2013). 'To Infinity and Beyond.: heterarchical governance, the Teach for All network in Europe and the making of profits and minds'. *European Educational Research Journal*, 12 (4), pp. 492-512.

Polkinghorne, D. (1995). 'Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis'. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8 (1), pp. 5-23.

Portela, A. (2013). 'Identity, inclusion and leadership', in Ruairc, G., Ottesen, E., Precey, R. (ed.) *Leadership for Inclusive Education: Values, Vision and Voices*. Sense Publishers, pp. 35-45.

Price, H. (2012). 'Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48 (1), pp. 39-85.

Richard, G. (2016). 'Coming Out', in Rodriguez, N., Martino, W., Ingrey, J., and Brockenbrough, E. (eds.) *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education: An International Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 47-56.

Richardson, D. (2004). 'Locating Sexualities: From Here to Normality'. *Sexualities*, 7 (4), pp. 391-411.

Rosick, J. (2016). 'Visibility', in Rodriguez, N., Martino, W., Ingrey, J., and Brockenbrough, E. (eds.) *Critical Concepts in Queer Studies and Education: An International Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 453-461.

Salih, S. (2002). 'Gender', in Salih, S. *Judith Butler*. London: Routledge, pp. 43-71.

Schempp, P., Sparkes, A., and Templin, T. (1999). 'Identity and Induction: Establishing the Self in the First Years of Teaching', in Lipka, R., Brinthaupt, T. (eds.) *The Role of Self in Teacher Development*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 142-161.

Smulyan, L. (2012). 'Constructing Teaching Identities', in Skelton, C., Francis, B., and Smulyan, L. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Gender and Education*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 469-482.

Straubhaar, R., and Friedrich, D. (2015). 'Theorizing and Documenting the Spread of Teach

For All and its Impact on Global Education Reform’. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23 (44), pp. 1-11.

The National Centre for Social Research. (2019). *British Social Attitudes: The 36th Report*. London.

Tompkins, J., Kearns, L.-L., and Mitton-Kükner, J. (2019). ‘Queer Educators in Schools: The Experiences of Four Beginning Teachers’. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 42 (2), pp. 384-414.

Tusin, L. (1999). ‘Deciding to Teach’, in Lipka, R., Brinthaup, T. (eds.) *The Role of Self in Teacher Development*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 11-35.

Watling, R., James, V., Briggs, A. (2012). ‘Qualitative Data Analysis: Using NVivo’, in Briggs, A., Coleman, M., and Morrison, M. (eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management (3rd ed)*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 381-396.

Wilson, A. (1996). ‘How we find ourselves: Identity development and two-spirit people’. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (2), pp. 303-317.

Wright, T., and Smith, N. (2015). ‘A Safer Place? LGBT Educators, School Climate, and Implications for Administrators’. *The Educational Forum*, 79 (4), pp. 394-407.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Approach / Recruitment Email

Email Subject Line: Invitation to Participate in Study

Message:

Dear [Insert First Name],

I hope you are well.

I am writing to invite you to participate in a research study that I will be conducting as part of the requirements for the MA Educational Leadership at UCL's Institute of Education. This study seeks to explore the experiences of LGBTQ Teach First and Enseña Perú teachers and how their sexual identities impacted their relations with their educational leaders. The study will consist of one semi-structured interview which will last between 60 and 90 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded and stored safely using encryption procedures. Upon completion of the study, these recordings will be destroyed.

You will be assigned a pseudonym to protect your identity throughout the analysis, reporting and dissemination of this study. If you agree to participate, the date and time of the interview will be coordinated to best suit your schedule.

[FOR ENSEÑA PERÚ TEACHERS:] I believe the level of trust, friendship, and respect we have for each other will allow us to uncover great insights about teaching as an LGBTQ person in Peru. While there are no direct benefits to you and you will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study, you will help give voice to LGBTQ teachers in Peru by reflecting on your experiences. However, because of the sensitive nature of the study, I understand and respect if you prefer not to participate. Please do not feel obliged to participate because we are friends if you feel uncomfortable sharing your personal experiences regarding your sexual identity. If you know of another Enseña Perú LGBTQ former teacher who might feel more comfortable than you in engaging in this conversation, I would appreciate you letting me know so I may get in touch with them.

[FOR TEACH FIRST TEACHERS:] While there are no direct benefits to you and you will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study, you will help give voice to LGBTQ teachers in the U.K. by reflecting on your experiences. However, because of the sensitive nature of the study, I understand and respect if you prefer not to participate. Please do not feel obliged to participate if you feel uncomfortable sharing your personal experiences regarding your sexual identity. If you know of another Teach First LGBTQ former teacher who might feel more comfortable than you in engaging in this conversation, I would appreciate you letting me know so I may get in touch with them.

I understand these are unprecedented times we are living through due to the Covid-19 crisis and I understand if the current situation prevents you from participating in my research study

due to health problems. If you are currently ill, please let me know so I may seek another participant. If you are a current teacher and/or frontline worker, please let me know as well since UCL is instructing us that frontline workers such as teachers should not be interviewed for research purposes at the moment.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you regarding your decision to participate in this study or not at your earliest convenience.

All the best,

APPENDIX 2: Informed Consent Form

Participation in Research Study

Purpose of the Study

This study seeks to explore the experiences of LGBTQ Teach First and Enseña Perú teachers and how their sexual identities impacting their relations with their educational leaders.

Procedures

You will participate in one semi-structured interview. This interview will last between 60 and 90 minutes. The questions will center around your experiences as a Teach First or Enseña Perú teacher, your relations with the various educational leaders you encountered while being a Teach First or Enseña Perú teacher, and how your personal and sexual identities impacted or not both your teaching experience and your relations with the educational leaders you encountered while being a Teach First or Enseña Perú teacher. This interview will be audio recorded to ensure the data collected is transcribed accurately. You will be able to review the transcript of your interview to ensure it is accurate.

Reporting and Dissemination

This study is being carried out as part of the requirements for the MA Educational Leadership at UCL's Institute of Education. The final report of the study will be submitted there. You will also receive a copy of the final report.

Potential Risks and Discomfort

There are minimal psychological and physical risks associated with participating in this study. However, you might experience some discomfort when retelling negative experiences related to your personal or sexual identity and/or to your teaching experience as a Teach First or Enseña Perú teacher. You may refuse to answer any question at any moment for any reason.

Potential Benefits

While there are no direct benefits to you and you will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study, you will help give voice to LGBTQ teachers in the U.K. and Peru by reflecting on your experiences, aiding in this way to fill a gap in academic literature. Likewise, you might potentially help educational leaders in the U.K., Peru and elsewhere reflect on their roles to ensure that they are being supportive of all members in their educational communities.

Participation and Withdrawal

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate in it and/or withdraw from it at any moment without penalty or loss of benefits. This will have no effect on your relationship with the researcher. Likewise, you may rejoin the study at any moment.

Confidentiality

You will be assigned a pseudonym to protect your identity throughout the analysis, reporting and dissemination of this study. The data collected will be secured safely using encryption procedures in the researcher's personal computer for one year, after which it will be destroyed. The researcher will be the only person with access to this data throughout that time period.

Questions

If you have any questions at any moment about this study or your participation in it, please contact [Name of MA Student] at [email address] or [mobile number].

Current Health Status

I am **currently in good health** to participate in this study.

I am **currently NOT in good health** to participate in this study.

Current Work Status

I am **currently working as a teacher** in an educational setting (school, university).

I am **currently NOT working as a teacher** in an educational setting.

Participation Decision

I have read the information above and **AGREE** to participate in this study.

I have read the information above and **DO NOT agree** to participate in this study.

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

Name of Researcher

Signature

Date

APPENDIX 3: Interview Questions

I. Background Information

1	What is your name?
2	What is your age?
3	What is your gender?
4	In what years did you teach as a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher? (2010, 2011, etc.)
5	In what city or region did you teach as a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
6	In what type of school did you teach as a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher? (Urban, rural; public, religious)
7	What grade level(s) did you teach as a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
8	What subject area(s) did you teach as a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?

II. Personal Identity

9	How would you describe your personal identity? <i>(If struggling: How would you describe yourself to a person who has never met you in order for that person to have a good idea of who you are?)</i>
---	---

III. Sexual Identity

10	How would you describe your sexual identity or orientation?
11	How would you describe your level of outness regarding your sexual identity or orientation today?
12	How would you describe your level of outness regarding your sexual identity or orientation when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?

IV. Teaching Experience

13	Why did you decide to become a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
14	How would you describe your experience being a Teach First or Enseña Peru Teacher?

V. School and Organisational Climate

15	How would you describe the overall climate or environment of Teach First or Enseña Peru as an organisation when you were a teacher?
16	How would you describe the overall climate or environment of the school you taught at when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?

VI. School and Organisational Climate and Educational Leaders

17	To what extent do you think the leaders of Teach First or Enseña Peru had a role in creating the overall climate or environment of the organisation that you described?
18	To what extent do you think the principal of the school you taught at had a role in creating the overall climate or environment of the school that you described?

VII. Personal Identity and Teaching Experience

19	Can you explain whether or not your personal identity had any impact on your teaching experience when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
----	--

VIII. Sexual Identity and Teaching Experience

20	Can you explain whether or not your sexual identity or orientation had any impact on your teaching experience when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
----	---

IX. Sexual Identity, School and Organisational Climate, and Relationship with Educational Leaders: Teach First or Enseña Peru Staff

21	How would you describe the culture or environment of Teach First or Enseña Peru with regards to LGBT issues and people when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
22	To what extent did that culture or environment impact you personally or as a teacher at the time?
23	How would you describe your relation with the leaders of Teach First or Enseña Peru when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?
24	How open were you with them regarding your sexual identity or orientation and why?
25	How welcome and accepted did they make you feel in the organisation?
26	How would you describe the support you received from them?
27	Can you explain whether or not you think they could have done anything to make you feel more comfortable or welcome in the organisation?

X. Sexual Identity, School and Organisational Climate, and Relationship with Educational Leaders: School Principal

28	Now I want to ask you about the culture or environment of the school you taught at with regards to LGBT issues and people when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher. Can you describe it please?
29	To what extent did that culture or environment impact you personally or as a teacher at the time?
30	How would you describe your relation with the principal of the school where you taught at when you were a Teach First or Enseña Peru teacher?

31	How open were you with them regarding your sexual identity or orientation and why?
32	How welcome and accepted did they make you feel in their school?
33	How would you describe the support you received from them?
34	Can you explain whether or not you think they could have done anything to make you feel more comfortable or welcome in their school?

XI. Closing

35	Is there anything else you would like to share?
----	---

Thank you once again for your time and participation. This marks the end of the interview.