THESIS TITLE:

MULTICULTURAL   EDUCATION: A SCHOOL-BASED ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY
OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

SUBMITTED BY

ABBY LOUISE PERLMAN CRONIN

FOR Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

TITLE:
MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: A SCHOOL-BASED ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF
POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

This thesis investigates the implementation of the 1977 ILEA
Multi-Ethnic Education Policy initiative in one inner London
comprehensive, 'East End High'. It is a school ethnography based
on data gathered throughout two and a half years, commencing in
spring 1979.

Chapter one explores the problematic nature of analysing
multi-ethnic policy implementation and describes the methodology
used. Chapter two considers the debate about racial minority
pupils and underachievement in the context of the post-war social
democratic consensus which fostered an ideology of equality
of educational opportunity. The politics of multi-ethnic
policy-making in the ILEA is considered before moving on to
chapter three where the multicultural/antiracist education
debate is discussed, taking account of the New Right's critique.
Chapter four examines the socio-economic, demographic, ethnic and
educational profile of the borough where 'East End High' is
located. The concept of educational achievement is problematised
in the light of compensatory policy and practice and the
Rampton/Swann methodology used to investigate the performance of
racial minority pupils is criticised.

The main concern of chapter five is to analyse the process of
underachievement inside 'East End High' from the point of view of
pupils. Evidence about the pupils is presented in terms of an
ethnic pupil profile, banding ratios, socio-economic background
and experiential data from interviews with fifth formers entered
for exams and a small group of truants. Chapter six
investigates teacher's views about multi-ethnic education in
East End High. Organisational, administrative and
decision-making matters inside the school are featured here and
also in chapter seven, which is an analysis of the committee set
up in the school to promote multicultural education. In terms
of the power structure in 'East End High', this committee
played a marginal role which helps to explain the uneven
and inconsistent nature of multi-ethnic policy implementation.
The thesis concludes with an overview of the interplay between
the institutional, ideological and pragmatic conditions which
regulated the process of multicultural policy implementation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORRIGENDA

Page	Ref.	Correction
17	line 17	should read: "consider the equality of opportunity debate".
19	line 3	should read: "perspective".
32	line -1	should read: "Simon 1973".
33	line 7	should read: "Simon 1973".
91	line 4	should read: "Cox & Dyson 1969, 1970; Cox & Boyson 1975,1977)".
98	line 16	should read: "Gordon & Klug".

Page	Ref.	Correction
376	add:	BERNSTEIN, B. & DAVIES, B. 1978. "Some Comments on Plowden", in Wilson, M. (ed): **Social and Educational Research In Action.** London: Longman.
377	add:	BUTLER, R. 1973. "The Politics of the 1944 Education Act", in Fowler G. et al (eds), **Decision-Making in British Education.** London: Heinemann.
377	add:	CCCS. 1981. **Unpopular Education.** London: Hutchinson.
378	add:	COMMITTEE OF HIGHER EDUCATION. 1963. **Higher Education, The Robbins Report.** CMND 2154. London: HMSO.
378	add:	CORNFORD, J. 1985. "A Note on Research". Annex G to **Education For All.** CMND 9453. London: HMSO.
378	add:	CORNFORD, J. 1989. "Research in a Plural Society: Pitfalls and Possibilities", in Verma, G. (ed), **Education for All.** Lewes: Falmer.
378	add:	COX, C. B. & DYSON, A. E. (eds). 1969. **Fight For Education: A Black Paper.** The Critical Quarterly Society.
378	add:	COX, C. B. & DYSON, A. E. (eds). 1970. **Black Paper Three.** The Critical Quarterly Society.
378	add:	COX, C. B. & BOYSON, R. (eds). 1975. **Black Paper 1975.** London: J M Dent & Sons.
378	add:	COX, C. B. & BOYSON, R. (eds). 1977. **Black Paper 1977.** London: Temple Smith.
378	add:	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1965. Circular No. 10/65.
378	add:	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1967. **Children and Their Primary Schools, The Plowden Report.** London: HMSO.
378	add:	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1970. Circular 10/70.
379	add:	DOUGLAS, J.W.P. 1964. **The Home and the School.** London: Pantheon.
380	add:	GASKELL, G. & SMITH, P. 1981. "Are Young Blacks Really Alienated?". New Society. 14 May.
381	add:	HALL, S. 1983. "The Great Moving Right Show", in Hall, S. & Jacques, M. (eds) op. cit.
381	add:	HARGREAVES, D. 1984. **Improving Secondary Schools.** London: ILEA.
383	add:	JACKSON, B. & MARSDEN, D. 1962. **Education and the Working Class.** Harmondsworth: Penguin.
384	add:	LEICESTER, M. 1986. "Multicultural Curriculum or Anti-Racist Education: Denying the Gulf". **Multicultural Teaching,** Vol 4, No 2.
385	add:	LOUDEN, D. 1978. "Self-Esteem and the Locus of Control: Some Findings on Immigrant Adolescents in Britain". New Community VI, No. 3.
385	add:	MILNER, D. 1975. **Children and Race.** Harmondsworth: Penguin.
385	add:	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. 1959. **Fifteen to Eighteen, The Crowther Report.** London: HMSO.

385	add:	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. 1963. **Half Our Future, The Newsom Report**. London: HMSO.
387	add:	REDBRIDGE C.R.C. 1978. **Cause For Concern**. Ilford: Black Peoples Progressive Association.
388	add:	SIMON, B. 1973. "Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School", in Silver, H. (ed): **Equal Opportunity in Education**. London: Methuen.
390	add:	WHITTY, G. & YOUNG, M.F.D. (eds). 1976. **Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge**. Driffield: Nafferton.

CHAPTER ONE.

INTRODUCTION

The Inner London Education Authority's 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education initiative was the first such policy ever to be adopted by a local education authority in the United Kingdom. This thesis will investigate the way in which the Multi-Ethnic initiative was approached in 'East End High', a boys' multiracial comprehensive school situated in the London borough of Innerton. [1] It is a case-study of one school purporting to be putting the ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education policy into practice. The thesis examines how this school set about implementing a policy designed to improve rates of achievement and promote the multicultural educational objectives contained in the ILEA policy document; it describes and explains in what way this policy fostered a multicultural awareness amongst a sample of pupils and promoted a commitment to multiculturalism amongst staff and the school's Multicultural Education Committee. A central organising question is whether this policy acted as an agent of change to reduce inequalities in the educational experience of racial and ethnic minority pupils in East End High.

The thesis is essentially an examination of a moment in the recent history of educational policy conducted through ethnographic data gathered contemporaneously with the events, together with its triangulation through documentation analysis, statistical records and a retrospective view of relevant

educational ideologies prior to, during and following the period in question.

The core of the fieldwork was conducted throughout a two and a half year period commencing in the spring of 1979 and continuing through the autumn term of 1982 when the school began to reorganise internally because amalgamation was scheduled to take place with a neighbouring boys' comprehensive in 1983. East End High had a long history, opening in 1880 as a boys' Industrial School. In 1928 it became a Central School and in 1965 moved into a seven-story purpose-built building designed to provide the new system of comprehensive education. Innerton was one of London's most deprived and rapidly changing inner boroughs with a tradition of absorbing waves of new immigrants. By the mid-1970s, 40% of the pupils in East End High were of West Indian origin along with a considerable percentage of other ethnic minorities. The extent to which the school and wider community were successful in accommodating the needs of these pupils is a theme which is addressed throughout this thesis.

THE POLICY CONTEXT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

During the past thirty years educational responses to cultural diversity in England have gradually changed from policies based on assimilationist premises into policies based on culturally pluralist-multicultural or antiracist premises. Early responses in the 1960s reflected a laissez-faire (Rose 1969, Sivanandan 1982) attitude in which it was assumed that racial and ethnic minority pupils could 'fit' into the existing educational system by adapting or assimilating to the British way of life. But as time passed, cultural diversity came to characterise the population which had absorbed waves of post-war immigrants from

the European continent as well as the British colonies and ex-colonies in Asia and the Caribbean. In the brief period from 1951 to 1971 Britain's black population had grown from approximately 0.5 million to 1.85 million or 3.4% of the total population (Willey 1984a:3). Britain had become a pluralist multiracial society, and the presence of large numbers of racial and ethnic minority pupils in English schools provided the basis for acknowledging that in a pluralist society the needs of all pupils should be catered for. But that acknowledgment was not made explicit in terms of policy prescriptions for minority group pupils. Instead the approach was described as a form of 'doing good by doing little' or 'doing good by stealth', a phrase used by David Kirp (1979). Kirp saw the British approach as one which diffused the significance of 'race' and embedded policy approaches in ethnic minority education in 'racially inexplicit' programmes. Thus while concern was expressed and commitments made to developing educational policies appropriate to the needs of a multiracial society, the actual 'politics of decision-making' (Dorn & Troyna 1982) exhibited a marked neglect of issues positively related to 'race' and education.

When statements were made they reflected a cautious assimilationist stance. Willey (1984a) points out that

> Early educational responses were dominated by a
> largely ad hoc approach to the 'problems' created
> by the presence of minority ethnic group pupils.
> The education task was seen by the DES as the
> 'successful assimilation of immigrant children'.
> [DES 1963] (Willey 1984a:22)

By 1965 the DES recommended a dispersal of ethnic minority pupils, again a reflection of assimilationist assumptions.

By the early 1970s, however, laissez-faire approaches were slowly transformed into approaches which sought to respond positively to the multicultural and educational needs of all. The tone of policy objectives was changing and beginning to take a more pluralist orientation. Thus formal advice from the DES (1971) urged schools to

> demonstrate how people from different ethnic
> groups and cultural backgrounds can live together
> happily....and can create the kind of cohesive,
> multicultural society on which the future of
> this country--and possibly the world--depends.
> (Willey 1984b:28)

The DES, nonetheless, stressed its lack of authority to prescribe policy in a decentralised educational system (HMSO 1974) while findings from the Community Relations Commission (1974) inquiry findings indicated that

> ....the responsibility of the DES to provide
> leadership cannot be evaded by the argument that
> local experience is too diverse to permit of such
> guidance. Administrative details and some experience
> must be peculiar to each locality but the common
> need is for:
> (a) the recognition of the task which faces our
> educational system;
> (b) the setting of national policy guidelines for
> tackling this task;
> (c) resources with which to tackle this task;
> (d) a pool of expertise in the techniques of how to
> tackle this task. (CRC 1974:17-18)

A senior HMI (Bolton 1979) pointed to the second-generation of British-born blacks, Sikhs, Hindus and Muslims and explained that these people share the same aspirations, interest and experiences as white youngsters but are also determined to retain their cultural identity. In a culturally pluralist society he argued,

> there should be integration in areas of
> common interest and concern such as housing,
> employment and education. There should be
> genuine equality of opportunity in a public
> life that is built upon, caters for and
> accepts cultural and religious differences....
> pluralism is seen as a system that accepts

> people's values and lifestyles are different
> and operates in such a way as to allow equal
> opportunity for all to play a full part in
> society. (Bolton 1979:6)

The implications for education were wide-ranging. In Bolton's view

> In education pluralism means broadening the
> content of the curriculum, teaching about different
> religions and cultures and about race and race
> relations for all pupils.....(Bolton 1979:6)

A more explicit policy response was to take steps toward providing multicultural education.

> 'Multicultural education' is coming to be
> regarded not as a set of disparate and
> optional extras, but as in integral part of
> good education for all children in a society
> prepared to accord positive recognition
> to cultural diversity. (Willey 1984b:27)

Throughout the 1960s, 70s and 80s, however, increasing concern was expressed about how racial discrimination had become manifest in a number of areas of British life. A wealth of evidence testified to the widespread nature of racial difficulties and disadvantage and the facts of racism came to be documented with increasing sophistication. (Rex & Moore 1967, Daniel 1968, Rose 1969, Foot 1969, Smith 1977, Runnymede Trust 1980, Brown 1984, CRE publications). Despite continuous attempts made to counter racial discrimination since 1965, including the passage of three Race Relations Acts, it was well established that the unequal material and educational circumstances of the racial minority population meant that this population (especially Afro-Caribbean youth) was more prone to higher levels of unemployment, lower income and job levels, poorer housing conditions, racial attacks, and lower levels of achievement in schools.

Accordingly, in a context in which the facts of racial disadvantage and racism in British society had assumed a new prominence, education policy-makers began to take the question of multiculturalism and definition of multicultural objectives on board. In the absence of a consensus about the aims and goals of multiculturalism, however, official policy responses reflected diverse views and a debate ensued as to what form multicultural policies should take. Thus while the climate of the times provides the wider historical context for the study, the moral and educational exigencies of the late 1970s and early 1980s, namely, a growing awareness of the need to combat forms of racism in education and improve the performance of ethnic and racial minority pupils, were matters requiring urgent attention. In this period of relatively moderate educational policy strategies, ILEA's 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education initiative, although itself moderate, broke new ground in publicly acknowledging the multi-ethnic nature of society and affirming that

> Unequivocally, the commitment is to all. Just
> as there are no second-class citizens, so there
> must be no second-class educational opportunities.
> (ILEA.1977:1)

The ILEA policy document reflected the social democratic tradition in policy-making with its benign forms of state intervention and egalitarian values. The policy itself grew out of the collaboration of several different groups of interests, eg. local education authority officials, classroom teachers, black groups, some radicals, and traditional socialists. In brief, a coalition of different interests, reflecting seemingly contradictory views, both educational and political, came together to promote the policy. These different

interests were felt by some to be at odds with each other. Indeed, in the course of my research this essentially benign strategy was challenged not only by the left who advocated an overtly politicised antiracist position, but also the New Right who began to challenge the fundamental social democratic values of equality of educational opportunity. This was a period in which the dominant political consensus of the post-war period was in the process of being replaced by a political and economic philosophy of free market liberalism in which individuals were expected to fend for themselves. Thus the rapidly changing political and ideological climate in this period influenced and shaped the formation, content and reception accorded the policy. These different views and interpretations will be elaborated in the course of this thesis.

Several questions are raised by the emergence of the ILEA policy position. What is the status of a Local Education Authority-wide policy statement? How is an Authority-wide policy statement interpreted and implemented? Are explicit aims, goals and a plan of action included in the policy statement? What happens when the people an Authority has devolved power to decide to carry out the policy? Conversely, what happens when those to whom power is devolved decide not to carry out that policy? How is the policy presented and publicised throughout the Authority and throughout the school? This study also seeks to contribute to the answering of these broader questions.

METHODOLOGY

In the past twenty-five years ethnographic methods have become increasingly popular with educational researchers. (Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970, Ball 1982, Burgess 1983, Woods 1983, 1986) The reason for the popularity of these methods lies in their inherent flexibility, ie., the ability to devise research strategies and evolve methods to suit specific circumstances encountered in the field. Ethnography enables certain kinds of questions to be asked, namely, the questions of process as opposed to questions of outcome. It is here that ethnography is more appropriate to studying policy implementation. Indeed, Finch's (1988) view is that the limitations of quantitative data provide a major argument for the usefulness of ethnographic work in policy analysis. This is so, she argues, because they can provide descriptive detail about particular settings; they can provide data upon 'natural' settings rather than those which have been artificially constructed for research purposes; and they facilitate study of situations in the round, reflecting the complexity of the total setting rather than studying only certain features which have to be decided in advance. Finally, ethnography makes it possible to study processes through time. (Finch 1988:188)

The difficultiy remains, however, as to how we can define 'ethnography', as such, with any precision. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) explain there is disagreement about what the distinctive feature of ethnography is. Is ethnography the

elicidation of cultural knowledge (Spradley
1980), detailed investigation of patterns of
social interaction (Gumperz 1981), or holistic
analysis of societies (Lutz 1981)....[or is it]
essentially descriptive, or perhaps a form of
story-telling (Walker 1981)...[or] the develop-
ment and testing of theory (Glaser and Strauss
1978:1).

The simple answer may be that ethnography is a combination of all of these processes. In the context of this dissertation, however, I take as my starting point Hammersley and Atkinson's (1983) view that ethnography is a cognate term for participant observation, located in the naturalistic tradition of social investigation which seeks to describe cultures in order to gain inside knowledge of 'how the world is'. Ethnographers thus enter 'natural' settings with the intention of causing minimal disruption. The ethnographer's aim is to remain an objective observer who occupies a marginal position which ideally enables her to remain 'outside' while actually being 'inside'.

There are no standardised procedures for conducting ethnographic research and 'access' to the cultural setting is only the starting point. Data are not to be taken at face value; they must be treated as a field of inferences in which hypothetical patterns can be identified (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983:18). Thus the ethnographers' task is to interpret the behaviour of the actors. In this way ethnography is located in the theoretical tradition of symbolic interactionism (Woods 1983). In symbolic interaction, in the sense that Mead used it, human beings interpret each other's gestures and act on the basis of the meaning yielded by interpretation (Blumer 1976:13). Ethnography does not, therefore, depend exclusively on a descriptive recording and subsequent reproduction of the events or people

in the setting. Rather, the ethnographer constructs her own actions and meanings about the objects in the world under study. 'Meanings' are not the same for all the actors in the setting and interpretation of the meaning of actions or remarks of other persons and defining the acts is an ongoing process. In brief, human interaction involves a positive shaping of the process in its own right (Blumer 1976:13).

There is inevitably a problem of 'ecological validity', ie., drawing inferences from what is observed or said in interviews and the extent to which these findings are valid both internally and externally and can be generalised across time and space. Unlike experimental situations, ethnography cannot control the variables under study. Given this problem, it is necessary to be aware of and sensitive to the effect the ethnographer and her procedures have on the responses of the people and culture being studied. An integral feature of ethnographic practice, then, is that once an ethnographer has joined the community, learned the language and devised methods for recording observations, she must be reflexive, ie., continuously engaged in further reflections about her understanding of what is being observed and assessing in what way she may have disturbed the naturalness of the setting. Reflexivity is, therefore, an indespensable and ongoing process. In addition, ethnographers generally supplement their findings with data from a number of sources which can further illuminate the natural setting under investigation. This helps to increase the vaildity of the analysis because ethnographers incorporate pre-existing sources of information which can include biographical, statistical, survey data as well as structured and unstructured interviews. In this way ethnography

involves data triangulation. Such practices form the methodological basis of this thesis, and in certain of the chapters which follow I draw on statistical and survey materials to provide the interpretive context of the observational and interview data.

With regard to access and field relations, Woods (1986) explains that 'getting in' is a common problem for ethnographers. "You have to sell yourself as a credible person doing a worthy project" (Woods 1986:23). To my surprise I had no difficulty in 'getting in'. My starting point was when my 'gatekeeper', a colleague at the polytechnic where I had been lecturing for twelve years, told me that East End High was responding positively to the Authority's Multi-Ethnic Education policy. She already had access to the school because she and another colleague had given a series of lectures on Afro-Caribbean culture and history to the whole staff. At her suggestion, I wrote to Mr. Ogden, the West Indian Deputy Head of East End High, in February 1979 asking if I could come along to discuss the possibility of conducting research into East End High's endeavour to put the ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education directive into place in the school. My request was met with a positive response. After meeting with Mr. Ogden and the Head, Mr. Kay, I wrote to the ILEA asking for official approval to conduct research inside the school. Once this request was approved in March of 1979, I began to plan how I would begin my fieldwork.

Woods (1986) makes the important point that access can be understood to take place on three different levels. The first is the public, the outer face of the school in its Sunday

clothes. In his view this level is the one we 'see' when we visit for a short period, say for open evenings, to conduct the one-off interview, or to observe a staff meeting. The ethnographer enters the second level when she enters the 'twilight zone' between the first public front and the latter deeper natural realities. At the second level, people are still on their guard and reluctant to confide innermost thoughts. It is at the third level, however, that the more 'secret' insights emerge. This is the level which the ethnographer only reaches after time, after her presence is no longer regarded as one of an 'outsider'. Her presence is natural when people begin to confide personal hopes, fears, aims, displeasures and frustrations. (Woods 1986:23)

It must be said that the subject matter of my thesis was bound to be intrinsically sensitive and somewhat controversial, not only to policy-makers in Country Hall but also to staff in East End High. Questions which probe into peoples' racial attitudes are notoriously difficult. People are evasive about these issues-- often openly unwilling to disclose their real views, feelings. For this reason I kept on my guard. My own concern vis a vis racial equality in education stemmed from a long-standing commitment to racial equality in the widest sense. As an American I had grown up in a multiracial society and had participated in the Civil Rights movement on my campus as an undergraduate. As a postgraduate I trained to teach secondary school Social Studies in New York State and had a spell of teaching in the mid-1960s in a New York City high school. There my classes were full of pupils from a wide variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. One of my clearest memories was when, in routinely saluting the flag in the morning registration period,

the class would say in unison, "with liberty and justice for some!". Their perception and experience of inequality moved me and has remained with me as has my concern with the ongoing struggle for racial equality in the United States. Settling in London did not alter this commitment, but it did widen my concern to one which encompasses the British context in general, and London's schools in particular.

In 1967 I became a sociology and politics lecturer in a newly-formed London polytechnic and to my delight many students were from London's inner city schools. Like those I had taught in the New York City high school, they were also from a wide variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. Gradually, however, I came to recognise that increasing numbers of pupils of West Indian origin and other ethnic minority groups in London's comprehensives did not appear to be moving on into higher education in proportion to their numbers. My interest and concern about this situation was further stimulated by my black British polytechnic students who told me they had learned little or nothing about their respective histories or cultures in school. There was one notable exception, a young man of West Indian origin, who had been a pupil at Tulse Hill School in Brixton. On one occasion he invited me to meet his former history teacher at this teacher's home in Brixton. I was curious see the classroom materials this teacher and his colleague had developed as a result of spending their school holidays in the British Museum library meticulously researching the history of the black presence in Britain. I was shown photocopied documents of paupers lists from the 1600s in which 'a black man' was listed. A remarkably wide range of primary source materials had been collected, including photos

of famous paintings in which you could see a 'negro'. These teachers had organised their information into curriculum materials which were subsequently published (File, N. & Power, C. 1981, File, N. & Hinds D. 1984). They have had a positive effect in helping to challenge the Eurocentricism so firmly embedded in the history curriculum in Britain.

This, then, is the background which explains my concern with the first local education authority multi-ethnic education initiative in England. As a former secondary school teacher myself, I was eager to get back into school to see what was happening vis a vis implementing change in a multicultural direction. My approach was to take the role of a non-participant observer with the support of the Head. He told his staff I would be conducting research in the school and asked them to cooperate with me. Nevertheless, I sensed that several teachers, even the pupils themselves, were wary of my presence in the initial months I spent in the field. With the passage of time, however, I successfully negotiated my way through the first and second levels of access and eventually found myself at the third level, which was my goal. The form which my non-participant observer role took is described in the chapters which follow. One further point which may be relevant before turning to outline the content of the thesis: I am a white female who is six feet tall.

PLAN OF THE THESIS

The thesis consists of an Introduction, six substantive chapters and a conclusion. Chapter two, follows this Introduction and examines the social democratic tradition of education policy-making in which the principle of equality of educational opportunity dominated the post-war period up through the late 1970s. Particular attention will be paid to the emergence of racial inequalities in education and the ILEA's 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education policy initiative. Chapter three addresses the multicultural-antiracist education debate noting the New Right's backlash and critique. Chapter four examines the socio-economic, demographic, ethnic and educational profile of the Borough of Innerton where East End High is located. The concept of educational underachievement is problematised in the light of the compensatory policy-orientation in this period. Data from the School Leavers Study in The Rampton/Swann Reports is criticised for its methodological inadequacies. Chapter five focuses on the process of underachievement from the point of view of pupils in East End High. Evidence about the pupils is presented in terms of an ethnic pupil profile, ability band ratios, socio-economic background and experiential data from interviews with fifth formers entered for exams and a small group of truants. Chapter six investigates the teachers' views about multi-ethnic education in East End High. Organisational, administrative and decision-making matters inside the school are featured here. Chapter seven analyses the life-history of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High, the main

forum where multicultural and antiracist matters were discussed. In terms of the power structure in the school, this Committee played a somewhat marginal role which helps to explain the uneven and inconsistent nature of multi-ethnic policy implementation. In Chapter eight, the thesis draws conclusions on three levels: first, the wider context of the post-war tradition of social democratic policy-making in education; second, the policy response at the local education authority level and third, views about multi-ethnic education implementation and practice inside the school. It is hoped that the thesis provides a well-rounded and clear picture of the quantitative and qualitative complexities of the evolution of multicultural policy-making, dissemination and implementation at that time.

NOTES
1. The names of the school and the borough have been changed to ensure that the identity of the informants and borough remain anonymous.

CHAPTER TWO

INEQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION: RHETORIC OR REALITY?
THE STORY OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY IN POST-WAR BRITAIN

INTRODUCTION

Equality of opportunity is a dominant theme in the story of state
education in England and Wales in the post-war period. But the
story of this theme is not easily told nor is the meaning of
equality of opportunity straightforward; its realisation
throughout the past 45 years has proved both elusive and
problematic. That this has been the case is due to different
expectations held by the different individuals and groups
concerned. Although free secondary schooling is now commonplace,
we need to ask whether there has always been a consensus in
favour of providing it. This chapter will approach this question
by beginning with a consideration of the inter-war debates in
which the main ideals and elements in the 1944 Butler Education
Act took shape. It will then move on to consider equality of
opportunity debate in the post-war period. Finally, with the
arrival of substantial numbers of ethnic and racial minority
pupils in the 1960s, discussion focuses on official responses
which initially were designed to meet the needs of immigrant
pupils. However, as the facts of racial inequalities in
education surfaced, we will explain how policies evolved which
aimed to reduce discrimination and promote equality of
educational opportunity for Britain's ethnic and racial minority
pupils. The exemplar used is the Inner London Education
Authority's 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education Policy.

BACKGROUND: THE INTER-WAR YEARS

The debates of the inter-war years centred on three conflicting views of the goals of state secondary education. The first emphasised meritocracy,ie., the need for selection and rewarding talent among working class children. The second stressed that all children should be educated to the highest standard possible while the third was based on the belief that talents were genetically determined and distributed disproportionately in the higher social classes. According to the third view, there was no need for large-scale expenditure to provide schooling for working class children who did not possess the requisite ability to benefit from it (Thane 1982:203-204). These views represent the substantive issues in the debates conducted both before and since the provision of free secondary schooling came about after the passage of the 1944 Education Act. The consensus as to the desirability of free secondary education and equality of opportunity has always been fragile, hotly disputed and has in recent years been considerably undermined by reintroduction of free places in the private sector paid for from the public purse. (Whitty and Edwards 1984, Simon 1988.)

In setting the scene we need to consider some of the evidence about the proportion of children attending secondary schools in the inter-war years. Thane (1982) noted that "in 1923-24 only 12.6% of all children remained in education beyond the age of fourteen" (Thane 1982:201). Although the 'free place' system at grammar schools had existed since 1907, (which in theory ensured that any child of suitable ability would not be debarred) in practice a high proportion of working-class children had to refuse places because their parents were unable to provide the

uniform or forego the child's earnings to age sixteen. In 1926,
Lindsay highlighted two figures which put the problem into
perpective:

> First, of the 550,000 children who leave
> elementary schools each year, 9.5% of an
> age-group proceed to secondary schools,
> one-third exempt from fees and two-thirds
> fee paying, while 1 per 1,000 reach the
> university. Secondly, of 2,800,000
> adolescents in England and Wales, 80% are
> not in full-time attendance at any school.
> (Silver 1973:28)

This was the type of evidence which provided the basis for the
debates of the inter-war years. The 1923-24 Labour Government
pressed for improving educational opportunities, specifically in
the form of promoting 'Secondary Education for All'(1922), an
influential pamphlet written by R.H. Tawney. As a major
educational spokesperson for the Labour Party, Tawney's views
represented a form of socialist egalitarianism---a repugnance
for the principles of class organisation as enshrined in the
education legislation of 1902. Tawney persuaded his fellow
members of the Hadow Committee, a standing consultative committee
of the Board of Education, that evidence indicated children were
capable of achieving far more than the existing educational
facilities afforded. Accordingly, the Hadow Committee
recommended that the school leaving age be raised to 15 and
that schooling be reorganised after the age of 11. The Hadow
Report of 1926 recommended that schools should cater for three
groups according to aptitude, thus foreshadowing the tripartite
framework for secondary schooling which was to come. It was at
this point that the principle of selection came to be enshrined
in the transition from primary to secondary education.
Secondary schools were to be organised for academically able
pupils who would attend grammar schools, pupils with a 'technical

bent' who would attend technical schools and the remaining pupils who would attend a new type of school, the 'modern school'. All three types of secondary schools were to be accorded equal social esteem, ('parity of esteem') but difficulties soon emerged which undermined the hope of establishing genuine 'equality of opportunity' for children with different talents and abilities. By 1931 Tawney was quick to see that the separate schools were not endowed with equal facilities or social esteem. He wrote in Equality, (1931):

> Working-class children have the same needs to
> be met [as the boys and girls of the well-to-do],
> and the same powers to be developed. But their
> opportunities of developing them are rationed,
> like bread in a famine, under stringent precautions,
> as though, were secondary education made too
> accessible, the world would end-as it is possible,
> indeed, that one sort of world might. (Tawney in
> Silver 1973:53)

That Hadow's recommendations did not really promote a genuine equality of opportunity was not lost in the debates and policy initiatives which followed. The Spens Commitee succeeded Hadow and reported in 1938. Following in the footsteps of Hadow's recommendations, Spens rejected the TUC's proposal for 'multilateral' secondary schools (the forerunner of comprehensive secondary school), schools designed to diminish social distinctions and cater for all children of secondary age. Reluctantly Spens abandoned the 'multilateral idea' and came out in favour of the traditionalism of the grammar school and the technical school. The rationale given for retaining traditionalism in secondary education was due to a preference for small schools, a need for a viable sixth form within traditional grammar schools, geographical factors, the needs of the curriculum and different teaching methods...all of which were viewed as incompatible within the framework of a large

multilateral school. But Spens did not abandon 'the

multilateral idea' altogether:

> The multilaterial idea, though it may not be
> expressed by means of the multilateral school,
> should in effect permeate the system of secondary
> education as we conceive it....The establishment
> of parity between all types of secondary school
> is a fundamental requirement. (Maclure 1986:198)

The Labour Party was critical of this position and questioned how

'parity of esteem' could be retained without parity of

expenditure on the different types of school. Expenditure on

education suffered in the 1930s and teachers' salaries were

actually cut as was building capitation. The percentage of

national income spent by central government decreased throughout

the 1920s and 1930s, dropping from 2.4% in 1922 to 2.2% in 1939

(Thane 1982:205). In such circumstances, parity of esteem could

hardly be realised.

The Spens Report emphasised selective examinations at 11+,

citing psychological evidence as a basis for arguing that,

> It is accordingly evident that different
> children from the age of 11, if justice
> is to be done to their varying capacities,
> require types of education varying in
> certain important respects. (Maclure 1986:195)

The human capital or investment model was also to be found in

Spens: schools should be meeting the needs of the economy. Here

the 'new type of higher school of technical character' was seen

as encompassing a distinctive character to develop training to

provide a good intellectual discipline and to have technical

value in relation not to one particular occupation but to a group

of occupations (Maclure 1986:196).

While it is undeniably true that secondary education improved in

the inter-war years, it was still only a 'minority' privilege. In 1938 46.9% of pupils in secondary schools paid no fees; but in 1937 only 19.2% of fourteen to seventeen year-olds were in school (Thane 1982:206). Although gains were made by lower middle class children whose parents could afford to forego their children's wages, on the eve of the outbreak of the War it was clear that working class children had gained least.

In the inter-war years these were the elements that helped to make up the framework which would become the the basis for changes in state education. There were, however, two notable exceptions: the position of the independent sector and the role of church schools. One further point should be stressed with reference to the ideal of equality of opportunity in education, namely, the multilateral school. The principle of 'multilateralism' or the common school had received much attention throughout the 30s. Many felt this was the only way of achieving educational equality while ensuring that social inequality did not reproduce itself in the schools (Barker 1972). Nevertheless even the Labour Party was not united in its understanding of multilateralism. For some it was seen as an 'addition' to the existing system of secondary schooling, with the grammar school remaining unaltered at the apex. Barker (1972) explains that in the early 1940s there

> were now three opinions on common schools
> within the party: Opposition to them in
> any form [which included Tawney], support
> for their introduction as additions to the
> existing system, and support for the common
> school as the only kind of secondary school.
> (Barker 1972:78)

This division of opinion would become more significant in years to come when, in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s

and 70s, the issue of comprehensive reorganisation came to prominence. But that is to get ahead of events. Let us move on to that crucial period, the wartime coalition government, when R.A. Butler achieved an educational consensus in which Labour Party thinking was to have a strong imprint.

THE WAR, THE COALITON GOVENMENT AND THE 1944 BUTLER EDUCATION ACT

Richard Austen Butler or 'Rab', a progressive Conservative, was appointed President of the Board of Education by Churchill on July 20, 1941 (Howard 1987). The period of wartime coalition government was crucial in determining the agenda of issues which were to be debated and legislated on, and Butler was a major figure throughout. The war itself shaped the character of postwar reconstruction (Finch 1984). Egalitarianism assumed more importance in wartime and a general levelling took place with hierarchy and privilege assuming less significance. The government intervened in areas hitherto out of bounds. Civilian upheavals in wartime highlighted the need for what Titmus (Finch 1984) saw as measures developed to meet the primary needs of the population irrespective of their social status and, to an extent, their wealth. In the coalition period three main themes emerged from the Beveridge Report in 1942 which influenced the content of post-war legislation and the institutions of the welfare state: collective responsibility, free universal services, and benefits provided as of right. These themes embodied the key principles underlying the social democratic consensus which characterised the postwar period. In brief, the government would assume a greater responsibility for the welfare of the entire citizenry.

An upheaval which assumed particular importance in September 1939 was the evacuation of children. The evacuation shocked the rural middle classes. William Temple, the Archbishop of York, asked

> Who were these boys and girls—half-fed, half-clothed, less than half-taught, complete strangers to the most elementary social discipline and the ordinary decencies of a civilised home? (Howard 1987:117)

Butler was moved to recall in his memoirs

> ....the revelations of evacuation administered a severe shock to the national conscience; for they brought to light the conditions of those unfortunate children of the 'submergd tenth' who would also rank among the citizens of the future. It was realised ....that 'two nations' still existed in England a century after Disraeli had used the phrase. (Butler 1971:3)

The call was for an overhaul of the nation's schools which would, ideally,

> given the common bonds that now united the entire population in the war effort, take in the fee-paying schools and weld them on to an improved and reconstructed national system. (Howard 1987:117)

The evolution of the education compromise which the 1944 Education Act eventually came to represent was tortuous. Perhaps it is to Butler's lasting credit that he forged alliances with three Labour members of the Coalition Cabinet: Attlee, Bevan and Greenwood. Indeed, Butler was to write

> I find in Education that much of the drive towards a vaguely progressive future comes from Labour. (Howard 1987:117)

Doubtless Butler was encouraged and supported in his progressive reformism by his Labour colleagues. Although he had come from a long line of distinguished academics (Howard 1987) and understood more intimately than most the importance of education, the left's influence reinforced his wish to create a better education

system for the post-war world. In this endeavour he succeeded in negotiating a critical compromise with the Church schools by creating two categories of schools: controlled and aided schools. In the former, controlled, the local authority became responsible for all funding and for the appointment of almost all teachers and of school governors. The agreed syllabus became the basis of religious education taught in local authority schools. The latter, aided, by contrast, meant that the local authority was responsible for the expenses of running the school, teachers' salaries but school governors retained responsibility for 50% of maintenance and the church could have a majority on the governing body with the right to appoint and dismiss teachers as well as arranging for religious education of a denominational nature (Finch 1984).

Butler was less successful in dealing with the fee-paying schools, however. He set up and gave the Fleming Committee "the vaguest possible terms of reference" which were "to investiate how the facilities of a boarding school education might be extended to those who desired to profit from them, irrespective of their means". (Howard 1987:121) But no significant action was taken to alter the status of the fee-paying sector and, significantly, the Labour members did not press the point. Howard (1987) argues that

> Rab's handling of the public schools question
> represented the one real failure in his
> general strategy for educational reconstruction.
> (Howard 1987:122)

Still, the Fleming Committee had temporarily removed the fuse and "the first-class carriage had been shunted onto an immense siding" with Butler acknowledging that there was no practical

solution to the problem of the public schools, of which he had never, in any case, approved.

Indisputably the single most important feature of the 1944 Act was the provision of free secondary education for all, with the actual administration of education left in the hands of local authorities whose basic structure remained unaltered. The settling of the position of church schools was a major achievement. The 1943 White Paper had proposed fundamental changes in structure and content and these were implemented in the Act by introducing 'three progressive stages' to be known as primary, secondary and further education. Education was to be offered to suit individual 'abilities and aptitudes' for which the child was best adapted. In this sense the Act was clearly child-centred. But the Act was strongly influenced by the 1943 Norwood Report which discussed children in terms of three 'rough groupings' with different 'types of mind'. Butler made it clear that he had the tripartite system in mind as the best available system. Yet the Act made no explicit reference to the tripartite system nor did it prevent the establishment of multilateral schools. The school leaving age was raised to 15 with the provision to raise it to 16 when feasible. Grants to university students were increased. The Board of Education was re-named the 'Ministry of Education' with enlarged if somewhat vague powers given to the Minister. All local education authorities were to submit plans for the development of education in their areas within a year. (Finch 1984, Thane 1982)

In assessing the 1944 Education Act, we can see that Butler was fortunate to be able to effect change in a period

characteristed by the absence of normal political conflicts. There was a strong consensus in favour of the Act and the principles or dominant themes of post-war legislation were adapted to suit the educational context. One key principle, access to education on a more equal basis (albeit with selection at 11+) would, it was believed, promote greater social justice. Second, the welfare of children would be furthered through education and would be complemented by the other measures to promote welfare throughout the whole society.

THE POST-WAR SETTLEMENT

We need to question whether the consensus embodied in the 1944 Education Act was sufficient to ensure that equality of opportunity in education could become a reality. The ideological framework throughout the post-war period until the mid-1970s was social democratic and was characterised by intervention on behalf of a benign state attempting to provide greater social equality. Thus the state assumed an active, interventionist stance, was promotional, not passive and aimed to change social, economic and political life by democratic means, ie., with the willing acquiescence of the mass of the citizenry (Finch 1984).

Social engineering was a dominant strategy in the social democratic tradition especially in the field of educational change. The aims or 'ends' of educational change throughout this period were predominantly geared toward producing more social equality and justice via equal access and two key strategies were applied in the interest of promoting greater social equality and justice: redistribution and positive discrimination.

These strategies were initially adopted for redistribution in favour of working class pupils but in subsequent years they have also been adapted to meet the needs of girls and racial and ethnic minority pupils. Above all, these strategies or polices for redistribution have been and continue to be measures designed to remove specific barriers to access. Redistributive measures can, of course, imply a more active strategy in the interest of promoting a fuller equality of educational opportunity. Since this thesis is concerned with assessing the extent to which such strategies are successful or limited with regard to the needs of ethnic and racial minority pupils, the discussion will review issues in general terms and then turn to focus explicitly on policies designed to reduce the barriers which prevent ethnic minority pupils from having equal access in education.

Two redistributive strategies have been central in the promotion of equality of educational opportunities in the post-war period: the meritocratic and egalitarian. Both were integral aspects of thinking which informed policy-making and were employed to widen access for working class children. The meritocratic model was based on the view that there is only a limited pool of talent among the nation's children whom it is vital to identify and train so that they can develop their potential leadership qualities and contribute to the nation's efficiency. Closely related to the concept of meritocracy is the idea of 'desert' (in contrast with the idea of 'undeserving'). Although there is no consensus about the desirability or meaning of the meritocratic principle, meritocratic strategies have always been a central feature of education in Britain. Tawney was critical of the 'ladder' of opportunity where everyone 'starts' in the same

place but 'finishes' up unequally; he disputed the idea that strategies can be designed to ensure more equality at the finishing point. (Finch 1984:118-119)

The second redistributive model, the egalitarian, regarded the idea of social justice as more important than the efficiency of the economy. Here education is understood as a valued good in its own right and need not necessarily be seen in relation to wider social and economic structures. Rejecting meritocratic principles, the egalitarian strategy has the potential for changing the social and economic structures which the education system feeds. While the egalitarian principle has dominated education thinking throughout this period, it is important to understand that egalitarian and efficiency aims are often--even usually combined. However, social engineering strategies may depend on the introduction of specific means for ensuring their success, and forms of positive discrimination constitute such a strategy.

Strategies of positive discrimination are relatively recent in the tradition of social democratic policy-making. In principle positive discrimination is a variant of the redistributive strategy. It is, as Finch explains, concerned with

> distributive justice understood in a Rawlsian sense,
> where justice is produced by concentrating resources
> upon particular groups and individuals hitherto
> disadvantaged. It represents a highly interventionist
> strategy of social engineering, for which education
> has provided the major testing ground. (Finch 1984:128)

Logically, there are three ways in which 'discrimination' can be practiced:

> negative discrimination against the underprivileged;
> positive discrimination against the privileged on

> their own behalf; and positive discrimination on
> behalf of the underprivileged, in a framework of
> universalism. (Finch 1984:128)

Pinker (1968) suggests that we can regard positive discrimination
as

> the only form of discrimination compatible with
> the idea of a welfare society because its ultimate
> goal is the achievement of optimal rather than
> minimal standards. Discrimination becomes a process
> of inclusion rather than exclusion.(Pinker 1968:190)

The strategies of positive discrimination which have been
operationalised in recent years have been seen as controversial
not only because, strictly speaking, they are prohibited by the
terms of the Race Relations Act 1976, but also because they have
caused a backlash in instances where the policy of positive
discrimination has been defined in terms of targets and quotas.
(Dorn 1985, Edwards 1987) Nonetheless, this is an important
principle with the potential to promote egalitarian aims.
Overall, the post-war period has witnessed the implementation of
both forms of redistributive strategies, the meritocratic and the
egalitarian.

We move on to consider the post-war period in terms of
four chronological phases (Finch 1984) in which the main policy
trends and research findings address the extent to which the goal
of equality of educational opportunity was met. The final
section of the chapter considers the emergence of policies
specifically designed to widen access and promote equality of
opportunity for ethnic and racial minority pupils.

1944-1959: CONSOLIDATING THE CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE 1944 ACT

The 1945 Labour Government was entrusted with the task of
supervising the implementation of the 1944 Education Act.
Pupils were characterised in terms of three types of ability

discussed in the influential Norwood Report (1943), and tripartism became the basis for selection by examination at 11+. Pupils passed from elementary school into one of three types of secondary school: the grammar, technical or the secondary modern. In this way tripartism came to be institutionalised, though some members of the Labour Government had pressed for multilateral schools. At this early stage, the secondary modern school was not yet viewed with opprobrium.

Early in the post-war period the goal of equality of educational opportunity was not seen as problematic. By the end of the 1940s, however, staunch supporters of the Welfare State began to question whether equality of opportunity was possible in education. There was evidence that all was not well in terms of widening access for working class pupils, and the debate intensified as to whether the method for selection at 11+ was fair. Two questions emerged which have still not been properly answered. The first concerned whether a pupil's ability could be adequately measured at 11+. Second, would grammar schools ever cease to be seen as superior, ie., would there ever be 'parity of esteem' between the three types of secondary schools?

These issues were debated intensely. Marshall (1965) wrote about the principles of individualism and collectivism. He took a meritocratic view because he doubted whether it was possible to bring these two principles into harmony.

> If the Welfare State is to bring its two
> principles into harmony, it must conceive of
> the basic equality of all as human beings and
> fellow-citizens in a way which leaves room for
> the recognition that all are not equally gifted
> nor equally capable of rendering equally valuable

> services to the community, that equal opportunity
> means an equal chance to reveal differences, some
> of which are superiorities, and that these differences
> need for their development different types of
> education, some of which may legitimately be regarded
> as higher than others. (Marshall 1965:266)

Marshall drew on the work of his contemporaries, including Glass

of the London School of Economics, who had begun to publish data

from his social mobility study of London school pupils in the

early 1950s. Glass found that working class children were

under-represented in grammar schools despite their numerical

superiority. When Himmelweit (1954) looked at Glass's data, she

questioned whether the procedures by which pupils were allocated

to secondary schools were fair, irrespective of test results.

Factors such as parental aspirations, ordinal position in family,

family size as well as the teacher's views were identified as

relevant in addition to test scores.

> In the eyes of the teachers...the boy with a
> working-class background is not so well integrated
> into the school. It is difficult to estimate how
> far such evaluation is the result of genuine
> differences in behaviour and outlook on the part
> of the boys or to what extent it reflects differences
> in the teacher's attitudes to pupils coming from
> different social backgrounds. (Himmelweit 1954:128)

Although these observations were made about class inequalities

and the tripartite system of the 1950s, they are just as

pertinent today with regard to inequalities of class as well as

girls, ethnic and racial minority pupils.

The function which the I.Q. test performed should also be

questioned. Simon (1953), strongly opposed to separating

children into different groups at the age of ten, posed the

deceptively simple question: "whether the scores obtained by

children on tests are 'reliable' measures?" (Simon 1953:116) He

challenged the premise that a child's intelligence quotient remains constant.

> Intelligence tests can only claim to be reliable
> measures of an innate quality if children, tested a
> number of different times over a period of years,
> consistenly obtain an approximately similar I.Q.
> (Simon 1953:116)

The role of the I.Q. test, then, is problematic, controversial and continues to provide a basis for ongoing debate (Eysenck & Kamin 1981, Mackintosh & Mascie-Taylor 1985).

As tripartism was consolidated, evidence accumulated about the disproportionate numbers of middle-class children in grammar schools and working-class disadvantage stemming from unfair and unreliable methods of selection at 11+. Looking back we can see that equality of educational opportunity was more rhetoric than reality; the relationship betwen educational failure and social background suggested that educational success was socially distributed.

1959-1964: FROM ACCESS TO 'ACHIEVEMENT'

In two major government reports on education, the Crowther Report (1959) and the Newsom Report (1963), evidence indicated that there was a severe 'wastage of talent' among 13-18 year-olds. If pupils were not realising their potential then they would be unable to contribute to fulfilling the economic needs of the nation. The Robbins Report (1963) on higher education recommended an expansion of higher education to facilitate meeting the country's growing need for trained manpower. These reports were instrumental in stimulating a new understanding of the way in which access to education touched on a much wider range of issues than just providing free secondary education for

all. Crowther, for example, explicitly identified education as a form of investment. In do soing, the human capital model again figured prominently as it had in Spens (1938) and has remained a persistent theme ever since.

The post-war economy was changing and it made sense for the government to look at other areas of education. In the Newson Report Half Our Future (1963), the brief was to examine young people between the ages of 13 and 16, of average or less than average ability. Newson recommended that these pupils should receive a greater share of the nation's educational resources. Here the human capital argument focussed attention on the 'wastage of talent' which the country could not afford and which might give way to rebelliousness or apathy. As with Crowther, however, there was little detailed discussion of the limiting aspects of the selective nature of the secondary system and whether this resulted in labelling children unfairly. The economic needs of the nation were explicitly identified in the Robbins Report (1963) which recommended the expansion of higher education, an essential prerequisite to fulfilling that task. Here again was the theme of 'untapped ability' ('wastage of talent'); the call was to provide places for all those capable of undertaking higher education. In particular, girls needed to be educated.

At this time important findings were emerging from the work of the newly recognised sub-discipline the sociology of education. Jackson and Marsden's Education and the Working Class (1962) studied 88 working class children in grammar schools. The importance of the study was that the authors showed how the

culture of the grammar school actively discriminated against pupils from working-class homes. Working-class pupils, it seemed, had to accommodate to middle-class values, adapt and risk becoming alienated from their own background. The study highlighted how the grammar school ethos was responsible for producing working-class failures. A second timely study was the first volume of Douglas et al, <u>The Home and The School</u> (1964), in which the child and family background were examined. Douglas' findings emphasised social class factors in the home which influenced the child's success at school. He found that failure in school could be attributed to circumstances outside the school such an an 'unsatisfactory' home.

Additional factors were identified as inhibiting educational equality in this period. Recognition changed from a primary concern with equal access to free secondary schools to one which began to focus on how the factors in pupils' social class backgrounds were linked with factors in schools which affected academic performance. Disproportionate numbers of working class pupils were not achieving (with girls beginning to be recognised as underachieving). Concern with the nation's economic efficiency and the extent to which education could contribute continued to figure in the debates. The strategies for changing this state of affairs takes us forward to the next period.

1964-1972: NEW BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT

Socio-economic patterns of achievement in this period showed clearly that equality of educational opportunity was still not being realised. Free and equal access was no longer regarded as sufficient because it was now clear that the technical and

organisational problems of education needed attention. Labour came to office in 1964 with the intention of promoting comprehensive secondary education because they saw it as a policy with the potential for improving academic opportunities. As Secretary of State for Education, Anthony Crosland issued DES Circular 10/65 requesting local authorities to produce plans for comprehensive reorganisation. The response was uneven and largely reflected patterns of party political control at local level, with Conservative authorities showing least willing. Looking back, the comprehensive initiative in this period can best be described as having had a see-saw effect because the Conservatives came to power in 1970 and withdrew Circular 10/65 and substituted 10/70, which indicated that LEAs no longer needed to follow comprehensive principles.

In the 1960s British education was influenced by events and policy initiatives taking place in the United States. In 1964 President Johnson had launched a 'War on Poverty' in which debates centred on inequalities, with particular attention on educational inequality. The Coleman Report, <u>Equality of Educational Opportunity</u> (1966) investigated expenditure and the material inequalities between black and white schools which were presumed to be the explanation for differential scholastic achievement by race (Karabel & Halsey 1977:20). Although Coleman did not collect data about the internal workings of schools or pupils' family background, he nonetheless drew the conclusion that family background was much more important than school characteristics in explaining differential achievement among school children (Karabel & Halsey 1977:21). This view gave substance to theories of cultural deprivation,

deficient home background and the inadequacy of ghetto families. Home environment was seen to be linked with school performance. Researchers and policy-makers were quick to pick up this interpretation and apply it in the British context.

In Britain the Plowden Report, <u>Children and Their Primary Schools</u> (1967) investigated primary schooling and rates of achievement and spoke about 'deprived' children for whom cultural barriers were seen to impede the development of their full potential. Initially the barriers were assumed to be mainly material and financial and Plowden's recommendations were predominantly geared to expanding resources to deprived areas (Educational Priority Areas), a form of compensatory educational strategies (adapted from the American policy package at that time). Plowden made an explicit call for positive discrimination in favour of 'disadvantaged' primary school children. (see chapter 4 for elaboration and critique of Plowden strategies.)

In addition to mobilising issues of race and educational achievement on to the agenda, Coleman (1971) redefined the problem of differential academic performance by distinguishing between the relatively passive notion of equality of opportunity and the more active one of equality of results (Karabel & Halsey 1977:21). This shift in emphasis was to stimulate a new agenda for educational researchers who recognised that pupils' performances could only really be understood by examining internal school practices which included teacher-pupil interaction, type of curriculum, and testing procedures used in schools. Schools were not empty black boxes; their internal

workings had to be understood just as clearly as did the extent of access to material resources.

Ethnic and racial patterns of achievement had already reached the full glare of publicity in the USA and similar trends were beginning to emerge in Britain. Caribbean parents expressed anxieties in the 1960s when increasing numbers of their children were placed in low streams, remedial departments and ESN-M schools. Black parents conducted their own research (Redbridge 1978) and supplementary schools were set up to improves rates of academic performance (Chevannes 1979, Cronin 1984). When the debates emerged in Britain during the 60s, however, they were less concerned with the achievement issue and more concerned with how far ethnic minority children should assimilate into the 'host' society. In a climate of assimilationism, questions were raised as to whether the preservation of the respective cultural backgrounds of the different minority groups was desirable or even relevant in the educational context. Debates publicised the 'problems' which these ethnic and racial minority children posed in an educational system where there was no overall strategy for meeting their needs. The two relevant policy issues between 1960 and 1965 in Britain centred on racial balance in schools and the teaching of English to non-English speaking pupils.

In the early 60s the second report of the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Committe (CIAC 1964) was concerned with the presence of immigrant children and how to facilitate their cultural assimilation into 'British life'. The means for achieving this end was to prevent there being a high proportion

of immigrant children in any one school.

> If a school has more than a certain percentage
> of immigrant children among its pupils, the
> whole character and ethos of the school is
> altered. Immigrant pupils in such a school
> would not get as good an introduction to
> British life as they would in a normal school.
> (Tomlinson 1983:16-17)

It was doubly unfortunate that this publication coincided with protesting white parents in Southall who were worried about the large numbers of immigrant pupils in two primary schools. The then Minister of Education, Sir Edward Boyle, suggested a limit of 30% immigrant pupils in any one school. This recommendation led to a policy of dispersal involving bussing which became official in August 1965. After much criticism, bussing eventually became illegal in 1975 (Killian 1979).

The most significant policy response to the presence of ethnic minority pupils in this period, however, was the teaching of English as a second language which was given additional force by Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act. Section 11 enabled the Home Office to reimburse LEAs at the rate of 50% (later 75%) of expenditure for 'special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence of substantial numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language and customs differ' (Tomlinson 1983:20). Thus, in the case of racial and ethnic minority pupils, the new barriers to achievement came to be defined in cultural terms with an emphasis on the need for these pupils to assimilate into the culture of the host society by learning English as quickly as possible.

Another governmental response was the urban aid program set up by the Labour government in 1968 to fund projects in immigrant

communities. It rapidly became a general fund for urban projects not necessarily linked to educational provision. Townsend's (1971) survey investigated the policies and practices in 146 LEAs and found that the most common policy was the provision of some form of English language teaching. Overall, there was no comprehensive or coherent approach taken to meet the needs of immigrant/ethnic minority pupils in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The response from schools was split between those all-white/'no problems' schools and those with significant numbers of ethnic and racial minority pupils, many of whom were not achieving academically.

Throughout this period the category of 'race' began to take on a new significance. Colour bars emerged in the early 60s in response to the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act. Racial discrimination was investigated (Daniel 1968, Rose et al 1969, Smith 1977), the political focus was on numbers (the 'numbers game') and Powell's inflammatory anti-immigrant speeches changed the mood from one in which Commonwealth immigrants had arrived to one in which black immigrants were here. Research highlighted cultural differences which separated the indigeneous from the immigrant pupils. 'Difference' was seen in terms of 'disadvantage' and 'deprivation'. It was only a short step from disadvantage and deprivation to 'deficit'. And from deficit it didn't take much to prompt pathological or biological explanations (Bourne & Sivanandan 1980). After all, in the USA biological explanations gained some credibility in explaining the allegedly inferior academic performance by black students (Jensen 1969), and in the British context Eysenck was sympathetic with this position (Eysenck 1971).

Critics responded with analyses highlighting the inherent racism in much of the thinking about disadvantge. In a well-known article, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Base of Institutional Racism", Baratz and Baratz (1970) identified the centrality of the pathology model used to interpret the behaviour of the ghetto mother. These insights were not lost in analyses of ethnocentric thinking in the British context. Bernstein (1970), for example, was critical of the concept of compensatory education which permeated policy initiatives because it

> ...... distracts attention from the deficiencies
> in the school itself and focuses upon deficiencies
> within the community, family and child....I suggest
> that we should stop thinking in terms of 'compensa-
> tory education' but consider, instead.....the
> conditions and contexts of the educational
> environment. (Bernstein 1970:113-114)

These critical insights were reflected in developments in the sociology of education in the early 1970s, known as the 'new' sociology of education. Innovative research questions and methodologies were evolved to investigate not only patterns of speech and social class but also the curriculum and teacher-pupil interaction inside classrooms. Researchers began to critically ask what 'counts as knowledge' (Young ed. 1971, Keddie ed. 1973, Gleeson ed. 1977, Whitty & Young 1976). The 'new' sociology of education problematised what it meant to be educated and questioned the legitimacy of the educational status quo both administratively and in terms of conventional measures of attainment and certification. The 'management of knowledge' (Bernstein 1971) was emphasised, and the 'hidden curriculum' meant that the process of schooling embodied forms of domination and control, with pupils learning to master the official curriculum to please teachers and to acquire work-related norms

such as achievement and market place ethics. (Apple 1979:84)

Research strategies developed by the 'new' sociologists of education were based on working hypotheses that evidence was potentially available which could become the basis for policy-making designed to promote equality of opportunity. Microsociological research methods, (for example, school and classroom ethnographies) had the potential to generate data which would lead to a fuller understanding of how patterns of cultural reproduction and transmission legitimated inequality, thus preventing the goal of equality of educational opportunity from being realised. 'Reproduction' and 'transmision' were used in the neo-Marxist sense and referred to the manner in which the labour force is prepared to 'fit' into the next generation of capitalist social and economic relations. In the context of education it referred to the way in which groups are socialised into acquiring appropriate work habits and behaviour so that they are easily accommodated into the social relations required by capitalist production. (Finch 1984:147)

Researchers hoping to influence policy-makers investigated interactional processes inside schools, the socio-economic contexts in which the schools were located, and how these processes reinforced and reproduced inequalities in the social structure. Rist's (1970) findings serve as an appropriate illustration here. He carried out a study in this period in which he researched teacher-pupil interaction in a ghetto primary school in Washington, D.C., hypothesising that the way in which teachers distributed pupils inside classrooms reflected the pupil's position in the wider social structure. He

observed that a hierarchical form of interaction emerged between the treatment of three groups of children in the classroom. Labelling theory was confirmed when teachers' expectations were reinforced by the pupils' performances---the 'self-fulfilling prophecy' in action. (see also P. Green 1985, Wright 1986) What emerged from Rist's study and the discussion in general was that there were invisible barriers to achievement embedded in cultural patterns of behaviour about which ethnocentric attitudes prevailed.

Officially little attention was paid to the achievement of racial minority pupils in this period, but there were signs that all was not well. West Indian children appeared to perform worse than other groups and West Indian pupils were over-represented in ESN schools (Coard 1971, Tomlinson 1978, 1983). There was a tendency to link poor academic achievement with poor self-image, a lack of cultural identity and forms of disadvantage (Bagley & Verma, eds 1979). Some schools began reviewing their curriculum and teaching arrangements with a view to developing strategies to meet the needs of a multiracial pupil population. But on the whole, the poorer rates of performance by black pupils tended to be subsumed within 'racially inexplicit' (Kirp 1979) categories of disadvantage (Tomlinson 1983).

1972-1980s: ECONOMIC CRISIS, EDUCATIONAL REASSESSMENT, BLACK PUPILS and SCHOOLING

The 70s and 80s constituted a period of major change in education, culminating with the passage of the Education Reform Act in August 1988. Although the effort to expand access and promote educational equality continued, after Britain's economic crisis of 1974 the pendulum began to swing back and a basic reassessment of the meaning, purpose and structure of state

education was debated by those wishing to promote equality of opportunity via the educational system and those wishing to see the educational system transformed in order to promote the economic efficiency of the nation. Both groups were disillusioned with the failure of interventionist strategies in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The first group contained articulate academics on the left who argued that schooling was a form of social control serving the interests of capitalism (CCCS 1981) and thus unable to foster genuine educational equality. The second group consisted of centre-right politicians, policy-makers and pressure groups who actively opposed social engineering designed to further equality of educatonal opportunity (Gordon 1989). Their concern was with the three R's, a core curriculum, standards and accountability. They influenced the content and direction of educational change in the late 70s and throughout the 80s.

This major shift crystallised in October 1976 at Ruskin College, Oxford when the Labour Prime Minister, James Callaghan, set the tone of the new education agenda in a speech which was to precipitate the 'Great Debate'. The Labour Party, in the guise of Callaghan's speech, had accommodated itself to the New Right's critique (Donald 1981, CCCS 1981). It was ironic that several of Callaghan's themes had been culled from a series of right-wing essays known as the 'Black Papers' which first appeared in 1969 and argued against progressive education, against student demonstrations, and favoured selective schooling—especially grammar schools which they regarded as guardians of standards and academic excellence. In effect the social democractic education settlement was on the wane despite

the appeals made to retain the values of equality and justice. These appeals came mainly from the local education authorities such as London and Manchester where grassroots demands were not easily dismissed.

Thoughout the 1970s the black constituency became more articulate and demanding as they became aware of the extent of the 'underachievement' of their children (Coard 1972, Tomlinson 1980, ILEA 807/81, Taylor 1981, Troyna and Williams 1986). The educational needs of this constituency were legitimated by parts of the 1976 Race Relations Act (Dorn 1985). We now turn to a fuller consideration of the position of ethnic and racial minority pupils in this period.

In the course of the 1970s, the black constituency became increasingly aware of the 'underachievement' of their children and they began to demand more equal treatment. (Coard 1972, Tomlinson 1980, ILEA 807/81, Taylor 1981, Troyna and Williams 1986). Key clauses in the 1976 Race Relations Act legitimated the educational needs of this constituency, and while the facts of racial discrimination were not regarded as relevant to educational policy-makers in central government, the presence of racial and ethnic minority pupils gradually stimulated several LEAs and schools to begin to take steps to meet the needs of these pupils (Little & Willey 1981, Mullard, Bonnick & King 1983, Rex, Troyna & Naguib 1983, Troyna & Williams 1986). Early responses were largely within models of assimilationism or cultural pluralism (Willey 1984b), however, and critics (Sivanandan 1982, Carby 1982) held that these responses did not adequately acknowledge that racial discrimination was

responsible for the lower socio-economic position and 'underachievment' of black British pupils. It was at this crucial stage that a discourse on 'race' and racial inequalities emerged representing a disjuncture with the discourse on class and class inequalities which had characterised the post-war period.

Issues of ethnicity and race began to receive increasing attention. For some, black pupils were seen in terms of 'problems' analogous to the 'problems' posed by working class pupils in the 50s, 60, and 70s (Halsey et al 1980). Williams (1986) characterised this as the 'racialisation of class inequalities' whereby initiatives originally designed to promote equality of opportunity for working class pupils had taken on 'racial' aspects reflecting changing structural divisions within British society. It was argued that class expectations were racialised and gradually became institutionalised within schools in terms of teachers' expecations, streaming practices and low rates of achievement. The 'underachieving' label was transferred from white working class to black pupils. For others, stereotyped images emerged characterising blacks and black youth as the 'undeserving poor', 'scroungers', and 'muggers'. Black pupils 'underachieved' in school, were 'disruptive', ESN, truanted, had 'alien' cultures, were disproportionately unemployed and their parents demonstrated a lack of concern for educational success. Black youth were characterised as a 'social time bomb' (Troyna 1984a:155), a reference to the high levels of unemployment and increasingly marginal position of black youth in relation to the labour market (Troyna & Smith eds. 1983). People feared this 'social

time bomb' would erupt into urban 'riots' or 'disturbances'.

In education one response to this situation was to move toward introducing 'multicultural/multi-ethnic' education. The concept of multicultural/multi-ethnic education emerged in the late 1970s and at first it seemed incapable of escaping from the essentially assimilationist and culturally pluralist ideologies which informed and shaped it. Some saw multiculturalism as offering an opportunity to promote greater understanding of 'alien' cultures or as a mechanism for the social control of black pupils in inner city schools (Mullard:1981). Others saw it as predicated on a set of reformist assumptions which complemented the educational status quo.

The question uppermost in this debate was how to explain the disproportionate 'underachievement' of black pupils (Taylor 1981, Tomlinson 1983, 1986). The commonsense understanding of this phenomenon was that low rates of achievement were a testimony of black inferiority. Solutions or remedies were thought to lie in specific aspects of schooling which would 'repair', so the rationale went, the 'deficiency' in the pupil. Williams (1986) argued it was a false debate. Central government did react insofar as it set up the Rampton Committee in 1979 to investigate the poor performance of West Indian children which was highlighted in the House of Commons report on The West Indian Community in 1977 (HMSO CMND 8273 1981). But central government did not respond with racially explicit educational policies. LEAs were left to devise their own 'solutions' to 'problems'; demands were made by black constituents who felt the educational system was failing their

children. Yet this demand was itself a way of evading evidence
which indicated that

> ...colour, not educational qualifications or
> motivation, persistence and commitment, is a
> prime determinant of occupational status.
> (Williams 1986:146)

The myth that needed to be shattered was that equal rewards were
on offer for equal effort and qualifications.

ILEA'S RESPONSE

This is the context in which the Multi-Ethnic Education policy
initiative of the Inner London Education Authority was launched
in November 1977. The following account of ILEA's policy
initiative has been constructed from official policy documents,
unwritten accounts of the politics of policy-making behind the
doors of the ILEA, and in the words of the first head of the
newly-formed Multi-Ethnic Inspectorate, Mr. Bev Woodroffe (see
full text of interview conducted March 20, 1989 in Appendix
2.1). Four specific dates and publications highlight the
evolution of ILEA's multi-ethnic initiative, revealing how the
original multi-ethnic orientation of the policy changed in the
early 1980s when it took on a more explicitly antiracist one.
Four dates mark significant policy statements and changes:

1- November 1977. <u>Multi-Ethnic Education, Policy Document 269</u>,
        a report and statement of the Authority's position on
        multi-ethnic education.
2- June 1979. <u>Multi-Ethnic Progress Report</u>
3- the 'Aide-Memoire' for the Inspectorate, 1981/82
4- April 1983. Multi-Ethnic Education- 'A Policy for Equality',
        which included an Anti-Racist Statement.

For our purposes, attention will be paid these documents insofar
as they mark significant stages in the process of clarifying the
Authority's position on multi-ethnic education and acknowledging
the existence of racism. In addition to official publications,

details of multi-ethnic education in the ILEA are told through the pages of the <u>Multi-Ethnic Education Newsletter</u> which began in September 1978 and published ten issues chronicling the Authority's initiative through 1980. Thereafter, the <u>Multi-Ethnic Education Review</u> commencing winter/spring 1982, followed ILEA's policy and practice through to 1986.

Inevitably the story begins well before the formal launching of the ILEA's 1977 Multi-Ethnic 269 policy initiative and establishment of the Multi-Ethnic Inspectorate in spring 1978 (Rex, Troyna & Naguib 1983). Bev Woodroffe explained that he went to the ILEA from Tulse Hill School in 1974 to take up a post as Inspector for Community Relations. The impetus to create this post had undoubtedly come from Peter Newsam, then Deputy Education Officer of the ILEA, who expressed serious concern about "the number of black teenagers who were both not achieving and who were also seen as fairly major behavioural hazards as far as secondary schools were concerned." (Woodroffe interview) However, the Inspectorate's role wasn't at all clearly thought out. Woodroffe remembers the Authority's lack of direction in those early years, singling out Peter Newsam as the main catalyst in fostering the initial policy statement. The politics of multi-ethnic policy-making were by no means smoothsailing. Woodroofe described the pragmatic formative stages which pre-dated the launching of the policy:

> At some point between 1974 and 1976 I remember
> I had lunch with Peter Newsam....We talked about
> what needed to be done and I felt at the time he
> had a feeling that something needed to be done but
> had not a great idea of what the real issues were
> and therefore not a great idea of what needed to be
> done.
>
> In those first two years, from '74-'76, work was

going on in the ILEA but it was (in the form) of
initiatives taken by individuals and groups—some
inspectors, some teachers, some advisers who were
responding to areas of educational need in their
sphere of need....but once identified by other
people, there was no bringing together of those
issues towards some kind of identification of what
needed to be broadened out across the Authority.

I think the key occasion which led to the issue
becoming seriously considered within the Authority
was a study visit to New York which Peter Newsam
came on. There were one or two people on that trip,
including myself and Trevor Carter, who were conscious
of the fact that this trip to New York was to look
at inner city education, not specifically to look at
issues of multiculturalism and race.

The trip went ahead and we saw a lot. I suppose the
thing I remember best was a school in the South Bronx
amidst the most awful degradation of building life...
in November 1976...and Peter was looking around and
was saying, "This mustn't happen in London"....when we
got back to England....there were meetings...We
discussed the need for a policy in the Authority in
relation to the education of black minority pupils
and we were going to shape a document. Now I think
what was an important thing here was from Trevor and
other people from the black communities....was
a recognition that RACISM was a key factor and there
was a need for really quite radical departures.

Peter is a tremendous politician and I think he
recognised what the political forces that existed in
and around ILEA were like and what kind of position
they were likely to take. And so he was aware that
any policy statement that was to get through those
ILEA committees at that time had to be 'steered'
through...but also needed to be something that he
could get a fair consensus about. So the document
that came out [269 in 1977] recognised the need for
action but also recognised that there would be no
action at all if the policy document didn't get
printed. But the idea was that we needed a statement,
a position, from which then work could develop to
produce a framework which would enable the kinds of
changes that were needed to take place across the
board.

Now Peter told me fairly confidentially—so I'll
present it in this way. When the policy was
constructed with his inner cabinet of about eight
people, there were only two people in favour of it.
Now I don't know how confidential this is, but it's
a long time ago now and people have moved away. That's
the officers, so that's the level of support he was
getting from the officers whose responsibilities
were for the whole Authority. Eight people, six
against, or six not supporting—six didn't want it.
....He (Newsam) put a lot of energy into getting the

support of two key people who were Sir Ashley Bramall,
then the leader of the ILEA and Robert Vigars, the

leader of the Tory opposition. (Woodroffe interview)

Woodroffe acknowledged that resistance to the multi-ethnic
policy initiative was in part a resistance to recognising the
significance of racism in British society. Initially people were
willing to take the language issues on board, were willing to set
up language centres, but acknowledging the existence of racism
was a big step.

> Shaping positions on certain aspects of education
> was extremely difficult for there was a lot of oppo-
> sition to it. And so the policy ended up with some
> information about numbers at the back....the numbers
> of ethnic minority kids in different boroughs was
> very significant and I remember a lot of people
> saying how surprised they were that there were so
> many black and ethnic minority kids in ILEA schools.
> One or two key people found that quite persuasive
> and were keen on doing something about it....when
> the evidence began to be discussed and the implications
> began to be considered, more did come round....So the
> policy ended up being rather pious statements about
> 'ought to be in a decent society'....and that was the
> first stage. You may remember there was a follow-up

> document in 1979, a 'Progress Report'. Now in the
> 'Progress Report' the four main aims of the policy were
> put down more clearly and they included <u>combatting</u>
> <u>racism</u> [my emphasis], if you remember. And there was
> some argument amongst us as to where that particular
> policy should come. We were arguing that it should come
> first.

> I think that what Peter very much felt was that you
> needed to have some kind of inclusive statement which
> enables people to come in and join rather than some-
> thing which excludes because it says things that
> people are going to find very difficult to stomach.
> So it's a good English compromise, in a way....You
> say 'tolerance' and 'justice' and things like this....
> it's very difficult for people to argue with that.
> But then within that idea of British tolerance and
> justice there is this canker running through it of
> racism. Now you've got to get people who've not
> really thought about racism at all to the point where
> they're thinking about it. So I think that was the
> first step. Now I mean it's very important to
> recognise that there were black groups, black
> individuals, ethnic minority groups and individuals
> who were knocking on the door and I think one of the
> things this policy did was to give a way into the
> hearing, the ears of the ILEA for more black indi-

viduals, black minority groups because this policy
statement was there....(Woodroffe interview)

In fact, each of the four policy statements mentioned above
contains references to racial discrimination and racism. In the
first policy statement, ILEA 269, 1977, there is explicit
reference to the 1976 Race Relations Act and the "need to
eliminate unlawful racial discrimination" and 'racial
discrimination' is cited as a major cause of deprivation. In
Appendix B to the policy statement the views of the ILEA/CRC
Consultative Committee contained the view that "There is an
increase in overt racism in schools, mainly the work of outside
agencies..." (ILEA 269:1). In the Schools Sub- Committee and the
Further and Higher education Sub-Committee report to the
Education Committee (8 November 1977), racism is mentioned
explicitly in relation to the aim to work toward "possibilities
of providing positive teaching against racism" (ILEA 1977:4).
The Multi-Ethnic Progress Report (12 June 1979), the second
policy document, contained four major objectives for developing
the education service in a multi-ethnic society. The third
objective was "to define and combat racism and the discriminatory
practices to which it gives rise...." The third policy
statement, the 'Aide Memoire', (Multi-Ethnic Education Review
vol.1 No.1 1982; See Appendix 2.2) emphasised the need to combat
racism and provided a coherent set of guidelines for use
throughout the Authority which had come about as a gradual
development.

> I was conscious of the way the HMI worked--
> that when they go in they produce an Aide
> Memoire. So the Inspectorate team worked
> on the Aide Memoire--which is how an inspec-
> tor should look at a school....If the Inspec-
> torate are going to have an impact in relation
> to this issue, they've got to be helped
> in terms of how to carry out their work....

> We produced a document for the whole ILEA
> inspectorate saying this is how you review
> a school in relation to anti-racist policy.
> (Woodroofe interview)

The fourth key policy document, the _Delivery Document_, ('Delivery of the Authority's Initiative on Multi-Ethnic Education' April 1983) was published in conjunction with the _Policy For Equality_. An integral feature of this policy was the publication of ILEA'S Anti-Racist statement (1983), a testimony that the ILEA was committed to combatting racism. The _Delivery Document_ opened with the statement

> The ILEA has expressed very clearly its full
> commitment to pursue as a top priority the
> development of its initiative on multi-ethnic
> education in schools with a particular emphasis
> on equality and anti-racism. (ILEA _Delivery of_
>
> _The Authority's Initiative on Multi-Ethnic Education
> in Schools_ 1983:2)

The paper went on to set out the main lines of activity necessary to achieve this aim and to specifiy a likely timetable. Woodroffe explained that the _Delivery Document_ was in addition to the 1983 _Policy For Equality_:

> We wrote that _Delivery Document_ which
> included what schools had to meet. They had
> to sort out their own policy relevant to their
> school; they had to have a program of action
> in order. (Woodroofe interview)

Thus, when reviewing the content of ILEA's four statements, it is clear that those promoting the multi-ethnic policy initiative in the ILEA were explicitly committed to acknowledging the existence of and the need to combat racism.

In rounding up this account, we should note Woodroffe's views about matters during the period 1977 through 1983. He felt something had gone wrong when Peter Newsam left the Authority and something had changed when the new policy came in in 1981.

He would personally have been much happier if the Authority had built on the work done up to that point. In his opinion the issues had become politicised and educational content brushed aside.

> .... some of the key educational issues got
> lost. We grabbed some of them back as we went
> along, but what I think I'm saying is that there
> was an educational bit and that could have been
> emphasised very strongly but in fact there was a
> period when the whole thing became very much a
> matter of political concern. Rightly there was
> much stronger concern for the rights of black
> teachers, rights of pupils and students but not
> so much concern for what they were learning, how
> they were learning, what supports were there for
> learning. (Woodroofe interview)

Issues had become polarised, with political demands set against educational ones. The consequences were dire insofar as this polarisation divided people into opposing camps: those supporting multi-ethnic (multicultural) education and those supporting anti-racist education. The consequences of this polarisation are taken up and elaborated on in the next chapter. Meanwhile, we need to ask how we should evaluate the 1977 ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education policy initiative. Woodroffe felt that the 1977 policy initiative had been a success.

> Did it succeed or not? ....I think the '77
> policy was quite successful because it was a
> very modest move and I think it actually achieved
> more than we might expect. I think the '83 policy
> has failed and I think there are all kinds of
> reasons for that....On the other hand the work
> has clearly had an impact around the country.
> (Woodrofe interview)

Assessing the success or failure of the politics of multi-ethnic policy-making is difficult at the best of times. The reflections of Woodroffe, a major architect of the initiative in this period, gives us insight into the difficulties involved in devising, implementing, monitoring and evaluating such a sensitive complex and, for some, controversial policy. However,

when Woodroffe's account is compared with Troyna and William's (1986), differences in interpretation stand out clearly. Troyna and Williams (1986) argue that ILEA's policy was essentially 'reactive' in the sense that black parents had begun to take matters into their own hands--

> it did not derive from pedagogical foresight
> but was impelled by broader and more immediate
> political and social considerations. (Troyna &
> Williams 1986:35)

For Troyna and Williams the main aim was to foster social cohesion at a point in time when racial separatism threatened to tear the fabric of ILEA's schools apart. In their view the ILEA policy was a form of 'benevolent multiculturalism' with no explicit reference to racism, a policy squarely on the terrain of cultural pluralism, a case of political pragmatism which aimed to keep contentious issues such as racism off the agenda. As such, it was a local response to a local issue intended to meet the needs of the local black constituents who were demanding equal educational opportunities for their children. It was essentially reformist and deracialised in its approach, with little chance that the structural causes of racial disadvantage would be tackled (Troyna & Williams 1986).

Troyna and Williams' interpretation appears unduly simplistic when compared with Woodroffe's 'insider's' account. They fail to acknowledge the complexities involved in policy formulation and implementation in an area as delicate as MCE/ARE; they conflate the educational and political dimensions which Woodroffe was so careful to explicate. Further, Troyna and Williams' interpretation misrepresents the aims, purposes and strategies of ILEA multi-ethnic policy-makers who were concerned to combat racism. Racism was clearly not off the ILEA agenda;

it was *on* the agenda throughout. Despite serious obstacles, ILEA policy-makers succeeded in developing, promoting and legitimating a multi-ethnic education policy because they were committed to providing educational equality, raising levels of achievement and combatting racism. The introduction of this initiative marked a major step forward in acknowledging the salience of racism in education and publicised the need to work collectively to eliminate it.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has focussed on the broad theme of equality of opportunity in education in the context of the inter-war years through the post-war period up to the 1980s. This information is intended to provide a broad historical map of policies reflecting the social democratic consensus in British education. From this account it should be clear that significant differences have characterised the meaning of equality of educational opportunity as a concept used by policy-makers, academics and politicians. In the immediate post-war period the education settlement reflected a strong consensus in favour of promoting the goal of equality by providing equal educational access. But with the passage of time, it became clear that equal access did not mean equality in terms of outcome, ie. achievement. Thus in the 1950s, class inequalities dominated the agenda when it came to identifying which pupils were least well served by an education system purporting to provide equal opportunities. By the 1960s, however, evidence was accumlulating about the underachievement of ethnic and racial minority pupils (Tomlinson 1980) and questions of racial inequality, disadvantage and racism were

raised. In the absence of 'racially explicit' policies from central government (Dorn & Troyna 1982), LEAs and schools began to recognise that a 'racially explicit' policy framework was required if inequalities were to be addressed. Here ILEA's initiative stands out because it was the first Local Education Authority to formulate a multi-ethnic education policy.

The discussion has also highlighted the tension between those who regard education as an institution designed to serve the needs of the economy and those who argued that education should be a means by which equality, including racial equality of opportunity, should dominate. Even though egalitarian goals were more influential in this period, after the economic reverses of the early-mid 1970s, New Right thinking in the form of Black Paper writers and the Callaghan Great Debate Speech of 1976, focused on the needs of the economy and contributed to shifting educational priorities from the point of view of central government. Thus, the social democratic education consensus broke down as the changing priorities of the centre came into conflict with LEAs committed to providing equality of opportunity. The priorities of the central government and those of LEAs became even more polarised in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s when some LEAs attempted to operationalise multicultural-antiracist education policies designed to meet the needs of the significant numbers of racial minority pupils in their schools. There are two points to note with regard to this polarisation: One is the difference in educational and political ideologies which informed the two broad positions. Second is the lack of consensus as to the desirability, and/or feasibility of implementing multicultural-antiracist education.

The next chapter will focus on these issues in relation to the multicultural-antiracist education debate taking account of different interpretations and critiques of multiculturalism and antiracism, and finally noting the importance of the New Right's <u>anti</u> multicultural/antiracist stance in the 1980s.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MULTICULTURAL-ANTIRACIST EDUCATION DEBATE: CONTEXT, CONTENT & CRITIQUE

INTRODUCTION

Debates about the meaning of multicutural and antiracist education policies and ideologies contain both education-focused and politics-focused approaches. Throughout the past 25 years these debates have been conducted in numerous sites outside the national education forum such as local education authorities, schools, universities, polytechnics and teacher training colleges. Advisory bodies such as the CRE, pressure groups like NAME, ALTARF, official committees such as Rampton/Swann, Schools Council (Plaskow 1985), and supplementary schools (Cronin 1984) have also been closely involved but central government has shown little sustained interest (Kirp 1979, Dorn & Troyna 1982). Although the debates have been regarded as marginal to the national interest, nonetheless, MCE-ARE lobbies have been influential in identifying and publicising the existence of racial inequalities in education while academic researchers and local education authorities have published ample evidence to sustain the case for promoting multicultural and antiracist education.

There are legislative reference points to note in the evolution of the MCE-ARE debate. One is Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act which helped to identify where local authorities were in need of extra resources for use 'in

consequence of the presence in their areas of substantial

numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language and

customs differ from those of the community' (Dorn & Troyna

1982:181, Hibbert 1983). It is interesting that funding for

Section 11 came from the Home Office and not the Department of

Education and Science.

The 1976 Race Relations Act has also served as a forceful

catalyst in promoting multicultural/antiracist policy changes in

education, particularly at local level (Dorn 1985, Arnot 1986).

The Act includes a number of concepts such as direct and

indirect discrimination which can be applied in educational

settings and raises more general issues concerning notions of

equality and justice. A 'keystone of policy' is Section 71

which places a duty on local authorities to

> 'make appropriate arrangements' with a
> view to securing that their various
> functions are carried out with due regard to
> the need to 'eliminate discrimination and
> promote equality of opportunity and good
> race relations between persons of different
> racial groups' (Dorn 1985:15-16).

Though Section 71 cannot compel, it is persuasive and has been

influential in encouraging Local Education Authorities to

develop policies designed to meet the needs of their

racial/ethnic minority pupils. Indeed, when ILEA published its

1977 'Multi-Ethnic Education' policy statement it cited Section

71 as having

> ....given legislative backing to the longstand-
> ing general duty of Local Education Authorities
> to meet the needs of the entire ever-changing
> population. Local authorities now have the
> specific duty 'to make appropriate arrangements
> with a view to securing that their various
> functions are carried out with due regard to
> the need:

> a) to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, and
> b) to promote equality of opportunity and good rela-
> tions between persons of different groups.'
> (ILEA:1977:1-2)

Even though the debate has been regarded as somewhat marginal to national educational interests, central government did acknowledge the special needs of minority groups (DES 1977:22) and the multiracial make-up of the population in the 1977 Green Paper, 'Education in Schools',(DES 1977):

> Our society is a multicultural, multiracial one,
> and the curriculum should reflect a sympathetic
> understanding of the different cultures and races
> that now make up our society....(DES 1977:41)

And when the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration report, 'The West Indian Community' (House of Commons 1977) highlighted the poor educational performance of children of West Indian origin, it recommended the Government set up an inquiry into the causes of underachievement amongst these pupils. This resulted in an inquiry into the education of children of ethnic minority groups, established in 1979 and culminating with the publication of the Rampton Report, 'West Indian Children in Our Schools' (DES 1981) and the Swann Report, 'Education For All' (DES 1985).

There is, therefore, both legislative and official recognition of the circumstances of racial/ethnic minority pupils in English schools. This recognition serves to legitimate the concerns of educationalists seeking to develop policies and practices to promote equality of educational opportunity for racial/ethnic minority pupils. The MCE/ARE debate should be seen in this context.

THE DEBATE

The debate is concerned with identifying differences in the ideology and practice of MCE-ARE. Chronologically, the debate began with the articulation of 'assimilationist-integrationist' positions in the 1960s and in the early '70s moved on to a 'culturally pluralist' one. From the late '70s an 'anti-racist' stance emerged which continued throughout the 1980s. However, these ideological positions are not always as distinct from each other as some have claimed. Both MCE and ARE endorse the main aims and goals of state education which have been to foster and promote equality of educational opportunity, specifically racial equality. Taken separately, however, the premises of the assimilationist-integrationist and cultural pluralist positions do not place 'racism' at the centre of their brief. Instead they address aspects of pupils' cultural identities and the extent to which pupils may be disadvantaged and underachieving in culturally pluralist Britain. By contrast, the anti-racist lobby focuses on racism which is understood both in terms of beliefs about the inferiority of non-indigeneous cultures and in structural, often neo-marxist terms, and focuses on the exploitation of racial/ethnic minority peoples in the socio- political structure. Anti-racists seek to combat racism in all its forms in the education system and wider society and argue that multiculturalism de-politicises racism because it fails to address the inequities of power relations and white racism. (Mullard 1982)

We can characterise the two competing ideologies as follows:

First the 'liberal' view, dominant in educational theory and policy throughout the 20th century, and pronounced in the 1960s,

> the decade of widespread comprehensivization, expansion in higher education, 'positive discrimination' in favour of the socially disadvantaged, and of experimentation with mixed ability and other 'progressive' methodologies. (Jeffcoate 1982:8)

A liberal ideology aims to promote the realisation of ethnic minority pupils' full potential, the education of all pupils irrespective of their ethnic identities, schools, and communities. Its task is to prepare pupils for life in multicultural society and is analogous to the traditional aims of eduction for international understanding and citizenship in a parliamentary democracy (Jeffocate 1982:7).

Second, the radical or marxist view, replaced liberalism as the dominant ideology of educational theory in the 1970s but not in terms of educational policy. Radicals emphasised the way schooling reproduced the class structure and social divisions inherent in capitalism. They argued that education performs a selective and allocative function for a highly stratified labour market, reproduces patterns of hierarchy and control typical of the workplace by means of the 'hidden curriculum' inside schools, and is generally biased in favour of middle class values and interests. (Bowles & Gintis 1976, Althusser 1971, Bourdieu 1971) These ideological differences are expressed in the writings of the participants in the MCE-ARE debate.

In one sense the multicultural and anti-racist education debate can be understood as an attempt to bridge the ideological divide between reformist [MCE] and radical [ARE] approaches.

Both multicultural [MCE] and antiracist education [ARE] reflect a range of orientations along the political spectrum, but a close inspection will reveal that each contains many of the same elements although these elements may be constituted and prioritised differently.

THE LIBERAL TRADITION

Parekh's (1986) approach is to present the case 'for' multiculturalism which is a synthesis of multicultural and antiracist education. He explains that the traditional and widely accepted view of education is one which cultivates basic human capacities, critical imagination, promotes in pupils the intellectual and moral qualities of truth, objectivity, healthy scepticism and respect for others. Such an education should familiarize the pupil with moral, religious, literary and other achievements. But education does not exist in a historical and social vaccuum; it is not culturally neutral. In England it is deeply mono-cultural, cultivates specific attitudes and values in order to reproduce and maintain a particular type of social and political order. This, according to Parekh, is a political activity and cannot be politically neutral (1986:20). Accordingly, he favours the development of multicultural education which he "perhaps clumsily" regards as

> essentially an attempt to release a child from
> the confines of the ethnocentric straightjacket
> and to awaken him to the existence of other
> cultures, societies and ways of life and thought.
> It is intended to de-condition the child as much
> as possible....education in freedom-freedom 'from'
> inherited biases....(1986:26)
> The inspiring principle of multi-cultural education
> then is to sensitize the child to the inherent
> plurality of the world.....(1986:27)

Parekh recognises inherent limitations of the educational system to radically alter the whole social and political fabric, but

schools can contribute to combatting racism:

> It [the school] can hope to undercut the
> intellectual and moral roots of racism and
> weaken it. (1986:31)

Parekh's approach is, therefore, one which bridges the MCE/ARE divide. Tomlinson (1987) also finds it difficult to accept a hard and fast MCE-ARE divide, and in taking account of the curriculum, she points out that

> It is very noticeable that, on the practical
> level, the kind of curriculum activities
> described as 'anti-racist' are in fact very
> similar to those attacked as only 'multicultural'.
> (Tomlinson 1987:100)

Although Bullivant (1986) defends multiculturalism, he takes a critical approach and acknowledges that there is a 'pluralist dilemma' which arises because:

> ....selections for the curriculum that encourage
> children from ethnic backgrounds to learn
> about their cultural heritage, languages,
> histories, customs, and other aspects of their
> lifestyles have little bearing on their equality
> of educational opportunity and life-chances. These
> are influenced more by structural, social
> class, economic, political and racist factors
> operating in the wider pluralist society, and by
> the control exercised by its dominant groups over
> access to social rewards and economic resources.
> Thus, to claim.....that teaching an ethnic child
> about his or her cultural heritage will lead to
> greater ethnic self-esteem and....better educational
> attainments and ...a better job is simplistic in
> the extreme. (Bullivant 1986:42)

Not content with merely critically analysing this 'dilemma', Bullivant takes us one stage further by advocating a radical version of multicultural education.

> Multicultural education must be politicised
> and made more power-sensitive[my emphasis],
> because it is through the curriculum and schooling
> that children....are being deprived of the much-
> needed survival knowledge...(Bullivant 1986:45)

Parekh (1986) helps us to see where a more power sensitive strategy can be operationalised. He suggests that an analysis

of the curricula and pedagogic relationships in <u>delivering</u>
curricula are appropriate sites for study. The implication
here is that institutional racism may exist because individuals
(teachers have power; pupils do not) interact in structures and
engage in practices (in schools) which may produce and reproduce
forms of institutional racism.

> ...a careful examination of the curriculum
> developed by the advocates of anti-racist
> education would show it is not very different
> from the multi-cultural curriculum... Further,
> the impact of the ethos of the school and....
> of the curriculum on its pupils is so deep that
> it makes little sense to describe changes
> in them as merely cosmetic. It makes little
> sense.... to say that a minority child who has,
> as a result of multi-cultural education, learnt
> to respect himself lacks the will to fight
> racism in society at large. (1986:30)

Thus the divide between multicultural and antiracist education
is difficult to sustain because the paradigms overlap. In
practice the differences between them stem largely from the way
the policy agendas are set and implemented, and not from
mutually exclusive philosophical or pedagogical aims and
goals.

Grinter (1985) makes a case for the synthesis of MCE and ARE by
calling for an 'anti-racist multiculturalism' which emphases the
shared purpose of education for a more just society. The case
put forward is one which rests on a reformist strategy which
Grinter calls 'warrenism' -- a multicultural version of
Fabianism. He urges a strategy of

> an 'inch here, a yard there,' exploiting
> what little latitude there is for change
> within the educational system at a time
> when....social forces are mobilised against
> any progressive movements in education. (1985:8)

He urges us <u>not</u> to adopt staunch antiracist positions which

are utopian and

> The end may very well destroy the means
> that are needed, because the baby of
> multicultural practice, whatever its defect,
> will very likely be swept away with the bathwater
> of anti-racism and its opponents.
> (Grinter 1985:8)

For Grinter, it is better to implement a strategy of
'anti-racist multiculturalism' which can enable teachers who
might be alienated by a rampant antiracism to come to accept a
carefully reconstructed and sharpened multiculturalism.
Grinter's point is that

> Any serious multicultural education must
> encounter racism, and any serious multicultural
> educator must therefore have the opportunity to
> deal with it. [And since]...One of the distinguish-
> ing characteristics of an educated person is the
> habit of critical analysis of experience......
> this provides common ground for extending
> multiculturalism into antiracism....(Grinter 1985:9)

And Grinter's preferred strategy is to work through existing
channels in a gradualist manner, recognising that education
works slowly and simple solutions will only activate a backlash.

Leicester (1989), like Grinter, believes that the liberal voice
of genuine multiculturalism, working within the curriculum,
should not be stifled. She insists that

> The wider anti-racist emphasis is crucial.
> A multicultural curriculum must be developed
> within an anti-racist perspective, and we must
> never forget that multicultural education, even
> this anti-racist multicultural education, is
> not IN ITSELF sufficient, it is after all,
> still located only in education, so it leaves
> institutional (structural) racism intact.
> (Leicester 1989:7)

Leicester's point echoes Milner (1983) who argues that the
relationship between school and society is complex and
dialectical and that

> it is clearly not the case that one single
> institution, like the education system, can

> unilaterally change the social structure around
> it. (Milner 1983:193)

Milner's argument is that there are two principle dimensions to racial inequality in education which help us to identify what the objectives of multiracial education should be. He defined the two objectives as:

> (1) The creation of an educational environment in which black minority children are not systematically disprivileged.

> (2) The creation of an educational environment which not only embodies racial and cultural diversity, but also actively fosters positive inter-group attitudes and behaviour.
> (Milner 1983:194)

The first objective is undeniably 'educational' in the narrow sense of the word. Here Milner emphasises that teachers still determine what goes on in the classroom, despite the increasingly centralised control over the curriculum. Thus teachers are probably the single most important factor in the success or failure of multiracial education. The second objective is arguably less 'educational' and opens the door to debate as to whether it is the business of the education system to foster a particular set of values which may come into conflict with the dominant values in the wider society. The question here is whether educationalists should be the 'self-appointed arbiters of children's attitudes in a democratic society' (Milner 1983:195).

Jeffcoate (1979, 1984) takes the opposite view and argues that it is not the role of educationalists to act as arbiters in the shaping of children's attitudes. But his position is inconsistent. First he recommends that schools adopt a 'multiracial principle' for the curriculum.

.....the regular curriculum should be 'permeated'
with a multiracial 'constant'. (Jeffcoate 1979:4)

Jeffocate then shifts ground and parts company with the case

for a multiracial (cultural) curriculum, explaning that there

are

....four grounds for 'resisting' [my inverted commas]
the development of a multiracial curriculum....two of
these——— the insignificance of race to young children
and the unacceptably 'political' cast to such a
curriculum....The other two....the straightforward
ideological contention that the business of British
schools....is to transmit British culture to each new
new generation [and]....that multiracial innovations
in the curriculum have too often been shown to yield
counterproductive effects.
(Jeffcoate 1979:27)

Jeffcoate's change of direction is more pronounced when

considering the classroom teacher's role. He argues against

the promotion of affective [attitudes, values and emotional

sets] objectives because he is reluctant to translate them into

curriculum goals and content. He explains

...I wanted very much to disown affective goals
such as respect for self and others. (1979:29)

[it is] arrogant and presumptuous for schools to
stipulate as a curriculum target that children
should respect other races and cultures.
Implicitly it is to treat children as objects
who need something doing to them. Children's
attitudes are their own affair.....(1979:30)

However,

Some affective objectives have a place in the
curriculum, eg., those to do with aesthetic
appreciation and attitudes toward work....but
others, specifically those stipulating which
moral attitudes and opinions are to be promoted,
do not. (1979:30)

Finally, he explains why he can not endorse racial self-respect

and interracial respect as curriculum objectives:

It is hard to envisage telling one's pupils
that two of one's objectives were racial
self-respect and interracial respect....
[it is not] that I do not want my pupils to
respect themselves and others. Obviously I
do. But that is a hope, not a curriculum
objective. (Jeffcoate 1979:30)

Although Jeffcoate's work represents a liberal child-centred multiculturalism, he takes a position which is so heavily qualified that it ends up by becoming defeatist. He doubts whether the fundamental aims of multiculturalism to educate pupils into an understanding of racism in terms of cultural differences, history and the inequalies which racial minorities experience in contemporary British society is feasible. Further, he questions whether a 'full-blooded' pluralism is either desirable or attainable (Jeffcoate 1984:128).

Milner disagrees. He argues that we need to locate an anti-racist teaching philosophy unambiguously within the education system. His rationale for a unified way forward strikes a balance between the multiculturalists and antiracists. He recognises that unless these approaches are reciprocal, any hope of combatting racism within the education system and ultimately in the wider social framework is unlikely. Thus, Milner advocates that teachers present an account of race and racism as well as culture.

> If we do not embrace those issues within the
> curriculum then we further alienate those children
> whose lives are crucially affected by these very
> forces..... And if we are pusillanimous in our
> approach we create a value vaccuum [my emphasis]
> which less scrupulous ideologues are only too anxious
> to fill. If we wish to equip children to confront
> racism, then we must set an example in our own
> classroom practice. (Milner 1983:227)

In referring to an antiracist teaching philosphy, then, Milner supports Parekh, Grinter and Leicester's desire to promote a form of antiracist multiculturalism, in sharp contrast to Jeffcoate (1984), who is stridently opposed to antiracist strategies. Even though Jeffcoate does acknowledge that 'racism' exists in terms of 'scientific racism', prejudice and

discrimination, his view is that institutional racism as a
conceptual tool of analysis is problematic. He rejects the
term especially when it is used by antiracists to characterise
'underachievement', the curriculum, schools' organisational
policies like streaming, exam entry, promotion of black teachers
and teachers' attitudes.

Indeed, the term 'institutional racism' is problematic. A
conceptual distinction in the 1976 Race Relations Act is
relevant here:

> The Act defines direct and indirect discrimination
> and, while the former is generally capable of
> recognition by reasonable people, the latter
> concerns a web of customary procedures and prac-
> tices which militate against the interests of
> ethnic minority groups in particular, and about
> which there is generally little awareness of their
> ill effects....The latter has also been termed
> unwitting, unintentional or institutional
> discrimination.(Williams & Carter 1985:4)

The concept of institutional racism is explored more fully by
Troyna and Williams (1986) who argue that although the term is
ambiguous in meaning, if defined by its consequences it can
provide an orientation for conducting research into both MCE
and ARE. Institutionally racist practices often conceal
individuals' ignorance of the consequences of their action or
their unquestioning acceptance of the rationale for particular
procedures which have unintended consequences. In analysing
whether forms of institutional racism exist, therefore,
particular care should be taken to examine relationships between
institutions (eg. between the family and primary and secondary
schools), the working of particular institutions (eg. internal
practices of specific schools), and the relationships between
individuals who are part of the institutional structures within
which they (eg. teachers and pupils) work. But in examining

these relationships we should take care not to reduce the causes of institutionally racist practices to the individuals in institutions. Instead we should recognise that it is common for institutions as sets of structures and practices to perpetuate inequalities which may have racist effects (Troyna & Williams 1986)

Evidence available in the early 1980s provided a context in which Jeffcoate could easily have analysed 'institutional racism' at work. Several publications highlighted its existence. For instance, the influential ILEA report, Black British Literacy (Mabey 1981) identified a number of factors related to attainment, suggesting that any explanation of black underachievement was multicausal. Further, the Interim Report of the Rampton Committee (West Indian Children in Our Schools 1981), Taylor's (1981) companion volume, Caught Between and Tomlinson's Ethnic Minorities In British Education (1983) cited a wealth of examples of research which illustrated the dynamics of institutional racism. In this period the salience of ethnicity in classroom interaction was also a focus of research. Academics found evidence of what we might call, in the legal sense, indirect discrimination, or in the sociological sense, institutional racism. (P. Green 1985, Wright 1986, Tomlinson 1987)

Notwithstanding this wealth of evidence, Jeffcoate (1984) is critical of schools for promulgating antiracist statements, arguing this is an infringement on teachers' rights and autonomy. He further takes LEAs to task for their stand on compelling teachers to attend 'racism awareness' courses.

Milner (1983) takes the opposite view, arguing that a more
sensitive and professional approach would be for LEAs to
give higher priority to improving equal opportunities in the
widest sense, such as ILEA's 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education policy,
Berkshire's Education For Equality 1982, ILEA Policy For
Equality 1983. He calls for

> a public statement of an anti-racist philosophy
> for the school [which] creates an unambiguously
> positive racial climate in which all groups can have
> confidence....With the background of institutional
> support it becomes easier to deliver what multi-
> cultural education promises: an account of race and
> racism as well as culture. (Milner 1983:227)

Within the liberal tradition of multiculturalism, then, there
are many different positions. Parekh, Tomlinson, Bullivant,
Grinter, Leicester and Milner's views are mutually reinforcing.
Jeffcoate, on the other hand, is not only sceptical of the
possibility of realising the goals of a 'full-blooded'
multiculturalism; he is also critical of aspects of the more
power sensitive strategies which encompass antiracist
dimensions.

THE RADICAL TRADITION

Neo-marxist contributors to the debate make Jeffcoate's views
look sober indeed. They adopt a strident left-wing position
based on the view that the state funtions to control ethnic and
racial minority pupils who are regarded as 'problems' and
constitute a 'social time-bomb'. These critics share a disdain
for the social democratic reformist nature of multiculturalism
which they regard as incompatible with the need to implement
antiracist strategies in the struggle to combat racism and
provide equality of education opportunity. For antiracists,
the doctrine of racism is deemed necessary to legitimate

inequality. 'Race' is understood primarily in terms of class relationships and not biological, cultural or categories of disadvantage. This radical and racialised ruling class analysis sees the state as the chief architect of social control. As Sivanandan argues

> ....the state atomised the working class
> and created hierarchies within it based on
> race and nationality to make conflicting sectional
> interests assume greater significance than
> the interest of the working class as a whole.
> (Sivanandan 1976:112-113)

Accordingly, multicultural education is an obvious target for antiracists' criticism because it is seen as integral to the reproducion of the social democratic status quo. The weakness of the antiracist approach, however, is that some of its advocates fail to acknowledge the complex debate within the multicultural camp itself (A. Green 1982). Unsurprisingly, neo-marxist advocates of antiracist education have come in for serious criticism, even by those who are fundamentally in sympathy with the aim of eliminating racism in school and society. Young (1983), for example, in speaking of the 'anti-colonial struggle' in the inner city, takes issue with the view that there is a 'colonial culture' steeped in resistance which some antiracists regard as the vanguard of black culture. Young's line is more cautious; he argues that we must adopt an analytical approach in order to understand that the various immigrant groups do not share common responses to their situation in Britain. What we need to do is delineate the complexities of immigrant subcultures and recognise that they are constantly evolving. Further, the relationship between politics and subculture is itself complex. Thus,

> To take one's favourite subcultural solution
> [eg. antiracist education] as indicative of the
> vanguard or even of the whole group just because
> it fits certain political preconceptions is a
> common problem which we must be constantly
> aware of. (Young 1983:133)

Hall (1980), too, is cautious. In writing about 'Teaching Race',

he adresses four sets of problems. First, in pedagogical terms,

race is strongly charged, 'neutrality' is not of much value,

unpopular things need to be said, and students' experiences must

be integrated into the teaching. Secondly, when it comes to

economic and industrial factors, Hall does not think

> that in a general theoretical sense racism
> is attributable in a simple way to capitalism...
> (Hall 1980:4)

Further, he warns us not to treat structural economic features as

adequate explanations. Do not

> ....collapse into a kind of economistic account
> .... a phenomenon [race] which is more complex
> than that. (Hall 1980:6)

Third, Hall cites the political context in which legislation

tried to reconstitute the black population as a more authentic

migrant force. 'Powellism', too, as a phenomenon is relevant

because it has used race in the political arena in a way which

has little to do with race at all. Here notions like the

'British way of life' and 'alien cultures' are thrust before the

public with enormously complicated repercussions. Fourth, are

the ideological questions like why differences of pigmentation,

language, and religion have become historically pertinent. In

Hall's account, these questions are coupled with the distribution

of racist ideologies which do not function in a simple

class-structured way. Hall warns us that

> this is not safe but combustible material
> that you are dealing with.....if you present
> some kind of idealised picture which doesn't
> look at the way in which racism has acted
> back within the working class itself.....
> as if somewhere around the corner some whole
> constituted class is waiting for a green light
> to advance and displace the racist enemy......
> you will have done absolutely nothing... for
> the political understanding of your students.
> (Hall 1980:13)

Both Young's and Hall's critiques identify key sociological factors which are indispensable for a thoroughgoing analysis of the issues which antiracists address.   We need to see whether antiracists on the left of the spectrum have taken these factors on board. We begin with a consideration of Chris Mullard's work, and then move on to briefly assess the work of Hazel Carby and Farrukh Dhondy before, finally, stepping back to assess Maureen Stone's critique of multicultural education.

Chris Mullard's disdain for multicultural education is widely explored in his numerous articles, pamphlets and 'notes' (1980, 1981, 1982,   1983a, 1983b, 1984b,   1985). He takes the view that it is impossible to deny that in a racist society, a material and racist culture will be transmitted by all schools. In one of his earlier contributions, <u>Racism in Society and Schools: History, Policy & Practice</u> (1980) Mullard asks his reader "How in fact is it possible to talk about multicultural education in racist schools?" (Mullard 1980:15) His answer is that MCE evolved out of a series of political interpretations made about the threat blacks posed to the stability of liberal democratic and capitalist society.

> The presence of blacks in white cities, white
> schools, white factories appeared to trigger
> off and articulate in policy action the racial
> history, memory and possibly, the guilt that
> had been dormant and culturally lodged and
> institutionally protected in ethnocentric
> definitions of self.   The way in which a
> colonial society had always perceived itself
> and its historical role in the development of
> capitalism and Western civilisation suddenly
> but quite logically manifested itself in its
> identification of the problem as the 'black'
> problem. (Mullard 1980:15)

Mullard interprets the official discourse as reflecting these views of the 'black' problem. Further, the action advocated in official quarters was to redefine the 'problem' in terms of an educational policy of assimilation. Although the assimilationist model was gradually replaced by a model of integration-cultural pluralism, Mullard argues this did not effect any change in its social construction, only in its social presentation. (Mullard 1980:17) This story is retold in an influential article: "Multiracial Education in Britain: From Assimilation to Cultural Pluralism" (Mullard 1982) in which Mullard discusses the limitations of the model of cultural pluralism by highlighting the specific features of the distribution of power. He argues that power is unequally distributed despite the theoretical underpinnings of this model. In theory,

> All groups possess power; all groups possess
> roughly equal amounts of power.....and all
> groups acquire enough power to ensure the
> maintenance of a of a high degree of cultural
> sovereignty......and are able equally to
> assert pressure on the political state....to
> see that a certain amount of cultural equilibrium
> is maintained. (Mullard 1982:129)

In practice, however,
> Neither West Indians, Pakistanis, Indians,
> nor Africans, nor blacks as a whole, possess
> anything like the same amounts of power as the
> white dominant 'British' group.
> (Mullard 1982:130)

Mullard concludes that power within the assimilationist, integrationist and cultural pluralist models is for all intents and purposes identical, and consequently,

> ....it is patently clear that black groups
> in a white society, black pupils in white
> schools, [can] not develop their cultural
> traditions without the unconditional permission,
> approval and encouragement of white society...
> and white power groups in particular.
> (Mullard 1982:130)

Accordingly multicultural education is dismissed. It only serves to reproduce racism in a racist society. In Mullard's view, power is conceived in a static way, incapable of changing or being used on an equal basis with whites by the various ethnic/black groups. His preferred approach is antiracist education and it is here that the earnest reader/practioner looking for insight into how to theorise and implement antiracist education will find themselves with little by way of coherent or substantive guidelines.

In some of Mullard's writings his analytical approach is at a level of pseudo-theoretical abstraction which can only be described as obfuscating generic issues in race and education. Collectively they have a decidedly impenetrable quality (see Mullard 1983a, 1983b, 1984b, 1985). For example, in "The Racial Code: Its Features, Rules and Change", (1983a) the features of this 'code' are spelled out in diagrammatic form; conceptual 'rules of regulation' are developed as is 'the code cycle'. Throughout Mullard alludes to empirical situations such as 'the summer of 1981', black pupil and parental resistance and opposition to official policies and practices in the field, but there is no substantive account of how this 'code' can be operationalised empirically. In another paper "Racism,

Education, and The State: The Class-Ethnic Formation" (Mullard 1983b), a new terminology emerges which builds on his 'racial code' (from 1983a). Terms like 'ethnicism', 'etharchy', and 'ethmission' are introduced. These concepts are not only theoretically obtuse, represented in neologisms, but liberties are also taken in redefining the accepted meaning of words like 'manumission'.

Mullard's analysis (1984a) was severely criticised by formerly sympathetic colleagues at the 1984 NAME Conference. The attack centred on Mullard's publication of three papers in pamphlet form: Anti-Racist Education: The Three O's (1984), prepared for NAME (National Association for Multi-Racial Education which subsequently became the National Anti-Racist Movement in Education in 1985). By dint of sheer repetition in a series of published papers and 'notes', Mullard appears to believe that his neologisms and diagrams have acquired a legitimacy—a 'meaning'. Richard Hatcher (1985) did not agree; he produced a substantial critique: 'Some Comments on Chris Mullard's Papers for N.A.M.E.' in which Mullard's method and language were taken to task. Hatcher (1985) explained that,

> ....the use of private academic jargon is an
> obstacle to a clear discussion of the issues.
> Much of the difficulty of language flows from
> Mullard's methodology...the manufacture and
> manipulation of formal categories, whose content
> is insufficiently specified in terms of the real
> world. [He] produces schema of little explanatory
> power. (Hatcher 1985: 1)

Hatcher acknowledged the usefulness of some of Mullard's notions, such as 'reconstruction' as referring to some form of neo-colonialism, but he was critical because of the circular nature of much of Mullard's argument.

> nowhere....is racism itself as a concept explained,

> it is simply taken for granted. Nor does Mullard
> define 'in relation to racism' his concept of anti-
> racist education.....this is a problem because
> there is no unitary understanding.... (Hatcher 1985:3)

Perhaps Hatcher's most substantive criticism is directed at Mullard's politics. Mullard implied that teachers and black communities would gradually develop antiracist education. But there is little or no mention of the role of the state, political parties or the educational establishment which resisted (and have more recently attacked) the spread of anti-racist education. By dismissing the role of the state as policy-maker in this area Mullard is unable to explain how anti-racist educational reforms would by themselves become determining forces. Such reforms depend for their legitimacy on the state's approval and promotion in terms of policies to be taken up and implemented at LEA and school level. Mullard seems to assume that antiracist education is some kind of 'inevitable' force in the hands of certain teachers and the black community, but this is a far cry from consensus politics. In Hatcher's view

> Mullard is pointing NAME in the wrong direction....
> (Hatcher 1985: 5)
> He has no critical conception of reformist
> antiracist education capable of being sponsored
> by the state. (Hatcher 1985:6)

Mullard analyses issues of race and education in terms of an anti-colonial struggle located in the neo-colonial inner city (see Young above). There is an ideology of resistance present which implicitly represents the vanguard of black culture, but Mullard does not explore the relationships between politics and subcultural formations in the contemporary urban British context. How, we must ask, will this alleged 'ideology of resistance', this 'vanguard of black culture' be realised? His work has none of the subtle and sophisticated insight of Hall's (1980) analysis outlined above. When we take Hall's point about

pedagogy and compare it with Mullard's, for example, Mullard's
analysis does not contribute in any way to enabling teachers to
take on board the complexities of dealing with 'racial'
issues inside schools. The polemical flavour of Mullard's
analysis emerges clearly in The Three O's. Here he praises
anti-racist education because it should lead to

> a full consciousness, and a creating and
> transmission of knowledge to secure the
> liberation from all forms of tyranny.....
> anti-racist rather than multicultural education
> makes these kinds of connections....
> Mullard 1984a:37)

Hall's (1980) point from 'Teaching Race' is apposite here:

> this is not safe but combustible material.....
> if you present some kind of idealised picture...
> you will have done absolutely nothing...
> for the political understanding of your
> students. (Hall 1980:13)

Thus, Mullard's polemical style of abstract theorising not only
divided those in sympathy with the goal of eliminating racism;
it has also invited critics from the New Right to cite his work
on antiracism as an example of how 'subversive tactics' are
promoted in inner city schools. (Scruton. 'The Times' 30.10.84).

Hazel Carby's (1980, 1982) approach is one which regards
multiculturalism as a new variant of compensatory education. Her
analysis highlights the process whereby inequality is
'constructed' and black people are viewed as social problems.
For Carby, the multicultural discourse mobilises a range of
social-educational policies to deal with these matters. An
integral feature of this discourse is the construction of a
multiplicity of categories to identify the 'complex disabilities'
of black pupils. These 'disabilities' include cultural factors
such as language, culture shock, cultural and generational

conflict, the number of black pupils in schools, testing, and achievement. These 'disabilities' are understood in pathological terms and seen as residing in the black family which

> is unable to provide the conditions for, or acts
> as an inhibitor to, the successful educational
> progress of the black child.....[with] the focus
> placed on the black mother. (Carby 1982:190)

This version of multiculturalism assumes that equality can be achieved through a cultural diversity removed from the realm of politics. Thus institutional racism is ignored and

> The school is made the site for containing
> the effects of racism. (Carby 1980:63)

In criticising the texts used in the multicultural curriculum, Carby explains that many assume a distinction between cultures and the main purpose of multiculturalism may be no more than to prove that 'blacks have a culture too'. Thus multiculturalism explicitly and implicitly evaluates cultures differentially. What is needed, Carby argues, is to put right the imbalance in the curriculum with a view to teaching pupils that 'black culture' is not an artefact but a 'lived experience'. This is what Hall above (1980) alluded to when he said that students' experiences must be integrated into the teaching. The texts used and the 'lived relations' present in the classroom are not held to be separate; they should become equivalents. The aim should be to reduce the divisiveness between the classroom and the world outside the school.

Who orchestrates this cultural divide? Clearly teachers play a central role, and Carby takes them to task for not examining their own racism.

> Like missionaries....teachers have not examined
> their own racism in their preoccupation with
> .....'doing good' to black youth....antiracist
> teaching has become a mere substitute for
> political action. (Carby 1982:199)

According to Carby we can only overcome the institutionalised racism in schools when we have a culturally informed pedagogy in which the 'two moments' (antagonistic cultural relations of domination and subordination) are fused.(Carby 1980:69) That is, the teachers must examine their own racism and recognise that the cultures of all students are valuable, meaningful and integral to their 'lived experience'. They deserve a legitimate and equal place in the curriculum. Carby's work helps us to understand the complexities involved in developing appropriate antiracist pedagogy and curricula.

Farrukh Dhondy (1978) writes about his experience as a classroom teacher in the late 1960s-early 70s in inner London's secondary schools. His message from the chalkface is powerful.

> There's a generation [of black youth] who won't
> go on the buses, which won't clean up in the
> hopitals, which won't accept that kind of work
> at all. They are in my classes at school.
> (Dhondy 1978:263)

Dhondy's view is that teachers work in colonial institutions with little concern for the 'culture' of black communities. Pressure groups (NAME, ALTARF) and official bodies (Select Committee of Race Relations and Immigration, Schools Council,etc.) are all

> agreed that part of the reason for the 'failure'
> of blacks in British schools is that the culture
> of the black communities is not represented in
> the curriculum. (Dhondy 1978:267)

Dhondy asks, 'what is black 'culture'? Does it mean teachers must present accounts which explain the values of working class

culture alongside the values of Britain's imperial history and black culture?

> If I, as a teacher, want to represent black
> culture, black values, histories, life-styles of
> the people I am paid to school, I am determined
> to start from the fact that young blacks fight
> the police, they refuse dirty jobs; their forms
> of cultural gathering always bring them into
> conflict with the rulers of this society.....
> and contain them in an antagonism to school
> and society as it is. (Dhondy 1978:268)

Accordingly, multiculturalism merely reproduces skills in race, class and gender categories in order to ensure the success of capitalist production and is thus analogous to Bowles and Gintis's (1976) view of schooling. Dhondy is not willing to merely 'contain indiscipline'. Instead he wants to do away with the system and the manner in which it assigns the 'unruly' section of the working class to the bottom of the British ladder of labour.

Collectively Mullard, Carby and Dhondy provide a strident critique of multicultural education which exudes passion and the rhetoric of 'struggle'. Perhaps they have unwittingly helped to promote the development of multicultural-antiracist classroom materials, a scrutiny of the content of the curriculum and styles of pedagogy. As such, they have helped to identify an antiracist agenda of educational issues and to this extent their critiques are welcome. However, these critics have not been inclined to collaborate with educationalists committed to combatting racism in education. As a consequence, this body of literature has not only highlighted the difficulties involved in bridging the gulf between MCE and ARE; they have also promoted the MCE-ARE divide itself and helped to sow the seeds of a right-wing backlash which can be seen in the evolution of the

New Right's critique of MCE-ARE. The New Right have sought to discredit both multiculturalism and antiracism; neo-marxist arguments are regarded as subversive and inverted forms of racism. This backlash has substantially contributed to undermining the legitimate case for developing a radical multiculturalism. (Palmer, ed.1986)

MAUREEN STONE'S CRITIQUE OF MULTICULTURALISM

Although Maureen Stone's (1981) work is in a different category, it is worthy of our attention because it will help us to make the transition from a concern with multicultural-antiracist education to the criticisms of the New Right. Stone regards multiculturalism with its varying emphasis on pupils' low self-esteem, teachers' expectations, styles of pedagogy, ESL/mother-tongue teaching, a eurocentric curriculum, streaming and assessment procedures as misguided. Her analysis can be summarised as examining the following issues: (1) to identify and explain the underachievement of the black child in British education, (2) to question whether the cause of this underachievement is due to the low self-esteem of black pupils, (3) to critique multiracial (MRE) education which is defined as a strategy used by some teachers and educationalists to 'repair' the black child who is allegedly 'suffering' from low self-esteem, (4) to challenge the appropriateness of progressive styles of pedagogy and (5) to urge a return to 'traditional' methods of teaching the three Rs or a 'back to basics' strategy.

Stone explains that both black and white working-class low-achieving pupils are regarded as 'problems'. This is the result of a 'cultural discontinuity' between home and school

(Gorbutt 1972). Schools cannot meet the 'cultural needs' of black children (Stone 1981:68) because the mainstream educational system is primarily geared to white middle class culture. Black pupils' alleged academic failure is due to poor self-concept and low self-esteem which, if 'treated', will result in higher achievment in school. The 'fashionable' 1960s 'treatment' for these 'problems' was compensatory education, ie. to aim to improve the performance of these groups by identifying them and providing extra resources. In elaborating on the rationale for compensatory education, Stone speaks in terms of programs for 're-socialisation'. Multiracial education (MRE) in this context is merely

> a misguided liberal strategy to compensate
> black children for not being white. It is
> ..... so patronising and ethnocentric....
> it probably has the effect of encouraging
> the very attitudes it seeks to change.
> (Stone 1981: 101)

As a variation of the compensatory strategy, MRE attempts to improve the circumstances of educationally 'disadvantaged' children through the development of special projects designed to promote a 'positive image'. What MRE amounts to, in Stone's interpretation, is an approach which focuses on steel bands, Black Studies, sports, dialect, and/or other topics such as the Rastafarianism religion —

> It (MRE) says that by presenting black
> children with other images of themselves
> they can encourage a positive self-image
> which in turn creates higher aspiration
> ....an opportunity to break out of the
> 'cycle of deprivation' through such inno-
> vations as Black Studies...or calypso...
> (Stone 1981:101)

The rationale for this form of MRE is to raise the self-image of black pupils. But Stone's evidence, which was gathered by administering self-concept and self-esteem tests on

pupils of West Indian origin, shows that black pupils do not
suffer from poor self-images or have low self-concepts (Stone
1981:94-95). Because there is no 'damage' and nothing to
'repair', she is critical of progressive child-centred pedagogy
and teaching methods which promote affective goals. Here she
is on common ground with Jeffcoate. She questions the place
of emotions in the classroom. Teachers should not be encouraged
to use methods based on romantic ideas of 'self-realisation' and
'self-fulfilment' because these are detrimental to the pupils'
interests. Such progressive multiculturalism

> .... takes schools and teachers away from their
> central concern which is basically teaching or
> instructing children in skills essential to life
> in this society. (Stone 1981:102)

It is the 'skills essential to life' that Stone wants to see
taught in school. MRE is condemned because it substitutes

> ....the traditional school curricula either
> partly or wholly with new curricula which are
> of doubtful value.(p.102)

This straightforward attack on progressivism coupled with her
own narrow version of MRE leads Stone to make proposals
which she admits are both conservative and controversial. Her
central recommendation is for more formal methods of teaching
West Indian children throughout their schooling. In policy
terms this means teachers should teach skills and knowledge;
teacher training should emphasize that teachers' professional
interest lies in inducting children into knowledge and skills.
More formal methods of teaching are preferred because they
command more overall parental support and are more effective for
certain children.(Stone 1981:248)

There are several weaknesses in Stone's analysis. First, her

interpretation of MRE is understood exclusively within a compensatory framework. Second, Stone provides no substantive account of the existence of underachievement. Third, the methodology underlying tests of self-image and self-esteem is inconsistent and is not amenable to the rigours of comparability. Thus, data from this research does not shed light on the 'alienation' of black or any other pupils. Fourth, there is no systematic discussion of how different schools affect pupils. Finally, to assert that any form of progressivism is contaminated is to dismiss innovations before evaluating their effects.

Stone's book received a great deal of publicity and quickly found its way onto teachers' reading lists throughout the country. What is particularly worrying is that her analysis has helped to justify throwing "the baby of multicultural practice, whatever its defect....away with the bathwater of anti-racism" (Grinter 1985 above), thus helping yet again to legitimate the New Right's anti-MCE/ARE stance.

SUMMARY OF MCE-ARE DEBATE

In drawing this section of the discussion to a close I want to endorse the main aims and goals of both multicultural and antiracist education policy and practice; they are not mutually exclusive. Both seek to promote equality of educational opportunity and combat racism. Indeed, Bullivant (1986 above) makes the case for a power-sensitive radical multicultural education and A. Green (1982) recommends a 'radical multicultural approach'. Green suggests that many of the arguments against multicultural and antiracist strategies have been based on analyses which are too 'purist'. They are guilty

> of believing that anything which the state
> or progressive sections of the state take up
> is immediately contaminated. (Green 1982:29)

In this light and with Young's (1982) and Hall's (1980) points in mind, it is clear that the respective critiques of Mullard, Carby, Dhondy and Stone only identify and comment negatively on selected aspects of multicultural education. They fail to spell out and extend the positive features inherent in multicultural strategies. A dynamic radical multiculturalism, as an alternative, is more likely to meet with the approval of Young, Hall and Green because it would seek to identify and eliminate forms of institutional racism which affect subcultural groups of school pupils. Ideally such strategies would encourage teachers to explore and challenge their own racism and remove eurocentric content from the curriculum. Schools, too, would come to recognise how their internal structures and mechanisms of allocation can inadvertently disadvantage pupils from ethnic minority as well as other backgrounds. In the final analysis, however, the justification for defending multicultural-antiracist education policy and practice is political, in keeping with the the traditions and political priorities of social democracy. We now turn to examine whether these traditions have been preserved by the Rampton-Swann Committee of Inquiry set up in the last months of the Labour Government in 1979 but whose membership was confirmed by the newly elected Conservative Government in July 1979.

THE RAMPTON-SWANN COMMITTEE

In the late '60s and early '70s policy-makers resisted responding positively to the needs of 'immigrant' pupils. The educational policies which were introduced were racially

'inexplicit' (Kirp 1979). By the end of the 1970s, however, the racially 'inexplicit' approach was criticised both inside and outside the education system and 'inexplicitness' was no longer tenable (The West Indian Community 1977, Education in Schools 1977, Dorn 1983). The focus of concern was the poor educational performance of ethnic minority pupils, and in 1979 a committee of inquiry began to investigate the causes of the underachievement of children of West Indian origin in maintained schools and to recommend remedial action (Tomlinson 1983). Originally constituted as the Rampton Committee (chaired by Anthony Rampton) which published an 'Interim Report', West Indian Children in Our Schools in 1981, it was subsequently chaired by Lord Swann and became a committee of inquiry into education for a pluralist society with global perspectives and published Education For All in 1985. Towards the end of the committee's life, however, Lord Swann's autonomous action vis a vis the chapter on achievement and underachievement caused some members of the committee to resign due to the weight he had given to social and economic status as a determinant of achievement (Dummett 1985). In Dummett's view, more attention should have been given to schools and their role in overcoming the underachievement of certain groups. As a result there was disquiet over the final version of the report. Nonetheless, these two reports publicly acknowledge the salience of the MCE and ARE lobbies' concern with the socio-economic, racial disadvantages and academic underachievement of ethnic/racial minority pupils.

While the Rampton committee was investigating the circumstances of ethnic minority pupils, there was growing pressure on the

education system to modernise. In the years preceeding the establishment of the Rampton Committee, the goal of equality of educational opportunity began to be shifted from the centre stage by Black Paper activists, (Cox & Dyson 1975, 1977 & Boyson 1975) who complained that progressive teaching methods had led to a decline in standards. A major issue in this debate was the extent to which comprehensive schools' exam results were worse than selective schools (Marks & Cox 1984). Black Paper writers alleged that comprehensive schools and progressive teachers were not able to authoritatively ensure the maintenance of high academic standards. The turning point came in 1976 with Callaghan's Great Debate speech (Chitty 1989) and new issues appeared on the national education agenda: standards, accountability and meeting the needs of the nation for a highly skilled workforce. In this climate the relationship between the DES, LEAs and teachers began to polarise, and the needs of the nation's economy took priority over LEA concern with the circumstances of disadvantaged, often ethnic/racial minority pupils. Right-wing intellectuals (sometimes referred to as Tory education radicals) formed an influential pressure group based at the Centre for Policy Studies, a think-tank set up by Sir Keith Joseph in 1974, took these issues up and gradually mobilised them into the national arena for debate after Thatcher's election in 1979.

The riots and urban disturbances in Bristol, Brixton and Toxteth in the early 1980s prompted policy-makers and teachers in LEAs and schools to produce written multicultural and antiracist statements (Dorn 1983). But as the public watched television and read press accounts of the inner city 'uprisings', a

right-wing backlash was taking shape. Tory education radicals were beginning to capitalise on the 'new racism' (Barker 1981, Edgar 1985, Seidel 1985, Gordon & Klug 1986). A few years later the 'new racism' was further legitimated by generous media coverage of events such as the 'Honeyford Affair' in 1984 (Foster-Carter 1987, Jones 1989). The New Right guru, Roger Scruton, wrote influential columns in 'The Times' and the British public was exposed to a high dose of 'daily racism' (Gordon & Rosenberg 1989).

In this rapidly changing climate, it is hardly surprising that the publicity given the Rampton Report in 1981 was chilly. Rampton's publication had coincided with the urban uprisings and the public was not sympathetically predisposed to its findings. The media reception highlighted the allegedly low levels of achievement of pupils of West Indian origin (The Times 6.18.1981, The Guardian 6.18.1981, Troyna 1984a), thus reinforcing stereotypical and pathological images of black people integral to the 'new racism'. Four years later, the reception accorded the Swann Report (Education For All, 1985) was even less favourable. The Times leader described the report as "....the strangest dog's breakfast ever to to emerge from HMSO...." and Sir Keith Joseph, the then Secretary of State for Education virtually ignored it. The New Right characterised Education For All as a threat to the content and structure of the English education system. The backlash against the multicultural-antiracist lobby now had a 807 page target for its venom.

In the context of the 1980s, then, the politics of the 'pro' and

'anti' multicultural-antiracist education lobbies became dramatically polarised. A heated ideological and policy debate ensued. While the 'pro' camp continued to prioritise democratic values and generally welcomed the Rampton/Swann Reports, they were nonetheless critical (Reeves & Chevannes 1981, Troyna 1984a 1986, Mullard 1984a, NAME 1985, Parekh 1985, Naguib 1986). The New Right 'anti' camp pointed to 'looney left' educationalists who, they alleged, were attempting to subvert the sound foundations and traditions of the education system (Palmer 1986, Troyna (ed) 1987, Edwards 1987, Lewis 1988, Gordon 1988, Jones 1989). For our purposes we will focus on those aspects of Rampton and Swann which were affected by the changing political attitudes in this period and led to a modification of the Committee's original terms of reference, and its interpretation of multicultural-antiracist education.

The Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration's (1977) original brief was for an investigation into the causes of 'underachievement' of children of West Indian origin. But as time passed the Government modified this request, insisting that the inquiry should be based within a more broadly conceived examination of the 'achievements and needs of all pupils for education for life in a multi-racial society'. In Troyna's (1986) view

> ...this is interesting because when the formal
> terms of reference were announced by Mark Carlyle
> in July 1979 this emphasis on the education system
> had been eschewed in favour of an inquiry into 'the
> educational needs and attainments of pupils of West
> Indian origin...' (Troyna 1986:174)

A recognition of the changing terms of reference is important because it helps to explain the nature of criticism from the 'pro' camp when the two reports were published. Thus criticism

was levelled at the Committee's failure to consider the manifest

forms of racism 'in schools' (my emphasis) and the way this might

impinge on the educational achievement of black pupils.

> If the original, albeit informal, terms of reference
> had not been changed by Carlyle it is likely that
> the committee would have paid considerably more
> attention to precisely those in-school processes
> which black and white antiracists have argued have
> been ignored.....[and] it would have been more
> difficult for Sir Keith Joseph to reject the claims
> that racism in education constitutes an important
> phenomenon for investigation and action.
> (Troyna 1986:174)

When Rampton was published the main message conveyed was that

pupils of West Indian origin 'underachieved'. However, the

evidence to support this view was based on methodologically

dubious data from the DES School Leavers Study. The data was

unstandardised in terms of key variables, ie. class, gender and

individual schools' records of achievement (Reeves & Chevannes

1981). Further, the allegation of teacher racism, or

'unintentional racism' (Rampton 1981:12) as it was referred to,

caused considerable disquiet among the teaching force. The DES

response to Rampton was confined to circulating the report to

LEAs, without comment on the recommendations, thus ensuring that

the Committee and its report would remain marginal to the

national decision-making forum. Despite this reception, however,

the Rampton Report marked a major turning point. Its main

achievement was that it legitimated the salience of 'racism'

in the educational experience of racial and ethnic minority

pupils and put it firmly on the national educational agenda.

Even The Times (18.6.1981) headline confirmed this fact:

> 'Racism Blamed For School Failures by West Indians'
> (The Times 18.6.1981)

Subsequently the Swann Report's approach to the question of

racism echoed the same concerns as Rampton although the emphasis

differed.   As Alan Little (1985) explained:

> Rampton was clear that racism, although
> not the only explanation for black under-
> achievement, 'had an important bearing on
> their performance'- a conclusion that may
> have led to his sacking. The present report
> is more equivocal: while statements about
> stereotypes and low expectations make
> 'disturbing reading', the committee finds
> the 'weight of research evidence' seems to
> be against a link between teacher expectations
> and performance. [Swann] is part of a more
> general change of focus by the committee.
> (Little 1985: 229)

Thus, while Swann was not different in principle from Rampton,
its main concern was to achieve changes in attitudes among the
majority community (Little 1985:229). In fact, this was a very
significant shift in terms of how the concept of racism was
understood and acted upon.   Little argued there was a general
concern on the Rampton Committee with

> West Indian underachievement, and the school
> and the wider community as a cause of it. This
> report [Swann] moves away from that, and brings
> to the centre of its focus the educational needs
> of all pupils and all schools in the expectation
> that in coping with them, the needs of black pupils
> will be met; as would the political and professional
> anxieties that are generated when racism is mentioned,
> and when black needs requiring explicit policies are
> discussed. (Little 1985:229-230)

Thus the committee's terms of reference had shifted, with the
result that the concept of racism in Swann became synonymous
with prejudice and situated on the terrain of cultural pluralism.
In practical terms, all the report could recommend was to tinker
with schools and the educational system rather than promoting
awareness and an understanding that racism will only be
eliminated if people work for changes in the wider social,
political and economic structures to ensure a more equal
society. The significance of the shifting terms of reference was
not lost on the black community. Naguib (1986) exposed this

shift as one in which there is

> A major concern expressed by the black communities
> .....that the prescription of 'Education For All'
> has masked the issues of real concern to the black
> community. (Naguib 1986:8)

In the end, <u>Education For All</u> did not move very far from the reformist and compensatory recommendations of Plowden. Swann's conception of 'racism' helped to circumvent and avoid the issues of how to provide and implement a power-sensitive radical multicultural education in English schools. Instead Swann confirmed cultural stereotypes, which was inevitable, given the concept of racism it worked with. If the Swann committee had given the ACER (Afro-Caribbean Education Resources, ILEA 1982) suggestions more attention it is possible that this need not have been the case. ACER recommended that research be focused on

> factors within schools which may help to
> explain the difficulties which children
> encounter, whether matters of school policy,
> organisation or classroom practice.
> (Education For All, 1985:177)

Had Swann taken this path instead of replicating the DES School Leavers Study, a fuller understanding of the crucial within-school dynamics which structure the experiences of pupils would have been possible. Accordingly this would have enabled a fuller understanding on the dynamics of institutional racism. It is worth noting, however, that James Cornford included the ACER suggestions in Annex G (<u>Education For All</u>:171-186) and the pressure group NAME (National Anti-Racist Movement in Education) endorsed the ACER recommendations as more appropriate to the task of investigating the racism in schools. As NAME (1985) explained in its critique of <u>Education For All</u>,

> The Report has failed to utilise the knowledge,

> experience and perceptions of the black
> community that was available e.g.the
> ACER suggestions. (NAME 1985:3)

Despite these important limitations, however, the Rampton and Swann Reports have legitimised the educational concerns of the black community and identified racism as a crucial factor in the educational context. We should not underestimate the significance of these two reports in helping to keep the goals of educational and racial equality and justice on the national education agenda of multiracial Britain. To this extent, therefore, the traditions of social democracy have been preserved—even within the strictures of the education policies of the New Right.

THE NEW RIGHT BACKLASH: CHALLENGING MCE-ARE

Although only in embryonic form at the time of my fieldwork, the New Right's approach to race and education grew out of the trends of that period. By way of a coda to this chapter, therefore, a note on its development since is appropriate here.

The New Right educationalists oppose both multicultural and antiracist education. Their brief became easier to sustain, given the rapidly changing educational terrain which was consolidated with the passage of the 1988 Education Reform Act. (Simon 1988) Throughout the 1980s, the educational right waged a determined battle with the result that the ideological divide became increasingly fragmented, thus enabling them to capture the ground which explicitly challenges the fundamental principles of the post-war settlement in education—namely equality of educational opportunity, non-racist education and social justice.

Two strands of thought lie at the heart of the New Right agenda. One is 'cultural cohesion', which emphasises the role of the strong state whose duty it is to control the evils of an unregulated society. The second is an extension of classical liberalism with its emphasis on the freedom of individuals to interact unfettered by state regulation (Jones 1989). These ideas constitute a political tendency which draws on old ideas and presents them in a new context, a context inhabited by both economic libertarians and social authoritarians. Gordon and Klug (1986) explain that

> Thatcherism acts as a bridge between the two
> strands, dismantling the 'collectivist' provisions
> which stand in the way of an unfettered economy,
> while bolstering the forces of law and order and
> promoting nationalism and self-discipline.
> (Klug 1986:12)

The crucial question is how is 'cultural cohesion' maintained? Hall's (1983) answer is in the form of an analysis of Thatcherism. For Hall, there is an authoritarian populism which exists within the accepted institutional framework but in which the content is changed. What is different is the manner in which the rhetoric of 'national interest' becomes the principal ideological form, in which 'nation' and 'people' are deployed against 'class', 'unions' and 'race' (Hall 1983:27). Authoritarian populism also includes the themes of organic Toryism, namely: nation, family, duty, authority, standards, traditionalism---to which have been added self-interest, competitive individualism and anti-statism. The ideological appeal is powerful and the sections of the media have been colonised to aid in disseminating these views (Gordon & Rosenberg 1989). The New Right education lobby has been successful in developing a discourse in terms of an educational populism which

takes three principal forms: first, it builds on and extends the 'Black Paper' themes. Second, it promotes the 'new racism'. Third, it attacks multicultural and antiracist education.

The 'new racism' is not meant, however, to connote a unitary or even coherent set of ideas. Rather, it represents a scattered and somewhat uneven ideology which is woven together from different sources: 'Powellism', 'human nature', 'people's instincts', 'a way of life', the 'other', the 'territorial imperative' and the 'denial of racism'. It is 'only natural' for people to keep the company of 'their own kind'; 'racial separation is just good common sense'; the 'nation' consists of similar people and 'other people are different'. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that black people cannot be part of the British 'nation'. The 'territorial imperative' metaphor has been successfully used to justify immigration laws and promote repatriation policy (Gordon & Klug 1986). There is no racism in Britain, according to this line of analysis because the New Right has individualised the concept (Lewis 1988). Institutional racism does not exist; all racism is relocated in the realm of personal morality whereby only individuals may engage in discriminatory behaviour (Gordon 1988).

In this political climate it is logical for the New Right to oppose both muticultural and antiracist education. Distinctions between MCE and ARE are often blurred. Insofar as there are threats posed by multiculturalism, they stem from multiculturalists who believe that schools have to take account of the different cultural, linguistic and religious backgrounds of their pupils and society as a whole. Antiracist

education, on the other hand, poses a threat because it questions the unequal power relations between black and white people and advocates a belief in power equality which should permeate social, economic and poltical structures. Some of the most well-known writings against multicultural and antiracist education have come from activist intelligentsia in the Hillgate Group, Centre For Policy Studies, The Salisbury Review. Ray Honeyford, for example, is a well-known member and a former Bradford middle school head, who gained prominence in 1979 when he spoke out against multicultural education (Jack 1985, Brown 1985, Foster-Carter 1987, Halstead 1988). This debate is rich in nuance and permeated by the two strands of thought outlined above: 'cultural cohesion' and individual freedom (Palmer, ed. 1986, Troyna ed. 1987b, Gordon 1988, Jones 1989).

Where does this leave the MCE-ARE debate at the beginning of the 1990s? It is undoubtedly true that the New Right educational populists have succeeded in discrediting both multicultural and antiracist education in the popular consciousness. The result has been to marginalise the context, content and critique of the MCE-ARE debate. A new centralised educational agenda, the 1988 Educational Reform Act, has shifted the priorities of both LEAs and teachers whose energies are being harnessed to the imperatives of implementing the provisions of the 1988 Act. Consequently, the issues raised by the MCE-ARE debate have been moved into a new arena, the National Curriculum, where they are yet to be defined. Significantly, however, the broad positive impetus generated by the MCE-ARE debate has been and continues to be taken on board in many schools and several LEAs—but for how

much longer?

We now move on to examine the issues raised by this debate in the inner city area, Innerton, where my fieldwork was conducted. We need to familiarise ourselves with this environment and appreciate the socio-economic factors which affected the case-study school, East End High. We will look at the educational profile of schools in this area, consider their profile of achievement and pose questions about the meaning and interpretation of 'underachievement' in this context.

CHAPTER FOUR.

THE COMMUNITY, EDUCATION AND 'UNDERACHIEVEMENT'

INTRODUCTON

This chapter will investigate the deprived inner city Borough of Innerton where the case study school, East End High, is located. Particular attention will be paid to educational, racial and ethnic inequalities and patterns of educational achievement. Part I describes the socio-economic circumstances and ethnic composition of the community in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Part II compares the pattern of educational achievement of pupils in Innerton's schools with other boroughs in the ILEA. A major aim of the 1977 ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education Policy was to improve the academic performance of low achieving ethnic minority pupils, and Part III will consider debates about 'underachievement' among ethnic minority pupils and critically assess policies, theories and methods used to analyse patterns of 'underachievement'. The sensitive question as to whether pupils experienced forms of 'racism' in schooling, a factor contributing to their 'underachievment', will be posed.

As discussed in chapter three, two major reports (West Indian Children in Our Schools (1981) & Education For All (1985) have extended the use of the concept of 'racism' and spoken of 'institutional racism' in relation to the educational system, emphasising how the process of schooling as well as the wider society systematically discriminates against pupils from ethnic and racial minority groups; pupils of Asian and Afro-Caribbean

origin are the groups most frequently cited. (Rampton 1981:14, Swann 1985:28-30)

We must be cautious when using the term 'institutional racism', however. Troyna and Williams (1986) argue that we need

> First, a clear and unambiguous theoretical
> outline of the nature of the relationship
> between institutions; second, an understanding
> of the operation and workings of particular
> institutions; and third, an appreciation of
> the relationship between individuals who are
> part of the institutions and structures within
> which they work. (Troyna & Williams 1986:55-56)

They warn that

> .....analyses of institutional racism often
> emphasise non-intentionality or routine
> institutional procedures....[and] distinctions
> need to be made between.....racist intent,
> racialist practices and racist effects (in the
> form of inequality)....(Troyna & Williams 1986:56)

By using the concept of 'institutional racism' in the manner outlined by Troyna and Williams we can investigate the relationships between the 'objective' socio-economic conditions, the ethnic profile of the community and the factors contributing to 'underachievement', ie.,

> ...the interrelationships between different
> institutions and their impact on the
> reproduction of racial inequalities. (Troyna
> & Williams 1986:58)

A critical understanding of these interrelationships is necessary if we are to recognise when 'institutional racism' occurs and how forms of 'institutional racism' affect the academic 'achievement' and 'underachievement' of ethnic minority pupils. It will be argued that no serious understanding of pupil outcomes in terms of academic performance can be made without understanding the relationships between conditions in

the pupils' community, home background and perhaps most significantly, internal school processes. Schools live in environments which bear directly on their internal functioning, and it is to this environment in both material and educational terms that we now turn.

PART I: PROFILE OF INNERTON

The Borough of Innerton was formed in 1965 when three previous London boroughs amalgamated. It is situated in the north-east centre of the city and has three parliamentary constituencies which were Labour held seats in 1982. The local council consists of 60 elected members, 50 of whom were Labour, 7 Liberal and 3 Conservative at the local election May 1, 1982. (Howes & Fulop 1982 p.1)

Innerton experienced more than its fair share of stress and extremes common to many of Britain's inner cities in the 1970s and 80s. A recent CRE report noted that

> ....results from 1981 Census show that it has
> one of the highest unemployment rates [in the
> metropolitan authority] at over 18% of the
> population; that this rate is steadily rising;
> that large numbers live in over-crowded accomodation
> (9.0%); that 11.9% of its households lack the
> exclusive use of a bath and an inside wc; and that the
> the area proportionately contains the largest number
> of single parent families (10.6%) in the country.
> (CRE 1984:17)

DEPRIVATION I: A SOCIO-ECONOMIC & ETHNIC PROFILE

There are seven characteristics to note: decline in the size of the population, the arrival of two groups of newcomers, the ethnic composition of the population, the age structure, household type, residential patterns and employment status.

(1) POPULATION DECLINE

The population declined from 389,000 in 1901 to approximately 180,000 in 1981. This decline was particularly rapid between 1951 and 1971 (Young et al 1980):

Table A
Size of Population
1951   265,000
1961   257,000
1971   221,000
(Source. Young et al 1980:5)

The rate of decline in the borough's population has slowed considerably since the mid-1970s but has continued to fall, along with the population of all inner city boroughs in this metropolitan authority.

(2) THE NEWCOMERS

The groups of newcomers comprised young middle class people and ethnic minorities. Many young middle class owner- occupiers were attracted to Innerton by the relative cheapness of houses which they could 'gentrify'. They were professionals who worked typically as architects, civil servants, university and polytechnic lecturers, journalists and design engineers. Others were professionals who owned businesses or held managerial positions but lived in council or privately rented accomodation (Young et al 1980:8-9).

The ethnic minorities consisted of West Indians, Asians, Cypriots (Greek and Turkish) as well as Africans, Irish, mainland Turks and the Chinese, with some very recently arrived Vietnamese 'boat people'. See Table B.

TABLE B
(3) INNERTON: ETHNIC STRUCTURE OF POPULATION 1978

ETHNIC GROUP	NUMBER ('000s)	% of TOTAL POPULATION
WHITE	134.4	69.3
WEST INDIAN	25.9	13.4
INDIAN	5.1	2.6
PAKISTANI	0.7	0.4
BANGLADESHI	0.8	0.4
CHINESE	0.7	0.4
TURKISH	4.2	2.2
OTHER ASIAN	0.7	0.4
AFRICAN	5.2	2.7
ARAB	0.4	0.2
MIXED ORIGIN	3.0	1.5
OTHER	12.7	6.5
TOTAL	193.9	100.0

Source: National Dwelling & Housing Survey 1978, table 33662

Just under 1/3 of Innerton's population were ethnic and racial minorities, the highest percentage in the metropolitan authority. West Indians, Africans, Jews and Cypriots were over-represented with West Indians making up a higher percentage of Innerton's population than in any other London borough. By contrast, South Asians were under-represented. A study by the Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews estimated that Jews were the largest ethnic minority in the borough in 1971, nearly 15% of the total. (Mullins 1982:2)

(4) AGE STRUCTURE OF POPULATION

The age structure of this ethnic profile is significant. The 1981 Census gave the proportionate sizes of each age group as:

Table C: AGE	% of POPULATION
Under 5 years	6.9
5-15	15.4
16-24	16.9
25-34	15.3
35-44	10.2
45 to retirement	18.5
over retirement age	16.9

(source: Howes & Fulop 1982:3)

There are four important features to note about the population. First, Jewish residents have been characterised by an outmigration since the 1950s and those who remained tended to be relatively elderly and poor, with the exception of a close-knit Jewish community which flourished in the north-east part of the borough. Second, the West Indians and Africans (the largest ethnic minorities) had a predominance of people in the 10-19 age group (26%) with the percentage in age groups falling as age increases and very few over 60 years old. Third, over 26% of the Indian sub-continent population are under 10 years and the proportion in each group decreased as age increased except for a slight increase in the 20-24 age group. Finally, the white/Turkish group had a flatter age distribution with a much higher percentage of older people than the other ethnic groups. (Howes & Fulop:4)

(5) HOUSEHOLD TYPE

Houshold type is a crucial variable to consider in relation to ethnic group. Different types of households existed and three important features stood out. First, a high proportion of West Indian households comprised single parent families. Second, a higher proportion of Indian/Bangladeshi and Pakistani households contained children. Third, a high proportion of 'white' households had no children and were made up of pensioners. (Howes & Fulop:5) The following table shows these different household types by ethnic group:

TABLE D
HOUSEHOLD BY ETHNIC GROUP (% HOUSEHOLDS IN EACH ETHNIC GROUP)

	PENSIONER H/Hs	SINGLE PARENT H/Hs	OTHER H/Hs with children	Other H/Hs no children
WHITE	28.8	3.4	24.0	43.9
WEST INDIAN	2.4	20.7	46.9	30.1
INDIAN/PAKIS/ BANGLEDESHI	0.8	4.8	68.6	25.7
AFRICAN	0.7	13.2	45.2	40.9
TOTAL	22.9	5.7	29.8	41.5

(Source: Mullins 1982:16)

(6) RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS OF ETHNIC GROUPS

A distinctive feature of the residential patterns of Innerton was the association of particular ethnic groups with specific geographical areas. West Indians and Africans were fairly evenly distributed across the central part of the borough with Asians more concentrated in the ward on the north-eastern periphery. Whites tended to dominate in the south west of the borough and were less than half the population in wards to the north of the borough, with the exception of the concentrated Jewish population mentioned above.

HOUSING TENURE

Housing tenure was also important. The result of the expansion of council house building in the borough in the first three post-war decades coupled with the decline in population meant that the proportion of council housing had risen substantially.

TABLE E
COMPARATIVE HOUSING TENURE (% of all households in each category)

	CENSUS 1971 INNERTON	DWELLING SURVEY 1977 INNERTON	METRO.AUTH	UK
OWNER OCCUPIER	11%	14%	44%	54%
COUNCIL RENTED	43%	56%	31%	30%
HOUSING ASSOCIATION	--	6%	3%	%
PRIVATE UNFURNISHED	33%	16%	14%	11%
PRIVATE FURNISHED	11%	8%	8%	4%
OTHER	2%	--	--	--

(Source: Young et al 1980:6)

From Table E we can see that Innerton had one of the highest proportions of council housing in the metropolitan authority and

the whole of Britain. Fifty-six percent of all households were in the council sector in 1977 compared with 43% in 1971 and 31% of people in the metropolitan authority living in council housing compared with 30% nationally. Table F shows the relative proportions living in the different tenure types by white and ethnic minority groups:

Table F
TENURE PATTERNS AND ETHNICITY IN INNERTON (% in each category)

ETHNICITY	OWNER OCCUPIERS	COUNCIL SECTOR INNER./METRO.AUTH.		RENTED-OTHER-TOTAL SECTOR		
WHITE	12%	38%	21%	23%	6%	100
WEST INDIAN	26%	39%	21%	9%	5%	100
ASIAN	48%	16%	7%	24%	5%	100
AFRICAN	35%	28%	21%	13%	3%	100

(Source: National Dwelling & Household Survey 1978)

From Table F we can see that 39% of West Indians lived in Innerton's council housing with a further 21% in metropolitan authority property. This pattern is similar to the relative percentages of white tenants in public sector housing. By contrast, nearly half the Asian population (48%) were owner-occupiers in Innerton with only 23% in council housing.

HOUSING STOCK

Bad housing contributed to many of Innerton's problems. Given that the proportion of council housing in Innerton was the highest in the whole of Britain, it is worth considering the legacy of different generations of council stock. The pre-war estates, while sound, were built for high density occupancy in an era of changing domestic technologies. These estates had become obsolete in that they were not centrally heated, were too small to accomodate fridges, freezers, washing machines or an adequate electricity supply. Estates of the 1940s and 50s had lower densities but were poorly designed with narrow alley-ways and free standing stair-wells which blocked out light and did not easily accommodate high child density,

cars or play space. The tower blocks of the 1960s were the products of industrialised building systems financed by government subsidies to local authorities in need of cheaper housing. Insufficiently tested methods of building had been used (a la Ronan Point) and maintenance costs were prohibitive. Socially, tower blocks proved to be unsuitable for high child density as lifts were frequently broken and vandalism was rife. In 1979, 14% of families with children under 16 were living above the fourth floor (Harrison 1983:207). A more enlightened phase of council house design emerged in the 1970s with a number of attractive estates built on conventional street patterns. However, technical faults plagued these estates, resulting in condensation, leaks, poor ventilation, cracking plaster and noise penetration. Overall, Innerton's council housing consisted of different phases of inadequate building and only a handful of estates were free of major problems. (Harrison 1983:206-209)

In considering ethnic patterns of housing allocation in terms of age of dwellings, West Indians and Asians were over-represented in pre-war housing which suffered most from deterioration and inadequate facilities while whites were over-represented in post-war stock. Regarding amenities, 13% of West Indians did not have sole use of a bath or shower compared with 16% of whites, 24% of Africans and 26% Asians. Whites and Asians expressed the greatest satisfaction with their accommodation and West Indians and Africans the greatest dissatisfaction. (Mullins 1982:24-25) Table G shows age of housing by ethnic groups and indicates a clear pattern of non-white occupancy in older council properties.

TABLE G
AGE OF PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY ETHNIC GROUPS (1978)
(% Household in Ethnic Group)

ETHNIC GROUP	PRE-1919	1919-39	1940-64	POST-64	TOTAL
WHITE/TURKISH	35.3%	13.6%	30.8%	20.3%	100
WEST INDIAN	42.9%	18.8%	17.4%	20.8%	100
AFRICAN	54.6%	14.4%	15.2%	15.8%	100
INDIAN SUB-CON.	70.6%	8.8%	5.3%	15.3%	100
OTHER	42.9%	21.2%	20.3%	15.6%	100
TOTAL	37.9%	14.7%	27.65	19.85	100

(Source: Mullins 1982:25)

Data on length of residence at present address showed that most white residents had been at their present address for more than 5 years and 1/3 for more than 10 years; 47% of West Indians had been at their present address for over 5 years and only 25% under 2 years. The period of Asian residence was shortest with only 25% over 5 years and 49% under 2 years. The Africans were under-represented amongst the group which had been resident for over 5 years and over-represented amongst the under 2 year group. (Mullins 1982:25)

(7) SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE; PATTERNS OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The socio-economic profile of the borough shows a higher percentage of manual groups than professional or other non-manual occupations. Because the ethnic and racial minorities concentrated in the borough were predominantly working class, there was little overall difference in the socio-economic composition of the black and white populations. However, some variations were noticeable. Asians were over-represented amongst both professional and managers and semi-skilled workers and under-represented amongst intermediate non-manual and skilled manual categories.

TABLE H
SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUP OF ETHNIC MINORITY HOUSEHOLD HEADS-1978

ETHNIC GROUP	Professional Manag/Employer	Other non-man	Skilled Manual	Semi- Skill.	Unsk. Manual	Other
WHITE/TURKISH	9.3%	18.7%	31.1%	16.4%	8.4%	16.0%
WEST INDIAN	2.3%	14.3%	33.5%	25.5%	8.2%	16.3%
INDIAN/PAKIS/ BANGLADESHI	15.1%	14.2%	24.7%	29.9%	4.1%	11.9%
AFRICAN	9.4%	22.6%	14.1%	19.7%	5.6%	28.7%
TOTAL	8.8%	18.0%	30.8%	18.1%	8.1%	16.1%

(Source: National Dwelling & Household Survey
        Data Table 35231, 1979 from Mullins 1982:28)

Data from the NDHS 1978 survey (Table H) showed that at that time a higher proportion of Asian (77%) and West Indian (72%) than white (54%) heads of household were economically active but this was partially explained by the different age structures of these communities respectively. That is, over 20% of whites but only 4% of Asians and 2% of West Indian household heads were retired.(Mullins 1982:28)

Unemployment in the borough had increased substantially over the past 15 years and was disproportionately higher than in the London area and the country as a whole. Until the mid-1970s Innerton's male unemployment was roughly equivalent to the national average: in October 1973 it was 2.4% rising to 5.4% in October 1975. However, monetarist fiscal policies had begun to bite after 1976 and Innerton's unemployment levels accelerated:

TABLE I

	% Unemployed	% Above National Avg.
1977	7.8%	25%
1980	10.7%	44%
1981	17.1%	50%

(source: Harrison 1983:114)

Rising rates of unemployment plagued Innerton—with 12,024 registered in February 1981. This was a greater number than in March 1936 at the peak of the Depression. In 1979/80 ethnic minority group levels of unemployment were twice as high as

whites: 11% Asian, 9% West Indians, 5% Whites. But the figures conceal two problems: (1) as unemployment becomes endemic people might have felt it was no longer worth registering because after the first 6 months unemployment benefit was not paid, and (2) the rates of unemployment were most pronounced for younger ethnic and racial minorities. February 1981 estimates revealed that the proportion of registered unemployed young people from these minority groups was 14.4% of boys and 15% of girls compared with 22.5% and 19% of adult men and women respectively. Although the data indicated that higher rates of unemployment apply to the older males we should also note that these figures probably underestimated the extent of youth unemployment. (Mullins 1982: 28-29) Tables J and K give a clear picture of the rising rate of unemployment:

TABLE J
PERCENTAGE ADULT MALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

	1979		1980		1981		1982	
	Metr.Auth/Innerton		M.A./Inn		M.A./Inn		M.A./Inn	
January	5.2%	12.3%	4.9%	12.3%	8.1%	17.1%	11.6%	21.1%

(source: Howes & Fulop 1982:7)

In the following table (table K) data on age specific ethnic unemployment for February 1981 shows the stark reality for the two black groups, bearing in mind that this data probably underestimates the extent of unemployment, given the two problems mentioned above.

TABLE K
AGE SPEFICIC UNEMPLOYMENT (%)

AGE	WEST INDIAN	AFRICAN	INDIAN SUB-CONTINENT	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
16-24	16.5%	6.7%	9.3%	4.0%
25-44	12.3%	2.3%	15.2%	1.9%
45+	17.3%	5.9%	29.6%	2.3%

(Source: Mullins 1982:30)

DEPRIVATION II: A QUALITATIVE ACCOUNT

Young et al (1980) provides a qualitative account of life in Innerton. The study looked at residents' views of their housing conditions. People were concerned about debris, which was commonly found on the borough's delapidated estates. With 56% of Innerton's population living in council accomodation (1971 figures), many grievances were expressed: complaints about the filth, lack of repairs, vandalism and noise—all characterised life in the tower block estates. An elderly resident expressed her disgust as follows:

> It's all those teenagers that's the trouble.
> We have swarms of them from other blocks over
> here causing annoyance. I've lived in my flat
> for 25 years this Christmas. It was nice to
> live here one time. But now there's all this
> filthy graffiti...(Young et al 1980:42)

A young woman whith two small sons living in one of the old pre-fabs described how the lack of amenities affected her:

> If you've no recreation, you've got to take
> out your frustration somehow. The kids go out
> to play football. Someone complains...There's
> nothing in [Innerton]. It costs 83p to go to
> the pictures for a child...There's no-where
> to take a child...The only nice thing is the
> library. They've had a free film every Thursday
> and things going on every day in the summer.
> (Young et al 1980:42-43)

Council staff and councillors knew the range of complaints well. But where were the resources to be found for improvements and maintenance? Both tenants and landlords regarded the environment on estates as anti-social. Young et al (1980) pointed out that the re-introduction of resident caretakers could go a long way to improving life on estates. Caretakers could act as channels of communication, used in emergencies, help to prevent vandalism, and coordinate cleaning and maintenance. But resident caretakers had been abolished in 1972 and there was no sign of reinstating them.(Young et al 1980: 45)

Another problem in Innerton was public transport. People were denied easy access to the commercial area in the centre of London because Innerton had no underground line crossing it. Even though two tube stations were located within the western boundaries, the only rail link was one surface British rail line and a few other surface rail stations. Residents had comparatively few cars to compensate (67% having no car compared with 47% for the Greater London Area) (Young et al 1980:49). The consequence of no tube service and fewer cars per capita meant that people were forced on to buses--or, more realistically, to wait for buses. People expressed fears about being mugged late at night while queuing. It was more difficult for old age pensioners who were not allowed on buses with their wheeled shopping baskets. Some locals referred to the 'banana buses' because they 'came in bunches' or to the 'Wells Fargo Express' because they 'stopped at nothing'. The lack of adequate transport was a daily obstacle in residents' lives.

Genuine efforts were made, nevertheless, by people who wanted to affirm their own dignity and self-respect. One enterprise was a local writers' publishing project situated in the heart of the borough. The project had begun in 1971 as a cultural centre with a bookshop and coffee bar, meeting rooms, a Welfare Rights Advice Centre and adult reading centre. When it began to publish, the centre became a mouthpiece for local writers and historians. 'Publishing' was interpreted as 'making public' exhibitions, talks by local writers and promoting the ideas behind the books and poems as well as working class, women and ethnic group culture. Grants from the LEA and other funding

bodies enabled wider dissemination of publications. The success of this grassroots project meant that voices from Innerton were heard well beyond the borough boundaries. (Mills 1978)

Not all such 'educational' endeavours were as successful however. And it is to the significance of education in the wider borough context that we now turn.

PART II: PROFILE OF EDUCATION IN THE ILEA AND THE BOROUGH OF INNERTON

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL INTAKE & OUTCOMES

Until 1975 secondary schools in the Inner London Education Authority operated a selective admissions procedure. In 1976 all secondary schools went comprehensive. From 1976 pupils were grouped at the age of 10 into 3 ability bands on the basis of their performance in a series of comparability tests of Verbal Reasoning, Mathematics, English and primary headteachers' assessments. Banding was designed to indicate whether pupils were in the top 25% (VR Band 1), middle 50% (VR Band 2), or bottom 25% (VR Band 3) and schools were supposed to have a balanced intake in terms of bands of ability. Despite this policy change, however, there was still considerable inequality of intake between schools. (ILEA Exam Results 79/70)

It was not until 1981 that data on first form entry by ability bands was published. This evidence (ie. the composition of the first form of secondary school pupils grouped in the 3 ability bands) was a regarded as a major indicator of eventual academic outcomes. For our purposes, it is very significant that there was an underbalanced intake in Innerton's secondary schools. When the proportionate size of ability Bands in Innerton's schools is compared with the proportionate size of ability Bands

in other divisions in the LEA (Table L), we can see that Innerton had the smallest proportion of Band Ones in the whole authority, almost 10% fewer then a balanced intake required. Band two contained the right proportion, but there was a significantly higher proportion of Band three pupils than in any of the other divisions in the LEA.

TABLE L

INTAKE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DIVISIONS IN THE LEA-1981

Division*	% of Pupils in VR Band			
	1	2	3	Not Tested
INNERTON	13.6	49.8	35.1	1.4
Blue	26.1	50.4	21.7	1.8
Yellow	27.8	48.7	19.7	3.8
Grey	17.3	49.8	29.5	3.3
Orange	21.6	49.4	27.3	1.8
Green	27.7	52.7	19.4	0.1
Purple	30.3	48.2	21.4	0.1
Navy	23.3	50.5	25.6	0.6
Crimson	22.7	48.4	26.8	2.2
Pink	27.9	48.6	20.4	0.3

(source: RS 826/82 Table 21:24) [* = Divisions in the ILEA are represented by colours.]

The higher proportion of band 3 pupils in Innerton's schools had serious consequences for the school's policy on entering candidates for externally set examinations. Table M shows the pattern of entry for exams by Divisions in the LEA:

TABLE M

ENTRY POLICY FOR 15-16 YEAR OLDS BY DIVISION

			% of PUPILS			
Div.	Roll	Candidates	Entered CSE only	Entered O-levels only	Entered 5or more Subjects	Entered 5 or more O-levels
INNERTON	2481	78.2	47.6	1.7	61.3	8.3
Blue	2934	82.2	39.7	11.4	68.7	21.0
Yellow	3442	85.1	32.5	12.8	70.5	25.3
Grey	2061	74.2	33.9	7.5	59.3	15.1
Orange	2316	75.4	40.7	3.4	61.9	14.0
Green	3454	83.5	39.8	6.4	72.2	24.6
Purple	3590	85.5	37.9	14.0	72.5	23.7
Navy	3673	77.9	41.4	5.3	65.2	14.0
Crimson	2525	78.8	42.9	7.2	60.5	14.9
Pink	3851	82.6	40.5	8.3	70.4	20.8
TOTAL	30327	80.9	39.6	8.1	67.1	18.1

(Source: RS/826/82 table 22:25)

The most noticeable features here are that Innerton had the

lowest percentage of candidates entered for O-levels only, the lowest for 5 or more O-levels, and the highest percentage of candidates entered for CSE only. It should be clear that the under-representation of Band 1 pupils had the effect of reducing the chances of pupils in Innerton's schools for exam entry and therefore exam success at 15-16 years. This is reflected in the Table N, which shows rates of achievement of pupils aged 15-16 years:

TABLE N
ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS AGED 15-16 BY DIVISION
% of PUPILS

DIV	NOT ENTERED	NO GRADES	1 OR MORE CSE 4/5	1 OR MORE CSE 2/3or O LEVEL D/E	1-4 CSE 1 or O-LEVEL A/C	5or MORE CSE 1 or O-LEVEL A/C
INNER	21.8	3.4	13.2	32.0	23.1	6.6
Blue	17.8	2.6	8.8	28.0	29.0	13.7
Yellow	14.9	2.3	8.6	25.7	32.2	16.2
Grey	25.8	3.8	9.5	25.3	28.2	7.3
Orange	24.6	4.6	10.7	28.8	24.8	6.6
Green	16.5	2.5	9.5	30.5	31.4	9.5
Purple	14.5	2.5	10.1	29.9	31.1	11.9
Navy	22.1	3.0	10.2	29.9	27.9	7.0
Crimson	21.2	3.6	12.8	26.2	26.3	9.9
Pink	17.4	2.8	9.2	29.0	31.0	10.6
TOTAL	19.1	3.0	10.1	28.7	28.7	10.2

(Source: RS/826/82 table 23:26)

What is striking here is that the outcomes in terms of rates of exam passes in Innerton's schools are the lowest (6.6%) for good O-levels and high CSE grades for the whole LEA, though Division Orange also had a 6.6% pass rate. However, rates of exam success were low throughout the whole ILEA, and it is important to remember that aggregate data does not tell us about proportions of pupils in different ability bands in different schools.

When we look at 'Achievement of 5th year pupils by VR Band and Division' in Table O, we note that despite the over-representation of Band 3 pupils in Innerton's schools, the

results of Band 3 pupils are impressive when compared with other Divisions. Of Innerton's Band 3 pupils entered for exams, 23.1% gained 1 or more CSE grades 4/5, 31% gained 1 or more CSE grades 2/3, 11.6% gained between 1-4 CSE or O-level grades A/C and the average performance scores compared well with other Divisions in the ILEA.

TABLE O
    ACHIEVEMENT OF FIFTH-YEAR PUPILS BY VR BAND & DIVISION

VR/ DIV BAND ONE	% NOT SITTING EXAM	% OBTAINING NO GRADES	%WITH 1orMORE CSE 4/5	%1orMORE CSE2/3or O D/EorO	% 1-4 CSE 1 A/C	%5orMORE CSE 1or O A/C	AVG PERFORMAN SCORE
INNER	4.9	0.3	1.0	19.6	42.3	31.8	27.7
Blue	4.1	0.1	1.5	14.4	37.4	42.4	29.1
Yell	4.7	0.3	1.3	8.4	40.3	45.0	31.4
Grey	8.8	1.6	3.8	14.0	43.0	28.8	24.3
Oran	7.5	0.9	2.0	17.6	43.8	28.2	23.2
Green	5.2	0.2	2.0	15.9	48.6	28.0	26.7
Purpl	3.9	0.6	2.0	12.4	44.3	36.7	29.2
Navy	9.0	1.0	1.8	20.9	46.1	21.3	23.8
Crim	5.7	0.5	1.4	14.7	41.3	36.3	28.6
Pink	6.3	0.2	1.3	13.9	47.8	30.5	26.6
AVERAGE TOTAL	5.7	0.5	1.8	14.3	43.9	33.9	27.7
BAND TWO							
INNER	15.2	2.7	11.7	38.1	28.9	3.4	13.1
Blue	16.1	2.7	11.0	38.5	28.2	3.5	13.7
Yell	15.3	0.7	8.7	35.7	34.2	5.4	15.7
Grey	20.5	2.9	9.3	33.1	31.3	3.1	13.7
Oran	19.0	2.6	12.1	38.0	26.5	1.8	12.0
Grn	17.0	1.7	10.3	38.6	30.1	2.3	14.1
Purp	13.9	2.4	11.1	40.3	29.8	2.6	13.1
Navy	18.7	3.1	10.3	38.6	27.7	1.5	12.2
Crim	17.3	3.8	10.5	34.4	29.3	3.8	13.4
Pink	14.9	1.5	10.9	40.1	29.7	3.0	13.6
AVERAGE TOTAL	16.8	2.2	10.6	38.1	30.0	3.0	13.5
BAND THREE							
INNER	30.0	5.5	23.1	31.0	11.6	0.1	6.5
Blue	30.2	5.3	22.1	29.7	12.4	0.2	7.0
Yell	28.0	3.1	24.5	34.4	9.8	0.2	7.1
Grey	35.9	5.2	17.1	28.6	11.5	0.6	6.5
Oran	35.2	6.3	21.9	28.9	7.0	0.2	6.2
Grn	31.7	3.3	23.9	34.0	7.1	0.0	6.5
Purp	31.1	4.5	22.3	28.9	13.2	0.0	6.6
Navy	31.3	6.9	19.1	32.9	9.7	0.0	6.6
Crim	28.2	7.2	27.8	25.6	8.5	0.2	6.5
Pink	31.3	3.2	23.3	31.8	10.2	0.3	6.8
AVERAGE TOTAL	31.4	4.9	22.6	30.8	10.1	0.2	6.7

(Source: RS/826/82 Table 26:28)

In general, given the disproportionately large Band 3 intake in Innerton's schools, the exam performance profile compared favourably with the other Divisions. Nonetheless, a few qualifications are in order. First, the only examinations included in the tables were CSE, CEE, and CGE O levels. Second, although increasing numbers of pupils sat other examinations such as those offered by the Royal Society of Arts, the City and Guilds Institute, or the Business Education Council, data on the entry policy and pass rates were not available and consequenty we know nothing about success in these exams.(RS/826/82:1) Third, there were some unclassified (ie,, not in ability bands) pupils who had either joined schools from outside the LEA or had other than in the first year; the performance of these pupils varied widely. (RS/826/82:29)

With this evidence in mind, there are grounds for questioning whether pupils were accurately banded when they transferred from primary to secondary schools, especially those Band 3 pupils who did well. Further questions need to be asked about the procedures used by primary heads in allocating pupils to ability bands and whether racial stereotyping led to band allocation.

Although data was not available in 1977 to permit a correlational analysis of ethnicity by examination results, the Education Authority had become increasingly aware that an ethnic profile of 'underachievement' was emerging. This awareness stemmed from the accumulation of evidence about low-achieving ethnic minority pupils in studies conducted in the late 1960s and 1970s (Mabey 1981, Tomlinson 1983). Little et al (1968) had done research on

11+ transfer in the ILEA and found that 82% of the 1038 immigrant pupils (of whom 56% were West Indians) fell into the bottom three groups of the seven profile transfer groups when assessed on verbal reasoning tests and teachers' judgements.

> This result indicated that 81% of the 583
> West Indian children were well below average
> in performance. Even when West Indian pupils
> had completed most of their primary education
> in the UK (101) only half as many ....as in
> other immigrant groups were in the top two groups
> for verbal reasoning. (M.Taylor 1981:62)

By the early-1980s discussion was well advanced in the ILEA as to how analyses of rates of achievement by ethnicity of pupil might be undertaken, (Martini & Mortimore RS/984/85) but there was uncertainty about which methods of analysis to use. However, ILEA data was already available on the reading attainment of black children aged 8-15 years. The most striking fact to emerge from this publication, Black British Literacy (Mabey RS/776/81), was the finding that the reading attainment of the black British included in this survey was very low when compared with other groups (Mabey 1981:4). The pattern of 'underachievement' by pupils of West Indian origin was also highlighted in 1981 by Mortimore and Mortimore (RS/807/81). Additional evidence of 'underachievement' was published in the Rampton-Swann Committee reports of 1981 and 1985, respectively. In both of these reports there was evidence of low rates of CSE and GCE attainment by pupils of West Indian origin when compared with the performance of Asian and White pupils. This evidence is problematic, however, and methodological shortcomings of the research design are discussed below.

It is noteworthy that the ethnic profile of ILEA's secondary

school population in 1981-82 consisted of approximately 44%

ethnic minority pupils (ILEA RS813/83:7). In Innerton, however,

pupils of West Indian origin were the largest ethnic minority:

INNERTON'S ETHNIC GROUPS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 1981-82

African	2.7%
Asian	8.5%
Chinese	0.8%
English	35.8%
Greek	2.9%
Arab	0.4%
So. Irish	5.4%
Turkish	4.7%
West Indian	29.3%
Mixed	5.1%
Other	4.3%

(Source: RS/873/83 table 5d:7)

Although there were disproportionately large numbers of pupils of

West Indian origin in Innerton, we cannot assume they were low

achievers. After I had completed my fieldwork, however, the

ILEA addressed the question of racial patterns of achievement in

its first report on 'Ethnic Background and Examination Results'

(RS/8766) [Note 1].

PART III. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO 'UNDERACHIEVEMENT': THE DEBATE & METHODOLOGICAL CRITIQUE

We need to identify and critically assess the main policies,

theories and methods used to investigate and promote

'achievement'. We begin by noting that for over twenty years

educational policies designed to improve academic rates of

achievement have relied largely on the interventionist

strategies modelled closely on those in the Coleman (Equality

of Educational Opportunity 1966) and Plowden Reports,

(Children and Their Primary Schools 1967). The Plowden Report

was concerned to analyse the causes of low educational

achievement among primary school pupils who were seen as

socially and economically 'disadvantaged'. The main

rationale for this strategy was that research evidence had shown

a strong correlation between pupils' social backgrounds and educational outcomes, with the most disadvantaged groups achieving the lowest results. However, there are serious weaknesses in the way interventionist policies were conceptualised. First, the central concepts of 'deprivation' and 'disadvantage' posed problems. Bulmer argued

> Not only is the concept of 'deprivation'
> itself contestable, but the components of
> deprivation when it is studied empirically
> are open to dispute....the definition of
> 'deprivation' is more fundamentally problematical
> than many empirical researchers would admit.
> (Bulmer 1982:56)

Second, Bernstein and Davies, in their critique argued that the Plowden model of the child was essentially biological.

> Development is viewed as the product of an
> interaction by nature and nurture, with a
> possibility of the environment being inadequate,
> the child being deprived and individual differences
> becoming heightened. (Bernstein & Davies 1972:49)

A deficit model of the child emerged in Plowden and informed interventionist policy strategies. We have a 'blaming the victim' approach which ultimately locates the reasons for academic failure in the child, thus exonerating the educational system. In the model, pupils slot neatly into categories with labels denoting the type and extent of disadvantage. Though the categories or labels are overtly 'deracialised' and 'classless', they are racialised when operationalised. Thus 'ethnic minority' and 'linguistic difficulty' covertly denote 'immigrant'-'black', while 'parental occupation' becomes synonymous with 'working class'. Racial stereotyping and labelling are thus implicit.

After 1967 Plowden's concept of educational priority areas (EPAs) coupled with the use of educational priority indices

(EPIs) became accepted practice in the ILEA. Even though EPA

policies were regarded as legitimate there was less

agreement about what criteria to use for data collection

(Sammons et al 1982:3). The measures used in the original

educational priority index were:

*Social Class Composition   Absenteeism
*Overcrowding   Immigrant Children
*Housing Stress   Retarded/Handicapped Pupils
*Family Size   Teacher Turnover
 Free Meals   Pupil Turnover

* = Information on these criteria was originally obtained from
1971 census figures. (Source: Sammons RS 858/82:3)

The EPI was then revised on a biennial basis to enable the

collection of up-to-date information reflecting changes in

schools' circumstances. In revising this index the most

fundamental change was that of moving from an _area_ to a

pupil base for the collection of certain information. One

danger inherent in this change was that characteristics

previously associated with the area were likely to be

transferred to individuals, thus increasing the likelihood of

stigmatising pupils. The reason given for the change was

because the original source of data, the 1971 census, was out of

date and did not provide a

> a reliable guide to pupils' occupational
> backgrounds or housing conditions because
> primary catchment areas are erratic in size
> and shape and it is therefore impossible to
> ascribe catchments to schools accurately
> without mapping all pupils' addresses.
> (Sammons et al 1982:3-4).

In theory biennial reviews improved the EPI measures and sources

of data. But because they were conducted on an ad-hoc basis,

there was "no systematic examination of the value of the

criteria, theoretical basis or method of constructing....

indices..." (Sammons et al 1982:4) Changes made in 1980 EPIs

and the 1981 surveys were, respectively:

MEASURES INCLUDED IN THE 1980 EPA INDICES AND IN THE 1981 EPA SURVEY:

PRIMARY INDEX 1980

Eligibility for free meals
Large families
Parental occupation
Behaviour
Verbal reasoning band
Fluency in English
Pupil Turnover

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION 1981

Eligibility for free meals
Large families
One Parent Families
Parental Occupation
Behaviour
Pupil Mobility
Fluency in English
Ethnic Family Background

SECONDARY INDEX 1980

All measures included in
Primary Index & five
building factors.
Split site:
Overcrowding of building
Overcrowding of site
Old buildings
Tall buildings
Source: Sammons et al 1982:4)

SECONDARY DATA COLLECTION 1981

All measures included in the
1981 primary data collection
& verbal reasoning band.

The variables 'fluency in English' (one of Plowden's original criteria) and 'pupils' ethnic minority backgrounds' were added when the index was revised in 1981, as were behavioural data and information about pupil mobility. Until these variables were added, however, schools where a high proportion of pupils had these characteristics were financially penalised. (Sammons et al 1982:4)

There are methodologial limitations inherent in this strategy and these instruments despite refinements in the content of the EPI. First, it is not possible to operationalise EPI procedures in a 'neutral' fashion; the pretence of 'neutrality' means losing sight of pupils' individuality when administrative procedures take priority. Further, there are difficulties inherent in establishing exactly what the target population is and how to measure or weight the different indicators of educational disadvantage (Acland 1978, Barnes & Lucas 1975,

Shipman 1980, Holterman 1975, Little & Mabey 1971). Acland (1978) argued that the EPA policy would not alter childrens' attainment in school because the program would not reach a significantly large proportion of underachieving children. The characteristics that would be altered were not necessarily closely related to academic performance. Acland also analysed the purported correlation between parents' attitudes and children's achievement and concluded that the EPA policy did little to alter the fundamental relationship between home and school because the variables used to measure maternal attitudes (eg. how often they were in contact with the school, whether they felt welcome in the school and their level of encouragement defined by helping their children with homework) mattered less than the traditional measures of social class and income. (Acland 1978:42) Bulmer (1982) pointed to the 'ecological fallacy' argument which suggested that the extent to which areas have a high proportion of deprived persons or households may be unintentionally exaggerated.

Practitioners themselves, such as Little and Mabey, (ILEA 1971) found practical problems in constructing an index to identify which schools or areas most closely resembled the Plowden definition of 'educational priority'. They pursued their task by using unobtrusive measures, ie. relying on existing (secondary source) material recorded for routine administrative purposes. Obvious difficulties here are that secondary source material is not always compatible with the researchers' aims and/or the information, as such, did not exist. Thus the number of children unable to speak English (a Plowden category) was equated with the number of 'immigrant' pupils, although

this was not necessarily the same thing. Weighting variables was also problematic. Were they all of equal importance? Which ones were more important and why? Little and Mabey said the EPI had limitations because it lacked:

> (1) either clarity or specificity in the policy objectives
> (2) empirical-theoretical support for the policy objectives
> (3) precision in criteria for determining policy
> (4) adequate measures of agreed criteria
> (Little & Mabey 1972:289)

These criticisms raise important issues which are relevant in our analysis of educational disadvantage in Innerton and East End High. First, the administrative practice of associating categories of disadvantage with areas and ultimately with specific schools can result in labelling the pupils attending those schools as 'non-academic'. Second, if there are large numbers of ethnic minority pupils in EPA schools, these pupils may be inadvertently seen by their teachers as 'non-achieving' children and the stigma of the area could be associated with the ethnic/racial (to include colour as a category) identity of the pupils, with insufficient attention being paid to the social and economic backgrounds of the individual pupils. Third, because the administrative practice of EPA policy implementation did not involve evaluating how effective compensatory educational strategies were, there was no way of monitoring or measuring the positive or negative impact of additional resource allocation. Fourth and most crucially of all, the Plowden approach did not critically address the extent to which internal practices <u>within</u> secondary schools affect pupil motivation <u>and</u> rates of achievement.

Given the limitations of the cultural deprivation/disadvantage

model, we need to ask whether it _is_ possible to measure the
factors responsible for educational achievement. The
psychometric approach is commonly used and has a

> quantitative, numerical basis, tends to have
> a statistical bias and to employ tests whose
> validity and reliability have been established
> on a white population....(Taylor 1981:210)

Thus testing is heavily relied on to determine the level of
achievement or underachievement. It is by means of the
psychometric approach, according to Taylor (1981), that

> abilty may be defined as 'capacities which
> are not so much specifically taught as picked
> up by children in the course of the interaction
> in the home, school and wider environments',
> attainment refers more specifically to 'concepts
> and skills which depend more on direct instruction
> and on the child's interest and industriousness
> in the particular subjects studied.(Taylor 1981:46)

Since it is usual to measure attainment by standardised tests of
known reliability, it is common practice to measure a pupil's
achievement by means of nationally validated examinations
(Taylor 1981:46). The results of tests can then be used as the
basis for making comparisons between individuals and groups.
But is it accurate to judge the efficiency of education systems
in terms of the number and type of externally set exams passed
by pupils?

Undeniably, patterns of exam achievement do reflect how
successful a school is. But this single variable is too
narrow to serve as an adequate indicator of pupil potential.
How can potential be 'measured' without taking account of
factors such as ability, motivation and aspirations?
Psychogenic factors should not be treated in isolation from
variables such as pupil intake, social class, gender, ethnicity,
socio-economic and environmental influences. Crucial aspects of

the school itself such as teacher attitudes, teacher turnover, falling rolls, exam entries, option choice, setting and streaming as well as other internal school management practices need to be taken into account. Internal school variables, ie., school effects, should be identified in order to analyse the influences which shape the academic and non-academic outcomes of pupils. (see Rutter et al 1979, Cornford 1985, 1989, Tomlinson 1987, Mortimore et al 1988, Smith & Tomlinson 1989)

Caution is urged, therefore, when interpreting the data on 'underachievement'. Where samples are drawn from the most disadvantaged sections of society and consisit of a disproportionately large percentage of the population in depressed inner city schools, evidence suggests that there is likely to be a case for suspecting that entry policies and internal school practices may systematically prevent pupils from being offered equal opportunities to obtain academic qualifications (as discussed above in relation to East End High). (see Intake Differences Between Divisions in the LEA-1981, Table L above)

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that data which presents ethnic and racial minority pupils as 'underachieving' has attracted a great deal of critical attention from educationalists, academics and policy-makers. Although the task of developing suitable research designs is problematic, three academics, Taylor, Tomlinson and Troyna have made valuable contributions by publishing methodological critiques of research into the alleged 'underachievement' of pupils of West Indian and Asian origin.

Monica Taylor's (1981, 1985) indispensable summaries of research on the education of pupils of West Indian and Asian origin, respectively, highlight specific methodological problems connected with measuring performance. First she suggests that there are limitations in sampling; samples are frequently too small and background variables such as place of birth, location and type of school are often missing. A second problem is access, which includes identifying target groups of ethnic minority pupils and may also involve overcoming barriers of language, culture and distinguishing between sub-groups such as Bangladeshis and to Asians. Third are problems of measurement with regard to measuring potential, ability, attainment, culture-free and fair tests. Fourth are difficulties in making meaningful comparisons between indigeneous white and black British and comparing a wide range of cultural backgrounds-eg. differences within communities are frequently ignored (Taylor 1985:533-541). On this point Troyna (1984) argues,

> the relationship of black pupils to
> society generally and educationally
> in particular are so profoundly different
> from white classmates, this militates
> against any valid use of intergroup
> comparison as a reliable measurement
> of performance. (Troyna 1984:158)

Tomlinson (1986), too, is fully aware of these methodological weaknesses and makes a plea for a different kind of research. She argues:

> The problem may be that while sociologists of
> education have studied the way the education
> system grades and allocates pupils at every level
> and what outcomes are in terms of social class,
> gender and ethnicity, they have seldom addressed
> themselves to the mechanism of this allocation,
> and the way in which within the dominant psychometric
> model of education testing procedures are seen as
> both necessary and justifiable. (Tomlinson 1986:190)

Indeed, we must question whether these mechanisms of allocation

and testing procedures are both necessary and justifiable. When they form a major part of the basis for banding and streaming practices in schools they have a considerable effect on what courses and levels of study pupils follow. Option choice, for example, often exhibits marked differences according to social class, gender and race; behavioural criteria are included for this may actually influence how teachers perceive which pupils are suitable (Tomlinson 1986:187-188). These were certainly Wright's (1986) findings. We need to scrutinise the methodologies employed in these studies, taking note of Taylor's concerns about weaknesses in research designs, Tomlinson's review of the key issues in the debate and Troyna's critical treatment of the very concept 'underachievement'.

Reeves and Chevannes (1981) and Parekh (1983, 1985) have commented critically on the issue of 'underachievement' in the influential Rampton and Swann Reports. Even Rampton, (1981) who chaired the 1981 Interim Committee on West Indian Children in Our Schools, expressed concern about the concept of 'underachievement':

> We gave much consideration to the term
> 'underachievement'. It is obviously a
> comparative term. What is the standard
> which is not reached? Are there different
> standards for different groups or cultures
> communities or social classes? Should there
> be? (Rampton 1981:3)

In their critique of West Indian Children in Our Schools, (the Interim Report of the Rampton Committee 1981) Reeves and Chevannes (1981) explain that while they do not deny that pupils of West Indian origin are underachieving, the

> Statistical data, in the form they
> are presented, are insufficient to support
> the assertion of underachievement or to

provide clues as to its causes.
(Reeves & Chevannes 1981:37)

Further, Reeves and Chevannes are critical of the concept of racism (defined as prejudice and discrimination) used. They point out that the reality of situations such as the 'unintentional racism' of teachers, combined with the absence of recommendations for schools and LEAs to formulate public anti-racist policies, cast doubt on the report which ultimately focussed on a simplistic model of home-school interaction to explain discrepancies in educational performance. (Reeves & Chevannes 1981:41) Further, the narrow concept of multicultural education in Rampton was understood in ethnocentric terms: 'British culture'--a "white man's weapon". (Reeves & Chevannes 1981:42)

Evidence on the 'underachievement' of pupils published in Education For All (Swann Report:1985) was also received critically. The DES School Leavers survey was conducted for a second time but only five of the original six LEAs cooperated in the 1981/82 cohort analysis (see Annex B to Chapter 3 in Education For All 1985:110-11). As a member of the Swann Committee, Parekh (TES 21.3.85) compared the findings from the two DES School Leavers Studies. He argued that the evidence raised a number of questions which the Committee did not address. That is, although West Indian children significanty underachieved in public examinations, the percentage of W.I. securing one or more A level passes increased from 2% (1979) to 5% (1982), and those securing 5 or more higher O level and CSE grades rose from 3% (1979) to 6% (1982). Therefore, some West Indians do achieve on par with whites and Asians since 5% did get one or more passes at A level. Asians were on par with whites in some

respects though lower in English. Nineteen percent of both Asians and W.I obtained no graded results at O and CSE exams. While Asian pupil performances remained 'static', the W.I. and whites improved. There were noticeable differences within the Asian community however, with Bangladeshis being the weakest and not much better than W.I. In the light of this evidence, Parekh asserts that the Commmittee asked the wrong questions. Since the Report assumes that Asians and whites perform 'equally' well, it asks what it is that the two share in common and what distinguishes them both from West Indians? In asking this question, it (the Swann Committee) lands itself in unnecessary trouble [and] must look for factors...specific and unique to West Indians. However, it either finds none or when it does, rightly feels uneasy...(Parekh TES 21.3 85:4)

From his analysis Parekh concluded that attempts to 'explain underachievement' reflected a lack of consensus and suffered from "the fallacy of the single factor." That is,

> participants [in the debate] tend to
> look for one specific factor, be it
> class, racism, the West Indian family,
> West Indian culture, the school or
> educational system, to explain the fact
> of underachievement. This was obviously
> an inherently impossible enterprise.....
> ....One needs to show how, within the
> framework of specific patterns of social
> conditions, various factors, which cannot
> themselves be easily disengaged, interact
> and modify each other and gave rise to a
> specific form of behaviour.(Parekh 1983:113)

Another major area of debate has been in connection with the validity of IQ. tests for testing pupils of West Indian origin and other ethnic minority backgrounds.(Jensen 1969, Kamin and Eysenck 1981, Mackintosh & Mascie-Taylor 1985) The current dominant thinking in Britain, however, is one which

> disposes of the idea that West Indian
> 'underachievement' can be explained
> away by reference to IQ. scores.
> (Education For All 1985:71)

In addition to the controversies surrounding the use of I.Q. tests, there are other problems, including the fact that pupils are sometimes misclassified, as with country of birth or mixed race. Further, assessment or testing procedures are often of dubious status because insufficient attention has been paid to the testing situation (including race of tester), the appropriateness of the materials used, the possibility of adverse teacher expectations, and the cultural bias in questions. It is impossible to quantify these factors, yet they fundamentally affect pupils' motivation and performance. (Rosenthal & Jacobson 1968, Rist 1970, Wright 1985)

Attention also needs to be paid to the favourable and unfavourable contexts in which the research is conducted, including who sponsors the research. This last point raises the question as to whether an "unacknowledged institutional basis" or bias, shapes the form of investigations. An analysis of just such institutional bias was the substance of Mullard's critique of West Indian Children in Our Schools. In The Three Rs: Rampton, Racism and Research, (Mullard 1984) Mullard argued that the bias inherent in the Rampton-Swann Committee exercise reflected the interests of the state in the very constitution of the

> independent inquiry into the causes
> of underachievement of children of West
> Indian origin, [and] these interests
> were only marginally related to education
> per se. (Mullard 1984:13)

In Mullard's view, the more immediate and politically sensitive issues were to do with black and radical-white radical criticisms

of state sanctioned racial oppression such as immigration controls, forms of black resistance to racist authorities like the police, journalists, employers and teachers. Black youth, Mullard argued, rejected conventional liberal democratic values and represented threats to existing stability by forms of resistance (Mullard 1984:13). It was within this framework that the Inquiry originated. The Committee proceeded with an Inquiry as though

>educational institutions, schools, teacher
>training institutions [and] even the DES
>are by definition almost beyond reproach.
>(Mullard 1984:16)

There was also a major and

>steadfast reluctance to engage with
>racism as either an all-embracing explanation
>of underachievement, or indeed as the real
>problem at issue.....(Mullard 1984:19)

Mullard's case is substantive. The strength of his critique has helped to reorient some research agendas---that is, to re-prioritise issues with a view to researching into forms of white racism in society and the education system (see Eggleston et al 1986). Notwithstanding Mullard's insightful contribution, and the methodological limitations of the Rampton-Swann data on 'underachievement', the main achievement of the Rampton-Swann Committee Reports has been to put both 'racism' and ethnic minority pupil 'underachievement' on the national educational policy agenda and to acknowledge them as legitimate issues for public debate and further investigation.

Parekh (1983) brings these issues to the forefront of the mainstream educational policy agenda in his contribution to a collection of conference papers, Ethnic Pluralism and Public Policy: Achieving Equality in the United States and Britain.

In his assessment of competing explanations for West Indian underachievement, Parekh emphasises that most <u>ignore</u> the

available experiential and research
evidence. (Parekh 1983:116)

In Parekh's view, the three most important factors responsible for West Indian pupils' educational underachievement are: (1) socio-economic conditions, (2) racism 'in' the school and (3) the academic ethos of the school. Research into these factors, he insisted, could provide us with sufficient knowledge to develop a set of policy initiatives designed to remedy this situation.

Many researchers have recognised that in order to acquire sufficient knowledge of the relationships between pupils' experience of schooling, within school effects and school outcomes, a more complex and flexible set of research strategies is required. They have argued that the collection of both quantitative and qualitative information can, when combined, illuminate the experience of schooling thus enabling a set of policy initiatives to be designed to remedy this situation. (Finch 1986) Here ethnographic accounts can add immeasureably to understanding when they interweave quantitative with qualitative data and focus on micro-social aspects of school life. Case studies of the internal workings of schools can provide insight into the variety of behaviours of both teachers and pupils, highlighting the constraints operating both inside and outside the school gates. The concept of 'school ethos' is helpful in this regard because it focuses attention on the

set of values, attitudes and behaviours
which will become characteristic of the
school as a whole. (Rutter et al 1979:179)

Investigating 'school ethos' can help to uncover relationships

which may contain forms of institutional racism inside the school itself. Ethnographic fieldwork allows researchers to combine qualitative and quantitative data, thus enabling a better understanding of the factors which help to explain why some pupils achieve and others do not.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has presented a socio-economic and educational profile of the disadvantaged, predominantly working class inner city community of Innerton in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Inequalities were pronounced in a number of ways: amenities, housing, employment and education. The Borough's pupil profile was bottom-heavy with Band threes, as was East End High. Given this background, it is hardly surprising that these pupils 'underachieved'. There is a strong case, therefore, for conducting further research into whether ethnic and racial minority pupils experienced forms of 'institutionalised racism' which contributed to low rates of achievement and the reproduction of racial inequalities.

In terms of policies designed to improve the academic performance of pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, attention has been paid to the weaknesses inherent in the interventionist strategies of the Coleman/Plowden policies which were in operation throughout this period. The meaning of the concept of 'underachievement' has been critically assessed. Discussion also focussed on methodological weaknesses which characterised many studies. Particular attention was paid to the two-stage DES School Leavers study in the Rampton and Swann Reports not only because this evidence was given national publicity but also

because it failed to provide a satisfactory explanation of the process by which these pupils came to 'underachieve'. Indeed it is questionable as to whether these pupils did in fact underachieve (Parekh 1985).

A more flexible, qualitative and triangulated methodology is needed to analyse 'underachievement' and institutionalised racism (see Cornford 1985, Cornford 1989). Here ethnographic accounts can fill a noticeable gap in the literature and have the potential to provide a fuller understanding of the relationships between individuals and structures and the unintentional and routine procedures in these institutions may affect—even disadvantage pupils from ethnic minority backgrounds. It is only by studying these reationships that we can begin to penetrate the dynamics of institutional racism and make meaningful distinctions between racist intent, racialist practices and racist effects. Here the concepts of 'school ethos' and 'school effects' are useful in helping to identify those features which require further investigation if we are to develop an appropriate framework for the development of equal educational opportunities and combatting racism, two integral aspects of multi-ethnic policy initiatives.

This discussion has provided a context for an analysis of data about pupils, teachers and the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High which is presented in the chapters which follow. We have examined the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the environment in which the school lived. We now turn to examine East End High from the inside in order to shed light on the school's response to the ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education policy at

the end of the 1970s and in the early 1980s. We begin with the
pupils because they were found to have been least well served by
an education service purporting to have "a commitment to all".
(ILEA 269:1).

NOTE 1:
After I had completed my fieldwork in the early 1980s, the ILEA
was engaged in revising the methods used to analyse the
performance of its pupils in the light of the findings of the
Rampton and Swann Reports, and given its new commitment to
promoting a 'Policy For Equality'(1983). Further, the work of
the Hargreaves Committee (Improving Secondary Schools 1984)
stressed the need to modify the meaning of achievement,
extending it to include personal and social skills, motivation
and commitment in addition to exam success. Coupled with this
more flexible definition, the procedures by which primary
school pupils were allocated to ability bands also came in for
closer scrutiny, indicating that the tests administered might be
inadequate predictors of future outcomes and that primary heads
may have under-estimated the attainments of ethnic minority
pupils. ILEA reports acknowledged that

> ...where there was a mismatch, Caribbean
> pupils were more likely to be assigned to
> a lower band...by the head than their VR
> test results would indicate, while the
> reverse was true for ESWI pupils.(ILEA/RS/
> 8766:16)

By the late 1980s, this under-estimation was of sufficient
magnitude to alter the conclusion that Caribbean pupils were
underachieving in examinations.(ILEA/RS/8766:16) Here the
Authority was innovatory and developed the instruments to record
ethnic minority profiles of achievement which, when analysed,
showed that some ethnic minority pupils were not 'underachieving'
when their performance was examined across a longer time-span.
(RS/1120/87, Kysel 1988)

CHAPTER FIVE.

THE PUPILS

INTRODUCTON

As we saw in the last chapter, pupils in the Borough of Innerton were generally low achieving. Since low rates of achievement by racial and ethnic minority pupils was one of the main reasons for introducing a Multi-Ethnic Education policy in the ILEA, I wanted to investiate the views of pupils in East End High who aspired to achieve academically. In theory this information would help to identify which school practices promoted or inhibited the realisation of academic outcomes. Pupils' experiences and attitudes could provide insight into conditions in the school and the community and highlight the salience of multi-ethnic education in East End High. For these reasons I conducted a set of interviews with a sample of Fifth Form pupils toward the end of my first full year in the field, 1979-1980. The information I gathered illuminated where good practice was taking place, highlighted the landscape on which the emergent policy could act and was useful in the development and specification of the multi-ethnic initiative in East End High. It also helped to set the multi-ethnic policy agenda inside the school as we will see in this discussion and in the chapters which follow.

There have been many contributions to the debate about why pupils underachieve. One influential study, 15,000 Hours (Rutter et al 1979) argued that the characteristics of pupil intake, for example, influence academic outcomes:

> The ethos of or atmosphere of a school may be
> influenced by the proportion of its intake which
> is intellectually less able or is socially dis-
> advantaged in some way. (Rutter el al 1979:153)

Low rates of achievement did indeed characterise pupil outcomes in East End High. Intake was determined by ILEA secondary transfer banding procedures and was largely outside the school's control. Banding proportions were decided on the basis of the range of primary school ability for all pupils in Innerton, and East End High was allocated a disproportionately low number of Band One pupils and a large proportion of Band Threes, ie., a fairly non-academic intake (as discussed above in chapter four).

In seeking to explain the process of 'underachievement', Parekh (1983) was concerned to investigate why disproportionately large numbers of pupils of West Indian origin underachieve. This question was particularly relevant in analysing the profile of achievement in East End High because there was a high proportion of pupils of West Indian origin in East End High (42.3% in 1979-80). Parekh identified three factors which he regarded as important in relation to pupils of West Indian origin, but his observations are also relevant to other disadvantaged groups. They are: socio-economic conditions, racism in the school and the academic ethos of the school. In referring to socio-economic conditions, he tells us

> It is argued that the majority of West Indians
> are relatively poor, ill-educated, engaged in low-
> paid, dull and unskilled jobs, working at odd hours
> and living in over-crowded houses.....many West
> Indian children are looked after by un-trained
> child-minders and grow up lacking linguistic and
> conceptual abilities.....they (children) miss
> sustained and relaxed contact with their parents....
> have little guidance from adults, are left to spend
> an unusually large amount of time with their peers,
> are poorly motivated etc...(Parekh 1983:111)

The second factor, racism in society and in the school, also affects pupil attainment. Outside the school racism demeans individuals, weakens the psyche, motivation and the expectations that young people need to have to feel that educational success is worthwhile. Inside the school

> ....institutionalised racism in the form of biased textbooks, culturally loaded tests, ethnocentric curricula, low teacher expectations, the all-white ethos of the school, etc, alienates the West Indian child from the entire educational system..[further] he internalises the low self image of his group and therefore of himself, and develops insecure self-identity and low self-esteem. (Parekh 1983:111)

Third, the structure and ethos of the school contributes not only to West Indian low achievement but also to low achievement for other groups. Although teachers paid lip-service to the existence of an academic ethos in East End High, the unbalanced intake meant that academic 'excellence' was not realised in terms of substantive outcomes.

In brief, analysing why pupils underachieve is a complex task and we should remember Parekh's warning of the fallacy of single-factor explanations. Instead we should identify the variables involved and examine the relationships between them. A fuller understanding of them all is germane to the development and implementation of a multi-ethnic education policy. This chapter will explore these factors from the point of view of the pupils themselves.

At the outset I will highlight five points about the findings from this phase of fieldwork. First, a sizable proportion of pupils sat exams and were relatively successful. Second, some Band Three pupils were entered for exams and achieved modest success. This outcome suggests the need to question the accuracy and reliability

of procedures for allocating pupils to ability bands and the exam entry policy. Third, a mixed ability core (4th and 5th year) subject, Social Studies, contained a unit on 'Prejudice and Discrimination'. Because everyone did this unit, it was important to investiate pupils' understanding of key concepts in the curriculum. In what way did they understand the meaning of 'prejudice', 'discrimination' and 'racism'? To what extent were pupils conscious of prejudice, discrimination, and racism inside and outside school? Was there a multicultural ethos in the school and/or the curriculum? Fourth, 'O' level Sociology was offered as an optional extra after school to any boy who wanted to 'have a go'. This was an opportunity for any academically ambitious boy to be entered for another exam. Fifth, truancy is explored because I became increasingly conscious that non-attendance was a serious problem amongst 5th formers in EEH, and toward the end of the chapter I present my findings about a small sample of truants.

THE PUPIL SAMPLE

A sample of 31 fifth form boys was selected by using a multi-stage stratified sampling procedure. The fifth form cohort was stratified in terms of type and number of exams pupils were entered for. I made lists of 5th formers entered for different numbers of exams, noting which boys were sitting 'O' level English, Maths and Sociology. I planned to interview boys who were mainly entered for 'O' level exams but this was inappropriate because many were also sitting CSEs and some only sat CSEs. The number of exams boys were entered for ranged from 9 to 1. Of the 31 pupils, all but 7 were entered for Mode 3 Social Studies, the core course. I wanted to include boys entered for 'O' level Sociology because they were likely to be academically motivated since this was an optional extra requiring an 'out-of-school' commitment.

The criteria used for choosing the exam sample were somewhat
pragmatic. I identified the boys entered for 'O' level English (32
in total) and those entered for 'O' level Sociology (6 of whom
were not taking 'O' level English). Housemasters suggested another
6 names of boys sitting exams who they thought would be willing to
be interviewed. Letters were sent to these 44 boys via
Housemasters inviting them for interview. Twenty-two responded
favourably to my first letter and a follow-up letter resulted in a
further nine responses (31 total). Interviews were conducted in
the Social Studies store room which was private and relatively
quiet. The interviews lasted between one and a half and two hours
and were tape-recorded. They began in March and were completed in
June of 1980.

The interview schedule took the form of a loosely structured series
of questions designed to elicit information about the pupils'
families, home circumstances and friends, use of spare time, views
about the community, work experience, plans for leaving or staying
on at school, money, numerous aspects of school life and experience
plus awareness and understanding of racial prejudice,
discrimination and racism. (see Appendix 5.1) Pupils completed a
form   before the interview commenced which asked
when they planned to leave school, age last birthday, years in East
End High, number of secondary schools attended, exams entered for
and subjects currently being studied. This information will be
presented in TABLES A-F below, which include exam results.

Originally I did not intend to investigate the attitudes of fifth

form pupils who were not attending school, but gradually it became clear that the proportion of poor and non-attending pupils was high. ILEA figures on Non-Attendance (see ILEA RS/895/83, ILEA RS/1028/86) showed that absenteeism was common, especially in the fifth year. In East End High the percentage of boys truanting was a cause for concern, and the school bulletin in December 1980 noted the extent of non-attendance as follows:

> The average attendance in Primary Schools was 91.8% and Secondary Schools was 85.4%. This term our attendance [in East End High] has been consistently below that figure. Attendance figures for the week ending 28.11.80 were:

Overall:	83.15%
1st year:	91.08%
2nd year:	88.01%
3rd year:	86.02%
4th year:	76.02%
5th year:	72.07%
6th year:	84.02%

Nearly 28% of fifth formers were officially recorded as non-attending in 1980-81. I queried this figure and teachers explained that at rising 16/16+ some boys left if they were not going to be entered for exams. Some took jobs when the opportunity arose and few bothered to inform the school. Teachers claimed the official school figures underestimated the true extent of non-attendance. The Education Welfare Officer exercised discretion as to which pupils he followed up in the 5th year because he was more concerned to chase up boys lower down in the school. In the school year, 1981-82, I approached the Education Welfare Officer hoping he would supply me with a sample of truants. He provided me with the names and addresses of 16 boys, five of whom still spent some time in school and eleven of whom were no longer attending. In January of 1981 I wrote to these boys. Two had moved and nine did not respond. Six boys returned to school to be interviewed; their responses are discussed below.

These two groups of 5th form pupils (exam sample and truants) constitute the main source of information about pupils' experience and attitudes about school in East End High. We begin with the exam sample, noting first the ethnic profile of the whole school and fifth form before moving on to see how these boys performed in their exams.

EXAM SAMPLE

TABLE A
ETHNIC PROFILE OF PUPILS IN EAST END HIGH—SCHOOL YEAR 1979-1980
TOTAL ENROLMENT: 1,073

| | WHOLE SCHOOL | | FIFTH FORM | | EXAM SAMPLE | |
	NUMBERS	%	NUMBERS	%	NUMBERS	%
AFRICAN	37	3.44	8	3.6	1	3.2
ASIAN	55	5.13	10	4.5	3	9.6
CHINESE	1	0.1	–	–	–	–
ENGLISH/SCOTS/WELSH(WHITE)	396	36.9	81	36.3	8	25.8
GREEK/GK.CYPRIOT	37	3.4	8	3.6	1	3.2
NO. AFRICAN	6	0.6	1	0.4	–	–
SO. IRISH	6	0.6	2	0.9	–	–
TURKISH/TK.CYPRIOT	33	3.1	3	1.3	1	3.2
WEST INDIAN	456	42.3	103	46.2	13	41.9
OTHER EUROPEANS	8	0.7	3	1.3	–	–
OTHER (including MIXED)	38	3.5	4	1.8	4	12.9
TOTALS	1,073	99.9	223	99.9	31	99.8

TABLE B
ETHNIC PROFILE OF EXAM SAMPLE: NUMBER-31

White	West Indian African (combined due to few numbers)		Asian	Turkish Cyp.	Greek Cyp.	Mixed
8	13	1	3	1	1	4

In the year 1979-1980, the ethnic profile of all pupils (Table A) in East End High shows that the largest ethnic minority group (42.3%) were boys of West Indian origin; the indigeneous white pupils were nearly 37%. In the Fifth Form boys of West Indian origin were an even larger percentage (46.2%), while indigeneous white boys were 36.3%. The Fifth Form exam sample consisted of 41.9% of pupils of West Indian origin. Overall the exam sample contained a spread of ethnic groups (Table B) which approximated

the ethnic profile of the whole school, though there were slightly fewer indigeneous white pupils.

TABLE C
EXAM SAMPLE BY ABILITY BAND: Number 31

BAND 1	BAND 2	BAND 3	NOT BANDED
5	15	5	6

It turned out that 25 of the pupils in the exam sample (see Table C) were balanced in terms of the comprehensive ideal with 25%= Band One, 50%= Band Two, and 25%= Band Three. Six pupils were not placed in ability bands because four had transferred to East End High from other secondary schools and one Asian boy did not have English as his mother tongue and was not banded due to his English language deficiency. Of the Band One pupils in the sample, (see Table B) it is important to note that two were indigeneous white pupils, one Asian, one Turkish Cypriot, one Greek Cypriot and none of West Indian origin. Band Two boys in the sample contained 5 indigeneous white pupils, 5 of West Indian origin, 1 African, 2 Asian and 3 of mixed race. Band Three contained 5 of West Indian origin. Of the unbanded pupils in the sample, 1 was indigeneous white, 3 of West Indian origin, 1 Asian and 1 mixed. The ability range was, therefore, 'bottom heavy' racially, ie. 8 pupils of West Indian origin were either Band Three or not banded.

TABLE D
READING AGE ON TRANSFER TO EAST END HIGH OF EXAM SAMPLE (assessed on entry)

ETHNIC GROUP YEARS:	6-7	7-8	8-9	9-10	10-11	11-12	12+
White						2	5
West Indian	1	1	3	1		2	
African							1
Asian			1(E2L)		1		1
Turkish Cyp.					1		
Greek Cyp.							1
Mixed			1		1		2
TOTALS: All- 26	1	1	5	1	4	4	10

NOTE: Reading Age not available for 5 boys in exam sample

It has been argued that banding procedures are unreliable predictors of academic potential (see above and ILEA RS/8766:14-17) With this point in mind, it is important to note the discrepancy between banded pupils and their Reading Age upon entry to East End High (Table D). Ten out of 26 in the exam sample had a Reading Age of 12+, four had a Reading Age of 11+, and four of 10+. This pattern suggests that there was little similarity or congruence between Ability Bands and the Reading Age. This discrepancy plus the reservations about banding discussed above highlight the problems of allocating pupils to ability bands on the basis of VR tests. The ILEA was reviewing the suitability of its tests at this time and seriously thinking about replacing the VR test and banding procedures with the London Reading Test. One report suggested that

> If the London Reading Test or a revised version of
> it were to be used instead, it would change the basis
> of assessment from an estimate of ability in verbal
> reasoning to a statement about a child's level of
> achievement in one particular skill at one particular
> time....A consequence of abandoning the Verbal
> Reasoning Test would be that children transferring
> to secondary schools would no longer be described
> as being of above average, average, or below average
> ability. This grouping of children is no longer felt
> to be sufficiently scientific or objective to be
> continued if an alternative can be found....
> RS/5570:11)

The exam sample is presented below in Table E. Pupils are numbered and identified in terms of ethnic group, ability band, number of years in East End High, number of exams entered for and number of exams passed.

TABLE E
EXAM SAMPLE/ ACHIEVEMENT PUPIL PROFILE:

Pupil Number	Ethnic Group	Ability Band	Reading Age	No.Yrs in EEH	No.Exams entered	No.Exams Passed
1	W.I.	2/2/2	11.2	5	6	4
2	W.I.	--	--	4	5	3
3	White	2/2/2	11.6	5	7	5
4	W.I.	3/3/3/	--	5	6	4
5	Asian	2/2/2	10.6	5	7	5
6	W.I.	3/3/3	6.8	5	6	6
7	W.I.	3/2/3	8.0	5	6	6
8	White	--	14.5	4	6	6
9	Turk	1/2/1	11.0	5	6	2
10	WI/Wht	2/2/2	8.0	5	9	9
11	WI/Wht	2/2/2	12.0	5	9	6
12	White	2/2/2	11.6	5	7	3
13	White	1/1/1	13.3	5	7	4
14	W.I.	--	--	1	9	5
15	White	2/2/2	10.3	5	7	5
16	White	2/2/1	15.0	5	6	5
17	W.I.	2/2/2	11.6	5	8	6
18	Greek	1/---	12.6	5	8	6
19	White	2/1/2	13.3	5	9	5
20	White	1/2/1	13.6	5	9	7
21	Asian	1/1/1	13.9	5	8	6
22	W.I.	3/3/3	8.6	5	3	2
23	W.I.	2/2/2	--	5	2	2
24	Afric	2/2/2	13.6	5	9	4
25	W.I.	2/2/3	7.6	5	3	2
26	Asian	E2L	8.1	5	8	5
27	WI/Wht	--	12.0	5	3	2
28	W.I.	3/3/3	8.9	5	5	3
29	W.I.	--	--	4	2	1
30	Asian/Wht	2/2/1	10.0	5	5	3
31	W.I.	2/3/2	9.9	5	_4___	_3___
					195	135

In examining the Achievement Profile of exam pupils (see Table E) several points emerge. Stability of the pupil population was a crucial factor. Of the 31 boys in the sample, 27 had been in East End High throughout the five years of their secondary schooling; three had been in the school for four years and one had joined in September of 1979 (ie. just one year in the school). The boys were entered for a total of 195 exams and passed a total of 135. While these figures indicate that overall they underachieved, we can gain more insight from these figures if we divide them in 'O' levels and CSEs (see Table F). In these

categories, 78 were entered for 'O' levels and 117 entered for CSEs. When we look at these grades, however, it is important to note that the figures disguise the fact that 13 boys gained a grade 1 in their CSE Mode 3 Social Studies which is equivalent to an 'O' level pass.

Success in exam outcomes shows that:
```
        1 pupil  passed 9 out of 9 exams
        3 pupils passed 6 out of 6 exams
        2 pupils passed 2 out of 2 exams
```

As a whole group, however, these pupils underachieved insofar as they failed to reach a pass standard in 60 exams.

Table F summarises the exam sample's performance in categories used by the ILEA. However, information about the 5th Form cohort as a whole was not gathered in terms of banding and exam entry so it is not possible to say whether the exam sample's performance was in line with achievement in the Division as a whole (see chapter 4).

TABLE F
EXAM PROFILE IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE (Adapting the LEA grid to exam sample of 5th formers)

VR BAND 1 ETHNIC GROUP	Nos.Obt. NO Grades	Nos.Obtaining 1 or more CSE 4/5	Nos.Obtaining 1 or more CSE 2/3 or 'O' D/E	Nos.Obt.1-4 CSE 1 or 'O' A/C	Nos.Obt. 5+ CSE 1 or 'O'A/C
White			1 (No.13)	1 (No.20)	
W. I.					
African					
Asian				1 (No.2))	
Turkish		1(No.9)			
Greek					1(No.21)
Mixed					
TOTALS All BAND 1s: 5	0	1	1	2	1
BAND 2					
White			3(Nos.3,12,19)	2(Nos.15,16)	
W.I.		2(Nos.23,25)	2(Nos.1,31)	1(No.17)	
African				1(No.24)	
Asian			1(No.5)		
Turkish					
Greek					
Mixed		1(No.30)			2(Nos.10,11)
TOTALS ALL BAND 2s: 15	0	3	6	4	2
Band 3					
White					
W. I.		2(Nos.22,28)	3(Nos.4,6,7)		
African					
Asian					
Turkish					
Greek					
Mixed					
TOTALS ALL BAND 3s: 5		2	3		
NOT BANDED					
White			1(No.8)		
W. I.		2(Nos.27,29)	1(No.2)	1(No.14)	
Asian				1(No.26)	
Mixed					
TOTALS NOT BANDED: 6		2	2	2	

DISCUSSION OF OUTCOMES

Band One pupils (Nos. 9,13,18,20,21) revealed a consistent pattern

of underachievement. When these pupils are considered in terms of

type of exams entered for, only one had not been entered for English Language and Literature (No.9), had failed Maths 'O' level and performed badly overall. Of the remaining 4 Band One pupils (Nos. 13,18, 20,21), all sat English 'O' level Language and Literature but two had failed English Language and all four had passed English Literature. Only one of these Band One pupils had passed Maths 'O' level despite the fact that all five had been entered.

A significant finding to emerge overall was that in Social Studies, a core subject taught in mixed ability groups (discussed above), 24 boys sat and passed the CSE Mode 3 exam with the following results:

                13 obtained grade 1
                 4 obtained grade 2
                 3 obtained grade 3
                 3 obtained grade 4
                 1 obtained grade 5

Seven boys in the sample were not entered for this exam. However, individually these boys did not sit many exams—with the exception of No.28 who attempted 5 exams but only passed 3 CSEs with very low grades. The 13 pupils achieving a grade one CSE pass in Social Studies suggests that perhaps the compulsory aspect of this course served to motivate pupils to work hard for an exam pass. Eight pupils were entered for the optional 'O' level in Sociology and four passed, with two gaining grades of B, 1 a C and 1 a D.

Band Three pupils are particularly worth noting because they were entered for and succeeded in passing some exams. These five pupils (Nos. 4,6,7,22,28) were all ethnic minority boys: 5 were of West Indian origin and 1 was Asian. Candidates Nos. 6 and 7 passed all 6 of the CSEs they sat. Candidate No. 7 got a grade one in his CSE Mode 3 Social Studies—again worth noting—an 'O' level equivalent.

In other subjects, though, the grades were low. Candidate No. 4 passed 4 out of 6 CSEs; candidate No. 22 passed two out of two exams and gained a grade C in 'O' level Art. Candidate No. 28 sat 5 exams and passed three CSEs with low grades. Bearing in mind that these are Band three examinees, there is, surely, substantive evidence here to suggest that these boys defied their Band 3 label and low Reading Age scores and went on to achieve some exam success.

This evidence shows that the performance of the exam sample did not conform to their band labels. This was particularly noticeable when examining Band 2 results where 12 of the 15 pupils obtained good results and Band 3 entries, who were all racial minority pupils, achieved some success.

The evidence here supports the Ethnic Background and Examination Results Report (ILEA RS/7078) of June 1987 where it is pointed out that a mismatch may occur wherby

> Caribbean pupils were more likely to be
> assigned to a lower band....than their (VR)
> test results would indicate and the reverse
> was true for ESWI pupils....[Further the]
> under-estimation of the VR banding of Caribbean
> pupils by primary heads (compared to VR test
> results) was of sufficient magnitude to alter
> the conclusion that Caribbean pupils were not
> under-achieving in examinations.(RS/7078:16)

We now move on to examine a profile of the exam sample in terms of socio-economic variables in the boys' backgrounds. It is clear from the evidence that the sample reflects the broader socio-economic trends in Innerton (discussed above in chapter 4).

PUPILS' HOME BACKGROUND
PUPILS' HOME BACKGROUND: EXAM SAMPLE

Pupil Number	Ethnic Group	Parents 2—1		Employment Dad—Mum		Unemploy Dad—Mum		Housing Coun—Own		No.Children in Family 1-2/3-4/5-6+			Position in Family 1st-2/3-4+		
1	W.I.	*		*	*				*	*				*	
2	W.I.	*		*	*				*	*				*	
3	White	*		*	*				*	*			*		
4	W.I.	*				*	*		*		*			*	
5	Asian	*		*	*			*			*			*	
6	W.I.	*		*	*			*			*			*	
7	W.I.	*		*	*			*			*				*
8	White		*	?			*	in care		*				*	
9	Turk	*		*	*				*		*			*	
10	WI/Wht	*		*	*				*	*			*		
11	WI/Wht		*			*			*		*		*		
12	White		*			*			*	*			*		
13	White	*		*	*				*	*			*		
14	W.I.	*		*	*				*	*		*	*		
15	White	*			*	*			*	*			*		
16	White	*		*	*				*		*			*	
17	W.I.	*		*	*				*		*			*	
18	Greek	*		*	*			*			*			*	
19	White	*		*	*				*		*		*		
20	White	*		*	*				*		*		*		
21	Asian	*		*	*			*				*			*
22	W.I.	*		*		*			*		*			*	
23	W.I.	*		*	*				*			*			*
24	Afric	*		*	*			*				*	*		
25	W.I.	*		*	*			*		*			*		
26	Asian		*	*				*		*			*		
27	WI/Wht	*		*	*			*			*			*	
28	W.I.		*	*	*				*		*	*		*	
29	W.I.		*		*				*			*			*
30	Asn/Wht	*		*	*				*		*			*	
31	W.I.	*		*	*				*		*			*	

Overall these boys came from relatively stable families. Twenty-six of the 31 lived with two parents; six boys came from single-parent homes and in two cases one parent had died. This profile contrasts with the Borough as a whole where there was a higher percentage of single-parent households (see Table D above in chapter 4). Parents' jobs were generally at the lower end of the socio-economic scale and reflected the employment pattern in Innerton which was predominantly 'working class' (C2, D & E), according to the Registrar General's Socio-Economic Groups. No parents had professional jobs. In 23 households both parents were employed. Two fathers were unemployed due to disablement. Four

of the five unemployed mothers were single parents. Types of employment included a father who worked in an optical factory as a supervisor, several were with London Transport, mothers who worked as domestics privately or in local hospitals as school cooks.

Housing tenure mirrored trends in the Borough. The most common form of housing was council rented, and 21 boys lived in council flats or houses. Three Asians, four West Indians, one African, one Greek Cypriot were owner-occupiers; no white family owned their own home. One boy was in care. Three boys had lived in tower blocks (one on the top floor for eleven years), but they had been rehoused in council houses or maisonettes which they regarded as much more desirable.

Family size varied considerably and six boys came from very large families. Six was the largest number of children in any one family. Fifteen boys came from meduim-sized families and two were only children. Eleven boys were eldest children which may be relevant in terms of their motivation to achieve. These boys (see Table F above) were entered for five or more exams.

From the boys' accounts, most parents took an interest in their school work—if in varying degrees. Some parents regarded success in school as a necessary prerequisite to obtaining a good job. Many of the boys had modest ambitions though several planned to stay on at school to work for further qualifications.

We turn now to the boys' own accounts. Parekh's (1983) three factors affecting pupil achievement will be used to structure

the views the boys presented in interviews. We are concerned to find out, first, what the socio-economic circumstances of these individual boys were. This factor includes the boy's material circumstances, relationships with his family, and his views about the area, ie. Innerton. Second, in terms of 'school ethos', what were boys' views of East End High and how did they feel about their school experience. This factor takes account of boys' attitudes towards teachers, subjects studied, discipline, control, and punishment practices, whether and why they had ever truanted, and their plans for leaving or staying on at school. The third factor, racism in the school, is interpreted here in terms of the boys' awareness of the multi-ethnic make up of the staff, their understanding of prejudice, discrimination and racism (concepts taught in the 5th year curriculum of the Social Studies core course), what they remembered and felt about the films which dealt with racism which they had seen in Social Studies course.

The basis for selecting these pupils was that they were high achievers and came, respectively, from the three ability bands, were entered for between six and nine exams and obtained relatively good results. All three had been in EEH for five years; the extent to which they came from deprived backgrounds varied. Before presenting an account in the boys' own words, we note their individual academic profiles beginning with the highest achiever.

TABLE H   THREE HIGH ACHIEVERS

NUMBER	NAME	ETH/GRP	BAND	READING AGE	NO.EX.EN	NO.EX PASSED
No. 10	LEWIS	W.I.(mxd)	2	8.0	9	9
No. 20	GEORGE	Wht	1	13.9	9	7
No. 7	ERROL	W.I.	3	8.0	6	6

LEWIS: 16 years old. Band Two.

Profile of Achievement:
Grades:
          A in 'O' level English Literature, History
          B in 'O' level Sociology, Accounts
          C in 'O' level Commerce, Maths, Computer Studies
          D in 'O' level English Language
          1 in CSE Social Studies ('O' level equivalent)

Given Lewis' background, this was a remarkable achievement. He was mixed race boy who had spent several years in a Dr. Bernardos Home.   Since the age of 8, however, he had lived with his mother (white), step-father (West Indian) and half-brother (7 yrs) in a rented council house where he had his own bedroom.   His mother worked part-time for the council doing meals-on-wheels and his step-dad was a telephone operator.   In material terms Lewis was not deprived.   He was given pocket money which he saved.   Saving seemed a compulsion and he often went without dinner and walked to school to keep his expenses to a minimum. The following comments help to highlight Lewis' family background and parents' attitudes towards his education.

Q- 'Do you talk to your parents about school'?

Lewis:
Yes. Basically because my father is always asking me about school. If he didn't, I wouldn't talk...but he does ask...we always try to make the family sit down at least one dinnertime so we can talk.

Q- 'Can you describe your parents' attitudes towards your progress at school'?

Lewis:
Very concerned! I used to mess around with the guys in the 3rd year. Used to bunk-off and steal from shops and everything. I got caught twice and my parents came up to the school twice and there were threats of expulsion.. I mean I used to get caned all the time....I used to get 6 wacks from Mr. Davey and walked out and laughed...kind of a status symbol...if you get 6 then you're on top. Then one can boast about it. There was a gang and we

enjoyed the excitment, stealing and running away.   One of the guys I used to mess about with left   at the end of the 3rd year and I settled down to work.

This incident established the existence of a strong parental

concern for Lewis' education.   Lewis explained how his father had

hit him, gone up to the school to talk with Mr. Davey, his

Housemaster, and promised that Lewis would never do it again.   As

he told me this, Lewis seemed to calm down.   He said Mr. Davey

had talked to him a lot and gradually he had stopped stealing

and bunking off because he could see he was   endangering his

future.

Q- 'Have you grown out of the need to bunk-off and pick up things from shops or is the temptation still lurking?'

Lewis:
The temptation has gone.... 'um....well.... the very last thing I stole was a book. I suppose I'm going 'up' in the world...that was a few months ago---well two books. I bunked off on a Friday morning and went down to Foyles...no one was looking and I wanted the two books so I slipped them into my bag, bought two books and went back to school.

We moved on to discuss how he felt about the area where he lived

and the community generally.

Q- 'Do you like this area?'   'Do you think there ought to be any changes in this area?'

Lewis:
I've lived   in inner London all my life. I don't know what it would be like to live in the suburbs or out in the country although I went to my grandmother's who lives in the country and it's very peaceful there.

You've still got 'twilight' zones in inner cities with a lot of buildings that need to be pulled down. A lot of poverty...a lot of depressed people living in slums. Industries are moving out now leaving people with   no jobs and that aggravates the situation. Inner cities should be made a place for commercial enterprise, an attractive place....

He was very articulate about his educational ambitions. He

planned to stay on after 'O' levels, do 'A' levels and go on to

take a degree.

Lewis:
I dont want to do other people's work; I only like my work.
Maths and Accounts are not for me....they use you as instruments
to do what they cannot do. I see them as subjects which do not
allow me to think as an individual.....I think I'll study
sociology, history and English next year....I'm more for written
work...that's why I have contemplated becoming a writer...

His considerable insight into the education system was expressed

in response to the question:

Q- 'If you could plan what to study in school, what would you

suggest pupils study?'

Lewis:
I think there should be a change generally with the whole system
of education...because to me it is too geared to passing exams
and this makes a lot of people dislike learning....because all
they can see at the end of it is just a piece of paper rather
than knowledge.... It's up to the pupil but he's got to have the
backing of his parents. If his parents don't give a damn,
don't care if he bunks off, then there's not much hope for him.
I suppose a new attitude to the whole process of education must
come about....Teachers are another part of this...

Here Lewis spoke about his close relationship with his

housemaster, Mr. Davey.

Lewis:
Mr. Davey is a good example of a teacher who tries to understand
his pupils. I dont think most other teachers are particularly
interested in getting any real relationships [established]
between pupils and teachers. Mr. Davey has pulled me through in
my time of trouble....then he made me a prefect. The other
teachers you only see in class and as you move up you leave these
teachers behind...The discipline is pretty lenient generally, but
when you do go too far, obviously there's expulsion, suspension.
In the first three years, if there's a weak teacher, the class
will be noisy and disruptive. After that there becomes a certain
amount of self-discipline.

Turning to racial aspects of school life, Lewis was aware of

the multi-ethnic make-up of the staff, but felt it made no

difference who taught him. However, the films shown in the

Social Studies course unit on 'Prejudice and Discrimination' had

made an impact.

Q- 'What did you think of the films you saw in Social Studies?'

Lewis:
It (In The Eye of A Storm) showed the evils of

discrimination...what I remember is quite frightening I
suppose....how easy it is to change a person's attitudes toward
each other because you were told you were superior and somebody
else was inferior.[1]
'Somebody's Daughter' was a bit overdramatised; general content
was correct. Perhaps I am the product of one of those
situations. [2]

He acknowledged that watching films in class broadened the

mind rather than just reading texts. In his view it helped

pupils to watch television more critically.

Lewis had a very clear understanding of the concepts of

prejudice, discrimination and racism, though he said there was

none in the school.

Lewis:

Prejudice is dislike of a certain group because they are in some
way different from yourself. Discrimination is a bit different
from prejudice in the fact that you do not offer equal
opportunity to everybody because of, for example, colour, or
ethnic origin. [Racism] I suppose is the banding together of
separate groups, fighting against other groups of a different
colour and showing strong discrimination————National Front is a
typical example. I think most of those guys flying the Union
Jack and all that nonsense———to me they're just holding on to
something that doesn't exist... They pick on something to create
their aggravation. That's why Hitler came to power———as
everybody knows.....he told these people the Jews were the people
to blame and everybody needed something to put the blame on..

We drew themes in the interview together around the question

Q- 'Does school treat children equally?'

Lewis:
Do you mean do the teachers treat the children as adults...or do
you mean does the school discriminate against different colours?
I think I know what you mean...you mean setting and so forth.
No. I don't think it does really. We did a bit of this in
Sociology. The comprehensive school is obviously the most
favourable school available at the moment for children from a
working class area. It should be favourable to everybody———no
matter what class they are, but there's bound to be setting
because if a good pupil is in a class with disruptive pupils,
perhaps they're going to suffer. But to keep them completely
separate is not a good idea either. So really, I think the first
three years in the school should be kept together———no matter
what their ability.....when you're going to take different
exams, different syllabus, obviously you're going to have to
divide everybody up.....Fine. But every other time, apart from
actual lessons, I think they should continue to mix, assemblies,
sports, games———dont separate them. The only problem is with the
public school! What would be interesting would be if these

public school boys were to come to a comprehensive school...see
how they get on here......I think they would most probably do
equally well because of their parents. But on the other hand,
some parents just send their kids to public school and forget
about them.

The final question:
Q- 'If you could begin school all over again and you could have
any kind of school you want, what would your school be like?'
elicited a very sophisticated response for a boy of 16.

Lewis:
Begin at 3 years (nursery school)--- ages 3-5 introduce them to
basic concepts like bricks. Too much time is wasted when
children are young. More money should be put into nursery
education. Should be compulsory nursery school. Get teachers
willing to spend time with children. Family ought to do more.
Some don't care enough about their children. Get teachers
qualified to teach that age group. Need much more mixing up of
primary and secondary processes of socialisation.

Lewis was unusually articulate. His views were well thought-out

and coherently expressed. It is hard to believe he was a Band

Two pupil who entered with a Reading Age of 8.0 years. He had

developed a strong sense of confidence and self-discipline which

set him apart from his peers. Perhaps this was due to

the close friendship with his Housemaster, Mr. Davey, and his

parents' involvement. Lewis was often found in his

Housemaster's room talking---he seemed to need the companionship

of adults more than his peers. In some ways he was out of step

with other pupils in East End High because he defied his ability

band, racial stereotyping and was confident he would achieve

academically. He was genuinely respected for his intelligence

both by his peers and teachers.

ERROL, while in a different academic league from Lewis, is

interesting because, as a Band Three pupil with a Reading Age

of 8.0, he was entered for six exams and passed all of them.

ERROL: 16 years old.   Band Three.

Profile of Achievement:
   Grades: 2 in CSE English
           4 in CSE Maths
           1 in CSE Social Studies
           4 in CSE Commerce
           5 in CSE Technical Drawing
           4 in CSE Accounts

ERROL was one of seven sons and two daughters, the eldest of whom was 29 and the youngest 13. Four of his brothers and one sister lived in Jamaica, so his father's owner-occupied house was not that crowded and Errol had his own room. Six were living at home: Mum and Dad, one sister, two brothers and Errol. Both parents were working: Dad, a motor mechanic and Mom, worked in the fur trade. His parents did not talk about school unless it was something important, but they were interested in his progress, especially in Maths and English which were regarded as more advanced. Errol was given pocket money regularly and saved when he could. He was a quiet and fairly solitary lad who preferred to read rather than watch television, spend time in the local library on Saturdays, had never truanted and liked school. When I asked 'How would you describe the area?', he didn't have very strong views, saying he 'disliked' and 'liked' the area and saw no reason to make changes-

Errol:
I've lived in the area most of my life...Don't know how to describe it. Don't think it's a good area to put the school in----too busy, too much traffic and noise. Yes, it's crowded but I like a place where there's people after I've done my work. ....prefer it to be quiet and peaceful.

For Errol, the school ethos was mainly academic. He was positive about his subjects and planned to go on to a further education college to do 'O' levels next year. He seemed to have a realistic and mature view of his own potential.

Errol:
I thought I would get into the 'O' level. [But] I didn't get a
mark of 70 or over. Afterwards I realised if I did 'O' level and
failed, I'd have nothing. [So I'll] do my best and get grade 1
or 2 and then I can go for 'O' level next year.....I'm going on
to college to do English, Math, and Sociology 'O' levels. I
don't like the way they sort of teach here. I don't really feel
comfortable but I'd feel comfortable in a college, more relaxed
and so on....My aunt lives near the college (I fancy) and
the college looks like a Greek building---like a
university----Thought, gosh, I'll never get there. When I went
to see the careers man, he gave me addresses of all colleges and
I saw this one on the list. I wrote--they sent it [the
application] back within two days. When I go back with the
application, they'll give me an interview.

His ambitions were modest and he planned to go into clerical

work, "a formal job" after taking his 'O' levels. He liked

Accounts and said he might try to do this type of work in

future. But there were aspects of life in East End High like

control, discipline and punishment which Errol didn't find

congenial.

Errol:
With a size school like this, boys can be very bad sometimes. I
reckon they should be more stronger on the boys. At the moment,
I reckon they're very weak. Should be more discipline....so much
people has got the cane---they come out laughing and say it
didn't hurt.

Q- 'What qualities does a good teacher have?'

Errol:
Good teachers are people who are determined to teach the kids,
who would sit down and go over it...don't find many teachers like
that. [But] some boys are shy and need to feel confident that
they can talk to the teacher.

Q- 'Why do you think pupils truant?'

Errol:
They don't like school. There's lots of people who don't like
school and some (like me) who do. They say education dosen't
worry them. [They] go home after Registration mark in morning and
afternoon and some parents don't really care. Some parents give
the old lie--make excuses for boys.

Initially Errol came across as a retiring lad who lacked

confidence in more worldly endeavours such as gaining paid

employment. But his growing confidence emerged when he told me

about the first job he had ever applied for and unexpectedly got.

Errol:
Used to work in supermarket! I used to wear an overall and I
would tell them which shelves needed filling up. Filled in a
sheet---[it was] about four months before Christmas. Then they
told me I was only needed until Christmas. Because I knew that
it was okay with me. I just went in and asked for a
job--(thought it would be a miracle if I got it) 'cause I was a
bit bored after school. When he asked me when I could start, I
said Monday. That come to me as a miracle because I wasn't
really expecting it---getting the job at all.

Q- 'Would you say young people don't stand much chance for
part-time jobs?'

Errol:
No--well, I don't know really. But it's just something I really
picked up. I don't think like---well if every young person went
out and found a job---then all the others can do the same. I
dont find it that way---I find it difficult.

Q- 'Were you frightened of being turned down?'

Errol:
Yeah

Errol was sensitive about prejudice, discrimination and racism in

society and school. He expressed these views when he explained

how he felt watching the films in the Social Studies classes.

Q- 'How did 'In The Eye of A Storm' make you feel?'

Errol:
....[long pause]....made me feel funny because when we were
watching it, there were all black and white kinds in the class.
And everybody was watching it....makes you feel sort
of...uh...different....All of us are different--cultures and
everything.

Q- 'How did you feel different? Black and white watching
together?'

Errol:
Well, it was about prejudice and um....you might have a white boy
as your best friend and you're sitting in there watching the
film--both of you are watching the film and then you feel this
sort of embarrassment coming over you---sort of like that. I did
feel a bit sort of uncomfortable about it.

Q- 'How would you define 'prejudice'?'

Errol:
Just reckon that it is just one set of people who don't agree
with another set of people....like they might not like their skin
colour or their culture or whatever. It's just that they
disagree with them....they don't like the way they act or they
speak or so on.

Q- 'Have you, your family or friends experienced 'prejudice' or 'discrimination?'

Errol:
No, not really. Well really, I'm expecting it to happen sometime---earlier or later. Am expecting it to happen.

Q- 'Are you preparing yourself?'

Errol:
Yes

Q- 'Have you talked about this with other people or is it something you keep to yourself?'

Errol:
Something I keep to myself really....
One of my final questions was about whether schools treat

children equally and in Errol's opinion, it was really up to the

boy himself.

Errol:
.....it's up to the kids though isn't it....if they want to be treated equally....If the kid doesn't behave himself and stuff like that, how would he expect to be treated as equal as the good boy? So really it's up to him if he wants to be treated equally.

My final question was:

Q- 'If you could begin school all over gain and you could have any kind of school you want, what would your school be like?' prompted a response I was not prepared for.

Errol:
Private School!

Q- 'Why?'

Errol:
[It's] quieter, more advanced subjects...a neater school.

Although Errol emerged as a self-contained, somewhat shy and

reticent young man, he illustrates different ways in which

socio-economic conditions, school ethos and racism in school and

society affected him. Where he differed from so many of his

peers was that he was motivated to achieve and worked hard

to realise this goal. He accepted that the most he could

obtain at school were CSEs exams, and in doing so he defied his

Band Three label by passing every one he sat.

GEORGE: 16 years old. Band One.

Profile of Achievement:
Grades:
           B in 'O' level English Literature
           C in 'O' level English Language
           D in 'O' level History, Sociology
           E in 'O' level Maths
           1 in CSE Geography, Social Studies ('O' level
                                     equivalent)
           3 in CSE Physics

George, a Band One pupil, was the eldest of two sons (brother 12 yrs). He lived in a new three-bed council house and had his own room. His Dad did skilled manual work in the optical industry and Mum had a part-time clerical job. The family had lived on the 14th floor of a tower block when George was in junior school and before that they lived in a multi-occupied house which was now derelict. His parents had always been interested in his progress at school and were generally supportive. He came across as a somewhat sheltered, shy young man, who was moderately 'studious', and reasonably confident he could achieve. Although he was not given regular pocket money and had never had a paid job, his Mum put money into his building society account for him to withdraw as required. George said he didn't spend anything, but his parents paid for horse riding school, school journeys such as walking in Wales and the ILEA Alpine expedition due to take place in the summer holiday. Even though his personal socio-economic circumstances were stable, he did have strong views about the area:

Q- 'How would you describe the area you live in?'

George:
It's all right if you don't go out after ten at night... quite a lot of litter about. People just throw it on the floor....[but] The marshes are quite nearby if you want to go and get some fresh air.

Q- 'Do you think there should be any changes in this area?'

Georqe:
If there were a few more police there might be less vandalising.
If people were more careful with their litter, it would be a lot
better....it's so dirty, even where I live.

As a Band One pupil George was expected to   achieve and he

appeared to be   fairly studious.   He was one of the few boys I

spoke with who actually bought books.

Georqe:
We get scholarship prizes of book tokens and there's a school
bookshop. I help in that, so I usually just look through the
books there and buy the ones I want.. When I've got book tokens,
I do go out to bookshops.

His experience of school and the academic side of school ethos

was positive.   He   planned   to continue in the sixth form to

take 'A' levels in History, English, and Geography and then go

on to teacher training college.   When I asked   him how he had

come to choose his particular options, he explained that he had

had advice from his parents and teachers but had made up his own

mind in the end.

Georqe:
English group 1 do 'O' level language and literature.   Then
subjects I chose in the 3rd year [were] History, Geography,
Physics and Computer Studies. Everyone had to do Social Studies
but people were picked to do Sociology in the 4th year. [Note:
This was not the case. Sociology was an optional extra for any
pupil who wanted to take the subject.]

Q- 'Are you happy with your choice?'

Georqe:
I like Geography, History and Computer Studies, but I don't think
I should have picked Physics. I'm not very good at it--I dont
think much of the teacher either.

Q- 'What subjects do you like best?'

Georqe
I like English and History, Geography--the best three I'd say.

Q- 'Sociology is a voluntary subject and I'm wondering whether
you're pleased that you're taking it?'

Georqe:
I'm not sure whether I should have taken it or not. Quite a lot

of pressure from all them different subjects. Every teacher seems to think their subject's the most important...

Q- 'If you have the choice again, would you bother with it [Sociology]?'

Georqe:
Yes, I think so. I just wanted as many exams as I could.

Q- 'Are you happy with the choice of options?'

Georqe:
Well, I didn't want to do Computer Studies. I wanted to do Art [but] not enough wanted to do Art--there wasn't enough for a class....I should have done French instead of Physics.

Q- 'Are you sorry about that?'

Georqe:
Yes

These comments anticipated George's results. We saw from George's profile of achievement above that did not pass his 'O' level Computer Studies exam and got only Grade 3 in CSE Physics. But he did well in some subjects and gained a D in the optional Sociology 'O' level. He did not do well in Maths, however, not uncommon in East End High. In some ways, George had an instrumental attitude toward school. He was ambitious to become a teacher and needed 'A' levels, and at this stage wanted as many exam passes as possible. He had never truanted and got along well with his teachers, even the ones he didn't think were very good. He made some interesting comments about the multi-ethnic ethos in the school.

Q- 'Are you aware of the multi-ethnic composition of the teaching staff?'

Georqe:
I get used to it, I suppose. If everybody's different around you, you get used to it. Don't seem to notice it after the first year or so.

Q- 'Would you say that you are aware of the fact that many of your teachers come from different racial and ethnic groups?'

Georqe:
Well you are, but you don't take any notice ot it. They're all teachers and they're trying to help you.

Q- 'Do you think it's a good idea to have teachers from different ethnic backgrounds?'

Georqe:
Yes

Q- 'Why?'

Georqe:
They can give you different ideas of society...they're all brought up different, different ideas to one another.

Q- 'Do you think that's a good thing?

Georqe:
Yes.

When we discussed the films shown in the Social Studies classes,

his comments about racial prejudice were perceptive. He

particularly remembered the impact 'In The Eye of A Storm' had

had on him.

Q- 'Do you remember that one day the children were asked to treat other children as though they were inferior?'

Georqe:
Yes. It was about prejudice. That was a good film. It showed that children should not be prejudiced. I think it was a good lesson....It showed how if we had some teachers like that in our infant or junior schools, we would have been less prejudiced. In some areas where they are more prejudiced, they should do that...perhaps they'd be less prejudiced.

Q- 'Would you say there is prejudice in Britain?'

Georqe:
Yes, there's prejudice in Britain, but there's not so much in London because people are more used to foreign people around.

Q- 'Would you say the boys in the school are foreign people?'

Georqe:
Well, West Indian people and Asians. People like that. People in London are more used to that, so they're not prejudiced any more, but people in other parts of the country are still prejudiced against them.

Q- 'How would you define prejudice?'

Georqe:
People's dislike of certain things. Could be anything. They might not always be right....Something you're against before you know what it's like...because they think foreign is inferior to theirs. They've got ideas that people have given them.

Q- 'How would you define discrimination?'

George:
If you're prejudiced against someone, someone's told you something about them and you prejudge them, you discriminate against them after you've been prejudiced. It's discrimination.

Q- 'Have you ever found any prejudice or discrimination here in school?'

George:
Some people are when they first come into school. But I think by the time they leave they've probably got rid of it because you can't discriminate against people in school. Really, even if you want to, there's always someone round you helping you to get over discrimination.

Q- 'Do you think you are in any way prejudiced?'

George:
Well I think I'm prejudiced against gangs of boys going round vandalising things and causing trouble.....[and] Yes, I think I discriminate against people like those who go round in gangs. I probably think they're worse than they are.

Q- 'How would you define racism?'

George:
That's being against anything but your own race....the National Front's against groups. I dont think much of them....I dont agree with them.

At the end of the interview we spoke about 'equality at school'

and George said he didn't think school treated everyone equally

mainly because of the practice of streaming.

George:
Well, when you have streaming, teachers have all got their own group of about the same ability, so it's easier for them to treat the whole group equally. But when you've got mixed ability classes, it's harder for the teachers to treat equally....the higher groups they help them get on with their work more, whereas the lower groups are being helped to actually do their work....It's difficult to treat everyone equally.

As to George's preference for type of school, he explained that

because he had only been to one secondary school he couldn't

really say. Ideally, he felt, pupils should do more work for

themselves and teachers should just be there to help them along.

George's views about multi-ethnic education and racial attitudes

indicated that he thought prejudice, discrimination and racism

led to socially undesirable behaviour. He acknowledged that if

teachers exposed pupils to these issues earlier on in their school life, then it would be possible to prevent or stem the development of negative racial attitudes later on.

The views of these three pupils highlight where multi-ethnic practice in East End High already existed and where it was emerging. Clearly, the Social Studies core curriculum was an important aspect of the evolving multi-ethnic school ethos. These pupils had taken the Social Studies course, seen the films shown in the unit on 'Prejudice and Discrimination' and appeared to have an understanding of racism in school and society. They expressed positive views about the multi-racial composition of teaching staff. This can be seen from George's view that "you get used to" the fact that your teachers come from many different ethnic backgrounds..."you dont notice it" and "they can give you different ideas of society". Errol, on the other hand, was less articulate about the salience of a multi-etnic school ethos. In his view it was up to the boys themselves, but a pupil's racial identity would not impede a boy who was determined to make progress. Lewis, finally, expressed himself in a sophisticated way, almost thankful that he had survived an unstable early childhood and now found himself in a school environment in which he had been able to forge strong relationships with his teachers, especially his Housemaster, who respected him and who had helped him to realise his academic potential.

THE TRUANTS

At the beginning of this chapter I explained that information gathered about pupils at this stage would take account of the high rate of truancy in the fifth year. The data gained from the interviews helps to give insight into the circumstances of non-academic boys who often had little incentive to attend. It is part of our purpose to address the experiences of these non-academic pupils in order to ascertain whether and how the development of the multi-ethnic initiative can help to accommodate their needs. One issue to consider here is the pastoral-academic divide (Reid 1986). This 'divide' draws attention to questions such as whether the needs of non-academic pupils can be accommodated within a multi-ethnic policy framework concerned to promote social, emotional and academic aspects of schooling.

Six pupils were interviewed with a view to finding out about their reasons for and pattern of truanting. Interviews were conducted in January 1981 and based on the same loosely structured schedule as the first pupil interviews, but the schedule was followed in a more flexible manner because these boys were not sitting exams. Three main issues emerged from their accounts: First, three of the pupils had been in the Remedial stream which was in itself a disincentive to stay on at school in the fifth year. Second, they had not been allowed to study the subjects which most interested them, and third, they felt their teachers had not given them sufficient individual attention. In concrete terms this meant that they had been given little or no guidance in their 3rd year when it came to choosing options and/or had not been allowed to take subjects of

their first choice.   It is hardly surprising, then, that they

subsequently lost interest in school and began to truant. Little

effort appeared to have been made .by the school (via the

Education Welfare Officer) to try and retrieve them.   In a sense

these boys were simply waiting to turn 16 so they could leave

officially; in the meantime most staff turned a 'blind eye'.

By definition, truanting pupils underachieve and it is important

to investigate why.   When did these pupils begin to truant: in

primary or secondary school? Were the boys in the remedial

stream?   Had they been in trouble with the police; been in

court; not been allowed to study subjects wanted?   Was there any

tension with teachers? Were they entered for exams?   What was

their home background?   We begin with the profile of their 'Home

Backgrounds/Socio-Economic Characteristics'.

TABLE H
TRUANTS: HOME BACKGROND/SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Pupil Number	Ethnic Group	Years in EEH	Parents 2—1	Employ. Dad—Mum		Unemp. D—M	Housing Cnl/Ren/Own		No.Chrn 1-2/3-4/5+	Pos.in Fam 1/2-3/4+	
32	W.I.	5	*	*	*	*			*	*	
33	White	5	*	*	*	*		*		*	
34	White	5	*			*	*		*	*	
35	White	5	*		*	* *			*	*	
36	White	5	*	*		*			*		*
37	W.I.	5	*	*			*		*		*

All six had been in East End High for five years. Most parents

were employed in skilled or unskilled work, with the exception of

'34' whose mother was on social security and '35' whose parents

were umemployed.

We will consider the three remedial pupils first.   In their

different ways they illustrate how pronounced the

pastoral-academic divide inside East End High was. This divide meant that the individual needs of these pupils was not adequately addressed. Reid (1986) explains

> The separation of pastoral and curriculum work
> in the 1960s and 1970s was arguably one of the
> greatest disasters for schooling....Arguably the
> move has been divisive, creating pastoral and
> academic empires, reducing the effectiveness of
> form tutors and resulting in more and more
> administration and bureaucracy.....The promotion
> of pupils' intellectual and behavioural growth
> should be the mutual aim of both tiers within
> schools...Poor pastoral work in schools is a
> failure of management. (Reid 1986:10)

We will take up this divide below and again in chapter 6 when we deal with the teachers and matters linked to weak management practices in East End High. Meanwhile, we turn to those truanting pupils who were in remedial sets. The Remedial Department in East End High was on the seventh floor (top floor) of the school. The location is significant as Bill, white, ('36') explains. He found the stairs

> terrible because [first]...your on the 7th floor...
> then you're on the ground. And after you've had
> your lesson on the ground, it's somewhere upstairs.
> It's like they're messing you around---you keep
> running up and down.

Bill's truanting had begun at primary school. The youngest of five, he had lived all of his life in a flat on a problem council estate with his mum and dad, four brothers, and one sister. He described the estate as noisy with people always rowing. The day I interviewed him he had a cold, seemed very confused, was unkempt, needed a bath and clean clothes. He had truanted since his first year, said he didn't like his teachers, and did not appear to understand several of the questions I asked. It seemed to me that he might have been more suited to an ESN school, but it was rather too late in his schooling to change. His main

recreation was 'mucking around' which turned out to be a form of gang warfare.

Bill:
I go after people and beat them. We have an A team and a B team...it's like a game. You've got 12 kids each side. They run out and the other side gives them fifty and then goes after them, try to find them and beat them....you know, muck around, punching them and that....it's not fighting; it's mucking around.

Jim('34'), Irish, was in a different category. He accepted that he was remedial. He lived with his mum, dad, two sisters and brother in rented accomodation where he had his own room. His family was on social security. There was some parental concern, however, and his mum, only marginally literate herself, wanted him to continue with school.

Jim:
It didn't really bother me. Remedial suited me. It was my sort of level. I settled in that class and I enjoyed it. I wanted to be up there on the 7th floor...felt safer there...

Jim explained that he had begun truanting when he was removed from the remedial stream in his 4th year and put into level 5 English. He found this too difficult, couldn't cope and began to bunk off.

Jim:
The English teacher I had took no notice of me. He expected us to be able to do the work---so when we couldn't, he didn't do anything and just sat there. I bunked off because I can't spell and read easily.

Q- 'Is one reason school hasn't worked well for you because of the exam system?'

Jim:
I don't know about the exam system at all. I mean, if I was entered for an exam I'd go and try for it. You see, as no one has entered me, I'm not really bothered to go to a lesson.

In fact, Jim was entered for 'O' level Art and he did attend the Art lessons, but that was all.

Jim:
I was told I was entered for the Art exam, so I stayed. The maths and that [English] didn't really bother me so I went to the Art and I hope I'll get a better grade.

The third remedial pupil I interviewed was Ron, ('32'). He was of West Indian origin, lived with his mother, brother, step-father and step-brother in a council flat where he had his own room. Relations with his parents were strained; his mother was short-tempered and he didn't like his step-dad. Once he had had to stop his step-dad from hitting his mother when they fought over him. His mum had told him he couldn't continue to live at home if he didn't get a job when he left school. Having never had a job, he didn't think he would find one. He was unable to talk to anyone at home so no one knew about the bullying he had experienced in his first year at East End High. Although he had enjoyed primary school and didn't really regard himself as a truant, in East End High he had been in withdrawal classes for English, spelling and reading twice a week in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years. Then he began to stay away in the 4th year because had been involved in fights which led to a brief suspension. Ron explained that he found lessons boring, the school too big, felt most teachers were not interested in him, couldn't understand his maths teacher, and spent most of his time out with his mates.

When it came to discussing issues of prejudice, discrimination and racism, however, Ron expressed an awareness and understanding of the meaning of prejudice, discrimination and racism. (The remedial boys had not seen the films shown in Social Studies due to their absence.) Ron had seen 'Roots' on television, however, and remembered how it had "made him mad". (3)

Ron:
They was my colour. I can't explain. Because they're black...it
could have happened to me if I lived in them times. Just lookin'
at the film, I know how they feel and all.

Q- 'Can you think of it in terms of you own history?'

Ron:
Yes, my ancestors are African. That's why I hated it....cause
they went over there....got them as slaves....[but] I can't talk
very good with my family...

Q- 'Can you tell me what prejudice means?'

Ron:
.....people dislike people because they are different...

Q- 'Do you think people are prejudiced?'

Ron:
Yes. Cause people are different---something is wrong with them.

Q- 'Do you know what discrimination means?'

Ron:
Yes...I think doing something to people...just going round and
beating them up or something...

Q- 'Have you experienced discrimination?'

Ron:
Yes. Calling me names...

Q- 'Do you know what racism is?'

Ron:
Other people from other countries don't like other people cause
them come from other countries. I think they think they're taking
jobs or something...

There was a sense that Ron was less comfortable with white people

and his circle of friends outside school was exclusively

people of West Indian origin. Bill and Jim, by contrast, mixed

with all ethnic groups. All three knew there was racial tension

in the area. Ron had experienced it first-hand when he had been

stopped by the police.

In general, the experiences of these remedial pupils highlight

where there were inadequacies in the school in terms of the

academic/pastoral divide and help to explain the development of

anti-school attitudes. Further, these boys came from backgrounds which were not very supportive, with few or no academic role models in their families or peer groups. All three had severe difficulties with reading. These boys could not cope with the academic demands of school and the pastoral system had not provided adequately for their individual needs.

We move on to the remaining truants in the sample for whom perhaps the most important reason for absenteeism was that because they were not entered for exams they had little or no incentive to attend.

Spencer ('37'), of West Indian origin, was 5th in a family of 9 children who all lived together in an owner-occupied house. He said quite openly that if he had been entered for exams he would attend school. He hadn't had any guidance when he chose his options and was now sorry that he hadn't chosen Building Studies. He knew he was a difficult lad to discipline and had been caned a lot when younger. His main ambition was to get a job painting and decorating. He perked up when I asked about what he watched on TV. 'Roots' had made a deep impression on him:

Spencer:
I thought it was good and if that's how it was in slavery it was quite bad....it was wicked....like you watch it on television and it's only acting but it really did happen like that. It does hurt because they are humans you know.

Q- 'Do you resent white people?'

Spencer:
Some

Q- 'Why?'

Spencer;
I don't like racialist people, like the National Front. I really
hate them and if I was able to catch one, I would do him
over.....occasionally a white man might say 'you black bastard or
something like that'...

We discussed teachers and I asked:

Q- 'Do you think it is a good idea to have teachers from many
different racial and ethnic groups?'

Spencer:
Yes, because there are other kids from different races. I might
get on with some black teachers because they know my problems.

The experiences of racism embedded in both Roy and Spencer's

accounts imply that their dignity was impugned and they

felt demeaned. When their comments are linked with their

unsatisfactory relationships with teachers, it is not hard to

understand why they truanted. In some ways their views

reflected instrumental and self-protecting attitudes which led

to selective attendance at school, apparently their way of

coping.

The remaining two truants illustrate other ways in which the

situations of many secondary pupils are unable to adjust to the

academic demands of the curriculum and for whom pastoral care

is often unsatisfactory. Carl ('33'), white, lived with his

parents and brother (14 years) in a council house. He did not

truant 100%---more like 50% of the time because he was entered

for three CSE exams: Technical Drawing, History and

Silversmithing. His truanting started in the 2nd year but

continued into the 3rd. He said he had problems sleeping and

stayed home. Bob ('35'), white, lived with his parents, three

sisters and brother in a council flat and was not new to

truanting. He had been expelled from his primary school and

assigned to a unit for children with discipline problems. After

a year there he returned to his primary school. However,

his truanting began almost immediately in his 1st year at East End High. The reasons he gave for truanting included: "I feel stress, noise bothers me, like it quiet, can't learn in chaotic classrooms, [and] I prefer the country". Further probing revealed a cycle of absenteeism which meant that he had never really attended school on a regular basis: "because I was absent I couldn't choose my options; so I didn't get the options I wanted most. As a result, I am not interested in my subjects and bunk-off".

In seeking to describe and explain truancy, then, we have seen that a number of factors are relevant. Some pupils found themselves having to attend a school with an academic bias for which they were unsuited. For others, there was a sense of disappointment that they had not been allowed to take the subjects which interested them most. Finally, a few had personal problems which often meant that they found school an unpleasant/intolerable environment. These circumstances need to be given a more prominent place in analyses of underachievement.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

In summarising the findings from this phase of data gathering, it is clear that a wide range of contrasting circumstances characterised pupils in the sample. There were highly motivated boys from stable homes who enjoyed parental support and good rapport with their teachers. These, as we saw from the discussion above, were entered for and gained 'fair' to 'good' exam passes. Some boys in this sample achieved despite a lack of parental concern and Band Three status. By contrast, some boys truanted because they found school inhospitable, irrelevant,

and said their teachers had little or no concern for them. They had not been entered for exams and saw no point in attending. Often these boys' parents took little or no interest in their schooling and a few parents even made excuses for their sons' absence.

What conclusions can we draw? First, in inner city comprehensive schools where the intake is often bottom-heavy, ie., under-representative of the full ability range, it is unfair and unrealistic to judge the performance of pupils and the school exclusively in terms of exam passes. Thus, the meaning of the concepts 'achievement' and 'underachievement' need to be carefully qualified so that due account is taken of pupil characteristics. Of course exam success is a key indicator of achievement, but there are other criteria by which we can assess a pupil's level of achievement. These include pupil motivation, the commitment to undertake tasks, develop social skills, the ability to communicate and apply knowledge practically should also be used to determine the extent to which a pupil has achieved or underachieved. (Hargreaves 1985)

Because our findings raise doubts as to whether each pupil was given sufficient individual attention by his teachers, a second and obvious conclusion is that teachers should be equally concerned with all pupils. Clearly, teachers should be as concerned with the non-academic as the academic pupils. All pupils should be guided into appropriate courses of study, careers, further or higher education. If this happens, then, ideally, the 'academic-pastoral' divide will dissolve. To a large extent this 'divide' is a reflection of the school's ethos.

Finally, this discussion has established that pupils did have a fairly good understanding of and in some cases direct experience of prejudice, discrimination and racism. Since racism contributes to underachievement, it is vital that in the development and specification of a multi-ethnic education policy, racism in all its forms must be identified and eliminated from the curriculum, teachers' attitudes, pedagogy and school practices in order to prevent the transmission of racism inside school. Good multi-ethnic practice was seen to exist in the Social Studies core course where all fifth years did a unit of 'Prejudice and Discrimination' and saw films which exposed them to different forms of racism which they could then discuss. In the pupils' accounts cited above, it was clear that this practice helped to raise consciousness, promoted an understanding of the negative consequences of racism, and fostered anti-racist views. This account of the pupils' experiences and views should help to inform the development and specification of the emergent multi-ethnic policy agenda in East End High. We now move on to consider the teachers.

NOTES

1. In The Eye of the Storm—was a film of an American primary school teacher's lesson about what it is like to be discriminated against. In the film the teacher's 8 year-old pupils role-played being 'strongest' and 'weakest'. The technique she used was to have all blue-eyed children be 'superior' one day and the next day all brown-eyed pupils were 'superior'. As the children discussed how it felt to be treated as though they were 'no good' they came to an understanding of what prejudice and discrimination was.

2. Somebody's Daughter was a somewhat controversial film in that it was made to a 'soap opera' formula and showed what happens to a young white girl and her black boyfriend when she gets pregnant and they need accomodation and he looks for a job. It showed their respective families and was meant to give some

insight into the adversities youngsters encounter when they find themseves in this situation.

3. Roots was a five-part television drama documentary of Alex Haley's novel, Roots 1976. It was a vivid historical portryal of slavery told through the ancestoral history of one man and his descendants. It started when white slave traders seized Africans in Africa and transporting them to the American Colonies where they were forced into working on southern planatations.

_____

CHAPTER SIX.

THE TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to present and interpret findings from my research on the teachers in East End High. The terms of reference were to examine teachers' views about and commitments to implementing the ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education policy within the school. In an area as controversial as multicultural education, policy implementation is problematic, and in East End High there was almost no consensus about the meaning of the term 'multicultural'. Several teachers accepted the term 'multicultural', others referred to 'anti-racist' education, and some ignored it altogether. A further complication was that the ILEA policy statement contained no guidelines for schools or teachers, no specific aims and goals were spelt out, no procedures for monitoring progress or criteria for evaluation were laid down. In short, while the 1977 policy statement marked a crucial turning point in promoting multicultural- antiracist education, it left matters largely to those at the chalkface, or rather, to the goodwill of heads, their deputies and teachers in positions of authority to develop strategies for operationalising multicultural education inside schools.

Given these limitations, why should schools have taken much notice of the ILEA policy statement on multi-ethnic education? One reason is that schools like East End High, with a large multiethnic population, were more inclined to take the policy

seriously because they felt it was in the best interests of their pupils. But since there was no element of compulsion built into the policy, schools were free either to ignore the 'top-down' initiative altogether or to adapt it to suit their circumstances, depending on the extent of their commitment to realising its aims. Indeed this dilemma generated my research question in the first place, namely, 'how did schools respond to a local education authority multi-ethnic policy initiative' which had no explicit guidelines and lacked any means of compulsion.

The data in this chapter is organised in terms of three phases of research into the work of teachers in East End High. Phase I interviews began in April 1979 and were completed by the end of the school year (1979). This set of interviews was pivotal because, as 'first impressions', they contained a wide spectrum of staff opinion. Phase I consisted of three exploratory sets of interviews which helped to identify (1) what the views of the Head and his two Deputies were regarding MCE, and (2) how the six Heads of Houses saw their roles in EEH and how they regarded the multi-ethnic policy in relation to their posts. (3) Four subject teachers (English, Social Studies, History and Commerce Departments) were also interviewed in this early phase because it was felt that the work of these departments lent itself to adopting a multicultural approach. It was important to find out whether departmental changes were taking place in the curriculum and styles of pedagogy. Teachers' individual interpretations and response to MCE were also a major focus of these interviews.

<u>Phase I</u> interviews were loosely structured and tape recorded. Teachers were interviewed once. The aim was to produce individual accounts of their specialist tasks, responsibilities and experiences within the school organisation as well as their views about the multi-ethnic policy initiative in East End High. It was vital to establish a sound rapport with teachers in East End High, and I thought it might be counter-productive in this early stage to focus mainly on the MCE policy initiative. If I had introduced myself as someone only concerned to investigate what these teachers were doing to implement the multi-ethnic education policy, this might produce a 'backlash'——even if the 'backlash' was 'invisible'. ILEA's Multi-Ethnic education policy was sensitive——even controversial in the minds of many (see Woodroffe's account above). Therefore I presented myself to these teachers as someone mainly seeking to find out how they saw their role in the school.

I soon learned three senior staff would be leaving at the end of the 1979 school year: (1) the Afro-Caribbean Deputy Head (for Pastoral Care) would be taking up a Headship elsewhere in the Authority, (2) a Housemaster was retiring after teaching for 30 years in the school and (3) a Housemaster was taking a year's study leave to complete an Academic Diploma. Given that staff turnover is significant in schools, this information alerted me to specific changes in leadership, ie., authority figures whose loss to the school would be significant. It seemed important to investigate how their replacements would perform these roles.

<u>Phase II</u> took place in the summer term of the school year, 1980-81. In the intervening period, 1979-80, and early in the school year 1980, I interviewed a sample of fifth form pupils in order to gain a broad view of their school experience and opinions (see chapter 5). In June 1981, I sent a self-completion questionnaire entitled: 'Teachers Opinions on Multi-Ethnic Education' to the whole staff (see Appendix 6.1 for Teacher Questionnaire). The response rate of 72% reflected the willingness of most staff to supply information about a number of issues ranging from the subjects they taught, their posts of responsibility, educational background, views about MCE in general and the role of the Multicultural Education Committee in particular. However, the non-response rate raised the question of whether anti-MCE views were 'invisible' among teachers who failed to complete the questionnaire. Non-response probably reflected the fact that some teachers were temporary or part-time, with little ongoing commitment to the school, so it was unsurprising that they did not return the questionnaires. It is likely, however, that non-response also reflected the lack of willingness by some teachers to express their scepticism or disapproval of the policy initiative. I was able to identify teachers who did not complete the questionnaire and in some cases I managed to interview them at a later stage in the fieldwork to elicit their views.

<u>Phase III</u> in-depth interviews were conducted with 12 staff and took place in the autumn term of the school year 1981-82. The interview schedule was loosely structured, tape recorded and conducted in the privacy of the teachers'

individual offices. The aim of these interviews was to probe the views of selected staff in more depth than had been possible in the self-completion questionnaire. Two of these teachers were amongst the non-respondents to the questionnaire and their views are presented below. This phase of data collection took place in the final stages of my school-based fieldwork after I had been researching in the school for two years, by which time I believe staff had come to accept my presence and I was able to elicit good quality data.

PHASE I

The presentation of my findings about the teachers is designed to illuminate the development of multicultural perspectives within the school by interweaving of policies, personalities, attitudes and opinions at all levels. By presenting it in phases of data collection, something of the historical dynamic of MCE policy development and the extent to which this policy was implemented is also captured. It is appropriate to begin the account of Phase I data with a consideration of the headteacher, Mr. Kay, and his response to the ILEA Multi-Ethnic policy initiative.

THE HEADTEACHER: MR. KAY

Troyna and Ball(1983) have written that

> it is difficult to imagine the philosophy
> and aims of a school being formalised without
> the unequivocal support and encouragement
> of heads.... The translation of an lea's
> policy on multicultural, or any other issue...
> is heavily dependent of the attitudes and
> and stance of the headmaster.
> (Troyna & Ball: TES 1983)

However, their research findings have also disclosed that only

> ...one inner city headmaster in three
> admits to ignoring local authority race
> policies...(Troyna & Ball: TES 1983)

In East End High, Mr. Kay, the headmaster, had responded favourably to the ILEA initiative because he was committed to promoting a multicultural society. In his view teaching was primarily about communication and he wanted all his teachers to become acquainted with information relating to the background of the pupils at East End High. As Head, he wanted to develop a multicultural ethos throughout the whole school especially at a time when the teacher turnover rate was stabilising. In the early-mid 1970s the teacher turnover rate had been approximately 30%, but by 1979 only eight or nine teachers were leaving annually out of a staff of nearly ninety. Mr. Kay saw this as a moment to encourage all teachers, even the weaker ones, to become more familiar with the backgrounds of the sizable number of pupils of Afro-Caribbean origin in the school. To facilitate an increased awareness amongst his teachers, he arranged for lecturers from a nearby Polytechnic to give a series of talks on aspects of black history, Afro-Caribbean culture and the black experience in Britain to all staff. These talks had taken place in 1978-79, before I began my fieldwork in the school.

Although Mr. Kay supported the multi-ethnic policy initiative, characteristically, he kept his distance. One Head of House described this as his (Kay's) 'defensive posture'. In brief, Mr. Kay had given encouragement but no direction or leadership. He did not monitor the policy nor did he appear to regard it as a priority. Why, then, did he support the policy

initiative?   One   explanation emerged from a first interview

(April 1979) with Mr. Thomas, an Afro-Caribbean Head of House,

who told me he felt that Mr. Kay was predisposed to working for

and encouraging multiculturalism and antiracism in an active way

becaue he was Jewish. Mr. Thomas explained that

> I want to feel that the fact that he is Jewish
> and has had a tremendous amount of experience
> in having been discriminated against, being
> subjected to racist insults.....that one of
> the reasons he's taken kindly to this policy
> initiative is because he can identify to some
> extent. I think you'd find if you go round to
> other schools in this authority, that despite
> the MCE policy initiative, nothing much is being
> done. Sometimes there's a bit of 'tokenism'; the
> argument is that it takes time. I feel, however,
> that it is because a number of these heads are
> totally ignorant about what they should be doing.
> Unfortunately, they haven't been given direction
> from the Authority. (Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

While Mr. Kay's support for the MCE policy was genuine, it is

likely that   he was also influenced by the concept of school

'ethos' which   was widely discussed following the publication

of Rutter et   al's   Fifteen   Thousand   Hours(1979).   The

hypothesis of the Rutter study went   somewhat   against the

prevailing   wisdom, which suggested that   schools matter less

than home background.   Rutter et al argued to the contrary:

schools do provide a positive influence on their pupils'

development despite the fact that the school might serve an

inner-city area of chronic social disadvantage such as the one

in which East End High was situated. 'Ethos' here was defined

in terms of the cumulative effect of various social factors in

the school which combined

> to create a particular 'ethos', or set of
> values, attitudes and behaviours which will
> become characteristic of the school as a whole.
> (Rutter et al 1979:179)

Mr. Kay had spoken about 'ethos' at staff meetings.   One type

of 'ethos' he particularly wanted to encourage in East End High was a multicultural one.

Inside schools, headteachers are also strongly influenced by senior members of staff who collectively make up the management team. In East End High three of Mr. Kay's senior teachers were black, and it is likely that he was influenced by them to promote the policy. They had responded favourably to the ILEA policy initiative, and in turn Mr. Kay encouraged them and other teachers to move toward MCE policy development and implementation.

THE INFLUENCE OF THREE SENIOR BLACK TEACHERS

The three senior black male teachers (two Afro-Caribbean and one mixed race) promoted a multicultural school 'ethos' in substantive ways. In their different roles, Mr. Ogden, Deputy Head for Pastoral Care, Mr. Ojukwu, Head of English and the Sixth Form, and Mr. Thomas, Head of House/English teacher, contributed to establishing an atmosphere in the school whereby the presence of black teachers in senior management positions was accepted. They had achieved their status on the basis of merit and had not benefitted from positive discrimination. Collectively these teachers helped to establish an increased multicultural awareness. Individually they encouraged other teachers to work toward defining multicultural aims and objectives in East End High as will be seen below.

In Mr. Kay's account of recent changes in staffing, he made no explicit reference to the fact that three senior teachers were black. He was more concerned with staff stability which had

gradually improved throughout the 1970s. Mr. Ogden, Deputy Head

in charge of Pastoral Care, had arrived in 1974. Mr. Ojukwu,

Head of English and Sixth Form, had joined the staff in 1974 and

been promoted in 1976. Mr. Thomas, Head of House, had been on

the staff since 1972 and became a Housemaster in 1977. Thus the

timing of these senior teachers taking up their posts was

significant. Mr. Thomas noted that,

> In 1972-74, there used to be a number of
> confrontations between teachers and black
> kids. At that time there were perhaps 3-4
> black teachers......There were two of us
> to whom the kids related and came to for
> discussion and counselling. There used to
> be confrontations with certain white members of
> staff and these boys. What we got from these boys
> was that they were being discriminated against
> or picked on by certain white kids in the school.
> Teachers didn't seem to understand how they
> should relate to black working class kids. I
> don't think they know how to relate to white
> working class kids. Inevitably the kids
> interpreted attitudes of a number of teachers
> as racist, prejudiced, what have you.(Mr. Thomas:
> April 3, 1979)

Thomas continued by explaining that

> in the opinion of a lot of people here
> and outside, when Mr. Ogden arrived in 1974,
> he made a lot of difference to discipline in
> this school. He does cane a few children
> when he thinks it's necessary, but more
> important than that is his status as a black
> person in this school. I think it means quite
> a lot (perhaps they don't articulate it in this
> way) to black boys who happen to make up nearly
> 50%, to have Mr. Ogden in a senior position. He
> is someone to whom they can relate, identify and
> listen to in assemblies. (Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

Mr. Thomas' views about the significance of Mr. Ogden's status

as a black Deputy Head was reinforced by Mr. Ojukwu. When I

asked Mr. Ojukwu to tell me whether 'race' was an important

factor in East End High:

There isn't any tension in the school. I
think it's partly because of Ogden. Ogden
is someone who is rather authoritarian, but
the children like him. They can trust him;
they know the limits, how far they can go.
(Mr. Ojukwu: July 7, 1979)

I asked Mr. Ojukwu if he felt Mr. Ogden's impending departure
(Ogden was due to take a headship at another school in the
Authority at the beginning of the next school year, 1979) would
make any difference to the ethos of the school. Was it like
having a father figure leave the family? Mr. Ojukwu said
"yes". Many of the youngsters had been in the school for the
four years that Mr. Ogden had been there. Mr. Ojukwu thought it
might be possible to replace Ogden with another black Deputy
Head, but he didn't think there was much chance of that
happening.

Mr. Ojukwu explained that Ogden had been instrumental in
generating support for the ILEA's MCE policy initiative in East
End High. He expressed the view that even though the Head
favoured the Multi-Ethnic Policy initiative, it was by no means
certain that if left to his own devices, Mr. Kay would have
taken a principled stand on MCE policy implementation. This
point was reinforced by Mr. Thomas who explained that Ogden
had encouraged the polytechnic lecturers' series of six talks
on Afro-Caribbean culture and history held after school so all
staff could attend, remarking that,

> Ogden influenced the Head into allowing the
> lecturers to come into the school. I don't
> think I would have been as influential because
> of my status as a housemaster. And Mr. Ojukwu
> is 'very English', and while black [mixed
> race, with a white mother], he does not identify
> with certain things that are black, nor has he
> had these experiences, upbringing. There are
> certain things Ojukwu simply doesn't understand.
> I don't know if anyone ever explained to him
> what it is like being black and growing up in
> a racist society. (Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

It was Mr. Ogden who had set up a Multicultural Education Committee in 1978. As is common with school committees or 'working parties', membership was voluntary and open to all staff. The number of staff (in 1978-79) in regular attendance at meetings was approximately 15, with Mr. Ogden taking the chair. Minutes from initial meetings (autumn 1978) indicated that Mr. Ogden had a very explicit set of aims which centred on examining subject syllabuses in East End High. He was keen to change the ethos of subject teaching to reflect the multicultural nature of British society; he wanted to move away from an assimilationist-eurocentric curriculum which was, he explained, conceived in homogeneous and ethnocentric terms:

> If we examine British education we will
> observe that (a) it is conservative in nature;
> (b) ideas of learning and teaching were derived
> for a homogeneous society. The change in the
> composition of the pupil population must be
> reflected in the manner of education. The clientele
> has changed so some adaptation is necessary.
> It is an accepted fact that children learn more
> readily where there is some identification with
> the learning matter or with the teaching material
> ....(Ogden's notes to staff-autumn 1978.
> Appendix 7.1)

Mr. Ogden's orientation clearly complemented the aims of the Authority's MCE policy initiative. One can speculate that if Mr. Ogden had remained in post it is likely that the Multicutural Education Committee would probably have played a more significant role in the life of East End High subsequently.

However, an ominous early warning emerged in my first interview

with Mr. Thomas, who had no hesitation in telling me that

> headteachers refuse—fail to generate any
> sort of interest among their staff in the
> multi-ethnic. They leave it to 'working
> parties' or a multi-ethnic sub-committee
> which, after a certain time, just peters out.
> (Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

Later on in my fieldwork (July 1981), Mr. Thomas's early warning

was substantively reinforced by   Mr. Ojukwu (not even a member

of   the Multicultural Education Committee)   who   saw   the

Multicultural Education Committee as peripheral:

> I think what's gone wrong is that what you
> need is a curriculum working party set up by
> the Head and run by a Deputy Head....with
> the absolute clout of authority. [It] sits
> down and reviews everything that goes on from
> all points of view and a multicultural one
> is obviously an important element.....the
> M-C-E Comm.,[in East End High] has suffered
> because they haven't had the clout and [they
> can't] effect changes within departments because
> they don't have the authority.
> (Mr. Ojukwu July 21, 1981)

With hindsight, I came to see that Mr. Thomas's initial

scepticism, coupled with Mr. Ojukwu's views concerning the

Multicultural Education Committee's lack of power, did not bode

well for the future success of the Committee.   In fact, it

transpired   that the Committee only played a marginal role in

the school in the period of my research.   However, in the early

phase of my fieldwork this was not my impression or

expectation. My initial impression was reinforced when I talked

to the second Deputy Head, Mr. Morrish, who took every

opportunity to insist that East End High was committed to MCE.

MR. MORRISH: SECOND DEPUTY HEAD

Morrish described himself as a very experienced Social Studies

teacher with a long-standing commitment to multiculturalism. He had been a social studies department head at another school for six years, a social studies Advisory Teacher in the Authority, had written a social studies teachers' handbook, and edited a series of social studies texts with a broad-based world perspective. As Deputy Head in East End High, he tried to recruit teachers (as senior staff retired) who were committed to developing a multicultural ethos. He also took pains to explain that irrespective of the fact that recent immigration to Britain had changed the composition of the school's population, "this really made no difference to the concept of multicultural education". In the light of this information, it was odd that Mr. Morrish was not himself a member of the Multicultural Education Commmittee.

Mr. Morrish conveyed a sense that the ethos in East End High had changed during the past 4-8 years. He spoke with considerable pride about the recent success of the school in competitions. The school had come first in the 'Youth Speaks' competition which involved pupils competing with teams from traditional grammar schools; and the school's steel band was acclaimed when it played at the Festival Hall. The teacher who had developed the high standard of the steel band in East End High had recently joined the Authority's music inspectorate. Mr. Morrish described the school as

> a happy and caring school.....everybody
> everybody knows that people are on equal terms.
> (Mr Morrish: March 26,1979)

Mr. Morrish encouraged me to meet the housemasters in charge of pastoral care. For pastoral purposes the school was divided into six houses headed by the following members of staff. I

proceeded to arrange to meet these teachers.

PROFILE OF SIX HOUSEMASTERS

NAME	NO. YEARS in EEH	AGE	SUBJECT TAUGHT
Mr. Hoxton	20	mid-60s	Maths/Tech.Drawing
Mr. Davey	9	mid-30s	English
Mr. Ballard	11	mid-30s	Integrated Studies
Mr. Thomas	10	mid-40s	English
Mr. Jacobs	15	mid-40s	English
Mr. Wickham	13	late-30s	Social Studies

Interviews with housemasters were taped and conducted in their offices adjacent to their houserooms. Although housemasters made every effort 'not to be disturbed' during the interview, the unpredictable and urgent nature of pastoral responsibilities frequently made this impossible.

Since my main aim in these interviews was to find out how they saw their roles as pastoral heads and whether multicultural education was of any concern to them, I encouraged them to elucidate on their work without directing them to comment explicitly the ILEA Multi-Ethnic policy initiative. Six issues emerged from these interviews.

First was the matter of school rules and discipline with reference to uniform. A disproportionate amount of time at staff meetings seemed to be given over to deciding what policy on uniform should be. This often meant that other pressing matters were insufficiently discussed (the MCE policy initiative, for example). School uniform was important, however, because it focused attention on the economic circumstances of boys who were unable to maintain a good standard of dress. In the third year school uniform was particularly significant because this was the point in a boy's school career when he was most likely to start truanting unless he had exam prospects. Fourth and fifth year boys knew uniform regulations were not strictly enforced,

were lax about wearing it, and, consequently, less likely to be
caught when bunking off. Linked to the school's policy on
uniform were general matters of discipline. Housemasters'
attitudes toward corporal punishment (caning) were important at
this time because the Authority had decided to abolish it from
January 1981. Mr. Thomas was adamantly opposed to caning, while
Mr. Ballard felt,

> there is a case for caning, because
> in an environment like this, rough as this,
> where that sort of violence is used by
> the family, anything weaker in their [the
> boy's] eyes....is regarded as a soft option
> ....In a place like this you've got to have
> something that is a positive statement.
> (Mr. Ballard:July 2, 1979)

These two matters, school uniform and corporal punishment,
revealed a lack of consensus among staff in terms of
coherent code of discipline in the school. Pupils recognised
that their teachers' views differed and they were likely to
exploit any opportunities they could find to break 'school
rules'.

A second issue was the depressed nature of the area where the
boys lived. Mr. Hoxton (white English with 20 years of teaching
in East End High) had been born and raised a mile from the
school. He conveyed a vivid picture of the disadvantages the
area conferred on its inhabitants which was very pronounced in
the formative years of childhood and adolescence.

> I went out to work at 14. My parents couldn't
> keep me at school in the 30s. I got into teaching
> because I wanted to make the kids around here
> feel they were somebody. I started the House
> system here 20 years ago...because when comprehen-
> sives came in they realised that no Head could manage
> 1200 boys- or [rather] you'd need six small head-
> masters--the Heads of Houses.
> (Mr. Hoxton: July 4, 1979)

A close colleague of Mr. Hoxton's, Mr. Wickham (white English with ten years in East End High and due to go on secondment for a year to complete an Advanced Diploma course in '79-'80), expressed strong views about the disadvantaged nature of the environment which he felt directly affected the pastoral work of the school. Alluding to the 'tough area' he said,

> we're not a prime area for people to want to
> come and teach in. You need good [teaching]
> material—more so—maybe some of the teachers
> who have such terrible problems might
> survive in a more middle class area....
> (Mr. Wickham: July 5, 1979)

While Mr. Wickham was preoccupied with trying to control the difficult behaviour problems, Mr. Jacobs (Israeli, 15 years in the school) spent a great deal of time looking after the boys' welfare. He was actively engaged in obtaining Local Authority grants for school clothing and pocket money which he sometimes doled out on a daily basis to individual boys:

> If they had to rely on their parents for
> money, they would never have any.
> (Mr. Jabobs: March 29, 1979)

Here the importance of parental attitudes emerged. All six housemasters visited the boys' homes when necessary, but the home-school links were not as stable as they should have been.

Teacher incompetence, the third issue to emerge, became more significant in the course of my fieldwork. Two housemasters expressed their concern about this matter:

> Certain teachers here have no idea. Why
> they're in teaching I have no idea. You
> often have to back the kids against the
> staff.(Mr. Hoxton: July 4, 1979)

Mr. Wickham echoed these sentiments more forcefully and in greater detail:

> We are only 'keeping the lid on'. When kids
> knock on your door [they've been sent out of
> of class to see their Head of House] for crass
> things like throwing pencils and staff can't
> discipline them, you know that people in this
> school are useless...they can't teach and the
> kids can't understand them. What am I supposed
> to do? I can't whack a kid for that. There is
> a member of staff here who has taken his
> probationary year 12 times. The only way is to
> have a contract system. You'd see them [staff]
> jump then! (Mr. Wickham: July 5, 1979)

Wickham elaborated:

> The biggest problem is if they're not going
> to put money into education, then they're not
> going to get the returns. It's that simple. Can't
> get science, maths, technical design teachers———
> they all go into industry.....We employ staff
> who are absolutely incompetent. There must be
> 12-20 people in this school, if you walk round
> and look into their classroom, if you were a parent
> or an ordinary thinking adult, you'd be absolutely
> horrified and they are employed because there's nothing
> better or we've got to have somebody...How can
> I perform competently when I know there are people
> in charge of the classes who are pleading with
> me to do something about the kids because
> they're [the kids] tearing them apart, when I know
> there's absolutely nothing I can do.(Mr. Wickham:
> July 5, 1979)

Undoubtdely teacher incompetence in East End High presented

problems and was related to the fourth issue, low pupil

achievement. One of the causes of poor performance which

characterised this comprehensive school was that the intake of

pupils was not evenly balanced across the three bands of

ability (see discussion of this point in chapter 4). This

situation posed difficulties even for the most able teachers.

In circumstances where poor rates of achievement were the norm,

weak or 'incompetent' teachers exacerbated the situation.

The fifth issue to emerge was the organisation and

administration in East End High. My initial impression that

'all was well' was soon dispelled by Mr. Wickham, who told me
in forthright terms how difficult if not impossible it was to do
a proper pastoral job in the school as presently constituted.
(Mr. Wickham was going on secondment in the following school year.
He probably gave me an 'insider's view', because he wouldn't be
around in 1979-1980.) Although five of his fellow housemasters
described their philosophy and practice of pastoral care in a
positive light, Wickham's views were negative. He began by
explaining that in theory the pastoral role

> is the key factor in organisation and
> administration of sound discipline, behaviour,
> personal relationships and effective integration
> of pupils within the school...The fact is that
> it doesn't quite work that way; it sounds better
> than it is.(Mr. Wickham: July 5, 1979)

This information contradicted what the other Heads had told me.
But then perhaps others were less critical and more willing to
accept the status quo at a time when school reorganisation and
amalgamation with a neighbouring school were emerging as <u>the</u>
organisational and administrative priorities for the forthcoming
year.

Mr. Wickham elaborated on the organisational and administrative
shortcomings in detail. Echoing the Head's (Mr. Kay) lack of
belief in democracy, Wickham told me,

> the hierarchy in the school is confusing
> and under-consultative...with lipservice,
> one gets the impression that the hierarchy
> consider the pastoral side to be the most
> effective and most important function within
> the school. If you examine it carefully,
> you'll see that isn't the case.
> (Mr. Wickham: July 5, 1979)

Mr. Wickham's view that the 'hierarchy is under-consultative' was
to surface at several points in subsequent interviews with
teachers.

A sixth issue to emerge from these interviews concerned the significance of the Authority's policy on MCE and the school's commitment to its implementation. While the Head and his two Deputies expressed firm support for MCE policy implementation, two Housemasters, Mr. Hoxton and Mr. Ballard, were not members of the MCEd Committee. Perhaps the fact that Mr. Hoxton was retiring at the end of the school year (1979) explained his absence. Mr. Ballard's comments implied he was not interested in actively promoting multicultural education. Mr. Ballard expressed a preference for teacher autonomy which implementing this policy might threaten. Mr.Thomas, (one of the three senior black teachers) on the other hand, was adamant about the need to develop MCE awareness and consciousness throughout the school. He was strongly committed to the policy and was subsequently elected Chair of the Multicultural Education Committee in January 1980. Mr. Thomas expressed his views in the following way:

> A number of people are suspicious....they see
> all this demand----the call for MCE, as a threat.
> I can understand why. It is a threat.
> (Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

In his role as Housemaster, Mr. Thomas recognised that,

> I have a responsibility to white kids as
> well, to 'decondition', 'desocialise' them. But
> I also have a responsibility to black kids about
> black consciousness, the need for them to under-
> stand what their position is about. I would not
> do it in the presence of white kids lest they mis-
> interpret my motives. I have a good relatonship
> with the Head and white parents [so]...if this
> gets back to people, it could be misinterpreted:
> 'here is a racist, a black activist trying to
> brainwash our kids....'(Mr. Thomas: April 3, 1979)

Mr. Davey's (white English) views on MCE were in sharp contrast to Mr. Thomas's. Mr. Davey's remarks only touched on MCE in an

indirect way. He felt a boy's House identity fulfilled an important function:

> ...I think the ability to identify with
> a group [house] rather than an ethnic or
> racial group is important.
> (Mr. Davey: June 29, 1979)

Of the remaining four housemasters, three were adamant that there was no black-white problem in the school. But their comments did not address issues of MCE in the wider sense, ie., that Britain was a multicultural and multiracial society and this should be reflected inside schools in a number of ways. Instead they spoke mainly about relationships within the narrow framework of East End High. Note the following examples: Mr. Hoxton stressed that,

> we're dealing with children not colour,
> ....There is a sense of fear of the unknown,
> but there is no difference between a black
> mum and a white mum. (Mr. Hoxton: July 4, 1979)

Mr. Jacobs told me:
> I do not see colour. Other staff do not
> understand this about me...but I am Israeli
> and perhaps it is because I am not really
> part of this society. I am not at all concerned
> about race...I do not find race a problem in
> this school.(Mr. Jacobs: March 29, 1979)

Mr. Wickham was quick to dismiss the 'ethnic thing' altogether. He explained that
> exposing the situation can create
> the 'problem',....the lectures on Caribbean
> history were a waste of time.
> (Mr. Wickham: July 5, 1979)

Mr. Ballard only made a passing reference to MCE in relation to curriculum change. He explained that the World History syllabus had replaced Tudors and Stuarts and the Integrated Studies (I.S.) syllabus was flexible, enabling some teachers to look at the history of the slave trade, New World, and the Caribbean.

Thus, housemasters did express a growing awareness of the relevance of MCE in East End High and a wide spectrum of views

emerged. Mr. Wickham's comments indicated that 'exposing the situation might create problems', while Mr. Thomas' position clearly revealed that some teachers had strongly-held pro-MCE opinions. These views are more fully explored below in this chapter and in the chapter on the Multicultural Education Committee.

FOUR SUBJECT TEACHERS

Phase I research also included four exploratory interviews with subject teachers in the following departments [number of staff in brackets]: English (11 staff), Social Studies (7 full-time/1 part-time staff), History (4 staff), Commerce (1 teacher). Neither Integrated Studies (I.S.), with a core syllabus containing Social Studies, History, Geography and Community for all 1st and 2nd year pupils, nor Geography departments were investigated in this phase. These departments were later researched, and findings will be discussed towards the end of the chapter. The aim of these four exploratory interviews was to elicit views from teachers on matters such as how they organised their pedagogy and curricula, ie. in mixed ability or sets, their understanding of the meaning of multicultural education, and to find out whether any changes had been made in the curricula in the light of the multi-ethnic policy directive.

PROFILE OF FOUR SUBJECT TEACHERS

NAME	No.YEARS IN EEH	AGE	SUBJECT TAUGHT
Mr. Hudson	6	late-20s	History
Mr. Whitten	10	mid-30s	Commerce/Bus. Studies
Ms. Foster	8	late-20s	Social Studies
Mr. Ojukwu	5	mid-30s	English

MR. OJUKWU: HEAD OF ENGLISH & SIXTH FORM

Mr. Ojukwu, The Head of English and Sixth Form, explained what

the department was doing by way of MCE. He had been department head for three years and had taken over from a man who had been in East End High for many years. Mr. Ojukwu was highly motivated, innovatory and had strong leadership qualities. He had been involved in promoting the Bullock Report's recommendations for 'language across the curriculum' (Bullock 1975). In the English Department he was endeavouring to order books written by and about black or Indian people because MCE was largely understood in terms of presenting work, books, and ideas from many cultures. Films which made reference to other races, were sought out as well as project work to encourage pupils to look at other cultures. A key aim was to encourage white and black children to read black literature which portrayed black people in non-stereotyped situations. Syllabus changes had been implemented in order to make the curriculum more multicultural and the department had adopted a Mode 3 syllabus, used in another school in the authority, because it had a multicultural approach. The Authority's English Adviser, with responsibility for Afro-Caribbean children, had advised departmental staff, taught classes with regular teachers observing and provided reading lists. Mr. Ojukwu explained that there was not much literature available about black children born in London but Dhondy and Linton Kwesi Johnson were read. The preference was for Afro-Caribbean culture because the Afro-Caribbean boys were the largest minority in EEH, and Ojukwu felt they were more likely to be discontented, ie. in need something to interest them. Other cultural minorities didn't get the same amount of attention. Ojukwu remarked,

> It's important for the [black pupils] to see
> blacks producing good literature....this gives
> a positive image of blacks. It's also important
> for them to have black characters to identify with.
> There's also the point that black children are more

likely to want to read if they have black characters
to read about. The demand for books with black char-
acters is not so great in the 1st and 2nd years, but
it is by the time they get to the 4th year. We
haven't really got to grips with Africa either. The
West Indian kids often laugh at the African ones and
make jokes about natives.(Mr. Ojukwu: July 7, 1979)

In the first two years pupils were taught in mixed ability
groups by English Department staff who contributed to the
core course based in the Integrated Studies Department. There
was some residual friction between the Integrted Studies (I.S.)
and English Departments because a few years earlier English had
been part of the I.S. curriculum, even though no English
teachers had been based in the I.S. Department. The head of
I.S. was not happy with this situation because he felt he had
lost control of the Integrated Studies course due to the loss
of English. In the English Department, third year pupils were
allocated to two top sets, four middle sets and two semi-remedial
sets taught by the English Department; two remedial sets were
taught by the Remedial Department.

When he became Department head, Mr. Ojukwu had made a concerted
effort to change the system of setting because he found that
previously too many black pupils had been allocated to bottom
sets. Mr. Ojukwu's review of setting allocations was beginning
to result in more black pupils passing 'O' level language and
literature; a few had gone on to take 'A' level. In the 4th year
there was one 'O' level set, 9 mixed ability CSE sets and 1
remedial set taught by the Remedial Department. Mr. Ojukwu
further explained,

This year we are trying an experiment in the
4th and 5th years and have a separate set
of difficult boys. It will be taught by a
fairly senior teacher committed to getting
something done. We thought carefully about

this and because most of the boys in the set
next year are black, they are going to be taught
by Mr. Thomas who is black himself. (July 6, 1979)

Academic work at Sixth Form level had increased with 4 boys doing English 'A' level and 18 doing 'O' level. The 'O' level pupils were mainly resitting or trying to improve their CSE grades to 'O' level standard. There were 21 boys doing CEE. From Mr. Ojukwu's account, it appeared that the changes he had introduced were beginning to result in higher rates of achievement amongst boys of Afro-Caribbean origin. Further, he was implementing the recommendations from reports and studies which called for more black teachers as role models (Select Committee 1977, Redbridge 1978). And his strategy to introduce literature by black authors was also a decisive move in a multicultural direction.

MS. FOSTER: SECOND-IN-CHARGE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Social Studies was part of the core curriculum of the school and all pupils were taught in mixed ability groups. The curricula consisted of 'Personal Relationships' in the 3rd year and CSE Social Studies in the 4th and 5th years. No Sixth Form work was done. Some boys were entered for 'O' level Sociology in their fifth year, however, because the Head of Social Studies offered it as an optional extra after school to any 5th form boy willing to make the commitment (an offer he made over and above his normal teaching load). Although 'O' level Sociology in the 5th form was voluntary, it provided an opportunity for highly motivated pupils, a few of whom were black, to try for an 'O' level which was not part of the package of set options. Approximately 15 boys had attended regularly (1978-79) and the pass rate for the option in 'O' level Sociology in the 5th year

had improved in the last two years. (see Exam Sample pass rates in chapter five)

Ms. Foster, (white English) second in charge of Social Studies, had taught in East End High for 8 years. As she saw it, there were two approaches to MCE: (1) looking at the cultural backgrounds of different children and (2) looking at the specific problems faced by the children such as racial prejudice. In both approaches, teachers needed to be aware that the materials they used must be relevant to the children and the problems they faced. She felt it was also desirable to have more teachers from different ethnic backgrounds. Regarding the actual definition and practice of MCE, Ms. Foster felt this was up to the classroom teacher to interpret because to a large extent different subjects would dictate the approach to MCE. There was, however, an important relationship between MCE and Social Studies as Ms Foster explained:

> [In Social Studies] we are looking at the
> society, community, and problems in detail.
> The curriculum looks at problems of racism
> and discrimination....A multicultural approach
> is inherent in everything we do because of the
> varied backgrounds of the children. In the 4th
> year we look at world religions, 5th year we
> look at prejudice and discrimination. We have
> been tackling questions like these for a long time,
> certainly before there was an attempt to
> introduce MCE throughout the school.
> (Ms Foster: July 6, 1979

Ms. Foster explained that MCE was important because it could give children a sense of identity, helping black children to feel part of what was going on. She felt more positive images of black people were needed in books, on TV, in adverts——— not just stereotypes, figures of fun or scapegoats.

At this stage, Ms Foster was not yet a member of the

Multicultural Education Committee, although Mr. Cox, Head of Social Studies, was. Ms Foster thought

> there is a real possibility that the Committee
> will collapse when Mr. Ogden leaves. They don't
> really publicise themselves enough. Some of the
> staff are very suspicious. They feel threatened
> by people poking into what they are doing.
> (Ms Foster:July 6, 1979)

She did mention, however, that while some teachers might be prejudiced, they would not put their prejudices into practice in the classroom.

> Some staff have worked here for a long time
> and have seen the school change a lot. Many of
> the staff live out of the area and don't see
> the problems the kids have in the area....many
> staff aren't aware of the problems outside of
> school. I don't know whether we really help
> to prepare them for living and working in the
> community. I hope this is what Social Studies
> is doing. This school works hard for all the
> kids in it, and the bright children will succeed
> regardless of colour. (Ms Foster: July 6, 1979)

Given that Social Studies was a core subject which all boys had to take, it emerged as a crucial area for further exploration. Because topics such as 'world religions' and 'prejudice and discrimination' were taught to all pupils, the content and pedagogy here was an obvious area where the curriculum could be said to be multicultural. The 4th and 5th year syllabus did come under scrutiny by the Multicultural Education Committee at a later stage in my fieldwork and is discussed in chapter 7.

MR. HUDSON: HISTORY.

In the first two years History was part of the Integrated Studies syllabus, but from the third year History was taught separately. Currently a new 3rd year course was being prepared for 1979-80 and was planned as a self-contained unit to be taught in mixed ability groups. The aim was to acquaint boys with the

contemporary world including a term on America, China, and Russia, a term of Colonialism and the Third World, and a final term on 20th century wars and the conflict between capitalism and communism. Although Mr. Hudson admitted it was an ambitious and crowded programme, he felt those boys who progressed on to examinable courses in history would be able to cover the areas in more detail. In the 4th and 5th years CSE and 'O' level were taught and 'A' level was offered in the 6th Form along with CSE and 'O' level resits. In the current school year, 1978-79, there were 25 'O' level and 30 CSE candidates in the 5th year and 3 boys attempting 'A' level. The Head of Department was in charge of arranging LINK courses with the local College of Further Education and consequently was not involved with the school's history curriculum.

Mr. Hudson (white, Northern Irish) explained that in East End High, MCE often meant West Indian culture, with hardly any reference to Asian or Greek or Turkish Cypriot culture.

> I think there is a need for children to know
> about their origins, but this should be in relation
> to British history. MCE should reflect the cultures
> of the children who are actually in the class.
> (Mr. Hudson: July 3, 1979)

Mr. Hudson felt there was
> ....a need to treat African history seriously,
> to make the kids take it seriously....if we
> have a film about Zulus, some kids treat it as
> a huge joke (usually the West Indian pupils) and
> point to other black kids and drum on the desks
> and laugh....[This type of incident] gives you
> the chance to look at prejudice and talk about
> it. Here the teaching and the teacher is impor-
> tant. The teaching must be anti-racist....There
> is a problem with some of the material. Some of
> it is very condescending. I mean the World History
> material on Africa. It seems to encourage the
> kids to make racist comments.
> (Mr.Hudson: July 3, 1979)

Mr. Hudson elaborated:

> I think the West Indian kids feel an attraction
> for the West Indies. They feel rejected here
> ....they're caught between two cultures....On
> the other hand, if anybody should feel rejected
> in Britain it's the Asians. Nearly all the kids
> look down on them...Yet they work in school. They
> achieve. They're motivated. I think this comes
> from their background...from their home and their
> culture. I think we should look at the background
> of West Indians to see if there are problems there—
> you know, things like one-parent families. We keep
> saying that it's the school that's the problem, that
> they feel rejected. And yet other groups, like Asians
> or the Cypriots have got the motivation.
> (Mr. Hudson:July 3, 1979)

Looking back, Mr. Hudson's comments on the effectiveness and appropriateness of multicultural education signalled a sceptical note. He was not on the the Multicultural Education Committee which may be explained by the following sentiments.

> I think that a lot of multicultural education
> is window dressing. It's very fashionable
> just now. A lot of people were doing this sort
> of thing already. It's like the Government's
> attitude, eg. the Race Relations Act. It makes
> them look better but it dosen't change prejudice.
> I feel that teaching can change attitudes, lessen
> prejudice, but people were doing this anyway.
> (Mr. Hudson: July 3, 1979)

Mr. Hudson's account was somewhat inconsistent. Multicultural education was 'fashionable', yet it was also necessary in order to address issues of race prejudice. However, this orientation was already firmly in place in the curriculum, in Mr. Hudson's opinion. The History Department was in the process of developing a new syllabus with a distinctly global approach and for those boys who could achieve academically. It was significant that Mr. Hudson mentioned that Asians and Cypriots achieved while pupils of Afro-Caribbean origin tended not to. That he attributed this in part to the lack of stability in their home backgrounds tied in with ILEA's findings. Mabey (1981), who

was a researcher for the Research and Statistics Branch of the ILEA, wrote <u>Black British Literacy</u> which discussed the West Indian experience of immigration, linguistic, social and environmental handicaps and teacher expectations as possible explanations for low levels of literacy.

MR. WHITTEN: COMMERCE

Mr. Whitten (white English), Head of Commerce, taught Commerce and Accounts to 'O' and 'A' level, CSE Economics and Sociology to 'O' and 'A' level, Politics and Government to 'O' and 'A' level. Commerce and Accounts were taught in the 4th, 5th and 6th Forms; other subjects were taught only in the 6th Form. Sociology and Economics were taught as one year 'O' level and one year 'A' level courses, with Accounts 'A' level taught over two years. This seemed a very heavy teaching load for one member of staff but Mr. Whitten, a bit of a maverick, did not seem to regard this as unmanageable. He was somewhat cynical, often joking; he even had an occasional slot in the weekly Staff Notice entitled: 'Harry Whitten's Agony Column'. Still, even with small classes, I wondered how he managed to teach all these subjects.

His cynical views on MCE are best expressed in his own words:

> I imagine that MCE would be directed towards
> an analysis and understanding of different
> ethnic groups in contemporary society. There
> seems to be a general commitment that MCE is a
> good thing. It's the liberal thing to do to give
> equal weight to different cultures. But I
> doubt if it holds water. I wonder if there are
> any educational reasons for doing it. It seems
> to be a way of coping with difficult West Indian
> kids. It could be a pernicious means of social
> control. It's hypocrisy to say that other cultures
> are equally valued within Western culture. It's a
> sop, guiding people away from genuine academic
> courses which might advance them. In any case,
> it's not really multicultural, but is mainly West
> Indian and Asian. There's nothing about the Greeks,

and Turks or Jews. Also the culture of the East End
is ignored.... (Mr. Whitten:July 3, 1979)
Mr. Whitten's views   also   implied   that   MCE was an excuse for
pupils not pursuing 'real' subjects:

> People might be saying that you can't do
> [ie. are not intelligent enough to do] science
> or maths...so [instead] let's look at where you
> come from...and study that...there is a total
> ignorance on the part of some teachers about the
> logic of Western culture...the development of
> industry and science and technology...I think
> that multicultural education is a measure to deal
> with a disaffected minority, the West Indian
> troublemakers....It's supposed to help promote a
> sense of identity but how is multicultural education
> going to enhance self-identity? It's more likely
> to create a sort of cultural schizophrenia.
> (Mr. Whitten: July 3, 1979)

Mr. Whitten felt MCE had few redeeming features:

> I can't see any   benefits for children.
> I think it exaggerates problems. I don't
> think it helps with educational attainment or
> potential. The problem areas in society which
> multicultural education might deal with ought to
> be things which are raised and discussed anyway.   ·
> (Mr. Whitten: July 3, 1979)

Mr. Whitten also spoke about staff attitudes toward MCE:

> ...a minority of staff are becoming hostile
> to the idea. They feel they are having multi-
> cultural thrust on them--imposed from above.
> There hasn't been any open discussion. The Multi-
> cultural Meetings [outside lectures] concen-
> trated on West Indian culture which incensed many
> people. There are many other cultures represented
> in this school, not all of them black. I don't think
> multicultural offers a solution to the disruption
> caused by some black children. The causes of this,
> I feel, lie in the home background.
> (Mr. Whitten:July 3, 1979)

Mr. Whitten's critique was really a broadside attack on the

multicultural initiative in East End High. There were distinct

echoes of Stone's (1981) anti-MRE (multi-racial) position and to

an extent, Jeffcoate's (1979). In taking the view that MCE was

mainly a ploy to contain disaffected West Indian troublemakers,

Mr. Whitten echoed Dhondy's (1981) views about 'containing

indiscipline' cited in chapter 3.

Mr. Whitten's views not only highlighted some of the inadequacies of the LEA's MCE policy; he also challenged the need for and relevance of MCE in East End High. In his opinion there was no clear educational rationale or specific set of appropriate policy guidelines being debated in the school, and none were contained in the policy statement. It was difficult, however, to be sure whether he was genuinely willing to engage in serious and open debate. Perhaps his views reflected his isolated position in the school's departmental structure. He was in a two-member department, enjoyed a high degree of autonomy, taught subjects which pupils opted to take rather than core ones, and was not really forced to adapt the curriculum he taught to suit pupils' needs.

These four teachers' views are important in understanding the reception given the MCE policy initiative in East End High. They reflected both the 'pro' and 'anti' MCE positions. 'Pro' views were expressed by Mr. Ojukwu and Ms Foster in terms of curriculum change and pedagogic practice. They helped to identify where MCE curricula were already in place and where innovation was underway. Hudson's position straddled the pro/ anti-MCE divide. He appeared to see MCE as 'fashionable', a 'bandwagon' which some teachers were climbing on to, perhaps naively and without appreciating the wider context and political implications, yet he also acknowledged the need for antiracist teaching. The clearest 'anti' stance was Mr. Whitten's who felt MCE would be more likely to divide rather than unite staff. He identified the unarticulated, perhaps latent hostility some staff felt and also expressed eurocentric views about what counted as

appropriate knowledge, a central question in the MCE-ARE debate.

PHASE II
WHOLE STAFF SURVEY OF 'TEACHERS' OPINIONS ABOUT MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION'

The content and organisation of my questionnaire on 'Teachers' Opinions About Multi-Ethnic Education' evolved gradually and incorporated issues arising out of the ILEA Multi-Ethnic policy initiative in general and developments inside East End High in particular. The self-completion questionnaire was divided into five parts. Part one contained questions about the teacher's departmental role, subjects taught, special responsibilities and years in teaching. Part two asked about educational background and whether teachers were engaged in any part-time study. The third part collected demographic information including ethnic group identity. Part four queried teachers' opinions about multicultural education in general and the fifth part asked teachers to express their views about the role of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High.

FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY OF 'TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION'

The Sample:
The questionnaire was distributed to 84 teachers on June 1, 1981. Two teachers were away: one was ill and one was on study leave. By June 15th, 59 questionnaires had been returned completed with the exception of one which had been returned with the teacher's comment, "Returned Incompleted" written on it. The total final sample consists of 59 questionnaires.

        _1_   "returned incompleted"
        58 total sample returned completed/partially
            completed
This gave a response rate of 72%. Of these teachers, 53   were

full-time, 3 part-time and 2 supply. Where totals do not add up

to 59, information was not supplied.

The non-response total was 25 or 18% and the pattern of

non-response by Subject Departments is as follows:

DEPARTMENT	TEACHER TOTAL	NON-RESPONSE
English	11	3
Mathematics	7	0
Art	8	5
Social Studies(includes Commerce, History & Geography)	13	0
Design Technology	7 (includes 1 p-time)	1
Integrated Studies	3	1
Languages	3	0
Music	3	2
Remedial	8(includes 1 p-time & p-t Youth Leader)	3
Science	6	3
Physical Education	6	3
Other	4 (EWO, Librarian, & 2 Supply)	4
Head & Two Deputies	__3__	__0__
TOTAL	82	24

There was a high rate of response from teachers who taught

subjects which had a natural multicultural dimension, such as

English, Social Studies, History & Geography, Integrated

Studies, and Languages. However, other departments such as

Remedial, Mathematics and Design Technology also had high rates

of return.   All 7 maths teachers completed the questionnaire: 4

of these teachers were Asian, 1 was Greek, 1 was African and 1 of

ESWI origin.   Fewer than half the Art teachers completed (3 out

of 8), which might have reflected their remote physical location

since they were situated on the top floor of the building—7th

floor. Only half of the Physical Education and Science teachers

and one of the three Music teachers returned completed

questionnaires.

FINDINGS FROM PARTS III OF QUESTIONNAIRE (See Appendix 6.2 for

additional findings from Parts I and II of Teacher Questionnaire)

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF STAFF:

Sex: 47 men and 11 women: nearly 80% and 20%, respectively.

Age Structure	Total Numbers
21-29 years of age	14
30-39	20
40-49	17
Over 50	7
TOTAL	58

Most staff who completed the questionnaire were young, with 34

under 40 years. The more experienced staff, ie. those over 40,

are also well-represented with 24 completed questionnaires.

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STAFF:

African	2
Asian	7
English,Scots,Welsh, N.Irish (ESWI)	34
Greek	2
West Indian	5
Other (including 1 Israeli)	3
TOTAL	53

We can see from the ethnic profile of staff that EEH had a

genuinely multicultural teaching staff with a cross-section

of teachers coming from Asia (7), the West Indies (5), Africa

(2), Cyprus (2), and Other (3) origins, or 19 teachers with

backgrounds other than English, Scots, Welsh or Northern Irish.

FINDINGS FROM PART IV, 'TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON MULTI-ETHNIC

EDUCATION' consisted of seventeen statements relating to issues

about the MCE policy initiative and its implementation in East

End High. The statements were organised into a Likert scale and

teachers were asked to give their answers on a five-point scale

ranging from 'stongly agree', 'agree' through 'neutral' and on to 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree'. Some items were drawn from those used by Brittan (Brittan:1975/6) with a view to replicating aspects of her research on teachers' opinions in multiracial schools. The questions were designed to elicit views about aspects of the MCE policy initiative.

Comments on the findings are grouped into five clusters. The rationale for the five sets of clusteres statements is explained for each cluster respectively. In recording the responses, the responses 'strongly agree' and 'agree' hae been combined as are 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'.

FINDINGS FROM QUESTION 18: MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION IN GENERAL

Cluster   One: 'Policy   Orientation   of   Teachers'. Statements a,b,c,d and e were clustered together:

a- Schools have a responsibility to promote good race relations amongst pupils.

b- It is the obligation of LEAs to take positive action to eliminate racial discrimination and promote equal opportunitites.

c- The ILEA should have a multi-ethnic policy.

d- It is difficult to devise appropriate policies for schools without statistical monitoring of the ethnic composition of the pupil population.

e- We should keep records of the ethnic composition of the pupils population.

Rationale for the cluster:

While a policy promoting multi-ethnic education is seen here as racially inexplicit, it is nevertheless understood to embody the goals of racial equality, social justice and equality of educational opportunity. It also reflects a culturally plural rather than an assimilationist perspective. Theoretically this policy position inside a school would promote a whole school

multicultural ethos and support the principle of ethnic monitoring.

Comments on Cluster One:

There was overwhelming support by teachers for the need for schools not only to promote good race relations among pupils but also to take positive action; 95% agreed to both of these questions. This view was reinforced by 84% of teachers who felt the ILEA should have a multi-ethnic policy, with only 5% disagreeing and 11% neutral. Support for ethnic monitoring was less strong; 52% of the sample agreed that ethnic monitoring was a good idea, with 26% giving neutral replies and 22% disagreeing. Only one teacher forcefully expressed her views on this issue. She did not answer these specific questions, but instead wrote the following comments on her questionnaire:

> It would be useful to have an approximate idea
> at least and would enable monitoring of achievement
> but I would oppose such a move in the current
> political climate.

The issue of ethnic monitoring and record-keping was controversial at this time (see New Society:6.12.1984; Booth 1983) even though the ILEA, CRE and NUT favoured the policy. (See Note 1 at end of chapter)

Cluster Two: 'Operationalising Multi-Ethnic Policy'.
Statements f,g,and h were clustered.

f- The curriculum should reflect an understanding of the different cultures and races that make up our society.

g- The school curriculum contains a patronising and dismissive view of other cultures, religions and societies.

h- What is needed is a closer scrutiny of factors within the schools that are important in structuring achievement and underachievement.

Rationale for the cluster:

Curriculum change was a major aspect in operationalising multi-ethnic policy. Accordingly, the examination of existing school curricula to eliminate racially biased/eurocentric syllabuses and pedagogic practice was central to promoting a culturally pluralist rather than an assimilationist orientation. (Tomlinson:1983, Craft, ed. 1984, Craft & Bardell eds.:1984) Internal school organisation (ie. setting, streaming, mixed ability teaching) also needs to be taken into account when evaluating how school practices contributed to academic performance and rates of achievement. These aspects of internal school organisation should be scrutinised in terms of how they promoted or inhibited achievement/underachievement and equality of educational opportunity.

Comments on Cluster Two:

Teachers overwhelmingly agreed that the curriculum should reflect the multiracial nature of our society (86%) and that factors within the school associated with achievement and underachievement should be examined more closely (83%). Opinion was more evenly divided as to the allegedly patronising view of non-indigeneous cultures, religions, and other societies contained in the school curriculum, with 38% disagreeing, 29% neutral and 33% agreeing. This issue, ie., that some subject syllabuses were eurocentric, was a source of disagreement amongst a few staff—particularly those active members of the MCEd Committee who had spent a lot of time discussing different subject syllabuses with a view to identifying examples of eurocentric bias. One member of staff whose syllabus was found to be eurocentric strongly resented colleagues' criticisms and commented that "witch hunts" were taking place (this issue is

explored below). Other responses indicated that when teachers took the time to write out their opinions more fully, they had indeed given thought to these matters as the following statements indicate:

> As regards the curriculum and syllabus, there could be certain areas such as History and Geography in which there has been racial disharmony. Much work can be done....not merely to mention the depravity of the Europeans in the early centuries and the inhumanities that occurred but to write a new chapter in the concern for our fellow men. (Asian male maths teacher)

> ....a general broadening of the curriculum (certainly in History and Geography) might be appropriate to take in World rather than insular considerations....[perhaps] detailed study of their own particular cultures is better done by their own community on an evening/weekend/holiday basis...(Head of Science department. white male, first year in East End High)

These kinds of statements suggest there was a lack of consensus as to what kind of curriculum orientation should prevail. Both cultural pluralist (Asian maths teacher) and assimilationist (Head of Science) orientations were implicit in these teachers' statements. This split is reflected in the even spread of responses to statement 18-g (see tables in Appendix 6.3).

Cluster Three: 'Pupil Self-Image'. Statements i and j were clustered.

i- A multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of minority group children.

j- Multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of majority group children.

Rationale for the cluster:

It is argued that in a culturally plural society multi-ethnic education promotes the cultural identity and raises the self-esteem of racial and ethnic minority group children. (Milner:1975, 1983, Louden:1978, Gaskell & Smith:1981, Verma &

Bagley; 1975,1979,1982, Taylor:1981) The theory is that an inhanced self-image will contribute to motivating pupils to believe they are equal and develop their confidence to achieve academically. This cluster proved difficult to interpret, however, and the problems are discussed below.

Comments on Cluster Three:

The responses to Q.i indicate that while 62% agree that multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of minority group children, nearly 30% were neutral and 9% disagreed. In answering Q.j, teachers' opinions were spread somewhat more evenly across the agree-neutral categories and 11% disagreed with the proposition that multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of majority group children. It is interesting that despite the inherent imprecision of these statements a fair majority accepted that there was a correlation between MCE and its relevance to identity maintenance.

Cluster Four: 'Compensatory Strategies': Statements k, m, and n were clustered.

k- Multi-ethnic education cannot compensate for aspects of social disadvantage which affect minority group childrens' achievement in schools.

m- The aims of multi-ethnic education are not compatible with academic achievement.

n- A multi-ethnic education policy will reduce inequality of educational opportunity.

Rationale for the cluster:

Pupils experience multiple deprivation in areas of the inner city. (Rutter et al:1976, Children & Their Primary Schools:1967, see chapter 'The Community' above) Here the aim was to elicit whether teachers interpreted or understood multi-ethnic education

as a form of compensation. What are teachers' views about multi-ethnic education with reference to the curriculum? One aspect of the 'compensatory' strategy was to assess whether 'multi-ethnic' was understood by teachers to mean a 'black studies' approach, ie. peripheral to 'real knowledge'. Was it viewed as an 'extra', as 'special education', seen as a form of 'appeasement', a 'holding operation' for disruptive racial and ethnic minority pupils? Or did teachers regard multi-ethnic education as compatible with the academic aims of the traditional curricula?

Commments on Cluster Four:

The response to questions in this cluster reinforces the opinions expressed in cluster one regarding support for a multi-ethnic education policy but this support is qualified in significant ways: first, while 61% agree to Q18-k, that multi-ethnic education cannot compensate for aspects of social disadvantage affecting minority group children's achievement in schools, nearly 40% were neutral or disagreed. An active member of the Multicultultural Education Committee remarked (reminiscent of Bernstein 1970) that:

> the school cannot compensate for the hostility
> of the environment at large but [it] could play a
> part easing some of the problems as the generations
> divide. MCE is not going to compensate for the
> disadvanatge of being working class....and to a
> large extent alienated within the present education
> system. (white female French teacher)

Multi-ethnic education was seen by over half the respondents as compatible with academic achievement (Q18-m) which implied that multi-ethnic education was not equated by 53% of teachers in the survey with 'Black Studies' or seen in terms of an inferior 'extra'/'added on'. Here, the Head of English and Sixth Form

(Mr. Ojukwu) 'strongly disagreed' that multi-ethnic education was not compatible with academic achievement <u>and</u> took the trouble to write his views on the questionnaire.

> Achievement in academic terms in East End
> High will not get underway unless people
> are prepared to unpack the whole curriculum
> and start again with the thought-out overall
> perspective. (Mr. Ojukwu)

However, a significant number of teachers were neutral (32%) on this issue which suggests that perhaps the term 'multi-ethnic' lacked clear meaning and teachers may have (a) felt it was not compatible with academic achievement, (b) were uncertain or (c) saw it in assimilationist terms. Those teachers who 'agreed' (15%) that multi-ethnic education was not compatible with academic achievement may have held this view because they saw multi-ethnic education as more suited for non-academic pupils. Responses to the final question in this cluster (Q18-n) may seem unduly optimistic in that 47% agreed that multi-ethnic policy will reduce inequality of educational opportunity. In relation to other aspects of compensatory thinking, this is not surprising because the majority of the sample responded positively in terms of the potential benefits of operationalising a multi-ethnic education policy. However, replies to this final statement also indicate that over half the sample were neutral or disagreed, which may also mean that teachers recognise there is more to reducing inequality of educational opportunity than merely introducing and operationalising a multi-ethnic education policy inside one school.

Cluster Five: 'Teachers' Satisfaction in Terms of Relationships with Pupils; Teachers as Role Models'. Statements 1, o, p, and q were clustered.

1- Teaching classes of multi-ethnic pupils is more satisfying than teaching classes of English pupils only.

o- Teaching classes of multi-ethnic pupils is more demanding than teaching classes of English pupils only.

p- Teachers from ethnic minority groups are likely to cope best with pupils from ethnic minority groups.

q- Teachers who are not from ethnic minority groups are less likely to cope well with pupils from ethnic minority groups.

Rationale for the cluster:

Evidence suggests that some teachers 'see' or 'label' pupils in terms of racial and ethnic categories which may 'unintentionally' lead them to view pupils in terms of stereotypes or within a deficit model. (Rosenthal & Jacobson:1968. Rist:1970) This can affect teachers' pedagogy in multi-ethnic classes. If teachers think these pupils are 'more demanding', they may have lower expectations. Alternatively, teachers may regard teaching multi-ethnic classes as 'more demanding' due to the variety of cultural backgrounds of pupils. Linked with these interpretations is the working hypothesis that teachers who are themselves from racial or ethnic minorities are less ethnocentric, not prejudiced and therefore more likely to establish good working relationships with pupils who in turn can identify more easily with these teachers whom they see as role models.

Comments on Cluster Five:

A high proportion of responses to Q.18-1 were neutral (64%) on this issue. Perhaps teachers were unwilling to commit themselves to supporting the simplistic generalisation posed by this question. It is more likely, however, that the question was 'loaded' and therefore 'invited' neutral replies.

Over half the sample, 56%, disagreed that teachers from ethnic

minority groups are likely to cope best with pupils from ethnic minority groups (Q18-p); 22% were neutral and 22% agreed. Teachers who were themselves from racial or ethnic minority backgrounds on the whole disagreed. This suggests that teachers do not necessarily regard a teacher's racial or ethnic identity as relevant or necessary for establishing good rapport with racial or ethnic minority pupils. When these responses are seen in relation to responses to Q18-q, this view is reinforced because 65% disagreed with the view expressed in Q18-q that 'teachers who are not from ethnic minority groups are less likely to cope well with pupils from ethnic minority groups', while 24% were neutral and 11% agreed. Replies suggest, therefore, that the ethnic minority teacher-as-role-model hypothesis was, on the whole, unsupported.

Not all clusters were equally informative. The most difficult to interpret were responses within clusters three and five, which included weakly defined terms such as 'alienation', 'satisfy' and 'demanding'. While these terms are part of the vocabulary often used in relation to aspects of multicuturalism, attitudes expressed in such terms are inherently ambiguous and led to difficulties of interpretation.

The strongest clusters, one and two, were mutually reinforcing. That is, most teachers approved of the multi-ethnic education policy in the ILEA and, by implication, also in East End High. Following on from this, teachers supported the view that the curriculum should reflect the multicultural make-up of society. There was agreement that internal school practices should be scrutinised to promote achievement. Thus when clusters one and

two are combined, there is no doubt that teachers seemed quite willing and prepared to operationalise a multi-ethnic policy in East End High. However, in the light of the findings from cluster four on compensatory strategies, it is clear that teachers had differing perceptions of multi-ethnic education. Thus, in consolidating findings from Q18, teachers' opinions on multi-ethnic education reflected a wide range of differing views and understandings which included assimilationist, culturally plural and antiracist orientations. We now move on to consider teachers' views on the role of the Multicultural Education Committee.

Analysis/Discussion of Question Numbers 19-22:

Teachers were reminded that East End High had a Multicultural Education Committee (examined in detail in chapter seven). The responses to Q.19 show that 62% claimed to be very familiar' or 'fairly familiar' (31% for each category) with the work of the Multicultural Education Committee; well under half, however, (37%) were 'not very familiar'. The responses to Q.20 corresponded to my own experience of attendance at Multicultural Education Committee meetings. My records showed that an average of 15 staff attended meetings regularly and the findings here are that 14 attended regularly and 14 attended only occasionally or 24% respectively, while just over half of the teachers 'have never attended'.

Answers to Q.21 about 'supporting the aims of the Multicultural Education Committee' reinforced opinions expressed above (Q.18-c) which favoured multi-ethnic policy generally. The findings here were that 39% said they feel able to support the

aims 'a lot', and 37% said 'a little', while only 4% were 'not at all' able to support the aims; 21% were 'not sure what the aims are'. Of the responses to Q.22, what the Multicultural Education Committee 'contributes to the life of the school', 5% were negative and 17% 'not sure':

3% said 'not at all'
2% felt it was 'harmful'
17% were 'not sure'

On the other hand, 16% felt the Committee contributed 'a lot' and 62% 'a little', to the life of the school.

When these returns were cross-tabulated with subject teaching, the pattern of responses reflected 'more familiarity', 'attendance', 'support' and 'contribution to the school' for the Multicultural Education Committee from teachers in the following departments: English (10), Maths (7), Social Studies/ History/ Geography/ Commerce (grouped together-15), Remedial (5), Language (2). By contrast, teachers in Art, Design Technology, Integrated Studies, Music, Science, and Physical Education showed less familiarity, attendance, support for the MCEd. Committe. These figures are consistent with the response rates reported above for the respective subject departments.

Analysis/Discussion of Q.23-The Multicultural Education Committee's Role in examining subject syllabuses. (see Appendix 7.1)
Comments on Question 23:

Staff were fairly evenly divided about whether teachers should be in charge of what they teach without interference from the Multicultural Education Committee (Q23a) with 38% agreeing and 36% disagreeing. However when 'disagree' and 'nil' responses are added together, we find that 43% did not agree. When these

figures are seen in relation to 19% neutral replies, the implication is that there was a preference for teacher autonomy in relation to subject teaching. A white female French teacher wrote, "it would be a pity if the Multicultural Education Committee's work were to be regarded as interference" on her questionnaire. It is relevant to interject that some staff saw the Multicultural Education Committee as unnecessarily 'interfering' when the Committee alleged there was eurocentric bias in syllabuses. There was no noticeable subject bias in these responses, however, and the 15 teachers' views spanned the whole range of replies with 5 'agreeing', 4 'neutral' and 6 'disagreeing'.

In Q.23b, 91% agreed that subject teachers should exchange views with colleagues about the content of their syllabuses, implying that teachers are willing to collaborate with their colleagues. Several staff were engaged in doing this already in the following departments: English, History, Geography, Social Studies and Integrated Studies. Only one teacher disagreed and one gave a 'nil' response to this statement.

In Q.23-c, over half or 66% of teachers agreed that the Multicultural Education Committee can play a positive role in examining syllabuses, with 21% neutral and 10% disagreeing. This view was reinforced by responses to the next question, Q23d, where 69% of teachers disagreed that 'the Multicultural Education Committee has no role to play', with 14% neutral, 12% agreeing and 5% nil response. Here 'agree' replies came from 2 teachers in Design Tech., 2 in Physical Ed., 1 in English and 1 in Social Studies which indicated a slight anti-MCE bias in

these subjects. On balance, and in the light of responses to Q.23, it seems reasonable to say that staff were largely favourably disposed to the Multicultural Education Committee's role in examining subject syllabuses.

Q.25-Advantages and Disadvantages of Multicultural Education:

The final question (no. 25) was open-ended and asked 'What in your opinion are the main advantages and disadvantages of multi-ethnic education?' There was space on the questionnaire for adding 'any additional comments you wish on multi-ethnic education' and a wide-range of comments were written in (ie. multiple responses). Responses were coded according to similarity of views and organised into four clusters identifying 'advantages' and five clusters identifying 'disadvantages'.

Response Breakdown to this question:
Comments on Advantages: 11
Comments on Disadvantages: 3
Did Not Reply: 18
Total No. of Replies: 30
Additional Comments   18

ADVANTAGES OF MCE

Of the four clusters of opinions on the main advantages, the first cluster included those teachers (30 replies) who expressed the view that MCE promotes integration, egalitarian attitudes, social equality, and a one-world view; helps to combat prejudice and racial stereotyping; and encourages anti-racism. The second cluster of responses (20 teachers wrote comments) focused on multi-ethnic education as promoting individual self-esteem, ie., a positive cultural identity. In the third cluster (11 replies) the emphasis was on promoting-encouraging a more stimulating, relevant and less eurocentric curriculum. The fourth cluster reflected the view (of fourteen teachers) that multi-ethnic education increases teachers' awareness and

positive understanding of a multicultural society and helps pupils and teachers to practice and 'live' a multicultural life.

DISADVANTAGES OF MCE

Turning to the 'disadvantages', the first cluster (17 replies) reflected the view that multi-ethnic education resulted in an unbalanced and potentially divisive curriculum that was ethnocentric and unintentionally promoted prejudice. In the second cluster (7 replies), teachers said that multi-ethnic education potentially alienates pupils and it can be used as an excuse for poor behaviour and low achievement. Cluster three (5 replies) contained a set of opinions which highlight disadvantages about multi-ethnic education based on the premise that because multicultural education was not geared toward obtaining qualifications, it takes attention away from teaching skills and subjects, and schools lack resources to implement/resource it adequately. Here MCE was seen by some teachers as an 'extra'-'added-on' and not integral to the whole curriculum. This set of opinions is most commonly referred to as the 'Black Studies' approach which characterises functionalist and assimilationist modes of thinking and styles of pedagogy. Cluster four (10 replies) focuses on teachers in terms of teachers' incompetence to handle this kind of information and included the following examples: more pressure was put on teachers' scarce resources and time for preparation; some staff felt that MCE alienated white middle class teachers; some felt it was fashionable, trendy and was creating a bandwagon effect. The fifth cluster of disadvantages (4 replies) emphasised MCE as an inadequately thought-out concept—that multicultural pedagogy was not sufficiently clear in its

meaning. Thus, it causes confusion and misunderstanding as to exactly what is meant.

'ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS'

In the final section of the whole staff survey teachers were asked for 'Any Additional Comments'. On the whole remarks here tended to emphasise the advantages of MCE. However, some teachers mentioned the problematic interpretation of the theory and practice of MCE in East End High in terms of school organisation. The peripheral role played by the Multicultural Education Committee in relation to a whole school debate was also stressed. A further point was that MCE policy and practice should be discussed by all staff so that all staff can become involved and not just the members of the Multicultural Education Committee. Some teachers felt the Multicultural Education Committee was exclusive, ie. did not actively seek new recruits. There was disquiet amongst some teachers and the seeds of a backlash could be detected. The question of which subjects lend themselves to 'multiculturalising' was also raised. Finally, some of these issues were not well understood by everyone, and responses to the open-ended question helped to identify where further clarification was needed.

Overall, the comments on 'Advantages' were expressions of moderate liberal sentiment mainly by English and Social Studies teachers. These views complemented the broad aims of the ILEA policy statements, but very little was said about whether MCE would or could improve achievement. By contrast, in their comments on 'Disadvantages', teachers expressed serious doubts, and said that MCE could lead to an unbalanced

curriculum, unintentionally promote racial prejudice, excuse bad behaviour, and distract pupils from pursuing 'real' knowledge, acquiring skills, and qualifications. Some teachers noted that not everyone was competent in this area, resources were scarce, and although some had climbed on the MCE bandwagon, others were alienated and felt the concept was inadequately thought out.

These views reinforced the reservations discussed above in the chapter on the MCE/ARE Debate. The seeds of a backlash, ie. an overt anti-MCE/ARE position were articulated. There was even an explicit assimilationist view put forcefully by a part-time Commerce teacher: 'When in Rome...' Further, organisational weaknesses in the school were noted in relation to the need for the staff to engage in a whole school debate instead of leaving the matter to the 'exclusive' Multicultural Education Committee. There was a fairly consistent subject divide in terms of which teachers were 'pro' or 'anti', and this division tended to reflect more sympathy/support from English, Social Studies, History, Geography, French and less sympathy—even negative views from Maths, Sciences, applied subjects and Physical Education. Before moving on to discuss the findings from the final phase of the research on teachers in East End High, we can draw the tentative conclusion that there was qualified support amongst teachers in EEH for operationalising a Multi-Ethnic Education policy, but that a consensus needed to be forged by means of an open and sustained debate in a whole school forum.

PHASE III
TWELVE INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED STAFF

Phase III interviews with 12 teachers represent the continuation of my investigation into issues which emerged during the fieldwork. They follow on from the whole staff survey and include two teachers who had not returned the self-completion questionnaire. The interview schedule was loosely structured, conducted in an open-ended style and tape recorded. (see Appendix 6.3 for schedule) Interviews were held at irregular intervals commencing with Mr. Ojukwu in July 1981 and finishing with Mr. Kay, the Head, in March 1982. Mr. Ojukwu was interviewed early because he was leaving EEH to become a Deputy Head in another school at the end of the school year, 1981.

The aim of this phase of data gathering was to probe these teachers' views on the MCE initiative with particular reference to changes brought about by the introduction of the policy in East End High and to check for consistency of staff opinion. Several aspects of teachers' work and background were covered: subject specialisms, work in the wider school context, teacher training and career aspirations, views about ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education policy, changes in attitude toward MCE, whether pupils experienced racial discrimination in EEH and whether teachers' expectations of pupils affected achievement.

These teachers were selected on the basis of their senior positions/managerial roles or because their subject

specialisms had not been adequately represented in the whole staff survey. For example, a Physical Education and Music teacher were included in this sample. Only four of these teachers were MCEd.Committee members. Messrs. Kay, Morrish, Ojukwu, and Thomas had already been interviewed in Phase I of the research because they were in senior managerial posts or were Heads of Houses.

TEACHERS (years in the school):
1- Headmaster: Mr. Kay: (7)
2- Deputy Head: Mr. Morrish, Social Studies teacher: (6)
3- Deputy Head: Mr. Glenn, Commerce, Accounts teacher: (33)
4- Head of Social Studies, MCEd. Comm. member: Mr. Cox: (12)
5- Head of English & Sixth Form: Mr. Ojukwu: (5)
6- Head of Physical Education: Mr. Brick: (20). no questionnaire
7- Chair MCEd.Comm., Housemaster, English Dept: Mr. Thomas: (9)
8- Head of Integrated Studies: Mr. Myles: (12)
9- New Head of House, History teacher: Mr. Drew: (8)
10- Geography Dept., MCEd.Comm. member: Mr. Jones: (3)
11- Acting Head of Remedial, MCEd.Comm. member: Ms Stoller: (5)
12- Music Dept.: Ms. Reed: (4) no questionnaire

Four clusters of opinion emerged. The first focused on teachers' views about multicultural education. Ten teachers approved of MCE but a negative set of opinions was expressed by the two teachers who had not returned the self-completion questionnaire. This suggests that some of the 18% non-response in phase II did contain strongly held negative views which could only be elicited by means of face-to face focused interviews. In some cases negative views about MCE seemed to be linked to a teacher's subject specialism. That is, some subjects were 'naturally' pro-multicultural (specifically-- English, History, Social Studies, Geography, Integrated Studies and languages) and most of these teachers supported MCE and had completed the questionnaire. However, even in this final stage of fieldwork, those who expressed 'pro' multicultural views reflected a spectrum of different interpretations:

Mr. Cox, Head of Social Studies:

> We're attempting to prepare our kids to enter
> a multicultural world. The school's job is to
> prepare pupils for their place in society and
> it is necessary for them to have an understand-
> ing of society as a whole......[but] the problem
> is that MCE is seen by both its critics and
> advocates as being 'black' education and people
> seem to ignore the cultural differences within
> Britain which negates a class-based society.

Mr. Glenn, Deputy Head:

> Obvously if you're teaching in this sort of area
> you must be involved---No other way of tackling it.

There really was no consensus amongst teachers who thought MCE
was important. One the one hand, there was a 'Black
Studies'/'added-on' understanding (which Cox expressed) coupled
with the view that multicultural education was only suitable for
'an area like this' (Glenn). Other 'pro' views were that:
'multicultural education acknowledges these children'; [it]
'needs to be carefully researched and sensibly done because you
can get into certain dangers'; 'related to history, it has its
part to play in the wider aspect'.

By contrast, those expressing negative views toward MCE taught
Physical Education, Music and Art. Cross-referencing these
subjects with the non-response rate by subject departments (see
above on Response Rates) confirmed this trend. Thus we can
hypothesise that teacher autonomy in these three subjects
helped to perpetuate an insular view of the curriculum and
teachers were, therefore, less favourably disposed to
'multiculturalising'. Although these teachers were careful to
qualify their negative views towards MCE, the following quotes
illustrate the way in which 'anti' MCE positions were
articulated:

Mr. Brick, Head of Physical Education:

> ...other issues are much more important...
> if teachers concentrate on multicultural
> education then they can produce a backlash,
> they can defeat their own ends....but it is
> duty for all of us to ensure that all pupils
> we have to teach really are afforded equal
> opportunities..

Mr. Brick expressed assimilationist views about immigrant groups

who had come to this country and had been resident for a very

long time....

> because of their determination to stick at it
> they've almost managed to merge now...third
> generation are part of the people....black children,
> brown children.....coming today ideally if they're
> treated well & we realise our responsibilities
> to them, without leaning backwards to them...will
> stand a better chance of being a responsible part
> of the community than if we take an overt approach...

Ms. Reed, Music, could only be drawn out after a lot of probing:

> [The ILEA's M-E Ed. Policy] is a bit of a
> political gamble...there is a lot of trend-
> setting in education and I question whether
> the Chief Education Officer set this trend
> to leave his mark.

Ms. Reed explained that the music department had a 'traditional'

approach to the subject and that she was just here to do her

job. She admitted to having discipline problems in the

classroom, and that boys themselves came with pre-set ideas

about what their kind of music was. She was unhappy about the

fact that parents were more concerned with their sons'

achievement in subjects like Maths and English. As she

explained,

> I tend to adopt the view that the various
> pressure groups working to promote harmony are
> in fact stirring agencies.....my view is to
> live and let live- a negative view really.

The second cluster of opinion incorporated a number of variables

linked with the MCE ethos in the school. A teacher's age or

generation was often related to their degree of racial awareness, attitudes toward MCE, and expectations of ethnic minority pupils in terms of achievement. These relationships were in turn affected by the composition of the school population and location. Whether a teacher's training had included a component of MCE was also relevant. Younger teachers were more likely to have had MCE as part of their training while older teachers had had to rely on in-service work in order to familiarise themselves with aspects of MCE in relation to their subjects and in terms of whole-school approaches. Mr. Glenn, the Deputy Head, who had taught in EEH for thirty-three years, illustrates the way these factors are interrelated. Glenn was asked if his attitudes towards multicultural education had been changed by circumstance or experience:

> Changed? Very much so. I was brought up in the
> local community here where the only other culture
> was the Jewish culture and the school I went to had
> a population of about one third Jewish boys. This
> was in the period before the Second World War and
> the Mosleyites, Black Shirts and Brown Shirts were
> a source of concern to me even as a young boy...over
> the years meeting people of different ethnic origins,
> I've realised that some of my early immature
> attitudes were very ill-informed and quite irrational
> I'm still conscious of times when my early prejudices
> are still there....I've had to try bring them out
> from the subconscious and argue them out.

Glenn's 33 years in EEH spanned a period of sweeping change. A dedicated teacher, he was favourably disposed toward the ILEA's MCE policy initiative and felt the ILEA was working at an official level to try to make the activities at the grassroots easier by directing resources so that staff and pupils became more aware of their responsibilities. He explained that the

> enthusiasm that you can pick up from
> colleagues on the staff for a multi-ethnic approach
> is far more important than official directives sent
> out telling you what you OUGHT to do.

Although he supported the policy initiative, in his view it
should be left to staff in schools to decide how to put the
policy into practice.

Another issue in this cluster is the hypothesis that teachers
'see' or 'label' pupils in terms of racial/ethnic categories and
stereotype them as low achievers. When the question asked was
'Do you think teachers' expectations of pupils affects their
achievement?', nearly everyone agreed, except Ms. Reed, who did
not comment. The following views help to illustrate.

Mr. Morrish, Deputy Head, Social Studies teacher:

> Of course it does. Far too many teachers have
> far too low expectations of, say West Indian
> and Turkish and other minority groups. Also-
> too many teachers have a desperately low
> expectation of the indigeneous white pupils.
> There is also a generational difference among
> staff.

Mr. Ojukwu, Head of English & Sixth Form:

> There is poor maths teaching in EEH...Academically
> they [pupils] lose and drop out. Put boys in a
> different environment and they will do better.

Mr. Jones, Geography teacher:

> When I came in 1978, no boys were entered for CSE
> or O level, but since that time we have competely
> restructured the department and we have now entered
> boys for CSE and O levels and in June 1983 we will
> have our first A level entry.

Mr. Brick, Head of Physical Education, answered in a different
way altogether:

> If a black child comes to us, we have the
> expectation that he will have physical character-
> istics which are advantageous. A significant number
> of them have increased hip joint mobility...a great
> advantage in sports. Black physique is somehow
> stronger. So we get higher performance than from
> white boys. I know multiculturalists would be
> surprised because of the stereotyped expectations
> in terms of academic [forms of achievement].

Clearly, several teachers were taking steps to promote academic

forms of achievement in terms of internal school practices such

as departmental reorganisation, curriculum revision, streaming,

setting practices and exam entry.   But Mr. Ojukwu highlighted

the view that in a key subject like maths, teaching was

inadequate and boys couldn't be blamed for their low

achievement. By contrast, Mr. Brick's reply contained an overtly

biological view of black pupils which implied that these boys

were not likely to be high academic achievers despite their

prowess on the playing field.   In their different ways,

therefore, respondents agreed that teachers' expectations of

pupils affected their achievement.

The third cluster of issues was concerned with the pupils'

experience of racial discrimination. Here staff opinion divided

into two categories: experience of racial discrimination (1)

'from staff' and (2) 'from pupils'. Teachers' commented that

they felt pupils did experience racial discrimination from

staff.

Mr. Thomas—   Racial discrimination is practiced when
               people refuse to accept that there are
               cultural differences and to cater for them.

Mr. Ojukwu—   I have heard staffroom people express attitudes
               that are racist without them knowing it...
               It's better than it was. The kids don't pick
               out the teacher as they used to.

Ms. Stoller- It's not overt [but] is reflected in things
people say...perhaps unconsciously the way
they treat children and their expectations.

Mr. Brick- An idealistic view of any teacher is not to be
colour conscious. In other words, when he looks
at a class he doesn't see colour...only sees
children. Until you've got that situation,
prejudice may occur. I don't believe that
obtains for many of my colleagues. Even I confess
there are times I can't hold the line myself...
I've got it most of the time...there is a lot less
prejudice than five years ago. When you work with
them for years, you know they don't look alike.

Staff also indicated that they felt pupils experienced

discrimination from other pupils:

Mr. Myles- I think the kids do suffer from racial prejudice
in the school--very often from each other.

Ms. Stoller- Asian kids are the most abused.

Mr. Cox- Our kids may play with each other, but they don't
take it out of school...They're friends in the
classroom--it stops at 3.45 pm. You'll see infant
and junior kids holding hands but by the time
they're 12 they just talk to each other. The
outside prejudices tend to break up relationships.

An important variation on pupil-pupil discrimination came up

when Mr.Ojukwu touched on matters of the pupils' self esteem

and self image.

Mr. Ojukwu- ....a lot of black kids are taking advantage of
their racial disadvantage..not to really look at
themselves personally and to do what's best for
them as people. They're prepared to blank out
everything that requires real commitment...to see
themselves on the scrap heap....not really think-
ing about the substance of themselves.

Despite the changing atmosphere coupled with a developing

multicultural ethos in East End High, these attitudes can be

seen as supporting the allegation that schools are sites

where 'unintentional racism' exists.

The fourth cluster focused on a number of aspects related to

matters of school organisation, administration and the
architecture of the school. There were problems because the
school was a seven story tower block and this determined the
physical location of departments such as Art and Remedial.
Regarding organisation and administration, teachers confirmed
views expressed in the initial phase of research, namely that
the school hierarchy was under-consultative and undemocratic.
Responses covered a wide range of matters, from leadership,
democratic management, and staff status.

Mr. Morrish:

> No real vision or leadership in the organization.
> For historical reasons there are little separate
> departments in Social Studies, I.S., Commerce..etc
> That's the pathetic situation which goes into the
> new school unfortunately.

Mr. Cox:

> [Organisation] is a disaster. It's one of the few
> possible areas where one could actually work on a
> democratic basis...if staff woke up, the decision-
> making process would fall to pieces.

Mr. Ojukwu:

> The school should organise a proper curriculum
> working party with the clout to go and say,
> "we've looked at what you're doing and we just
> don't think this can go on"....we can't really
> systematise these things cause there are too
> many egos to pamper.

Ms. Stoller:

> Too hierarchical...Too much a 'them' and 'us'
> situation. Anyone below Scale 4 is 'them',
> and those above are 'us'.

The central role played by the Headmaster in implementing the
MCE policy initiative should be seen in the light of these
attitudes. Perhaps Mr. Kay was unaware of the extent of some of
his teachers' discontent. When commenting on arrangements for
amalgamation, scheduled to take place in September 1982, he
explained that as 'Head Designate' of the new school,

> I am in the fortunate position of knowing my
> job and future are secure...I made the promise
> I would continue for the next five years.

He outlined some of the changes he wanted to make in the new school:

> ...senior posts for ESL....we're going to
> extend this area...[and] responsibility for
> links with the community and MCE. The multi-
> ethnic composition of the area is changing.

Reflecting on organisational changes which contributed to improving opportunities for ethnic minority pupils, Kay stated openly that he was

> not sold on mixed ability teaching [although]
> I think it has served a valuable purpose....
> it broke the old streaming system...broke
> away from the fact that being black automatically
> placed immigrants in the bottom streams and you
> never had an opportunity to get out of them.

In terms of low achieving pupils, his comments echoed some of the truants' own stated reasons (see chapter 5) for non-attendance,

> ...we have so few boys of outstanding ability
> at 11, compared with the intake, those boys
> become neglected...bored, drop out because they
> are not extended...fully motivated...Setting
> has [in English] enabled us to improve our results.

Mr. Kay's comments in this final interview reinforced findings from Phase I. He confirmed that substantial curriculum changes had taken place in History and English. The librarian had also contributed by ordering multicultural literature and publicising this throughout the school. Mr. Kay explained that there had been

> a steady movement of staff to appreciate
> the fact that the old order changes and they
> have got to keep up with the new.

Many changes were taking place. As older staff retired, younger teachers were recruited. Mr. Kay admitted that while teacher expectations were low, he did not think this was racially based. Instead he attributed this to boys' bad behaviour which teachers associated with being 'thick' and coming from a

run-down inner city area. The matter of racial prejudice did come out, however, when Mr. Kay acknowledged

> a colour blindness in education. I find it
> so difficult to accept the fact that teachers
> in 1982 can't look at a class and see them as
> individuals....

Mr. Kay continued,

> the effort [to implement MCE] has been as non-
> revolutionary as possible...to change attitudes
> and get people thinking along these lines.

Mr. Kay avoided making a direct evaluation of the MCE policy initiative in East End High, explaining that

> the Authority has done as much as one could
> hope...[even though] all heads aren't as convinced
> of the need for MCE policy as I am.

It is significant that Mr. Kay did not regard the lack of compulsion in the Multi-Ethnic Education initiative as a weakness. Instead, he emphasised his belief in teacher autonomy and that compulsion could create opposition.

In assessing Mr. Kay's management of the implementation of the ILEA multi-ethnic education policy, perhaps his main achievement was that he had put MCE on the school's agenda. Although there was no consensus as to the philosophy, aims and goals or strategies for implementing MCE in East End High, most staff said they supported the policy in principle. But responses were uneven, with some teachers expressing disquiet and frustration.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this rapidly changing climate, with its severe inner city disturbances, multicultural-antiracist awareness accelerated. The period was also characterised by high rates of teacher turnover, falling rolls, low teacher morale and ultimately the

instability brought on by amalgamation. Here the individual style of Mr. Kay's leadership was pivotal. He was described by several of his staff as 'undemocratic and under-consultative', of even adopting a 'defensive position'. One senior teacher thought this style characterised Kay's generation, ie., authoritative with little inclination to move towards acting in an openly consultative and collectivist manner.

Nevertheless, Mr. Kay did respond positively to the multi-ethnic policy when it was introduced. In the first instance he did so by delegating the responsibility for operationalising the policy to Mr. Ogden, First Deputy Head, who set up a Multicultural Education Committee in 1978-79, which all staff could join. In the absence of ILEA guidelines, Mr. Ogden set the Committee's initial terms of reference which were to establish procedures for reviewing curriculum and materials in order to promote a multi-ethnic/anti-eurocentric perspective throughout the school. The teachers who 'joined' or attended the Committee meetings did so because of their individual pro-MCE inclination/positions. The commitment of the Social Studies department Head, Mr. Cox, was apparent from the beginning. However, a large proportion of teachers who did not join the Multicultural Education Committee were also committed to promoting multicultural education in terms of departmental practices vis a vis changes in curricula, streaming practices, exam entries, and working to improve rates of achievement. Thus, many non-Committee members were, nonetheless, working to operationalise MCE in their own departments. Here initiatives in the English Department under Mr. Ojukwu's headship stood out.

It was unsurprising that responses to the policy statement were fragmented and lacked consensus. Teachers' understanding and interpretation of MCE reflected differences which ranged from an anti-MCE/ARE stance across the spectrum to supporting assimilationist, cultural pluralist and antiracist positions. There was, however, a strong link between teachers' subject/departmental location and their pro or anti MCE views. Here my findings are reinforced by those of Troyna and Ball (1985) who also found

> that Arts teachers (ie. English, History, and
> Social Studies, Humanities) are more likely
> than their colleagues in other departments to
> integrate multicultural or antiracist perspec-
> tives into their courses. Despite evidence to
> the contrary there is a tendency for those
> teachers not in Arts departments to see few
> curriculum opportunities for the development
> of multiculturalist or antiracist work.
> (Troyna & Ball 1985:40-41)

Further, the different views expressed by teachers reflected their status, age, sex, race/ethnicity, social class, training, the academic or vocational nature of their subject, and the degree of stability which they enjoyed in the school at this time.

Towards the end of my period in the field, the ILEA was in the midst of revising its views on multi-ethnic education. In 1983 it introduced a 'Policy For Equality', which featured a staunch antiracist position. In the light of this ideological change, when Mr. Kay applied for the position of 'Head Designate' of the newly amalgamated school, he could point to the four-year old Multicultural Education Committee in East End High as a testimony to his commitment to implementing the 1977 Multi-Ethnic initiative. Thus he gained both

professionally and personally by virtue of taking a principled

stand in favour of the policy. In practice, however, the ILEA

1977 Multi-Ethnic Education initiative in EEH was only taken on

board in a fragmented and unsystematic manner by those teachers

who were individually predisposed to support its aims, given

the absence of strong leadership, guidelines and compulsion.

NOTES
1- Since the completion of this fieldwork, both the Rampton and
Swann Reports have recommended the collection of ethnic data on
pupils and teachers. In 1989 a DES Circular instructed LEAs to
collect this data (DES:1989). In the 1980s the climate changed
and plans are currently underway to include an ethnic identity
question in the 1991 Census, though this is still seen as a
controversial issue in certain quarters.

Chapter SEVEN.

THE MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the role played by the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High from its beginning in 1979 to the autumn term of 1981 when it ceased to function, the year before the school was due to amalgamate. The Committee represents the school's main response to the ILEA's 1977 Multi-Ethnic policy initiative. Before turning to focus on the work of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High, we will briefly consider aspects of the climate in which multicultural education began to be taken on board at LEA and school level in this period.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s increasing racial tension and disturbances in many of Britain's inner cities (NUT 1980, Scarman 1981, Kettle & Hodges 1982, Benyon 1984, Benyon & Solomos 1987) plus academic research findings from Mullard (1980), Taylor (1981), Stone (1981) and the Rampton Report (1981) contributed to promoting a recognition of the need to develop and implement multicultural/antiracist education at local authority level and inside schools. Multicultural and antiracist education was already on the agenda in East End High and increasingly, groups of committed multicultural-antiracist teachers were becoming active in developing MCE/ARE policies and practices in individual schools. (see Birley High School 1980, Straker-Welds (ed) 1984, ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Newsletter

1978-1980, ILEA's <u>Multi-Ethnic Education Review</u> 1980-86, <u>Multicultural Teaching</u>, Troyna & Ball 1986). Pressure groups were also making their views felt (NUT, NAME, ALTARF, CTA, Black Parents Groups, supplementary schools). The activities of these groups and individuals reflected a wide range of different interpretations of multicultural and antiracist education.

In this period, working parties inside schools and teachers centres began to devote their energies to developing multicultural-antiracist curricula and pedagogy. In-service courses attracted increasing support from heads and classroom teachers. (see ILEA <u>Contact</u>, ILEA <u>Multi-Ethnic Newsletter</u>, <u>Multi-Ethnic</u> & <u>Multi-Ethnic Education Review</u> from 1978) Many lessons were learned from these endeavours, and three points highlight the main issues which teachers felt needed to be resolved before they could develop and implement MCE-ARE policy, curricula, and pedagogy in their schools: first was the need for a working definition of multicultural education; second, an understanding of what teachers were trying to achieve inside the school, and third, full support and leadership from the Head. A good illustration of these points can be found in the work of teachers in Birley High School, Manchester who arrived at a definition of multicultural education in the early stages of their work:

> 1) Multicultural Education is a whole curriculum which also involves an attitude to life. It aims to promote a positive self-image and respect for the attitudes and values of others. Such an education will improve academic attainment. (Birley High School 1980:2)

These teachers then asked themselves:

> 2) Whether we were discussing education
> in a multicultural school or education for
> a multicultural society. We concluded that
> the latter subsumed the former. (Birley High
> School 1980:2)

The Birley Working Party also recognised the need for strong leadership:

> 3)....the Head establishes the aims of the
> school, and often provides the driving force
> towards multi-cultural goals. He ensures that
> his staff are well informed about the pupils'
> backgrounds and that discussion and thinking
> about curriculum innovations are encouraged. He
> ensures that links with the local community are
> sound and that a variety of extra curricular
> activities are available. He publicises the
> achievements of his pupils, and above all else,
> he established the ethos of his school which will
> foster the growth of all aspects of multi-cultural
> education. (Birley High School 1980:14)

We should keep the lessons from Birley High School in mind when examining the work of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High. In many ways Birley High seems to have had a clear sense of purpose and direction. Perhaps this was due in part to the unequivocal support given by the Head of Birley High School. The importance of a Head's commitment to multicultural education is pivotal as Troyna & Ball (1983) have argued. And, as we have already seen above in chapter six, Mr. Kay's leadership proved to be something rather less than a driving force towards achieving multicultural goals.

Notwithstanding support from the Head, Mr. Kay, this account is mainly the story of how a small group of teachers gathered together of their own volition because they were committed to implementing the multi-ethnic education policy in their school. In order to assess the extent to which the ILEA's multi-ethnic education policy initiative was taken on board inside East End High, we begin by looking at its origins and work of the

Committee.   In the course of my fieldwork, however, it became apparent that there was a lack of consensus amongst these teachers as to what they understood by multicultural-antiracist education.   Accordingly, the views below reflect divergent understandings and interpretations of multicultural-antiracist education, a core theme in the chapter.

Most of the data in this chapter comes from   my record of twenty-two meetings of the Multicultural Education Committee which took place during the two and a half years of my fieldwork.   In addition to my notes, I have used minutes from meetings and information   acquired from loosely structured interviews   and informal conversations   held with numerous teachers.   The course materials and documents considered by the Committee at various   points are included in Appendix 7. Most Committee meetings were held in after-school hours in the library, starting at 4pm and often going on till 6pm or beyond. A stable core of teachers   attended   most   meetings, but attendance fluctuated due to teachers' changing commitments. Approximately twenty-four teachers from East End High attended meetings of the Committee at various points in time, including the Education Welfare   Officer and librarian.   Average attendance ranged from twelve to fifteen.   I was present in an observer role and took notes with the approval of the Chair and members.

THE GATEKEEPER: MR. OGDEN:

I gained access to the school when I wrote to Mr. Ogden, the Deputy Head in charge of Pastoral Care.   A polytechnic colleague had told me he was very keen to implement the ILEA's

multi-ethnic policy and would welcome support and interest in monitoring the school's endeavour. I met Mr. Ogden, an Afro-Caribbean in his mid-40s, for the first time in February 1979. He told me he had set up a Multicultural Education Committee in the autumn of 1978 with the Head's approval and in response to the ILEA 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education policy statement (ILEA 269/1977). Initially the Committee started to look at ways of developing multi-racial/multi-cultural departmental syllabuses for the school. (see Appendix 7.1) They were also concerned to examine books used with a view to assessing their suitability for multicultural education, and the school librarian had begun to look into library-related matters.

I maintained contact with East End High as a result of this first meeting with Mr. Ogden. In the spring of the school year of 1979 I was involved with conducting an exploratory set of interviews with the Head, his two deputies and the six Housemasters; findings from these interviews were discussed in chapter 6. In May of 1979, I met again with Mr. Ogden and asked what the Multicultural Education Committee was doing. Their remit was mainly advisory and they were planning to look at the multicultural nature of the syllabuses. He explained that due to industrial action the Committee had not met since the autumn term, and at this point in the school year it was too late for the Committee to begin to review subject syllabuses.

THREE STYLES OF LEADERSHIP OF THE MULTICUTURAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: AN OVERVIEW

The first Chair, Mr. Ogden, established the Committee in the autumn of 1978 but left the school in the summer of 1979. His successor, Mr. Williams, a geography teacher, chaired the

committee for two terms in '79-'80, and also moved to another
school.   Mr. Thomas, a Housemaster/English teacher, was elected
Chair in September 1980 and led the Committee until it came to
an end in the autumn of 1982 when EEH amalgamated with a
neighbouring boys' comprehensive.

Despite Ogden's short-lived leadership, the initial impetus he
had given sustained itself in the wake of his departure in
summer 1979 and the Committee met regularly throughout the
1979-1981 school year.   Regarding Ogden's motivation to set up
the Committee in EEH in 1978, Mr. Thomas explained:

> Ogden wasn't a political animal by any means.
> He was a black liberal who felt very strongly
> about his colour------and he used to speak out at
> meetings, not only in EEH but anywhere....that
> sort of thing gained him some sort of popularity
> and acceptance. But at the same time it made
> him unpopular and people rejected it. But working
> with Kay, he was able to influence him.
> (interview, March 1989)

Although Mr. Kay, the Head, had given his approval and
encouragement, he remained relatively uninvolved--- somewhat
remote. He did not attend Committee meetings on a regular
basis nor did he issue any formal directives to staff
instructing them to develop multicultural practice. Department
Heads, Housemasters and other senior teachers were not mandated
to join the Committee. The main encouragement from the Head
took the form of occasional items published in the weekly
'Staff Notices' announcing forthcoming meetings of the
Multicultural Education Committee and inviting all staff to
attend. Thus, in the absence of clear guidelines from the
Head, no systematic monitoring or evaluation of the multi-
cultural initiative in East End High was possible. Even at
this early stage in the field, therefore, it appeared that the

Committee lacked power, had no set brief, was peripheral to the decision-making process and somewhat marginal in terms of influencing whole school policy.

In the autumn term of 1979, Mr. Williams became Chair of the Multicultural Education Committee. Mr. Williams, white British, was a young graduate who taught Geography. He had joined the staff in 1975 and became Departmental Head of Geography when his predecessor became ill and left. Mr. Williams was undoubtedly committed to promoting multiculturalism in East End High, but he was relatively junior, lacked experience, and did not have the authority or charisma enjoyed by the first Committee Chair, Mr. Ogden. It was not clear what the Head thought of Mr. Williams in his new role as Chair. After all, Mr. Williams followed in the footsteps of a Deputy Head. Mr. Williams was committed, however, and set an ambitious agenda with two main items for the school year 1979-80: (1) to plan a Multicultural Festival for July 1980 and (2) to continue reviewing subject syllabuses in order to assess their multicultural aspects, which had been one of Mr. Ogden's aims. Mr. Williams' commitment to MCE matters was not confined exclusively to the Committee, and he also brought matters to the Head's attention and to full staff meetings. But since he held the post for less than a full school year, he was unable to consolidate the initiatives he had promoted; he left East End High in summer 1980 to take up a post outside the Authority.

Mr. Thomas was elected Chair at a Multicultural Education Committee meeting in a two-way contest early in the following school year (September 16, 1980). Mr. Thomas, Afro-Caribbean,

had originally joined the English department in 1972, left in 1974 to teach in another school in the area, returning to East End High in 1977. He was an active member of the Parents' Association and a staunch advocate of MCE/ARE. Indeed his multicultural/anti-racist convictions were so pronounced that several colleagues were discouraged from joining the Committee because Mr. Thomas was regarded by some as uncompromising. But Mr. Thomas had obvious leadership qualities and was on good terms with the Head. During his period as chair, however, the process of setting an agenda was somewhat less than a collective effort. Mr. Thomas was aggressively anti-racist, believing that the conditions which had produced the St. Pauls, Bristol disturbances (April 1980) added a sense of urgency with regard to MCE/Anti-Racist policy implementation in East End High. For him, time was of the utmost; it could not be wasted. The Committee needed to address itself urgently to the serious business of operationalising multicultural-antiracist policy in the school. Mr. Thomas widened the Committee's brief and added a new item to the agenda in 80-81—'Teaching Against Racism' as we will see below.

The different leadership styles of Mr. Ogden's successors is significant in an analysis of the work and progress of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High. Staff probably felt more comfortable with Mr. Williams because he was not a threat. However, he did not confine his activities vis a vis multicultural education matters exclusively to the Committee; he promoted the Multicultural Education Committee throughout the whole school which helped to raise its' profile. (see Appendix 7.2) Mr. Thomas was in a different category

altogether. Under his Chairmanship, crucial questions about race and racism began to be aired. Hitherto the Committee had managed to side-step these matters, but for Mr. Thomas, forms of racism, prejudice and discrimination were blatant in British schools and society. He viewed them as unequivocally oppressive forces inhibiting the full development and intellectual growth not only of black pupils in the school but also of black people in Britain. Further, he believed all people of whatever ethnic origin should learn to recognise and understand these forces. Thus, for Mr. Thomas, the issue of multiculturalism and antiracism was much wider than the school curriculum or the LEA's policy statement. It was an issue which permeated British society.

THE MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE AGENDA: 1979-1980

This section will review the meetings of the Multicultural Education Committee in the school year, 1979-80. The Committee met twelve times in 1979-80 and two main items dominated the agenda: (1) to plan a Multicultural Festival for July 1980 and (2) to assess the multicultural content of selected subject syllabuses used by teachers in the school. We begin our review with the first meeting of the year held on September 13th [I did not attend this meeting because I was waiting for the Committee to approve my presence in an observer role] when Mr. Williams, the Chair, opened the the discussion by suggesting that

> ....we should educate the staff on the role
> of the Committee. Perhaps we should hold an
> open day session with each department offering
> an element under the heading 'The Multicultural
> School'. This would encourage every member of
> staff to consider it. (Minutes of meeting
> 13, September 1979)

There was support for this suggestion and Mr. Thomas went on to

propose that the Committee hold a Multi-Cultural Festival.

> We should write to High Commissions of relevant
> countries for contributions which would reflect
> their cultures. We could invite the Friends
> of East End High [parents association] and
> cultural groups to participate. The Festival
> could take place towards the end of the school
> year...perhaps three days next summer. We could
> expect financial support from the Innerton C.R.E.
> ....The events should combine 'internal' and
> 'external' talent, and attract the attention of
> community at large. (Minutes of meeting 13,
> Septmber 1979)

This, too, was supported by members. Discussion then continued

with reference to the need to have

> the Chairman marshall the facts and take
> the idea to the Headmaster so that he would
> be as well-informed as possible. Williams
> said he had talked with Mr. Kay, but had
> not yet gone into detail about the ideas
> and function of the committee.
> (Minutes from 13 September 1979 meeting)

Tasks were delegated to Committee members, with Mr. Thomas

agreeing to meet with the Innerton C.R.C. and report back.

Members also requested that Mr. Myles, Head of the Integrated

Studies Department,

> be invited along to a future meeting,
> bringing further materials so that we could
> get a better idea of the content of the I.S.
> syllabus. (Minutes of meeting 13, September 1979)

And under A.O.B. Mr. Williams said

> the Headmaster had given him a D.E.S.
> questionnaire for staff to complete
> of their own estimation of the origins of
> immigrant pupils. They require reliable
> information on how different groups of immigrant
> pupils are getting along. (Minutes of meeting
> 13 September 1979)

Minutes from the first meeting reflected an ideology of cultural

pluralism, and at this early stage the views of committee

members appeared to reflect a consensus. The Chair's

recommendation for an open day to publicise 'The Multicultural School' found favour with members who then proceeded to support a further recommendation to hold a Multicultural Festival in summer. This mood encouraged members to feel it was appropriate to contact the High Commissions of relevant countries to ask for contributions reflecting their cultures. Even though the manner in which staff were requested to fill in the D.E.S. questionnaire (to estimate the "origins of immigrant pupils") implied that these pupils were not 'British', committee members did not appear to view this as problematic. There was no discussion as to whether there were forms of 'racism' latent in the D.E.S. definition, in the school curricula or society at large. Thus, the approach the Committee adopted at this early stage in the school year seemed to be one which emphasised the need for 'understanding' the variety of cultures within the school. The impression created was that the Committee appeared to endorse a particular version of multicultural education, one which is characterised by Bullivant (1981) in the following terms:

> (1) That by learning about his(sic) cultural and
> ethnic "roots" an ethnic child will improve his
> educational achievement;
> (2) the closely related claim that learning about
> his culture, its traditions and so on will improve
> equality of opportunity;
> (3) that learning about other cultures will reduce
> children's (and adult) prejudice and discrimination
> towards those from different cultural and ethnic
> backgrounds. (Bullivant 1981:236)

It is hardly surprising that this consensual view characterised discussion at the Committee's first meeting. After all, this was the dominant thinking of the period. However, later in the 1980s, Bullivant (1986) pointed directly to the limitations of multicultural education, saying that

> A disturbing feature of this approach is that
> it seems to be based on the same conventional
> wisdom about pluralist and compensatory education
> as previous approaches. That is, given sufficient
> intercultural understanding and goodwill between
> members of ethnic groups, enough government funding
> and the kind of democratic liberal idealism......
> the problems of achieving intercultural under-
> standing, equality of opportunity and improved
> educational achievement will be solved......
> Spurred on by its underlying assumptions, alternative
> approaches are denigrated, and more realistic inter-
> pretations of the nature and effects of pluralism are
> ignored. (Bullivant 1981:33)

At this stage in the fieldwork it was too early to identify where individual members of the Committee stood on the ideological spectrum of MCE-ARE, but it was fairly clear that not all members endorsed the conventional wisdom of pluralist and compensatory education. At one level the differences can be characterised as falling into two broad but not mutually exclusive categories, ie. the 'academic' and 'pastoral' aspects of multicultural education. Broadly speaking, 'academic' aspects involved the curriculum, teaching methods and teachers' attitudes, resources and levels of pupil achievement. 'Pastoral' aspects, on the other hand, involved setting agendas concerned with social and cultural aspects in the life of the school and community.

In the meetings and conversations which took place in subsequent months, Committee members' differences became apparent and the consensus view seemed less stable. Although the Committee as a whole endorsed the goal of providing equality of opportunity, certain Committee members recognised that this in itself would not take ethnic minority pupils very far if they were powerless. Some members recognised that a weakness in this version of multiculturalism was that it ignored the crucial

elements of power and racism. A few members took the view that one way of acquiring power was to acquire knowledge, that combatting racism required a more explicit anti-racist strategy. These teachers favoured the development and promotion of multicultural education inside the school in order to eliminate eurocentric bias, racism in the curriculum, pedagogy, resources and learning materials and to promote the achievement levels of pupils. These strategies and concerns can be understood collectively as the 'academic' dimension of multicultural/antiracist education.

Some Committee members felt uncomfortable with this 'academic' emphasis, fearing they might lose their professional autonomy when colleagues on the Committee came to scrutinise their subject syllabuses, teaching methods and materials. These teachers had a preference for more 'pastoral' activities such as festivals, Caribbean evenings, and parents' activities which acknowledged the multicultural nature of the pupils in the school and the community. These events were popular and less politically sensitive. They did not threaten normal school practices and had a wide appeal, attracting members of both the parent body and community into the school to 'celebrate' the richness of their community's cultural diversity. Significantly, the dichotomy between the 'academic' and the 'pastoral' categories was not rigid and several Committee members were as active in planning festivals as they were in critically assessing the curricula. Some were not, however, and differences amongst Committee members surfaced from time to time, causing tension, as we will see from the account of the investigation of subject syllabuses below.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

I began to attend meetings on a regular basis with the approval
of the Committee members. At the meeting of the Committee on 9th
October 1979 a number of straightforward items were dealt
with. The Chair opened the discussion by introducing the ILEA
Multi-Ethnic Education-Progress Report, published in June 1979,
but the Progress Report was not discussed extensively. Some
members thought the ILEA might be willing to help with funding
for the festival because of ILEA's policy. Other agenda items
included matters connected with festival planning. A
representative from the Innerton C.R.C. was present to discuss
funding and assistance with the festival. Information from the
Innerton Teachers' Centre Workshop on In-service activities was
presented and the festival sub-committee set a date for a
meeting. Members were also assured that Mr. Myles would come
along soon to discuss his Integrated Studies syllabus, and the
Youth Centre leader, Mrs. Gee, (white British, part-time remedial
teacher, late 20s) wondered if the Committee could invite the
ILEA Multi-Ethnic Inspectorate along. Matters became somewhat
more contentious, however, when Mr. Thomas proposed that the
Committee ought

> to do something about getting a 'spot' in
> assembly...[develop] a scheme of work that
> could be used in assemblies. Hall assemblies
> are very important.(Notes from Multicultural
> Education Committee meeting. 9 October 1979)

Mr. Thomas elaborated, suggesting that hall assemblies would help
to focus the whole school's attention on these matters. He
spoke with a sense of urgency as he introduced a new series of
items for the Committee's agenda:

> We ought not to be surprised if staff aren't
> interested. Those of us who are more conscious
> ought to be directing their thought. We don't
> really know what goes on in classrooms. We
> know there are books, etc., but we can't be sure
> teachers are using this material effectively. I
> propose that the Multicultural Education Committee
> formulates a scheme of work which could be used by
> a number of departments--especially Social Studies.
> ....Different levels--but for the WHOLE school, eg.
> culture, intelligence and superiority, race and
> race relations....(Notes from Multicultural
> Education Committee meeting. 9 October 1979)

A few weeks later I spoke with Mr. Williams (Chair) who seemed to

be in no particular hurry to promote a whole school approach.   I

asked   what   he   thought   teachers'   views   were   of   the

Multicultural Education Committee and its work.   His   view   was

that

> there was a fair amount of apathy but
> the best thing was simply to continue to press
> away at the job of getting the Committee to
> achieve something. After all, this was only
> the second year of the M-C's existence and it
> was too early to know how staff really felt.
> (Notes from loosely structured interview.
> 12 November 1979)

Mr.   Williams did not refer to the specific issues Mr. Thomas had

mentioned,   but   he   did   indicate   that   certain   matters   were

possibly a bit contentious, such   as   the   DES request for ethnic

data.   (I   was   myself   in the process of   compiling   an   ethnic

register   of all the pupils   with the cooperation of the Heads of

Houses.)   Mr.   Williams   said that   some   staff   did   not   agree

with this in principle, but his view was that it was important to

record this information.   He could see the   logic   of it because

increasingly   data   was   being   analysed   in   terms   of   ethnic

profiles   of   pupils'   academic   performance.   Another   matter

which   came up was   the   need   to   increase   the   stability   of

staffing   in   the   school.   Mr. Williams' view was that now that

many of the older style staff had retired,

> it would take a few more years for the younger
> and more innovative Heads of departments to
> consolidate their influence on the curriculum.
> But there was evidence that these changes were
> in the process of being worked out. (Notes from
> loosely structured interview. 12 November 1979)

This informal interview with Mr. Williams helped to clarify my early impressions: 'Don't force these matters. Let things move at their own pace.' The point seemed to be that the Committee was getting on with 'it'—and while 'it' was not defined precisely, EEH was at least being seen to be doing something.

The most crucial meeting in that first term of the 1979-80 school year took place when Mr. Myles came along to discuss his Integrated Studies syllabus on November 19, 1979. On this occasion the agenda was entirely devoted to 'academic' matters—ie. curriculum content. 'Integrated Studies' as a subject area had emerged in the context of curriculum developments in the late 1960s-early 70s. The Integrated Studies curriculum combined English, History and Geography for all first and second year pupils who were taught in mixed ability groups. McGlynn et al (1984) explain that

> The idea of Integrated Studies was very much
> in vogue in the late 1960s when there was an
> acute teacher shortage. By the early 1970s
> the I.S. department at William Penn was well
> established but by 1976 it was apparent that
> the syllabus no longer met the needs and
> expectations of staff and pupils. A review
> of the course was therefore undertaken by the
> staff......During the 1970s increased attention
> was being paid to the multi-ethnic composition
> of British society.....The new syllabus took
> up this theme in a general way in its central
> aim....(McGlynn et al 1984:71-72)

These points are relevant to the position of Integrated Studies

(I.S.) in East End High in the same period. There was some disquiet about the Integrated Studies curriculum in East End High. This was partly due to the fact that English had been removed from the package of subjects making up Integrated Studies. Mr. Myles, Head of the I.S. Department, had not been very happy with this change because it affected syllabus content and his departmental autonomy. This background information may help to explain why Mr. Myles adopted a defensive stance when his syllabus was scrutinised by the Multicultural Education Committee; in his eyes this activity represented yet another intrusion which challenged his autonomy.

The Multicultural Education Committee meeting of November 19, 1979 had one main agenda item: to look at the Integrated Studies syllabus in order to ascertain the extent to which it contained a multicultural dimension. The Committee was concerned to see whether I.S.,

> reflected the exerience and culture of pupils
> from many ethnic backgrounds and gave them an
> understanding of the geography, history, liter-
> ature and language which have shaped their own
> and other societies. (McGlynn 1984:72)

This was clearly one of the original aims of the Committee as Ogden had conceived it.

At the meeting discussion commenced with Mr. Myles explaining the rationale for the syllabus and also pointing out that due to the removal of English, the amount of time devoted to I.S. was reduced from 12 to 8 periods weekly. This, he suggested, presented problems in terms of what to leave out. He argued that there were a great many demands being made on this syllabus, one in particular coming from his departmental colleague who wanted a

'West Indian Community' element included in the section on 'The
Community'. Mr. Myles explained

> there is almost naturally a multicultural
> element by virtue of geography....I am against
> introducing something artificially. (Notes from
> Multicultural Education Committee meeting.
> 19 November 1979)

When the Committee looked closely at the first-year lesson
on 'Discoveries', which Mr. Myles had circulated, the level of
acrimony rose. (See Appendix 7.3) Staff began to express their
reservations; they detected a consistent bias running through the
material. Perhaps the most consistent bias was the decidedly
eurocentric nature of the information. It was not surprising
that a topic entitled 'Discoveries' would have a eurocentric
bias. Committee members commented on and pointed to the way in
which Cortes was portrayed as having 'discovered' the 'rich'
civilisation of the Aztec Empire in Mexico...which he 'conquered'
with 'only' five hundred men before he sent out exploration
parties who then 'discovered' California. There was a
consistent eurocentric tone to the whole exposition. The material
read as follows:

> Even today there are natives who know little
> about white men. A great English explorer,
> Colonel Fawcett, made the journey into this
> jungle... (quoted from Myles' course materials
> in Appendix 7.3)

The Committee proceeded to read through these materials. (All
quotes are from my Notes taken at the Multicultural Education
Meeting 19 November 1979) At the end of this exercise Mr. Myles
was asked by Mr. Thomas if he

> personally believed that anything can be gained
> from an explicit multicultural element?

Mr. Myles said he thought the

> multicultural element is there and always
> has been. No use putting something in artificially.

Mr. Davey (English Head of House, English teacher in his 30s) commented that

>   where it isn't obviously multicultural, then
>   it is difficult to easily fit in a multi-
>   cultural element.

Myles: The English village has only one culture and
            to try to introduce multicultural into first
            half of first term's work is artificial. I
            feel the balance across the whole first year
            is right.

Thomas: When you introduce studies about different
            people around the world, is this what you
            mean by multicultural?

Myles: Essentially YES. Children are multicultural
            (coming from a wide range of backgrounds) but
            they don't have a wide range of experience. I
            use the boys' experience as city-dwellers to
            contrast with life in rural environment.

Ms. Gee (Youth Centre Leader/Remedial teacher):
            What hits me is perhaps teachers are being
            broader in their teaching. How do you know
            your teachers are doing multicultural
            teaching?

Thomas: I get the feeling that this is NOT the case.

Myles: (read out the preamble to the 'Communities' topic and
explained that)
            comparative work is done. There are different
            backgrounds of pupils in the class. Also 10 text-
            books including sample studies of various peoples
            around the world. All examples are from far
            distant villages around the world. I want
            people to develop what they want to do (ie.teachers)
            that they should contribute something they're
            interested in.

Ms. Hamblin (French teacher in her 30s):

            Can children bring in their own background?
            How do you present the tension of multi-
            ethnic community conflict? We have West Indian
            children in the school constantly calling
            each other 'African'.
Myles: I don't think I've completely succeeded. Some-
            thing had to disappear when English was taken
            out. In fact, with reference to the multicultural
            I don't think I.S. has any more to contribute
            than any other department.

Ms. Gee: What about the various immigrant groups who
            have historically come into Innerton? I don't
            find 'Immigration Into London' taught.

Myles: We need to rewrite material so it is
            appropriate for 1st and 2nd years.

Ms. Wood: (I.S. Department in her 30s, of Afro-Caribbean origin)

>Individuals are doing their own little bit
>...It's a very big dilemma. I use the West
>Indian Regiment in Second World War, but
>Myles probably uses Alamein or something...

Singh (Maths teacher in his 30s):

>Have you ever looked at the case FOR migration?

Myles: The time is not available to plan it properly.
Requires a year to plan it properly.

Bryce: (I.S. Department in his 40s, of Afro-Caribbean origin)

>I wonder if the school as a whole should
>involve itself in this exercise, or are
>you starting with departments whose
>curriculum should reflect multiculturalism?

Williams (Chair):
>There is only the ILEA Directive, as far
>as the Head and Deputies are concerned. We have
>no information or guidelines for the school.

Myles: I think the bulk of this falls on the
Multicultural Education Committee.

Ms.Wood: This is not necessarily a waste of time.

Myles: Amalgamation will probably mean the disappearance
of Integrated Studies.

Ms. Gee: But the children will follow I.S. for the
next four years.

Myles: But when I go at Easter, they may not replace
me. To a certain extent, you will be wasting
your time. Why not work out what you would like
to see as multicultural policy?
[He did not leave at Easter]

This exchange highlighted a number of major points which
needed to be clarified. At a general level, it was obvious
that the Committee needed to identify more precisely what it
should be looking for when investigating the extent to
which syllabuses contained Eurocentric bias. More specifically,

the exercise had the effect of making Committee members aware
that they did not have a sufficiently clear set of multicultural
aims or goals. Without a clear vision they could not promote
and implement a multicultural education whole school policy. The
Committee needed to clarify what constituted a multicultural
syllabus before it could assess whether multicultural aims could
be achieved in the context of specific syllabuses. Pedagogy,
too, needed careful consideration because it was useless
developing multicultural curricula unless its delivery was
conducted in a multicultural/anti-racist manner. Mr. Thomas's
point is crucial here:

> ....you've got staff in the school who are supposed
> to be delivering that [an anti-racist curriculum]
> and these people have got to undergo some sort of
> changes. You don't just change the curriculum,
> you've got to change these people. You've got to
> get them to understand why it is that from Monday
> of next week we'll be approaching the curriculum
> and delivering THIS kind of curriculum as opposed
> to THAT....So they go along with it [and] they
> know why they go along with it.
> (Interview with Mr. Thomas 21 March 1989)

More substantively, this exchange highlighted the fact that the
Committee lacked the authority to compel staff to revise their
curricula. Therefore, despite these blatant criticisms of Mr.
Myles' Eurocentric materials, Myles was able to leave the meeting
with his syllabus intact, without even offering an apology or
promise to revise his syllabus to suit the aims of the
Multicultural Education Committee. Some teachers felt the
scrutiny of syllabuses was too personalised---that they were
being blamed for using ethnocentric or biased teaching
materials. The Committee recognisd this was a serious
difficulty; they were confused as to how to proceed, and
acknowledged the complex and time-consuming nature of the
'multiculturalising' task. But it was Mr. Myles himself who

pointed to the central weakness in this exercise when he told his colleagues that the Committee and the whole school needed to get on with the job of formulating a multicultural education policy. While several teachers regarded this as top priority, a balance needed to be struck between teachers who had mainly 'academic' goals and those with mainly 'pastoral' ones. Irrespective of what was prioritised, the Committee needed the power and authority to conduct its business with the full cooperation of all staff.

In the spring and summer terms, a number of issues helped to increase multicultural awareness in East End High. Although the main agenda item at the next meeting in February 1980 was concerned with the 'pastoral' matter of planning the Multicultural Festival scheduled for 5th/6th July 1980, 'academic' issues were also raised. Mr. Williams, for instance, was anxious to increase staff involvement in multicultural activities and had devised a questionnaire designed to be completed by all Department Heads and Housemasters. The questionnaire included three questions concerned to investigate: (1) any aspects of your House/ Department which reflect a concern with Multi-Cultural Education (2) ...areas of the school life where multi- cultural education could play a more important role... and (3) Do you exercise 'positive discrimination' in any way in favour of minority cultural groups? Unfortunately whatever information collected was never disseminated to Committee members or to staff as far as I could ascertain.

A second 'academic' matter was that the Parents Association, 'The Friends of East End High', planned to have an evening devoted to 'Multi-Ethnic Education' on 6th May 1980. The venue would consist of a panel of speakers, including a member of the ILEA Multi-Ethnic Inspectorate and three teachers from the school. Mr. Kay publicised this event in school notices and flyers   for staff and pupils.   As it happened, the Parents Association 'Multi-Ethnic Education' evening was held in the aftermath of the riots in the St.Pauls district of Bristol.   Mr. Kay was very concerned about the St. Pauls situation and publicised it in the Staff Notice, April 25, 1980:

> Recent events in Bristol make this long planned
> meeting particularly topical and the response
> which the school gives to this whole area of
> education is likely to be viewed with great
> interest in the community within which we work.

Mr. Thomas was   also concerned about events in   Bristol because he felt circumstances in St. Pauls were not that dissimilar from those in Innerton.   He wanted to encourage the school to develop an 'overall policy for involving pupils more directly in running of the school' and in running their own lives.   Accordingly, he drafted a questionnaire designed to be given to pupils but which he circulated to teachers the day after the full staff meeting, April 22.1980. (see Appendix 7.4) Mr. Thomas felt

> staff must take seriously the possibility that
> there could be a St. Pauls here in this area.
> (informal interview April 24, 1980)

He hoped the questionnaire would encourage staff to think about how they could involve   the   boys   more   directly.

Even though only twenty-six out of eighty-six staff responded, Mr. Thomas hoped to use the data as the basis of a 'discussion paper' which might stimulate debate about how school organisation could be improved from the point of view of pupil involvement. He was concerned about the Head's under-consultative and undemocratic style of leadership which discouraged any serious exchange of staff opinion and participation.

The timing of these 'academic' initiatives helped to focus attention on multicultural education throughout the whole school. Notwithstanding the importance of these matters, however, the item which absorbed most of the Committee's time and energy during the '79-'80 school year was planning and carrying out the Multicultural Festival. Altogether eight of the twelve Committee meetings in 1979-80 held were more or less completely given over to organising this ambitious task. Numerous events needed to be coordinated: arranging for a float to carry the school's steel band around the neighbourhood on the Saturday to publicise the Festival, printing and circulating a booklet announcing the events, setting up a variety of stalls for books, artefacts, games, international food, gymnastics displays, etc.. and informing the ILEA's weekly newspaper, Contact.

A tight schedule of events was planned to take place in the school hall and playground on Saturday July 5th and Sunday July 6th. Good weather helped to bring people out and approximately half the staff (40+ teachers with their families), pupils and their families, the local M.P., and

people from the community turned out. Events ran smoothly. Festival income was in credit--£186.45. The Head extended congratulations and thanks to all involved, adding

> I hope we can look forward to a repeat
> performance next year.
> (Staff Notice July 11 1980)

The success of the Festival was not lost on Mr. Thomas either-- "it will be better next year!" and the year ended on high note!

With the benefit of hindsight, however, we can see that the agenda in 1979-80 was somewhat insular and school-centred. Further, the Committee seemed more concerned with pastoral than academic matters, despite heated discussion over the Integrated Studies syllabus which had taken place at the meeting in November 1979. Although reference was made to ILEA's In-service activities, no one was mandated or volunteered to attend and provide feed-back about MCE In-service work taking place in Innerton or elsewhere in the ILEA. Members had not investigated what other schools were doing by way of developing MCE policy and practice. Thus the end-of-year 'report' on the Multicultural Education Committee's progress should note that (a) the Committee had not yet developed a clear multicultural education policy position, (b) teachers had made very little progress in deciding what they wanted to achieve inside the school, and (c) the Head had not really provided firm and focused leadership. By contrast and in this same period, the Working Party Report by teachers at Birley High School had made considerable progress in defining and setting goals for promoting multicultural education. (Birley High School 1980)

Nonetheless the Committee's work had begun to gain ground, and progress was made toward developing a coherent multicultural strategy inside the school. However, in December 1979 it was announced that East End High would be amalgamating with a neighbouring boys' comprehensive in the autumn of 1982. Amalgamation meant staff would inevitably be distracted from pursuing their multicultural interests as plans for the merger proceeded. Every teacher in the school was concerned with job security, and everyone would have to reapply for their posts.

THE 1980-81 AGENDA:

In the school year 1980-81 some Committee members were beginning to take greater notice of the climate of racial disharmony in Britain's inner cities. The riots in St. Pauls, Bristol had sounded the warning bell; the Deptford Fire, Black Peoples' March, the Brixton, Toxteth, and Southall 'Riots' plus the publication of the Rampton Report (West Indian Children in Our Schools, June 1981) were in the wings. (Kettle & Hodges 1982).

In September 1980, Mr. Thomas was elected Chair and the Committee's orientation began to move in an overtly anti-racist direction. 'Teaching Against Racism: A Discussion' was the main agenda item at the first meeting on 14 October. Areas to be covered included :

(a) Race: What is it? Should we be consciously educating pupils about it?
(b) Intelligence or levels of consciousness/ awareness?

                (c) .Culture:
                      i- Language
                      ii- History
                      iii- Art
                      iv- Social Institutions,'Systems' & World
                          Outlook
                      v- any other
                (d) Racism and Sexism
                (e) Race Relations in Britain
                (taken from the Agenda circulated at this meeting)

The Minutes under the heading 'Teaching Against Racism' read:
        The Chairman said that the Committee have the very
        important task of developing multicultural education
        in the school, and that even though we appreciated
        the usefulness and benefits to be gained from
        multicultural festivals, social evenings, etc.,
        we should not lose sight of the fact that most of
        our work has to be done in the classroom. I propose
        that the Committee might discuss 'Teaching Against
        Racism' in sections over a number of weeks, and
        perhaps, ultimately, we might devise a C.S.E.
        syllabus on Race Relations in Britain.
        (Minutes circulated at Meeting October 14, 1980)

Aspects   of   multicultural/antiracist   education   were   thus

prioritised   by   the Committee   as the school year commenced.

The ethos was   decidedly   'academic'   rather than 'pastoral'.

The Headmaster (present at this meeting) suggested someone be

invited   to speak to staff about   why   the   education   system

fails so   many   West   Indian   children.   The   Head   of Social

Studies,   Mr.   Cox,   agreed to circulate the materials he used

on   race   and   prejudice so the Committee could discuss them.

Together four Committee meetings   serve   as a record   of the

teachers'   views about MCE/ARE in East End High in the school

year   1980-81.   Teachers attitudes and opinions   reflected   a

wide specturm of multicultural and antiracist views.

FIRST MEETING: NOVEMBER 11, 1980

The   main   theme of this meeting was 'Prejudice'.   Discussion

highlighted two distinct aspects: (1) how to combat prejudice

and (2)   the   suitability   of   the   Social   Studies classroom

materials on 'What is Prejudice?'   Staff also looked into how

main Hall assemblies might be used as a venue for exposing aspects of prejudice.

The First Deputy Head, Mr. Glenn, attended this meeting but the Headmaster did not. Mr. Thomas opened the meeting by suggesting that the behaviour of 'skin-heads' ought to be brought to pupils' attention because recently they had beaten up a Sikh boy, taken his turban and cut his hair. Mr. Thomas referred to this as 'cultural castration'. Mr. Glenn responded by saying that main Hall assemblies might be used as a forum for exposing 'prejudice':

Glenn: We must not isolate this matter. For example,
         last Sunday was Remembrance Day. What did we
         remember? Persecution of minority people—like
         Jewish people. [Then] I will open it up to general
         persecution going on in all parts of the world. [I]
         will try to convey the message [that] they [pupils]
         must not be like silly sheep; they must not be like
         their elders; they must think about things for
         themselves.

Thomas: ...try to get them to think about what it's like
         to be on the receiving end—read some poems from
         Searle's World in a Classroom where he tried to
         get the kids to imagine what it is like to be Jewish
         in Hitler's Germany, a West Indian in Britain, and
         Black in South Africa.

Not all staff were as openly anti-racist as Mr. Thomas and
Mr. Glenn, as we can see from the following exchange:

Jim (Irish) [was]..worried about stirring up something which had
P.E.   not occurred to them [pupils]. I grew up on the
teacher   streets of Belfast and I never thought about these
            things.
The exchange became heated as other teachers joined in:

         - Do you think there is the same climate in Belfast today?
         - Didn't they see 'Holocaust' [on tv] and they knew
         what it was about?
         - We've got to bring it to them.
         - If we get defeatist, nothing gets done.

Jim: Certain parents may not approve. Let's leave it
         there. It's just my view.

Thomas: I don't agree with Jim. I've heard it so many times.
There is such a thing as prejudice--from the age of
two years. There seems a contradiction in what Jim
is saying...You mentioned parents. Getting at
parents is a gradual thing and we know from
experience what is involved in getting at parents.
Kids come to school for 5 days a week. We have a
a responsibility to educate them.

Jim: We've got a joint responsibility.

Ms. Harris (white French teacher from Zimbabwe):
    The boys' peers have just as much influence as
parents.

Ms Chantal (white French teacher):
    I'm pleased to draw it to the surface. I think it's
vital, eg. there have recently been attacks on Jewish
people.

Ms Waller (white Remedial teacher):
    You can't leave it alone if you live in London.

Thomas: Jim said we should look at it. This is very
important. This is what the Committee should be doing.

Mr. Elkins (West Indian I.S. teacher):
    What is your aim? Are you going to try to make
them aware of prejudice and try to combat
prejudice?

Glenn: This is a tiny beginning; it is not the end.
We need limited aims to make [pupils] aware that
discrimination and prejudice are not just a thing of
the present. They have gone on in the past and we
want them [pupils] to understand this. It is only a
limited objective. Whatever we do in school can only
have a small impact.

This exchange exposed ، fundamental differences in outlook

among members of the Committee. Consensus as to the

desirability and need to expose forms of prejudice,

discrimination and racism in Assemblies still seemed remote.

But when discussion moved to the second agenda item,

reviewing the Social Studies materials on 'Prejudice',

matters took a different direction, and the orientation of

the Committee began to move in an overtly anti-racist

direction.

It was time to look at prejudice and discrimination in its

various forms and try to devise ways of combatting racism. Copies of classroom materials on 'Prejudice' used in the 4th year Social Studies core course were circulated to each Committee member by the Head of Social Studies (see Appendix 7.5). Reactions to this material varied: one teacher wondered how it was handled in the classroom, what teachers' attitudes were, how it was put over? Some of the material contained cartoons meant to represent racial/ethnic stereotypes which were accompanied by stock comments like: "dammed foreigner", "Jewish blood obviously", "you can see he's working class, old chap". When staff said some of this material was analogous to comics, Mr. Barker, a housemaster who taught English, defended this form of pedagogy.

Barker: It's for kids after all—and for those with low ability."

Cox: The kids even read comics badly..

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the materials were counter-productive; they didn't set out to destroy prejudice. He drew attention to how words were used—that the standards were 'white'.

Cox: (defending the materials)..we live in a 'white' society.

Thomas: No we don't! It's not necessarily to do with race, but that is the example used.... [these materials] are counterproductive in a multiracial classroom.

Discussion continued until 6.30 pm. (2 1/2 hours). Toward the end, acrimony subsided and staff recognised they were more likely to make progress by looking for materials they could agree were suitable.

Thomas: Is it possible we don't really know what we're looking for?

Cox: [the materials] weren't set up for detailed critical examination. Perhaps the Committee can re-write the materials to avoid perpetuating racist statements.

Discussion ceased at this point because Mr. Thomas felt the need to adopt a set of 'Guidelines' which would enable the Committee to engage in a more systematic analysis of teaching materials. He undertook to produce a set of 'Guidelines' for the next meeting.

SECOND MEETING: 10 MARCH 1981

The warning bell of St. Pauls, Bristol rang and the Deptford Fire (January 18.1981) found its way on to the agenda at the March 10, 1981 meeting. Mr. Kay attended to register his concern about the tragedy of the Deptford Fire and the Black Day of Action (see Race & Class '81-'82) on the 2nd March. He expressed concern about the Deptford Fire in which thirteen young black people had lost their lives; he could not believe there had been no spontaneous gesture or leadership from the Sixth Form. People had turned a blind eye———like in Nazi Germany. He was going to mention the fire in Assembly:

> In Assembly this week I'm devoting
> the topic to Louis Armstrong and
> 'It's a Wonderful World'. I want
> to ask if it is a wonderful world.
> (Minutes 10 March 1981)

A teacher offered to ask for contributions from pupils to send to families of the deceased. Twenty-five pounds was subsequently collected for the New Cross Fire Fund in an Assembly.

Other agenda items focused on 'pastoral' matters and

included liaising with local Community Centre groups to support their activities, trying to involve the boys in the work of these organisations and preparation for the 1981 summer Multicultural Festival. Festival preparation was the single agenda item at the next meeting, May 19, 1981. The Head's presence at this meeting signalled his concern. Racially sensitive matters outside school needed to be acknowledged inside.

THIRD MEETING: 9 JUNE 1981

Mr. Thomas circulated two papers (see Appendix 7.6) in advance to Committee members : (1) 'practical guidelines for assessing children's books for a multi-ethnic society', and (2) an article entitled "Doing It Yourself" from the CRE Education Journal (March 1981), written by the Headmaster of Birley High School in which he explained how his staff had painfully and patiently overcome obstacles encountered while working to develop multicultural education in Birley High School. In the event, neither of these two papers was discussed at the meeting.

By June 1981 the atmosphere changed. Tension had increased in the aftermath of the Brixton and Toxteth 'riots'. The publication of The Rampton Report, West Indian Children in Our Schools, (June 1981) helped to legitimate both the Committee's role in the school and its concern to explore the meaning of 'racism'. Rampton had acknowledged the existence of racism both in schools and society.

Thomas: Until we agree about racism we cannot go
               on to look at school syllabuses.

Mr. Thomas circulated an agenda for a 9th June '81 meeting
with the following items:

AGENDA:
1. Multicultural Festival-speedy progress report
2. Teaching Aganst Racism

Mr. Thomas then elaborated in some detail, making the
following points:

It was decided at our last meeting to devote
as much time as possible to a discussion on
racism, in order to ascertain as far as
possible that, as members of a Committee,
we all mean the same thing when we use
the term 'racism'.

I offer below some guidelines and a definition
of racism for discussion: Racism is ......
1) the belief that there are well-defined races
2) the belief that some races are superior to others
3) the belief that the superior races should rule
over the inferior and the attempt to put this
belief into practice.

If we agree on a definition of racism, I feel
that we should then investigate the following:
1- language
2- staff attitudes towards multicultural
education in the school
3- sexism and the pupils

(quoted from Mr. Thomas' pre-circulated agenda for the
Multicultural Education Committee 9th June 1981).

No agreement was reached regarding a sastisfactory

definition of racism even after lengthy discussion.

Thomas: ..... if it's fear and mistrust it isn't
racism, it's racial prejudice but when we
start thinking about dominating/
exploitating them, then racism emerges.

..... I don't believe that race is a biological
entity, but there are people who are respected
and who do think there are races--National
Front, for example.

Ms Harris: We've got to start looking at the effects of
racism in the school, that the teachers are
racist or perpetuating racism...

Cox: (Casting doubt on the value of this exercise)
Is this Committee about racism or
multiculturalism?

Thomas: Has anyone suggested that? We're educated
people trying to do certain things here in the
school and we should be discussing teaching
against racism.

This exchange helped Committee members to begin to come to terms with the implications of racism/racist practices in the context of EEH and the society at large. Mr. Cox, in defending his materials, took the position that 'multiculturalism' and 'racism' were somehow incompatible, while in Mr. Thomas' view, it was not possible to separate 'racism' from 'multiculturalism' in any precise way and this had direct implications for the work of the Committee. If agreement could be reached on the meaning of terms, then there would be a basis for moving forward collectively.

FOURTH MEETING: 30 JUNE 1980

This meeting marked a turning point. Events outside the school contributed to increasing the racial awareness among teachers in East End High. At this meeting the 'academic'—even 'political' agenda item came into conflict with the 'pastoral'. The publication of the Rampton Report had provided staff with something 'official' to study. This official report highlighted issues of immediate relevance to pupils and teachers in East End High. Which issue should be prioritised? Working out a whole school MCE/Anti-Racist policy or Festival planning? Some Committee members felt the need to attend to ('pastoral') Festival preparations; others felt it was important for the school to reach a consensus about a policy ('academic'-'political') position.

The Rampton recommendations that schools should devise multicultural education policy statements were particularly timely. Rampton stated that:

> The DES should, as part of its current review
> of curriculum arrangements, invite all LEAs
> to define their policy and commitment to
> multi-cultural education and to describe how
> this is put into effect in their schools.
> (Rampton 1981:78)

> Heads should seek to involve West Indian teachers
> and teachers from other ethnic minority groups
> more directly in the overall development of the
> curriculum.(Rampton 1981:78)

> Heads should consider the establishment of staff
> working parties to consider their own school's
> response to multi-cultural education.(Rampton 1981:78)

At the meeting on June 30, 1981 the Committee noted Rampton's recommendations and recognised the urgent need to evolve a whole school MCE/Anti-Racist policy in East End High. This recognition was coupled with a belief in the need to establish a power base within the school's decision-making structure in order to become an integral part of the decision-making process. Views were expressed forcefully about this situation:

Thomas: Someone should say we demand greater say in decision-making in this school.

Cox: The Head says he is not a democrat———we can have a say, but he [Head] really doesn't want the staff to get together.

Although these deliberations were cut short, they would come up again in the following school year when Committee meetings recommenced. The year ended on a depressing note when, due to the tension in some inner city areas, Mr. Kay was seriously worried that perhaps members of the Innerton community might react and engage in 'copy-cat' behaviour stimulated by the 'riots'. I later learned that the Head felt that he could not guarantee the safety of the school. Apparently Mr. Kay felt that the racially charged climate in the area might disrupt the Multicultural Festival. At

short notice and with minimal consultation, he cancelled the

Festival planned for July 11, 1981. In the week of 17th July

1981, the following statement about the Multi-Cultural

Festival appeared in the 'Staff Notice':

Kay: It was with feelings of tremendous regret that in
     view of the disturbances and the possibility of
     violence, I was forced to cancel the event. I wish
     to extend most strongly my regrets to Mr. Elkins,
     his hardworking Committee, the many parents,
     friends and boys, as well as girls from Chatham
     School, whose efforts were brought to nought by
     this decision. I only hope that we have not lost
     their goodwill and that in more settled times the
     festival will be held.

THE CODA: AUTUMN 1981

The final chapter in the 'life' of the Multicultural Education

Committee in East End High took place in the autumn of 1981.

There were only two meetings and both focused on one item: the

need for a whole school Multicultural/Anti-Racist policy which

in theory would take effect in the newly amalgamated school.

At the first meeting on November 3rd, eleven teachers attended

(see Appendix 7.7)
and re-elected Mr. Thomas Chair. Mr. Thomas began by reviewing

the Committee's history and then proceeded to introduce a

number of urgent issues, including the Head's attitude:

Thomas: .....there were 6 lectures given in 1978-79
           on the Caribbean. The Head has never
           come out with the school's policy....[We]

           have looked at a few syllabuses and organised
           the Festival[s]. Something is lacking. I
           recommend that part of staff's commitment
           should be to go to meetings and be involved.
           [There is also the question] of the statistics
           on achievement which the Local Authority is
           publishing this week (ILEA RS/807/81).
           (Minutes of Meeting 3 November 1981)

Ms Harris: We've not even addressed the question of
           achievement...maybe we can do something
           about the underachievement of our kids.
           ...we need more in-service training...

Ms Chantal: A number of courses are available....
            Promotion within the school is relevant
            to black and white staff. We also have
            to think about amalgamation and the percentage
            of black and white teachers who get jobs...
            We may come to 'positive discrimination'.....
            These things should be part of the multi-
            cultural policy for the school..

Perhaps most significantly, teachers finally recognised the

need to develop a whole school policy.

Ms Chantal: if all these things were concretised in a
            school policy, people couldn't get away
            with it...

Thomas: Looking at the new school---- we can
            invite staff from the other school to
            explore these issues.

Specific matters were identified: the importance of teachers'

attitudes in classrooms, the teaching of Mother Tongue, the

curriculum, needs of minority pupils, links with parents and

the community. Most important of all, however, was feeling

that a general statement of policy on Multicultural/Anti-Racist

education was needed from the Head.

November 10th 1981 was the final meeting and the thirteen

teachers present expresed a commitment to formulating a

multicultural/antiracist education policy for the new school.

Thomas: I want something positive on multicultural
            education in the school right now. [There] is
            not a single Head of House or Department at
            this meeting. I will recommend that part of the
            staff's commitment should be to go to meetings
            and be involved.

Gold: This Committee is a voluntary thing...it is
            very presumptious of you to ask people to
            attend...You as Chair should discuss these
            matters with the Head.

 Ms Chantal: I see what [Thomas] is really getting at...
            an Anti-Racist policy ought to come from
            the top....

Thomas: People shouldn't attend this meeting out of
            coercion. But we might ask for regular
            discussions on matters of multicultural education.
            The policy-making body is the Joint Heads meeting—
            ... either Heads of department attend this meeting
            or they discuss multicultural regularly at their
            meetings......The Head gets a copy of the agenda
            and minutes for every meeting. But because
            of what we've been doing, there was no real need to
            talk to the Head. We do not, therefore, have
            a school policy on multicultural and people have not
            been told what to do because there is no school
            policy. We can't make decisions here. We need to
            talk with the other school.

Teachers   recognised   that amalgamation provided an opportunity
to collaborate, to engage in the joint planning of a
multicultural education whole school policy which could take
effect in the new school.   But bureaucratic changes brought
about by the amalgamation process dominated.   There was little
opportunity for collaborative MCE-ARE work.   Circumstances
dictated that everyone would be re-applying for their posts.
The consequence was that the work of the Multicultural
Education Committee in East End High gradually lost momentum.

In my final interview   with the Head, I learned that Mr. Kay
was the Head Designate for the new school and that he planned
to establish two new posts of responsibility. One was for ESL
in the context of the 'Special Needs Department', to replace
the existing Remedial Department. The second was a senior post
with

            responsibility for community links and Multi-
            cultural education. That's going to be one of the
            planks of the new school—to cater for the needs
            of the local community.(Interview March 16.1982)

Mr. Kay stressed that the structure of the new school needed to
take account of the changes taking place in the community and
one obvious area in need was Mother Tongue. But he also

referred to multicultural education on a broader level and noted,

> The multi-ethnic composition of the area is
> changing—perhaps rapidly. Whereas seven years
> ago the school was desperately trying to react
> to what was suddenly, it appears, an
> overwhelming introduction of West Indian youngsters
> into school, now the most rapidly growing group
> of people are Turkish-speaking.....Somehow
> they're taking over in the immigrant situation
> as the successful West Indian parents are moving
> out....One of the other rapidly growing areas
> from the Asian subcontinent are Gujerati-speaking
> people, and I'm told we have something like 50
> Gujerati-speaking youngsters in this school.
> (Interview March 16, 1982)

The establishment of these two senior posts incorporating aspects of MCE/ARE into the structure of the new school suggested that these issues would be given serious attention. Kay indicated that the school had sought continuously to accommodate to the changing needs of the pupil population in the area, and multicultural education was about to become, so it appeared, a major feature in the authority structure of the new school. However, at this point in time, it was impossible to anticipate how successful the multicultural-antiracist initiative would be in the newly amalgamated school.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The chapter has described and analysed the role of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High throughout the two and a half year period, 1979-1982. We have seen how members of this Committee interpreted and responded to the 1977 ILEA Multi-Ethnic Policy initiative at a time when the teaching profession was beginning to give more attention to developing multicultural education policies both at LEA and school level. In making sense of this account, however, we must remember that in this period there was no consensus as to the meaning of

multi-ethnic (multicultural) education. As we saw above in chapter two, the ILEA had itself achieved a delicate political balance in policy-making and the 1977 Multi-Ethnic policy initiative did not truly represent a consensus view.

At first the rationale for developing this policy framework was based on the need to improve the rates of achievement of ethnic and racial minority pupils in the ILEA. As time passed, however, racial tension increased in Britain's inner cities and demands were made for a firmer antiracist stance to be taken inside schools with a view to reducing potential sources of conflict. Thus the interplay of the underachievement of ethnic and racial minority pupils and the manifestation of urban unrest amongst black youth in the early 1980s combined to legitimate the development of multicultural education policies. In the aftermath of the 'riots' and with the publication of Rampton, antiracist education policies were given serious attention and a higher profile inside schools.

In East End High the Multicultural Education Committee had embarked on its task without clear guidelines. Even though the Head had given his approval and was sympathethic to the broad ethos of multiculturalism, he took no active leadership role. Significantly, two of the three Chairs had taken middle ground positions. Mr. Ogden, who set up the Committee and was its first Chair, was later described by Mr. Thomas, (the third Chair) as a

> Black liberal.....he would have wanted to go to
> a certain point and that was it...... don't rock
> the boat too much. Go as far as the establishment
> will tolerate...(Interview notes March 21.1989)

Mr. Thomas described Mr. Williams, the second Chair, as an

> easy-going gentle person, as I remember him.
> Not half as aggressive as I. He became involved
> in a number of working parties....did command
> respect from staff....did show a lot of interest
> in multicultural education, but like lots of
> other people, I don't think he truly understood
> how far he should be going....the sort of demands
> he should be making on the establishment, if you
> like. (Interview with Mr.Thomas. March 21. 1989)

When Mr. Thomas was Chair, however, he was conscious of the
fine line which, if transgressed, would antagonise Committee
members. Nonetheless, he gradually changed the content of the
agenda by mobilising the issue of racism and pressed for the
formulation of a whole school antiracist education policy. The
priorities of Thomas' agenda reflected and responded to the
changing climate of the time.

Teachers who attended meetings represented a variety of
different views spanning broadly assimilationist, culturally
pluralist and actively antiracist positions. Accordingly, they
were unable to agree about the meaning of multiculturalism;
they had different aims and expectations. These differences
have been characterised as 'academic', ie., concerned to
eliminate Eurocentrism from the curriculum and pedagogy, and
the promotion of antiracist strategies on the one hand, and
'pastoral', ie., 'festivals', Caribbean and parents' evenings
and 'Black Studies' approaches, on the other.
Because this 'academic'-'pastoral' divide was never truly
bridged, the Committee was unable to evolve a stable
consensus view vis a vis whole school MCE-ARE policy and
practice.

What is significant in telling this story, however, is that the

Committee's progress reflects the growing multicultural—antiracist awareness and concern in the profession and wider community in this period. Thus, as the Committee came to accept the need to take a positive step in an antiracist policy direction, ILEA published an 'Aide Memoire' which provided substantive guidelines for schools engaged in developing multi-ethnic education and combatting racism. (ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education Review vol. 1 no.1 1982) The 'Aide Memoire' identified and addressed: How is the school taking steps to combat racism, the curriculum, how staff behave inside classrooms, what form of support is given to teachers and pupils in developing strategies to combat racism, and whether the school creates opportunities for staff and parents to meet and discuss aspects of racism. The 'Aide Memoire' complemented the Rampton Report which helped to legitimate these issues officially. However, for the purposes of the work of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High, the publication of these guidelines came at a time when the Committee was distracted by the amalgamation process and was unable either to follow the guidelines in the 'Aide Memoire' or implement Rampton's recommendations with a view to consolidating the progress that had been made during the previous two years.

Retrospectively, it is fair to say that the Committee did foster a multicultural—antiracist ethos throughout the school. However, this ethos instilled fear in some Committee members which Mr. Thomas expressed in the following way:

I think multicultural education is really a
dangerous thing....people didn't dare to talk
about anti-racist education because had they
talked about that, it would have meant inevitably
that every member of staff would see herself/
himself as having to cope with anti-racism.
Coping with multicultural education, you
know, well, I don't know anything about saris
or getting kids to sing caplysos or play steel
bands......so that's fine. I don't need to worry
about that. But by God I would have to worry about
it if it was anti-racist education.....because we
live in a society where there is racism and and it's
something that we've got to tackle in education.
(Interview with Mr.Thomas March 24. 1989)

In commenting on the role of the Head in East End High, Mr.

Kay should be given credit for responding positively to the

climate and circumstances of the time. Although he did not

provide the kind of strong leadership required to develop and

implement the MCE policy initiative in East End High,

nonetheless, he enabled a legitimate forum to emerge in which

the themes of the multicultural/antiracist education debate

and policy issues were taken up by several teachers. As Mr.

Thomas explained, Mr. Kay

was very sympathetic to the idea of multicultural
education in his school because of his own
experience.

[But] Kay had a 'social conscience', as opposed
to 'consciousness'....he was very concerned about
what was happening to black people and was aware
of the antagonism being directed towards one section.

[And] Kay's age might have had a lot to do with
the fact that he didn't do more....and there's
no two ways about it, he could have done more.
(Interview with Mr.Thomas 24. March 1989)

Regarding the creation of the senior teacher's post for

Multicultural Education and Community Links in the newly

amalgamated school, Mr. Thomas doubted that Mr. Kay would have

consulted with the other Deputy Heads from either East End High

or the other school

because in those days it wasn't the general
practice for Head teachers to pay any kind
of attention to a whole school policy approach
to decision-making......So Kay would have done
this thing with his senior people. He would
have consulted with the District Inspector and County
Hall, or that might have been part of his ticket
to the appointment. (Interview with Mr.Thomas
24. March 1989)

In the light of Mr. Thomas's comment, one can argue that Mr.
Kay was taking more credit for promoting MCE than he had
earned.   Kay knew that multicultural/antiracist education had
become very important in the ILEA by the time East End High
was amalgamating; he stood to gain by giving a high profile to
the work of the Multicultural Education Committee. That he
himself did not have a clear sense of direction and had not
provided forceful leadership would elude those in County Hall.
It is likely that Mr. Kay gained from the 'fashion' for MCE/ARE
while the work of his committed band of teachers went largely
unnoticed.

Several accounts of school-based MCE/Anti-Racist initiatives
have been published since I conducted my fieldwork in East
End High. (Birley High School, Manchester, 1980, Straker-Welds,
1984 & ILEA Multi-Ethnic Review 1982-1986, Multicultural
Teaching).   These sources are instructive for a number of
reasons, not least because they include case studies written by
practicing teachers and highlight a range of individual school
circumstances. They also demonstrate that MCE/ARE strategies
are inherently pluralistic and can be implemented in a variety
of different ways.   In the light of the circumstances in East
End High, however, and with the points made by teachers in
Birley High School above (pp:2-3) in mind, the Multicultural
Education Committee could have made a more positive
contribution to implementing MCE-ARE policy and practice inside

the school if the Head had given unequivocal support to
promoting the realisation of multicultural-antiracist aims and
goals within the framework of a whole school policy.

CHAPTER EIGHT.

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has investigated the 1977 ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education initiative in one school, East End High, which sought to put the policy in place in the period from 1979 through 1982. The development of the ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education policy evolved within the ideological framework of the post-war social democratic education consensus, and East End High's response to this policy reflects a wide spectrum of views about and interpretations of multicultural-antiracist education which were debated at this time. In this chapter I will summarise and draw conclusions in terms of three levels of policy before turning to discuss the policy implications.

By using a variety of ethnographic research methods, I was able to combine data from published sources with interviews, survey material and observations collected at various stages in the period of fieldwork. I have presented a socio-economic and educational profile of the deprived community of Innerton and assessed the relevance of these variables in analysing low levels of pupil achievement. I have identified key organisational factors inside the school, the extent of multicultural practice already in place, investigated a sample of pupils' experiences, presented a profile of teachers' attitudes toward the multicultural initiative inside East End High and examined the work of the Multicultural Education Committee.

In summarising, I will first consider the wider context of the post-war period in which social democratic ideals in education policy-making prevailed before they were challenged by a Conservative government elected in 1979. Second, I will acknowledge that the multi-ethnic policy itself grew out of the rapidly changing climate in England's inner cities, notably in London in the 1970s. The London Borough of Innerton had absorbed, along with many other inner city boroughs, considerable numbers of immigrants whose children were in local primary and secondary schools, making up a disproportionately large percentage of the pupil population. The needs of these pupils were recognised both nationally and locally, though national rhetoric tended to misrepresent the extent to which LEAs and schools were taking steps to make adequate provision. Despite this increased recognition, however, there was no consensus as to how best to respond. The most clearly articulated set of responses consisted of a debate about the meaning of multicultural and antiracist education reflecting different and seemingly contradictory views which had to be accommodated within a policy framework acceptable to both education policy-makers at the level of the LEAs and teachers inside schools. The issues raised by this debate contributed to and helped to legitimate the formulation of multi-ethnic education policies by LEAs, most notably for our purposes, the ILEA. The third level of analysis will draw conclusions about East End High's response to and experience of implementing the multi-ethnic policy initiative, taking account of multi-ethnic practice which was already in place inside the school. I will argue that insofar as there was a consensus about the desirability of promoting multicultural-antiracist education

inside East End High, it was a fragile one which encompased various interpretations of the meaning of and strategies for implementing multicultural-antiracist change.

LEVEL ONE: THE POST-WAR SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION CONSENSUS

My motivation for undertaking this project stemmed largely from a concern to assess the extent to which the dominant principles and values in the post-war social democratic education consensus, namely equality of opportunity and social justice, including racial equality, were fostered by the introduction of the ILEA 1977 Multi-Ethnic Education initiative. These principles and values have characterised policy-making since the passage of the 1944 Education Act, and the goals of educational equality have been promoted by means of benevolent strategies of social engineering designed to remove barriers to access and redistribute opportunities in favour of disadvantaged groups. While these principles and values dominated the post-war education agenda until 1979, there were always tensions and contradictions inherent in the the social democratic consensus itself. Specifically, the concepts of egalitarianism and meritocracy, although integral to this consensus, were problematic. On the one hand the egalitarian approach emphasised the need for all pupils to be given equal access and opportunities to develop their individual potential, while the meritocratic view implied that pupils were not all equally endowed with potential and some would progress more successfuly than others. A further contradiction was that because the education system had always been understood as complementing and serving the needs of the economy, of necessity it prepared different groups of pupils to enter a labour market based on

inequalities of class, gender and race. Thus an ideology of meritocracy legitimated inequalities and posed problems for the realisation of equal educational opportunities.

Although the ideals embedded in the social democratic education consensus have largely accorded with the egalitarian aims of central and local government policy-makers, inequalities have persisted, most noticeably with regard to class. In the 1960s and 1970s, however, growing concern about inequalities of gender and racial minority pupils was publicised. Particular attention began to be given to questions about which factors contributed to the underachievement of racial and ethnic minority pupils (Mabey 1981, Tomlinson 1983). National and local concern increased when evidence of low rates of achievement and high rates of unemployment amongst black youth came to light (Select Committee 1977). Despite this official recognition, however, in the 1960s the ideological and policy responses to the presence of black pupils in British schools was 'racially inexplicit' (Kirp 1979), located within a 'deracialised' discourse (Reeves 1983) which reflected assimilationist thinking (Mullard 1982, Troyna 1982, Dorn & Troyna 1982, Willey 1984b). This changed in the 1970s when cultural pluralism became the dominant ideological model and multicultural education emerged as a key policy strategy for meeting the needs of ethnic and racial minority pupils. The arrival of multicultural education marked a new stage in the evolution of policy-making within the social democratic tradition. However, as with many previous policy initiatives, the specific aims and goals were imprecisely spelt out and there was no consensus as to how to define the meaning of the concept 'multicultural'. Thus an interminable

debate ensued which highlighted and publicised the fact that 'multicultural education' was a complex notion, assumed different meanings in different educational and political contexts, and was variously interpreted at different levels by policy-makers and practitioners.

Undeniably the multicultural education debate mobilised issues of racial disadvantage and discrimination on to the policy agenda with the result that gradually 'racial inexplicitness' was transformed and began to take a more 'racially explicit' orientation. Compensatory or 'racially inexplicit' strategies which defined problems in terms of educational priority areas (EPAs) were inadequate. EPAs could not guarantee that deprived pupils would benefit merely from the allocation of extra finances to areas with high indices of disadvantage. Racial disadvantage, it was argued, could only be mitigated by the introduction of more 'racially explicit' strategies designed to combat racial inequalities in education. Findings from research conducted inside schools provided sufficiently strong evidence to support the argument that ethnic and racial minority pupils' opportunities were adversely affected by forms of institutional racism inside schools. The question in policy terms, however, was how to achieve a consensus whereby multicultural education could be made acceptable to those educational professionals (both policy-makers and teachers) who were unable to agree that there was racism in society and that forms of institutional racism could be found inside schools which needed to be identified and eliminated.

The official responses by central government to racial matters

in education were fragmented and diffused. Initially the
response was assimilationist, emphasising English language
teaching and the dispersal of high concentrations of immigrant
children.   Subsequently central government paid lip-service to a
policy of cultural pluralism but avoided formulating any uniform
racially explicit policy (Troyna 1982, Dorn & Troyna 1982).   In
Dorn and Troyna's (1982) view, this was both because of the
sensitive nature of the issue and because any centrally
orchestrated policy would encroach on the freedom and autonomy of
the local education authorities. Given that arrangements for
school management were decentralised, the implication was that
the responsibility and power to formulate policy ultimately
rested with the LEAs.   The consequences of this position
contributed to the further marginalisation and powerlessness of
those groups, bodies and individuals who lobbied on behalf of
multicultural education.

> The state sponsored bodies responsible for
> generating ideas and information on multiracial
> education are simply not part of the mainstream
> process of policy formation they seek to influence.
> Thus the Schools Council, APU (Assessment of
> Performance Unit), Rampton/Swann Committee,
> Commission For Racial Equality, and so on, are
> structurally [my emphasis] peripheral to the
> core of educational decision-making and there
> is no clear mechanism by which their deliberations
> and proposals can be inserted into the official
> policy-producing machine. (Dorn & Troyna 1982:178)

Thus in the decentralised education system of the day,
multicultural education increasingly came to preoccupy
policy-makers working in local education authorities.   The
ideological, social, political and economic climate of the
late 1970s and early 1980s legitimated the rationale for
multiculturalism, while moral and educational exigencies of the
day, ie., the need to to promote racial equality and combat

racism and raise levels of achievement amongst ethnic and racial minority pupils, were regarded as matters requiring urgent attention. The Inner London Education Authority was the first to forge a fragile consensus in favour of introducing a multi-ethnic education policy in the autumn of 1977.

In this same period, however, the priorities of education policy-makers in central government began to undergo major changes due to the economic crisis precipitated by the the 1973 Middle East war. It was somewhat ironic that the changing priorities in education were announced by the Labour Prime Minister, Callaghan, in his Great Debate speech of 1976. Hitherto Callaghan had been committed to the realisation of egalitarian goals in education, but his Great Debate speech marked a turning point. The assertion was that standards were falling, teachers' progressive methods had led to a breakdown of discipline and the curriculum was unsuited to meeting the needs of industry. Although these themes had been around since the publication of the first Black Paper in 1969, the social democratic education settlement increasingly came under attack. An emergent band of New Right educationalists asserted that comprehensives had failed and pupils should be selected on the basis of academic excellence. The ideology of meritocracy came into conflict with and began to supersede the ideology of equality of opportunity and social justice.

With the election of a Conservative government in May 1979, the ideological tide changed. The Rampton/Swann Committee, set up in 1979 with a brief to conduct an independent inquiry into the causes of the underachievement of children of West Indian origin,

began life in an unstable political climate. The wider policy context was characterised by rapidly changing educational priorities in which central government took an increasingly 'colour-blind' approach. In brief, the circumstances of the late 1970s signalled the beginning of a polarisation in the values and politics of policy-makers in central government and those in LEAs still wedded to promoting the goal of racial equality in education. 'Riots' in the inner cities in 1980/81 and the publication of the Scarman and Rampton reports contributed to an interminable debate. The debate consisted of the demands of multiculturalists who defined racial minority pupils' needs in culturally pluralist terms, antiracists whose position represented an overtly politicised stance seeking to combat racism, and new right educationalists who were beginning to challenge the fundamental values of social democracy itself. As the post-war consensus began to break down the political, economic and social philosophy of free market liberalism was gathering pace in the wings of Whitehall.

LEVEL TWO: MULTI-ETHNIC POLICY FORMULATION IN THE ILEA

The Multi-Ethnic Education initiative marked an important move forward in acknowledging the needs of ethnic and racial minority pupils in the Authority. The policy stood firmly on the terrain of cultural pluralism, represented a move away from assimilationism, and served as an official endorsement by the chief education officer and senior education officials of the need to promote multicultural education throughout the Authority. The initiative was largely a pragmatic form of education policy-making. It was, as Woodroffe explained, a beginning, a modest first step, "a good English compromise". It acknowledged the

need for action and recognised that there would be no action at all if a policy document was not published......that unless there was a statement, a position from which work could develop to produce a framework for the changes that were needed to take place across the board, nothing would happen.

Dorn's (1983) comments about the extent and limits inherent in official thinking about race and education in this period are relevant here. He argued that policies may

> ..... serve as indications in the evolution of
> white structures' and institutions' responses to
> racism. The overwheming impression on this score
> is that LEAs see their policies as responses to
> pluralism and cultural diversity......Though the
> policy statements frequently commit themselves
> to "promoting equality" and "combatting racism"
> these concepts are rarely defined in terms of
> educational practices and tend to float rather
> uncomfortably on a sea of "harmony", "respect",
> and "tolerance". And when racism is defined it
> is presented as an aspect of prejudice and ignorance
> rather than as a major structural and ideological
> feature of British society. (Dorn 1983:3)

To an extent Dorn's observations are echoed in Woodroffe's comment that "[we] needed to have some kind of inclusive statement which enables people to come in and join rather than something which excludes". In this way the Authority's stance legitimated the multi-ethnic concerns of officials working in the Authority, teachers at the chalkface and members of the wider community. It acknowledged the need to address matters such as low achievement, behavioural issues, and by implication the racism inhibiting the realisation of racial equality in education. The policy was framed in a persuasive mould. It drew attention to the legal implications of the 1976 Race Relations Act, included advice from official sources, and highlighted evidence that racial minorities suffered worse deprivation than white groups of the same socio-economic

status....and that "The 'racial dimension' of urban deprivation needs to be considered as a separate and urgent item in all local authority policy-making" (ILEA/269/1977:4).

There were serious limitations in the policy document. It lacked a definition of 'multi-ethnic' education; there were no guidelines for implementing, monitoring or evaluating the policy. There was no power to compel heads and teachers to implement change. The responsibility for action was implicitly devolved to those at the 'chalk face'. Resources were minimal although a multi-ethnic inspectorate was established. Many officials within the ILEA were unclear about the precise role and jurisdiction of the new inspectorate. One view was that multi-ethnic education would have gained more credibility if it had become part of the responsibility of all mainstream inspectors rather than the exclusive province of the newly formed multi-ethnic inspectorate. Against this, it could be argued that multi-ethnic education could easily have become ghettoised if it had been allocated to the subject based inspectorate teams. The policy also suffered from an absence of publicity. Policy documents were mainly circulated to senior staff and were not printed in the house journal, Contact; not everyone knew of its existence (Troyna 1983).

Woodroffe was unapologetic about alleged weaknesses in the Authority's position. While not disregarding the urgency of these matters, he emphasised the educative function of the policy framework. That is, the policy acknowledged and encouraged the innovative work of teachers who were exploring and developing techniques and curricula in respect of

multi-ethnic education. Further, it marked a turning point, "clearly had an impact around the country" and was a success. However, Woodroffe did express concern about the increasing politicisation of the policy by antiracists who were gradually prioritising political demands over educational ones. The Authority increasingly acknowledged the salience of racism despite the lack of an overtly antiracist stance in the policy documents in this period. It is the case, however, that policy statements, specifically the Progress Report of 1979, explicitly stated as one of the major objectives the need "to define and combat racism and the discriminatory practices to which it gives rise..." (ILEA 1979)

Antiracist critics were sceptical. They argued multiculturalists were reluctant to identify racism as the main problem. Racism was an integral feature of social and political structures and institutions; racist practices reproduced social, political and economic inequalities. Combatting racism was the goal and 'racial explicitness' an indispensable first step in policy formulation. Antiracist, not multicultural education, should provide the dominant organising philosophical rationale and orientation in the policy framework because this was a more effective means for combatting racism. Antiracist education could expose the manner in which racism rationalised and perpetuated differential and unequal access to power both in the education system and the wider society; multicultural strategies merely maintained the status quo. Reconciling differences between multiculturalists and antiracists was no easy task and would have to be undertaken by teachers working collectively to develop strategies for multicultural-antiracist change inside schools.

In sum, central government's policy strategy vis a vis racial matters in education lacked coherence and implicitly devolved the responsibility and power to formulate racially explicit policies to LEAs. The ILEA undertook to formulate such a policy, but problems of implemention stemmed from the absence of a clear definition of multi-ethnic education, guidelines and a course of action designed to be followed by teachers in the Authority's schools and a lack of power to compel Heads and teachers to comply. Further, the policy was only given a luke-warm reception, and ILEA would have to rely on the convictions of Heads and staff to take a principled stand in favour of developing appropriate strategies for implementing multi-ethnic education.

LEVEL THREE: EAST END HIGH'S RESPONSE TO THE ILEA MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION POLICY

It has been shown that when schools have a high proportion of ethnic and racial minority pupils on the roll they are more likely to respond positively to multi-ethnic policy initiatives than when there are few minority pupils or when the school has white pupils only (Little & Willey 1981). By 1980, however, the broad consensus was that multicultural education should permeate the curriculum, pedagogy and ethos in all schools. Multiculturalism was not to be understood in terms of 'separateness'—an 'added-on' subject, appropriate 'for black pupils only'. In the case of East End High it probably is the case that its multi-racial composition was a key factor which contributed to the policy being taken on board. In 1979-1980, for example, the percentage of ethnic and racial minority pupils

was 61%, of whom 42% were of West Indian origin. Ethnicity of teachers was also relevant. The ethnic and racial identity of 53 teachers in the sample who supplied this information showed that 19 were members of ethnic minorities, 5 of whom were West Indian, 2 African, and 7 Asian. Amongst the black teachers, three were in senior positions: a West Indian Deputy Head, an Afro-English Head of Sixth Form and English Department, and a West Indian Head of House.

In what way then did the school actively seek to implement multicultural education strategies? Although Mr. Kay, the Head, had given the policy a warm reception and had taken a principled stand, he had not presented his staff with a working definition of multi-ethnic education, specified criteria of good practice or issued guidelines to be followed. In brief, the Head's leadership role was ambiguous, and, as Ball (1977) has pointed out, subjected to contradictory pressures.

> ....on the one hand, the head will be faced with
> the problem of maintaining control— both in an
> organizational sense, ensuring continuance and
> survival, and in the educational sense, through
> the making and implementation of policy. Both
> aspects of control or of domination, may embody
> and provoke conflict and opposition.
> (Ball 1987:82-83)

Mr. Kay did not provide a centrally coordinated set of multi-ethnic goals inside the school. There was no timetable for implementation, no one was delegated the responsibility to coordinate multi-ethnic activities on a whole school basis and there were no particular expectations of teachers. Thus positive responses to the policy in the wider school context were uneven. Insofar as the policy was acted upon, it was largely because individual teachers were sympathetic to the principles and underlying rationale of multiculturalism and volunteered to act

either collectively or individually to promote the policy within the framework of the Multicultural Education Committee and/or in their respective subject departments.

In evaluating the multicultural initiatives in East End High, we note that the ILEA multi-ethnic policy document "encourage[d] the many imaginative and capable people within the Authority's service who are exploring and developing techniques and curricula in respect of multi-ethnic education" (ILEA 1977:1). Accordingly, it is important to acknowledge and comment on good multi-ethnic practice which was already in place. Good multi-ethnic practice is defined here as practice which 1-promotes racial equality in education, 2- aims to combat racism, and 3- improves rates of achievement. Instead of commenting on individual examples of good practice (they are discussed in the chapters above), I will discuss the work of the Social Studies Department because it provides a good illustration of the way in which departmental procedures, curricula, pedagogy, teachers' attitudes and exam success helped to realise multicultural goals.

All pupils took the Social Studies core courses in their 4th and 5th years. Teaching was in mixed ability groups which meant a boy's band and stream in other subjects was irrelevant. In theory everyone had an opportunity to be entered for the CSE Mode 3 Social Studies exam. In this way departmental procedures meant boys in lower Bands or streams were not discouraged from working, and their opportunity to achieve an exam pass was maximised. Of the 31 boys in my sample, 24 sat and passed this exam; 13 obtained a grade one pass or 'O' level equivalent and 4 obtained

a B grade. Another significant feature of Social Studies departmental procedures was that all boys had the option to attend 'O' level Sociology classes which were held after school. Here again there was considerable exam success with 8 boys sitting and 4 passing, of whom 2 gained Bs, one a C and one a D. Significantly, the profile of academic success here did not correspond to a pupil's lower band location or low stream placement in other subjects, and as we saw above in chapter 5, several of the pupils who were successful in passing the Social Studies Mode 3 CSE exam were of West Indian origin.

The Social Studies curricula had a multicultural dimension which included a unit on 'World Religions' in the 4th year and a unit on 'Prejudice and Discrimination' in the 5th. In their 5th year everyone saw and discussed two films which portrayed forms of racism, and several boys chose to do their Mode 3 projects on aspects of 'race'. The course-work element of the Mode 3 syllabus thus motivated and enabled pupils to follow-up areas which they found interesting and which also formed part of their final assessment. All pupils, therefore, had an opportunity to study the meaning of prejudice, discrimination and by implication, racism. Practice here can, therefore, be seen to incorporate and illustrate a form of multicultural/antiracist pedagogy which was very largely student-centred (Troyna 1987).

Another aspect of good multi-ethnic practice in the Social Studies Department was that the Head, Mr. Cox, and his Deputy Head, Ms Foster, participated fully in the work of the Multicultural Education Committee. On the occasion when the Committee scrutinised the Social Studies unit on 'Prejudice and

Discrimination', the exchange had been heated, but it did demonstrate that Social Studies teachers felt they were not above criticism by their peers and believed themselves to be accountable to their colleagues. Accordingly, they were willing to defend and even modify the content of their curricula in the light of criticism. They did not seek to hide behind a veneer of teacher autonomy, an attitude so commonly expressed by other teachers I spoke with.

Although a great deal of good multi-ethnic practice was already in place in the Social Studies Department, this practice was clearly insufficient to achieve the goals of multi-ethnic policy implementation on a whole school basis. Nonetheless the work in the Social Studies Department fostered the goal of racial equality by motivating all pupils to achieve. Success in combatting racism is impossible to measure, but all pupils were taught about racial inequities in society, and ideally this should have raised their consciousness and helped them understand the need to work to eliminate these forms of social injustice both inside school and in the wider social context. As Parekh explained above

> It makes little sense to say that a minority
> child, who has as a result of multicultural
> education, learnt to respect himself lacks
> the will to fight racism in society at large.
> (Parekh 1986:30)

Insofar as other multi-ethnic practice existed in East End High, it was largely fragmented, uneven and inadequately publicised. It is not clear whether teachers throughout the school knew that the History Department was engaged in revising their curriculum to give it a more global dimension. Nor was it likely that many teachers knew that in the English Department, Mr. Ojukwu's effort

to place pupils of West Indian origin in higher streams was beginning to result in these pupils gaining 'O' levels or that pupils were now reading literature by black authors. In Geography, too, teachers were revising departmental procedures with a view to allocating more pupils of West Indian origin to higher streams in order to increase their opportunity for 'O' level entry.

In assessing the contribution of the Multicultural Education Committee, we are reminded that membership was voluntary, with only occasional participation by the Head and no consistent broad-based representation from subject department heads, except from Social Studies. One of the most senior teachers, Mr. Ojukwu, Head of English and the Sixth Form, was not a member. Those who did participate generally favoured the multi-ethnic initiative, but their understanding and expectations differed as we saw above when we examined the content of agendas set by respective Committee Chairs. The content of agendas reflected an 'academic'-'pastoral' divide and mirrored the changing content of the multicultural-antiracist debate in the academic and policy context outside the school. Those involved in promoting 'pastoral' activities were teachers with mainly assimilationist orientations who confined their support to activities such as the annual Multicultural Festival. By contrast, others were committed to the view that Britain is now a multiracial society, that racism was an issue which affected the lives of many of their pupils, and the Committee should address itself to working to promote antiracist education. This stance became more pronounced with the publication of the Rampton Report and in the aftermath of the inner city 'riots' in 1981.

At this point in the Committee's life, however, the 'academic'-'pastoral' divide became somewhat blurred as the antiracist lobby in the ILEA gained ground and urged the Authority to adopt an overtly antiracist policy position. With the publication of the 'Aide Memoire' (1982) the educational aims and goals of the 1977 Multi-Ethnic initiative were subtantively revised and superseded by antiracist, more policiticed aims which formed the basis of the newly drafted 'Policy For Equality' (1983) and the Authority's document, 'Delivery of the Authority's Initiative on Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools' (1983). In brief, the life-span of the Multicultural Education Committee in East End High mirrored the changing ideological responses to the 1977 Multi-Ethnic initiative at the 'chalk face'. The work of this Committee illustrates the difficulties encountered by teachers genuinely concerned to foster a multicultural ethos inside East End High, but in the absence of a coherent plan of action for implementing policy, the lack of authoritative leadership, and the Committee's marginal position in the school's power structure, the Committee only had minimal influence in the wider school context.

There was evidence to support the view that institutional racism could be detected in a number of routine school practices. The unbalanced Band intake whereby the school was bottom-heavy with Band three pupils and under-represented with Band ones, tended to perform a labelling function. Pupils were prejudged in terms of their likely ability to achieve on the basis of their band location. The effect of this practice was to discriminate against the large proportion of Band three pupils of West Indian

origin and Band threes generally. Streaming and option choices acted to further prevent pupils from having the opportunity to take subjects which interested them most. Boys who truanted sometimes said this was because they had not been allowed to take the subjects they wanted. The knock-on effect here was that a boy's lack of interest in his subjects undermined his motivation to work. He lost interest, did not work, was not entered for exams and 'underachieved'. Thus when 'underachievement' is analysed in terms of a racialised profile of outcomes, there were grounds for questioning whether individual pupils were given an equal opportunity to be developed.

Another form of institutional racism emerged from teachers' ethnocentric attitudes. Mr. Myles defended his Integrated Studies syllabus to members of the Multicultural Education Committee because he was convinced it was already multicultural. Teacher autonomy increased the likelihood that a teacher would not be accountable to colleagues for his/her attitudes and behaviour towards pupils. Mr. Brick, the Head of Physical Education, admitted that "If a black child comes to us, we have the expectation that he will have physical characteristics which are advantageous. A significant number of them have increased hip joint mobility...." And Ms Reed said, "I tend to adopt the view that the various pressure groups working to promote harmony are in fact stirring agencies....My view is live and let live". In brief, there was evidence that in a number of ways the racist effects of routine school practices served to perpetuate racial inequalities in the educational experiences of these pupils.

On the whole teachers held favourable attitudes towards the Multi-Ethnic Education initiative because they saw it as a way of combatting prejudice, promoting positive cultural identity, would provide more relevant and stimulating lessons; it also had the potential to increase teachers' awareness of the multicultural nature of society. The reservations expressed included views that MCE would unbalance the curriculum, would unintentionally promote prejudice and alienate pupils, be used as an excuse for poor behaviour, was anti-academic and thus not geared to obtaining qualifications. Some felt the Multi-Ethnic initiative would increase pressure on teachers, given scarce resources; a few felt it might alienate white teachers. In some respects these views and the findings elaborated above in chapter six echo Acker's (1988) analysis of teachers' 'resistance' to implementing equality initiatives. Acker sought to explain the lack of sustained efforts by teachers to implement antisexist initiatives and her four explanations are relevant to teachers' 'resistance' to Multi-Ethnic policy implementation. Multi-Ethnic initiatives may be uncongenial or threatening by their nature or mode of introduction. Characteristics of teachers such as age, sex or social class may influence receptivity to reform. Teacher ideologies about multicultural/ antiracist education may set limits to what appears acceptable. The conditions in which teachers work may not be conducive to enthusiatic innovation (Acker 1988:307).

FINALLY

Did the 1977 ILEA Multi-Ethnic Education policy initiative act as an agent for change? A qualified 'yes' is the short answer.

The ILEA initiative performed a number of functions which led to changes on a number of levels. First, it publicised the Authority-wide policy commitment to combatting racial inequalities in education whereby pupils from ethnic and racial minority backgrounds underachieved. In this way it helped to promote an awareness of racism and racist practices in education. Thus it performed an educative function not only within the ILEA but throughout the country thus signalling that other LEAs were well advised to embark on the development of multi-ethnic policy and practice. Second, it brought these matters to the immediate attention of Heads and teachers, ie. to the 'chalk face', where it served as a catalyst for further discussion and debate as to what schools should or could do. In this way teachers began to question their practices, the content of the curricula, their relationships with pupils. Often working parties or committees were set up to coordinate and foster multicultural work.

As to how successful the initiative was in terms of effecting real change, reservations are in order. The case material presented here does show that slowly and pragmatically one school had 'made a start'. The Head had encouraged the multi-ethnic initiative in East End High and had gone on to establish a post of responsibility for Multicultural education and Community Links in the newly-amalgamated school which complemented the overtly antiracist stance in the Authority at this time. In this way Mr. Kay and his staff were an integral part of the wider multicultural-antiracist groundswell which was developing its own momentum. On balance, however, the school's response to the ILEA Multi-Ethnic initiative reflected

difficulties of operationalising a multicultural-antiracist education policy which lacked a plan of action and machinery for implementation and monitoring. Thus, when policies do not include programmes of action, strategies, timetables for implementation, monitoring and evaluation they are merely statements of intent and will not necessarily result in substantive change. Nevertheless, the policy embraced a moral imperative which reflected the climate of the times and resonated with teachers committed to combatting racial inequalities in education.

APPENDICES

Appendix 2.1

Interview with Mr. Bev Woodroffe. Interview held at the Commonwealth Institute, March 20, 1989

A- I've got a list of areas I've identified. They may overlap, They may just trigger memory. The broad first point is the 'politics of the Multi-Ethnic Education Policy' of the autumn of 1977, (Policy 269) inside ILEA. Background of the policy. You say you went to Tulse Hill in 1974,

B- 1974, yes

A- So you were there when the Race Relations Act was passed...whether that had any relevance to debates, discussions inside ILEA, key people who were promoting the policy- possibly not promoting it. Issues were important like underachievement or behaviour problems, awareness that maybe labelling was going on. Then outside the ILEA were there particular constituencies--black constituencies, different ethnic minority groups promoting or pressing for some kind of reform or response to their pupils', their particular children's needs? That's the sort of general thrust of it. But then Troyna & Williams (1986) say in their analysis, it was a 'reactive policy', that is, it was impelled by broader political and social considerations rather than for the sake of good pedagogy. In a way saying they're that ILEA was pressured into this. There was perhaps a 'social time bomb'--black youth & unemployment, the fact that kids were coming out with no qualifications that they could actually use for getting into jobs and some sort of career structure. Another point I want to raise, time-permitting, is why were there no guidelines in the policy? It was more a statement and a series of statements rather than 'you should take it up and implement in the following way'. Why no guidelines for how to implement and then obviously, monitor. Finally, your views about whether it was in any way successful or unsuccessful. Let's return to the first point, the politics of the multi-ethnic education policy as it took shape inside ILEA?

B- Right. Very difficult really to get that clear. I think one thing that's really quite significant is the role played by Peter Newsam. I'll start by working from what I remember from a personal point of view, from the work that I was doing, the position I was in to try to work it out from there. In 1974, there was a decision taken to appoint an Inspector for Community Relations and I'm pretty sure that the impetus for that came from a concern with the number of black teenagers who were both not achieving and were also seen as fairly major behavioural hazzards, as far as secondary schools were concerned. But in a way I don't know too much about that because I saw an advertisement to which I responded. I'm not quite sure exactly what the discussion was that led to the creation of that post. Anyhow I came into a post.

A- That was you...

B- I was appointed the Inspector and that's when I left Tulse Hill to join the Inspectorate. I think it was quite significant that

when I joined the Inspectorate it wasn't at all clear to what I was responsible. There was an Inspector with whom I worked and I was the Centre for Urban for Educational Studies in what had been a storeroom in which they had created an office for me. And I think that has some significance. I had no real brief as to what my work should be and so, clearly whatever the reason for doing something at that point was. It wasn't thought-out. It wasn't seen that it was necessary to construct a framework within which I should work. So, that's the first point.

And at some point between 1974 and 1976 I remember I had lunch with Peter Newsam, who was then the Deputy Education Officer of the ILEA. We talked about what needed to be done and I felt at the time that he had a feeling that something needed to be done but had not a great deal of idea of what the real issues were and therefore not a great idea of what needed to be done. Really in those first two years, from '74-'76, work was going on in the ILEA but it was initiatives taken by individuals and groups— some Inspectors, some teachers, some advisors who were responding to areas of educational need in their sphere of need in their educatonal work which they'd identified which were general. But once identified by other people and there was no bringing together of those issues towards some kind of identification of what needed to be broadened out across the Authority.

Now I became conscious because of my position that in fact because of being in Tulse Hill & what I'd done before, I'd already got quite good links with people in community groups. I'd been conscious of a range of people--mainly black teachers, some professionsals, some community workers, some parent groups who were pressing for action to be taken. And they included people like Winston Best who worked with Bernard Coard in Haringey and a number of approaches were being put forward were linked to Bernard Coard's book, How the British Educational System Makes the West Indian Child Educationally Subnormal--and I don't know, this may be a romantically selective view of what happened---I think the key occasion which led to the issue becoming seriously considered within the Authority was a study visit to New York which Peter Newsam came on. And I think he was still Deputy then. There were one or two people on that trip, including myself, Trevor Carter for example, who were conscious of the fact that this trip to New York which was to look at inner city education, not specifically to look at issues of multiculturalism and race,

A- Trevor and yourself, and Peter Newsam

B- And some other people, but it was really Trevor and I who I think had recognised at the time that this was ---we were going to spend two weeks with Peter Newsam, we were going to see things in New York which was important for him to respond to and react and we did set up some meetings with some black educationalists in New York.

A- For Peter

B- Yes--for Peter to be involved. The trip went ahead and we saw a lot and my, I suppose the thing I remember best was a school in the South Bronx, admist the most awful degradation of building life...in November 1976...and Peter was looking around and was saying "this mustn't happen in London" and anyhow when we got back to England, Trevor and I.... maybe I'm putting too much emphasis

on Trevor and I---he decided things for himself. There were
meetings, and Peter Kilne, Assistant Education Officer, came in
on them. We discussed the need for a policy in the Authority in
relation the education of black minority pupils and we were going
to shape a document. Now what I think what was an important thing
here was from Trevor and other people from the black
communities...and to some extent from me, there was a recognition
that 'racism' (my emphasis) was a key factor and there was a need
for really quite radical departures.

Peter is a tremendous politician and I think he recognised what
the political forces that existed in and around ILEA were like and
what the kind of position they were likely to take. And so he was
aware that any policy statement that was to get through the ILEA
committees at that time had to be steered through those committees
one but also needed to be something that he could get a fair
consensus about. SO THE DOCUMENT THAT CAME OUT RECOGNISED THE NEED
FOR ACTION BUT ALSO RECOGNISED THAT THERE WOULD BE NO ACTION AT
ALL IF THE POLICY DOCUMENT DIDN'T GET PRINTED (my emphasis).

A- You're saying that the trip in a way was a kind of
catalyst---we're got to back to London and do something. We can
see that if we dont do something--in a way this can get out of
hand. On the other hand, Peter with the slightly more
authoritative position, has to do this within the
framework--- concilatory way, you've got to get some consensus
here. Better to have policy luke-warm than nothing at all--as a
first step.

B- Going back to something you said before we started
talking...um...we really didn't know what to do. We knew certain
things that we thought should be done, but the idea was that what
we needed was a statement, a position, from which then work could
develop to produce a framework which would enable the kinds of
changes that were needed to take place across the board.

Now Peter's told me fairly confidentially, so I'll present it in
this way. When the policy was constructed with his Inner Cabinet
of about eight people and there were only two people in favour of
the policy. Now I don't know how confidential that is, but it's a
long time ago now and people have moved away. That's the
officers, so that's the level of support he was getting from the
officers whose responsibilities were for the whole Authority.

A- two in favour---

B- He was one of them.

A-Ten people?

B- Eight people.... six against, or six not supporting...well, you
know...the way he put it to me was in terms of events, six didn't
want it. That's the kind of situation. He then put a lot of
energy into getting the support of two key people who were Sir
Ashley Bramall, then the leader of the ILEA and Robert Vigars, the
leader of the Tory opposition. And when the policy was launched,
both Bramall and Robert Vigars were there and said some words in
support of the policy....As you can imagine getting the policy
together in terms of getting information together.... shaping
positions on certain aspects of education, was extremely difficult
for there was a lot of opposition to it. And so the policy ended

up with some information about numbers at the back of that policy.... The numbers of ethnic minority kids in different boroughs was very significant and I remember a lot of people saying how surprised they were that there were as many black and ethnic minority kids in ILEA schools. One or two quite key people found that quite persuasive and were keen on doing something about it.

A- Were any of those key people not amongst the non-supporters? Did they come round?

B- No, I'm not qure. Certainly some of those people did come round, but I'm not sure. The people....

A- When the evidence was presented...

B- No, because they'd seen the evidence. That six had seen the evidence. But it was when the evidence began to be discussed and implications began to considered, more did come round. I'm quite sure some people didn't come round at all. And so the policy ended up being rather....pious statements about 'ought to be in a decent society'....and that was the first stage. You may remember that there was a follow-up document in 1979, A 'Progress Report'. Now in the 'Progress Report' the four aims of the policy were put down more clearly and they included combatting racism, if you remember. And there was some argument amongst us as to where that particular policy aim should come. We were arguing it should come first and.

A- It was definitely going to be one of the four?

B- It was one of the four but it was the last of the four of I can't remember which....

A- The consensus was it should definitely be an integral part of your aims...

B- Yes, it was there.

A- So you've moved on in the two years to coming out publicly and stating....

B-- Yes, but you- see I mean, ILEA had moved on--it was difficult to see how they could say that given the constraints that existed in terms of the senior officers and politicians. And I suppose to some extent, although I don't remember this particularly. I mean there's always a feeling that you're meant to get a reaction from certain sorts of parents as well-- who very knew what was going on....

A- the white parents? What about black parents? Because there were really quite articulate groups around at this time.

B- Yes, perhaps we should go on to that...

A- You really have explained the rationale for '269 in 1977---and the way the consensus was a sleight-of-hand.... once we get something as a public platform we can move on a bit more in terms of defining, as you've said, the two years on, 'The Progress Report' where you spelled out your four aims, one of which was combatting racism.

B- Yes, I think that what Peter very much felt was that you
needed to have some kind of inclusive statement which enables
people to come in and join rather that something which excludes
because it says things that people are going to find very
difficult to... a lot of people are going to find very difficult
to stomach. So it's a good English compromise, in a way....you
say 'tolerance' and 'justice' and things like this....it's very
difficult for people to argue with that. But than within that
idea of British tolerance and justice there is this canker
running through it of racism. Now you've got to get people who've
not really thought about racism at all to the point where they're
thinking about it. So I think that was the first step. Now I
mean it's very important to recognise that there were black
groups, black individuals, ethnic minority groups and individuals
who were knocking on the door and I think one of the things this
policy did was to give a way into the hearing, the ears of the
ILEA for more black individuals, black minority groups because
this policy statement was there then.

A- An invitation? A signal?

B- In a sense, it was a signal, an invitation to come in and put
views, make suggestions and so on....

A- And did they?

B- Yes, very much so. One of the things that came out of that
policy was ILEA's support for the ACER project

A- Yes, Len Garrison

B- I found an office for Len at CUES. And that was done purely by
sleight of hand. I didn't tell anybody I was doing it. I didn't
find an office; I found a desk. And Len came in and we
worked----I worked with him to try and get ACER supported and I
introduced Len to Peter Newsam and we wrote into that policy, that
was one of the new things that was one of the projects. So
that---going a bit further back, when I first became an Inspector,
I, with a chap called Martin Lightfoot (who was the other person
who supported as a senior officer at that time)...Martin and I
talked about Brixton and I suggested through Martin Lightfoot,
that the then Chief Education Officer, Briault, that a report
should be done on Brixton. Anyhow, I produced a report suggesting
a quite comprehensive approach to education in Lambeth which
required action in relation not only to schools but to the
careers service, adult education....

A- This is what, about '77?

B- This is about '75. And in fact what happened was (I dont
think I did the report particularly well) but all that came out of
it was something called 'The Brixton Initiatives' and they picked
up some projects to develop in Brixton. That seemed to be one way
that ILEA worked on these issues at that time, but that you may
present a rationale for comprehensive development but in fact what
they went for was 'can we afford to spend a bit of money on
developing work in this area of the city on this project'. So
that it was partly continuing to go down that line that led to one
or two projects being added on to that policy stand

A- Would that be the Lambeth Whole School Project?

B- Yes. But the Lambeth Whole School Project came out of what I had been thinking about since I left Tulse Hill....I mean it didn't work, the Lambeth Whole School Project, but it could have worked if it had been better organised and shaped. But also it just didn't have the support that it needed.

A- I remember at the very beginning there were quite a lot of papers written about it and I met some of the teachers who were absolutely with it. I think it was again, a similar sort of thing as a few years on with the policy statement...What does it mean ti implement this thing. You have all the kinds of internal school impediments, barriers....

B- Yes, and you also had, for anything like that to work, you had to work through the school. But you also had the roots in the Inspectors, the advisers, the teacher centre wardens...but I mean ...jumping back to where I think I was, I think really we sort of knew what to do, or some of us thought we did and you need action on a very broad fron to tackle it from the issue of teachers and resources related to change, to curriculum area by curriculum area, there was the necessity for change to take place. And here the battle just continued. In order to get change in terms of subjects content and approach to subject, unless (as happened lated after 1981 when the new kind of Labour Authority) later on, Inspectors were told we want a report from you about how you're going to implement anti-racist work within your subject area..

A- When did you leave?

B- 1986. It only sort of happened. It was a very big Authority and there were lots of priorities and there were ways in which Inspectors who didn't see this as an important area for development of their work.

A- at that stage?

B- All the way through. Even to the end. But certainly by the time I left, the potential for curriculum change was beginning to be realised in certain areas and was being taken on pretty widely.

A- We're talking about almost ten years

B- Certainly eight years...Things began to happen through the hard slog of persuasion of somebody like Mike Hussey..... I came in in '74. There was a guy called Roy Truman an Inspector for the Educationally and Culturally Disadvantaged. And he was sort of my boss.... He didn't really agree with the policy. He took no part in the construction of it but when he saw that the Chief Inspector was not going to take this issue on across the whole inspectorate, he agreed with the formation of an Inspectorate Team. He was head of that Inspectorate team for two terms and then I took over. We're now talking about 1978. And Mike Hussey, Jim Wight, Yvonne Connolly were appointed in late '78. And then in August '78 I was appointed Deputy. Roy Truman was head of the team for about a term and a half then he retired.

A- Was he, in a way, of a different generation?

B- Yes. He was a very interesting man and he was responsible for a

number of initiatives, particular in relation to language development. He was the District Inspector in Islington and saw an issue which needed to be dealt with. You know, kids who couldn't speak English and nobody was really coping with them in the classroom and nobody was doing anything about it. And he set up CUES as a result of that. Then set up language centres....

A- In a way you could argue he was the initiator

B- Oh yes, I mean things go back to the early sixties so he responded long long before....

A- CUES was set up...can you remember?

B- About '63

A- That early? I never took that one on board. So where have we got to? There is a sense in which, I'm not even looking back but I'm not at all surprised that (a) you had this resistance but once the policy began to be discussed, as you say, then you could actually add on 'racism'--acknowledging there's a racist theme as a central issue. You can't really deny, ignore --we've got to put it up front at some point. Did you stick with this kind of 'Progress Report'?

B- Yes..... You mentioned monitoring. There was nothing really set up with which you were saying to people: "We're expecting this to be done", and so a lot of what we were left with was persuasion. And I went to quite quite terrifying awful meetings with the Heads of Division Ten, Wandsworth, for example, who were powerful secondary heads. They were a powerful In-Group. They were known as 'The Barons'--they were all men. They all---when they had a meeting they treated the thing with a certain flippancy and disregard. I met a group of primary heads a short time after that and I reached a point ----I made a mistake out of about 25 primary headteachers and they were just attacking the policy, saying how wrong it was.

A- This is what, '78?

B- Yes, '78. I saw a teacher who looked to me as if she were from South East Asia and I saw she wanted to speak. And I thought well maybe she's going to support---and she absolutely layed into the policy saying that "we've come to Britian and we've got to be British"---all that sort of thing.

A- I heard that-- I heard the full spectrum of views in 'East End High' when I was there, but very much more the feeling there was pro-policy, at least there was lip-service. That's the way I've interpreted it.

B- I mean cutting through it, it seems to me what happened was that the black and ethnic minority communities increased their voice, in fact, on the ILEA. The Multi-Ethnic Inspectorate team we began to set up and create networks and get things developed between 1978-81. Get teams of people working in different subject areas and so there was gradual development. But what DIDN'T happen was any expectation from the centre--- from the top of the ILEA--that all institutions should respond to a policy paper and take action in certain ways and that taking action in certain ways actually didn't exist. So that one of the things we decided to do

in '78---I was conscious of the way HMI worked--that when they go in then they have an 'Aide Memoire' that will follow. So I thought we'll produce an 'Aide Memoire'. So the Inspectorate team worked on the 'Aide Memoire'--which is how an Inspector should look at a school. We were fairly clear--we produced it for our colleagues.

What we argued was there are 100 (?) Inspectors; we're five. If the Inspectorate are going to have an impact in relation to this issue then they've got to be helped in terms of how to carry out their work in relation to this. We were fairly clear that if this thing got through then schools would come to recognise that that the Inspectorate had a document they were using in schools and they'd be interested. They'd have to be and so heads of schools would want it because the Inspectorate were using it so they wanted copies. The whole ILEA Inspectorate. We produced a document for the whole ILEA Inspectorate saying this is how you review a school in relation to anti-racist policy. And we launched it in an Inspectorate Conference and some of our colleagues used it, some of them didn't. Some of them used it a lot, some didn't use it. But then schools heard that the ILEA Inspectorate had this document, so they wanted a copy of it.

A- It didn't automatically go to the Heads?

B- No. I can't remember. I think maybe there was a decision taken at the Inspectorate Conference that schools should have it or it should be may available to them. I'm not sure.

A- Am I correct to say that with the publication and dissemination of the 'Aide Memoire', even though the centre had no precise expectations and wasn't monitoring as such, there were guidelines emerging?

B- Yes, yes,

A- So you could say if schools were interested in taking this on board they had a pretty clear idea of what they should be looking at inside their own school.

B- Yes, right. And it became a very good document to work with. One thing running along side of this we haven't mentioned, was the work of the Research and Statistics Branch. They did a long study on performance particularly on reading and literacy, but not only literacy.

A- The 'Black British Literacy' report?

B- Yes. It started, I can't remember when. But it ran over ten years. And so that when the policy came out, that information which had been discussed as a sort of separate issue at certain committee metings was now seen as being related to the Authority policy, not just some aspect of ILEA work that might warrant some consideration.

A- Well I myself have used that material a great deal and I ---to highlight the inequalities, extremely useful. You're saying that if you add up all these separate initiatives, you do really have a pretty firm commitment by the Authority.

B- Yes

A- On the other hand, these isn't any sense of compulsion.

B- Until after 1981 when the new policy came through--1983.

A- published in 1983.

B- I personally thingk something went wrong when Newsam left. And I actually would have been very much, and Mike Hussey and the others, would have been very much happier, to have built on the work that we'd done up to that point rather than to take a position which was actually to take the Berkshire paper prior the to their policy and issue it as the ILEA policy. There was a lot of discussion went on---big meetings with ethnic minority groups, committees set up so on and the issue became very much a political issue. It is view that some of the key educational issues got lost. (my emphasis) We grabbed some of them back as we went along but what I think I'm saying is that there was educational bit and that could have been up very strongly but in fact there was a period when the whole thing became very much a matter of political concern. Rightly there was much stronger concern for the rights of black teachers, rights of pupils and students but not so much a concern for what they were learning, how they were learning, was supports for learning.

A- That might have come around as a sort of logical development if it hadn't become so politicised and polarised. I dont want to put words in your mouth.

B- Yes. No, I think it did. It did. And in fact we got into the debate that a lot of people got into at that time of anti-racist versus multicultural which was ----the debate had to take place but in a sense I dont think the debate's ever properly taken place. (my emphasis) What tends to happen is that people state two positions and, as far as I'm concerned, in a society that is multicultural and is racist, these two things have got to come together. You've got to find a way of dealing with both and there are things that have been developed under the banner of multiculturalism which were extremely valuable but they needed to be affected by an anti-racist perspective. There were a lot of people who thought they were doing the right thing---following the multicultural line who either confused or deeply frustrated who told them what they were doing was wrong.

A- This is politicising the debate. There's goodies and badies...

B- it's politicising with a small...some kind of 'p'--I'm not sure which. I mean the issue is obviously a political issue but it's also very stongly an educational issue. And I think working out the politics, I dont just mean the politics of change, working out the change only in terms --mainly in terms of setting up certain types of structures which were important, that would enable equality to take place.....all that got till 90% of the work behind it and irrelevant to what was being taught in schools, how it was being taught...that sort of thing didn't get a lot of concentration. We actually, the Multi-Ethnic team, really didn't have much to do with the development of the policy. We developed

A- the anti-racist policy and the equality-education for equality....

B- Yes, we had a slightly, a different line that we wanted to take. Anyhow, they took the Berkshire line and we came in and said that if this is going to work now there's got to be a 'Delivery Document'. So a 'Delivery Document' was set out. We wrote that 'Delivery Document' which included what schools had to meet, they had to sort out their own policy relevant to their school, they had to have a program of action in order. It's in addition to the 1983 policy. Now that's the bit they we put in. Now it didn't work because of teacher action.

A- Teacher action under Joseph...people got side-tracked....

B- And they just wouldn't with their time. You see what we'd been working on all along was that teachers would have meetings after school and that sort of thing. And when those stopped people---a lot of people did have meetings but a lot more didn't, so the whole 'Delivery' movement was really stymied by teacher action.

A- To clarify about the 'Delivery Document'. Just to clarify your position of the anti-racist/ multicultural debate. Would you say that you were working in the Inspectorate, that as a spectrum....a sense in which at one end of the spectrum maybe it's more of a Black Studies-type approach, more 'adding on' Festivals, the old three S's---Saris/ Samosas/ Steel Bands---but towards the middle you've got more of a sense that the teachers need to be involved in this, the currlculum must be scrutinised, the experience of the pupils is relevant here without maybe stepping over a very thin line and becoming and becoming full-blown anti-racist, highlighting just the racist element.

B- I think our **Aide Memoire** puts the position very clearly. That is that it was based on an idea of the kind of society we hope would be achieved in which there was clear room, not only for students to interact, and to learn to challenge but also for cultures to interact to emphasise other cultures. There's no question of not being full-blown anti-racist, but just to be full-blown anti-racist, to do the analysis of how racist the society is, and how racist the institutions therefore are, and much of our practice and behaviour is because that leads you to a position where you understand the situation very clearly but it dosen't lead you necessarily into doing anything effective to change. And the effective change has to bear in mind that you've got kids coming into a gathering, and it's not just a question of trying to make sure that they don't bear upon each other because of racism, but they also actually get on with each other and appreciate different cultural perspectives and manifestations and so on. And that's the position we tried to take.

A- And that in itself is anti-racist

B- Yes, it's anti-racist as long as what they're doing is attempting to destroy the argument and manifestations of the way history is recorded and literature is chosen and so on. You've got to get rid of the racist bit that is so biased in the curriculum. As you do that, what does that mean, what have got as your curriculum? What do you come back to? And you come back to a curriculum which, as I feel more and more now, has got to be more and more international than it is at the moment. I think it's horrifying the extent to which the national curriculum is in danger of becoming nationalisitic.

A- It's interesting, Bev, because I do notice that the---since it's taking me so long to complete this [project-thesis] I have to account for the post-Thatcherite setting of the agenda. And you touch on, in a way, that if this past ten years hadn't come about in the way it has, and if we had been able to build on the kinds of initiatives and policy direction in which you were moving, you would have not just multiculturalised, you would have also 'gloablised'....We do live in a global viallage...

B- Yes, I mean I think the kind of multiculturalism that actually takes that aspect of one's culture which is the arts and the food and the dress is terribly limited. That's, you know steel bands etc... and the attack on that is absolutely right. Um...but the kind of curriculum content that one needs is curriculum that recognises that people live together in different circumstances, in very similar ways, but with obviously different manifestations which tend to show how the family lives and works together, how people spend their time....there are all kinds of things....

A- religion

B- yes, a whole range of things. It's obviously very dangerous to assume because you live in Britain, the way things are done in Britain are better than anywhere else. As you say, in a global village, the whole time needing to adapt to changes....

A- I really want a few minutes about that, I really do because I have a section in my analysis about the New Right and the resetting of the agenda which was to take any element of race awareness....

B- Let me say one thing about this. The time when I felt we got closest to something really exciting was in one year of 'Black Studies' in Tulse Hill in 1971---when we took the kids, if they wanted to, to O/A General Studies exam. I happened to be on the working party which set up the exam, so I knew it very well. And I knew we could fit in a 'Black Studies' program to enable kids to get exam results. There were two or three black kids who got their first O levels through taking that exam. But what we did included some fairly sketchy stuff, but 'Introductions to' China, Tanzania, certain aspects of American society, a real internationalising of the curriculum and what ----that was a group where there were twenty kids and I think there were something like 12 blacks and white and one Asian boy. There was a tremendous interest in actually taking on something that was incredibly relevant to the kids. And that's 18 years ago and we're miles ---getting further and further away from being able to develop anything like that. And I feel that those kids, black and white, who did that course were much more aware of what was happening in their own society and more confident about making political judgements about their own society and their own patch because of studying in that way.

A- The paradox about this whole 'enterprise culture'...how can it but benefit in the real sense without the young men and women in this society having a genuine grasp of the world and the cultures and when they negotiate with them the choose towards selling, or marketing or buying in --they've simply got to understand the different cultures...never mind your inter-personal relations, but in the cut and thrust of the market place, you build on it...

B- Yes, and subtly something else is happening as well and that is you're widening the whole idea of (an old-fashioned word) but what a citizen is if you're it's actaully an educational word ....citizen of the world rather than citizen of Britain.-- You begin to see that....that means that Gary is black and his parents came from Grenada is not a thing that bars Gary in some way from being a citizen. It opens up the possibility for seeing Britain as playing a part in the modern world in the way that it should.

A- Very worrying, all of this. Okay. I've got a question which is one I'd be annoyed if I didn't ask you: **What are views about the success or lack of success of the policy?** Going back to '77 as the 'take off' point. Consolidate....

B- I think....the '77 policy was quite successful because it was a very modest move and I think it actually achieved more than we might expect. I think the '83 policy has failed and I think there are all kinds of reasons for that and I dont think the '83 policy actually changed things in the sort of 'Mega-way' they were trying. In certain ways it had to build on what was already happening.

Did it succeed or not? You could do one of those studies that people do. If I could direct you to 25 schools where, my goodness, you really see, both in primary and secondary schools, which is another 50---they've hardly been touched. It is difficult to find a school that hasn't been touched.

A- This is what I'm thinking--the momentum and the staff moving about the system and bringing with them the commitment---Even my own students who come out of the poly into the schools and become very active in promoting these particular issues.

B- To be fair to the '83--in the whole business of interviewing for senior posts changed. Everybody knew they were going to be asked their stance on the development of anti-racist/multicultural policy in the school and program. Okay, you got some people who just mugged it up and did their bit at the interview. But on the whole people have changed quite markedly. I think if you look through the kinds of In-Service work which was done over the period you'd see it had an impact. I think that just judging from things here (Commonwealth Institute Education Officer)---we do Baker Days, for example. Some of the schools are very backward but they know something about the issues. There's always some people who've been doing some work there. There's always some indication that the resources for the kids to use have changed. When ILEA schools come in here they're doing good work.

A- You're talking from '71-'89----a helluva a long time. You would expect some evidence of change...

On the emergence of and the success of the New Right's position- ....when I think through, because I going to have to account for the rise and perhaps the fall of this initiative, how would you see the post-'83 period in ILEA? Did it actually confirm the worst fears of the New Right educationalists? That kind of labelling, imaging, the anti-racist lobby....

B- I don't think so. I think that's a huge exaggeration. I suspect one or two groups of staff in one or two schools would

take that line to a ludicrous proportion and renege on their duties to deal with the other part of it. On the whole, no. An interesting thing to do would be to look through the educational development plans of the new London boroughs and you'll get Kensington, Westminster and Wandsworth who have gone rapidly backwards and taken the colour-blind approach, talking about education for ethnic minorities, particularly in language. But almost nothing about the overall anti-racist education that should be developed. But if you look at all the Labour controlled borough you'll see, for example, Southwark, Hackney...they're saying, "You know ILEA attempted to do certain things, but they didn't put enough support and we're going to give that support." So you see it's carried over quite strongly.

A- What I had in mind was, because slipping in the abolition of ILEA late in the day, after the party manifesto, they already had the bill in place--slipped this clause in---I'm just wondering whether they were able to cash in on the imaging -- you know the sorts of Gay Rights, Anti-racist--all this sort of...at that level....

B- Yes, I think that's right. But they used what was going on in Brent and Haringey as much as ILEA to make their case. I don't know enough about Brent and Haringney. I know more than what I've read in the papers, but a lot of the attack on that kind from the Right on those two LEAs rather than ILEA.

A- the 'Race Spies' in Brent...

B- Yes, it was absolute nonsense. Another story.

A- It was given enormous coverage though. So people dont necessarily think of Brent as not being ILEA; they dont know quite what ILEA is. Similarly with Haringey, it's all London to them.

B- That's right.

A- Up and down the country, you know, what do you mean the ILEA and then there is Haringey...Brent..lumping together...

B- Another thing. You can exaggerate the influence of ILEA, but ILEA with some inner city Authorities, the work has clearly had an impact around the country. There are lots of ILEA people who have been going around the country doing In-Service work. A lot of interest in their resources produced by ILEA, by ACER...

A- Is there any chance that ACER could survive?

B- Well....I dont know. Len Garrison who was here last week is no longer there. He said they were trying to get joint thing of money from some sponsorship as well as getting support. The problem is (I was at CUES last week as well) they're trying to get Lambeth to take them on and other boroughs to buy in and I fear that's not going to work. The boroughs are going to be so worried about how they're going to survive, they're not going to be in a position to commit themselves to put in the kind of money to keep some of the ILEA-wide anti-racist going....

A- Research and Statistics Branch is another---tragedy. Not just a British resource; it's a global resource. People do look,

if they're in that field, they would compare major urban areas-
ILEA's experts.

B- The people who I know who are still working in ILEA below the
level of Inspector, are likely to end up in schools, back in
teaching. Now that might not be a bad thing for them for a bit
but all sort of things-......you can't keep the thing alive without
once in a while stoking the fire.

A- One hopes that if the borough schemes are writing in their
brief to continue this work, to build on it, there's the skeleton
of some sort of shared/across borough awareness to promote these
initiatives. There is also the whole question of the National
Curriculum. How can you in real terms, continue to get this
multicultural/multi-ethnic dimension as an integral feature of the
National curriculum?

B- It all depends..In fact we had a group of teachers who were
doing an In-Service course...here to do with art. They were
primary school teachers and they were all on Working Parties for
the National Curriculum. It's not quite at the stage where one
knows what's going to be possible. Just as an example, what we're
doing here is we've got parties from different parts of the
Commonwealth, an Indian painter here today working with kids from
a Lewisham school and I was putting it to them,-- how can we work
so that the work that they do with this indian artist, to what
extent can we continue this work so that by insuring that the kind
of attainment targets that the students are expected to reacher,
are being met through this kind of activity. That will either
work or it wont. I don't know.

A- Your earlier comment was moving back to a kind of insular kind
of curriculum--Eurocentric, old empire way of thinking.

A- A post-mortem on Ogden. Did you know him? What happened was I
wrote to him saying I understand you're taking action on the '77
initiative.. and then he left East End High....

My mini-working hypothesis was that without Ogden taking some
stand within East End High, the school might not have responded.

B- Might be so. Mr. Kay had shown interest in doing things from
an earlier period when he was Head of Central High before he went
to East End High. Whether he ---he would have been happy to
approve action being taken in his school rather that initiating it
himself, I don't know. I can't remember who else there
was....

Going back to what you were saying about Ogden, I think at that
time there would be few people, Chris Power & Nigel File would be
exceptions, one or two others, who would have seen that the kind
of introduction of black material that your Polytechnic
colleagues produced as relevant---wouldn't have had the confidence
that this was something that really should be being done and could
be done and done well. Something that Chris Power has said-- that
he remembers us leaving books on his desk for him to read...to get
him involved. Chris Power was like me. When I arrived at Tulse
Hill, it took me about 3 years to come round---to do something
about the situation, including something about the curriculum, for
which I was responsible. That generation who knew moved
downwards to Nigel File. Really we had no experience....

A- a bit more about Ogden....Kay was sympathetic. He may not have taken the bull by the horns, but would respond positively to somebody like Ogden. There were other people in the school quite strongly in favour.....

B-   There wouldn't have been all that many heads who would have sanctioned that. I can think of some who certainly wouldn't.

APPENDIX 2.2 (PAGE 331) REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

Woodroffe, B. (1982). 'Editorial', Multi-Ethnic Education, 1(1).

Abby Cronin
March, April, May 1980

Research into Attitudes of Fifth Formers at EAST END HIGH

Interview Schedule-(Loosely Structured Interview)

Interview commences with a brief introduction by A. Cronin as to the nature and purpose of the project. The boy is asked to complete a form with information on boy in terms of age, how long he's been at East End High, and subjects being studied for exams as well as non-examinable subjects being studied. Respondent completes form.

Areas Covered in Interview -(recorded on tape/loosely structured interview)

Family and Background

Parents

Friends

Spare Time

Community

Jobs/Work Experience

School-Leaving:Plans for Leaving/Staying On

Money

School:
Curriculum
Control, Discipline, Punishment
Truancy
Teachers
Lessons

Racial/Ethnic Attitudes

Life Aspirations

FAMILY AND BACKGROUND

I'd like to ask you about your family:

Tell me, how many people are there in your family? brothers? sisters?
                                                                mother? father?

How would you describe your home? eg.- crowded/plenty of space for
        everyone, etc.---elicit pupil's view of his housing.

Do you have a room of your own?

Where do you do your school work/homework?

Do you know your neighbours? Do you see neighbours very much?

PARENTS

Do you talk to your parents about school? What do you talk about?

Can you describe your parents' attitudes towards your progress at school.

Can you tell me about your parents' educational background?

Socio-Economic Status of Parents:

What work does your Father do? How long has he.........................

What work does your Mother do? How long has she........................

Have there been periods of <u>unemployment</u>? probe to elicit when + for how long.

FRIENDS

I would like to hear about your friends.........

Do your friends go to East End High?   Are they in the same House you are?

Would you say you have any good friends? How long have they been good friends?

Do you have any friends in other schools?

Do you have friends who are Black/White/Indian---from other Ethnic groups?

What do your friends do?

        Work?
        Unemployed?
        Still at school?
        Studying?   where?----Day Release/F.E. college/Polytechnic/University/
                        Evening Classes?

SPARE TIME

I would like to know how you spend your spare time..............

How do you spend your spare time on: a) school days
                                      b) weekends
                                      c) holidays

Do you belong to any clubs? What clubs? How often do you go to clubs?

What would you like to do with your spare time that you don't have time for?

Do you ever do away on holiday/s? Where? What current plans do you haave
                for going on holiday?

Do you ever go to the Cinema/ Theatre? favorite films/plays seen recently?

Do you watch TV? What is you favorite program/s?

Do you listen to music? Play an instrument? Go to concerts?

Do you read for pleasure? Newspapers? Magazines? Book? etc...

Do you ever use the library? in School? your local branch?

COMMUNITY-.

How would you describe the area you live in?

How would you describe the area the school is in?

Do you like this area? Why/Why not?

Do you think there should be any changes in this area?

What changes would you like to see in this area? Why?

Do you ever go into the West End? What For? What do you think of
          other parts of London? Do you go to other parts of London often?

JOBS/WORK EXPERIENCE

Have you ever had a job for money? What paid jobs have you had?

Was there anything you liked/disliked about the job/s?

Do you have a paid job now? If yes, what kind of job is it?

Do you think you will be able to get the kind of job you would like
          when you leave school? that is---

> a- what job do you think you can get when you leave school?
>
> b- what job would you like to have after you have had some
>   work experience?
>
> c- what job would you like to be doing in ten years' time?

SCHOOL LEAVING

When do you plan to leave school?

What will you do when you leave?

Have you considered staying on at school?

Would you/are you considering staying on at East End High in the 6th Form?

What is you view of the 6th Form at East End High?

Do you plan to go on to an F.E. college or pursue any course of study at all?

Have you discussed these matters with the Careers teacher? Head of House?
                                        other teachers?

MONEY

How much money do you get to spend each week?

Is this on a regular basis?

How much do you spend in a typical week?

If you had more money, how would you spend it?

SCHOOL

CURRICULUM

What subjects are you taking this year?

How did you come to take these subjects?

Which subjects do you like best? Why?

Which subjects are you best at? Why?

Which subjects do you need help with? Why?

Options

Are you happy with your choice of options?
Are there subjects you want to study which you aren't studying? Which ones?

Summary Question-
If you could help plan what to study in school, what would you suggest
pupils study? Why?

School Activities
Do you belong to any clubs or teams in school?

    sports   school newspaper
    clubs   school council
    dances   music, eg. steel band
    trips/school journeys/outings debating club   other............

CONTROL, DISCIPLINE, PUNISHMENT

What sorts of control, discipline, punishment do they have in school?
What do you think about them? PROBE (try to elicit views on the cane)
What kind of discipline is most effective? Why?

TRUANCY
Did you ever stay away from school without a proper reason/excuse?
Why did you do it? Can you explain why you did it?
What do you do when you truant from school?
Would you say that many boys truant from East End High ?
Why do they truant-'bunk off'?
In what year of school do you think truanting happens most? Why?

TEACHERS

What special qualities does a good teacher have?
What sort of teachers do you find you can get on with? Can't get on with?
Do you find your teachers are friendly/ open to discussion/ interested in
      you as an individual?
Do you think enough time is spent by teachers and pupils trying to
      understand each other?
Are you aware of the Multi-Ethnic composition of the teaching staff? That is,
      that your teachers come from many different racial and ethnic groups?

Do you think it is a good idea to have teachers from many different
      ethnic backgrounds on the staff?   WHY?

Pupil's Sense of Belonging and Pastoral Care

What do you think the House System is for? Do you find the House System
        works well? In what ways?
Do you find that your Head of House has been a major influence on you here
        at East End High ?
What kind of relationship do you have with your Head of House? with Other teac

LESSONS:

TEACHING STYLE/CLASSROOM CONTENT

What type of lessons do you _like_ most?
What type of lessons do you _dislike_ most?
How do you like to work in the classroom?
Do you like having: a- visiting speakers?
                        b- films?
                        c- participating in outings? eg. Off Centre?
What did you think of the films which you saw in Social Studies:

                        a- _In The Eye Of A Storm_? --how did it make you feel?
                        b- _Somebody's Daughter_?
Do you like informal lessons?
Do _you_ want to be able to speak more in class, ie. give you personal
        opinion and discuss different issues with other boys as well
        as the teacher?
Would you say pupils are encouraged to express their points of view in
        class? Why? Why not?

FINALLY, imagine that you had to tell someone about this school, what
        would you say? How would you describe the school, teachers, sunjects

RACIAL/ETHNIC ATTITUDES
At several points in our talking, we have discussed issues related to
'Prejudice' and 'Discrimination'.
Tell me:
How would you define _prejudice_?
Do you think people are prejudiced?
In what ways are people prejudiced?
How would you define _discrimination_?
Do you think people discriminate?
In what ways do people discriminate?

Have _you_, your family or friends experienced prejudice of discrimination?

Racial/Ethnic Attutudes

IN SCHOOL

Have you ever found any 'prejudice' or 'discrimination' here in school?

Do you think you are in any way prejudiced?
What are you prejudiced against?
Do you think you discriminate? In what way do you discriminate?
Finally, what do you think 'racism' is?   probe to elicit views

LIFE ASPIRATIONS

Let us try to draw together some of the areas we have been talking about.
I am interested in knowing what you think you can realistically do when
    you leave school.
        a- Has school helped prepare you for life?
        b- What use do you think school has been to you?

SCHOOL AND EQUALITY

Does school treat children equally?
Should school treat children equally?
Do you feel you have had as good a chance as other boys at
        to make a success of school?
Finally---If you could begin school all over again and you could have
        any kind of school you want, what would your school be like?

Finally---For School Leavers

We talked earlier about leaving school in the summer and you said you plan
to leave. Can you describe your feelings about leaving---getting out----
After all, you've been forced to come to school for 11 years and now
you're free to leave. How do you feel about it?

Appendix 6.1

June 1st 1981

Dear Member of Staff,

During the past two academic years I have been conducting research
in EAST END HIGH   .   My activities have included a wide-range of
strategies such as classroom observation, attending staff meetings,
careers evenings, Multicultural Education Committee meetings, and
interviewing a number of fifth form boys including a small number of
boys identified as truants.   Throughout I have found both the staff
as well as the pupils very helpful.

Now I am at the stage in my research where I very much need the
help of all teachers.   Because one of the aims of my research is to
inquire about the extent of multicultural education being done in
EAST END HIGH, I need a clear, full and accurate view of what the teachers
think.   It is to this end that I am asking you to complete the
questionnaire attached to this letter, put it in the envelope and
return it to me via my pigeon hole in the Staff Room by June 8th.
You may not wish to answer everything, but please do try to answer
as much as you can.

The overall aim of my research is to gather enough information
about EAST END HIGH   to enable me to write a case-study on the
school which will be incorporated into a thesis for a higher degree.

ALL INFORMATION IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.   NO PERSON IS INDIVI-
DUALLY IDENTIFIED AND INFORMATION IS CONVERTED INTO TABLES AND SUMMARIES.
NO MEMBER OF STAFF WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THIS INFORMATION.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Abby Cronin, M.Sc (Econ)
Senior Lecturer in Sociology
Polytechnic of North London

SELF-COMPLETION QUESTIONNAIRE   JUNE 1981

TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION
STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

INSTRUCTIONS:

The following questionnaire is divided into 5 parts. It includes
questions about your own teaching, the Multicultural Education Committee in
EAST END HIGH., multi-ethnic education in general and your qualifications.
Please read each question and tick the appropriate box.   When the
question asks you to give your opinion or add additional comments,
please feel free to write as much as you wish.   You may attach an
additional sheet/s if necessary.

		Cols
Serial		(1-3)
Blank		(4)

			Cols
PART I YOUR OWN TEACHING	CARD NO. 1		(5)
Q.1 What is your present post according to the Burnham Scale?			(6)
PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX	a) Scale 1 Teacher	a	1
	b) Scale 2 Teacher	b	2
	c) Scale 3 Teacher	c	3
	d) Scale 4 Teacher	d	4
	e) Senior Teacher	e	5
	f) Deputy Head Teacher	f	6
	g) Head Teacher	g	7

	Cols
Q.2 Which department are you in? _____	(7)

	Cols
Q.3 What subjects do you teach? _____ _____	(8 - 10) ABCD EFGH JKLM NOPQ RSTU VWXY
Q.4 Can you please outline the nature of any special responsibilities which you have, eg for a subject, House, remedial work, departmental head, careers, etc: _____ _____ _____ _____	(11 - 15) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 X Y

		Cols
Q.5 Are you currently teaching Full-Time or Part-Time?		(16)
PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX	Full-time	1
	Part-time	2
	Supply teacher	3
a) (IF PART-TIME) What proportion of a post do you have? _____		(17)

	Cols
Q.6 How many years altogether have you spent in teaching? _____	(18-19)

	OUO CARD NO.

Q.7 How many years have you taught at EAST END HIGH?
PLEASE STATE HOW MANY YEARS & TERMS _____ (20-21)

PART II   YOUR OWN EDUCATION AND STUDY

Q.8 Are you presently engaged in part-time study?   (22)

PLEASE TICK   YES [   ]   1

                                                 NO [   ]   2

Q.9 IF 'YES', PLEASE SPECIFY: _____   (23-25)

_____   1 2 3

_____   4 5 6

_____   7 8 9

0 X Y

Q.10 Have you recently taken part in any In-Service training?   (26)

                                                 YES [   ]   1

                                                 NO [   ]   2

Q.11 IF 'YES', PLEASE SPECIFY: _____   (27-29)

_____   1 2 3

_____   4 5 6

_____   7 8 9

0 X Y

Q.12 Which of the following features describe the main school you attended
between 10-16 years of age?   PLEASE TICK ALL APPROPRIATE BOXES   (30)

(a) School Type   Public/Fee Paying/Direct Grant [   ]   1

                                       Grammar/Technical [   ]   2

                                        Secondary Modern [   ]   3

                                          Comprehensive [   ]   4

                                                  Other [   ]   5

(b) Was it denominational (ie affiliated to a religious body)?   (31)

                                                    Yes [   ]   1

                                                     No [   ]   2

(c) Single/Mixed   (32)

                                                  Mixed [   ]   1

                                              Single sex [   ]   2

(d) Racial Mix   (33)

                                Racially Mixed Above 30% [   ]   1

                                Racially Mixed Below 30% [   ]   2

                                       Not Racially Mixed [   ]   3

'Q.12 Contd

    (e) Location   (34)

Located in a British city, town etc. [ ] 1
PLEASE STATE WHICH CITY, TOWN ETC.

                                                        2

_____

                  Located abroad [ ] 3
PLEASE STATE WHERE _____   4

Q.13 Which of the following qualifications do you have?   (35)
      PLEASE TICK ALL APPROPRIATE BOXES

Post-secondary school qualifications (eg HNC, HND,
City & Guilds, BEC etc.) [ ] 1

Teachers' Certificate [ ] 2

Academic Diploma [ ] 3

P.G.C.E. [ ] 4

First Degree (eg BA, BS, BSc, BEd) [ ] 5

Higher Degree (eg MA, MSc, MPhil, PhD) [ ] 6

Please add any other qualifications obtained by [ ] 7
professional societies:

_____

Q.14 What was your main subject/s when you trained for teaching?   (36-37)
                                                               ABCDE
_____ FGHJK
_____ LMNOP
_____ QRSTU
                                                         VWXYZ

PART III   DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Q.15 AGE   PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX   (38)

21-29 [ ] 1

30-39 [ ] 2

40-49 [ ] 3

50-59 [ ] 4

Over 60 [ ] 5

342

OUO
CARD NO.1

Q.16 <u>SEX</u>   PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

(39)

MALE [   ]   1

FEMALE [   ]   2

Q.17 PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX TO SHOW WHICH
ETHNIC GROUP YOU BELONG TO.

(40)

African (excluding No. African) [   ]   A

Asian [   ]   B

Chinese [   ]   C

English, Scots, Welsh, N. Irish [   ]   D

Greek, Greek Cypriot [   ]   E

N. African, Near/Md. East (except Israel) [   ]   F

Southern Irish (Eire) [   ]   G

Turkish, Turkish Cypriot [   ]   H

West Indian (including Guyanese) [   ]   J

Other European [   ]   K

Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) [   ]   1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
0 X Y

TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION

PART IV   MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION IN GENERAL

HERE ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS CONCERNING MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION.   COULD YOU
PLEASE INDICATE WHICH RESPONSE COMES NEAREST TO YOUR VIEW BY CIRCLING THE
APPROPRIATE NUMBER.

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DIS-AGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	COLS	OUO CARD NO.1
18(a)	Schools have a responsibility to promote good race relations amongst pupils.	a 1	2	3	4	5	(41)	
(b)	It is the obligation of Local Education Authorities to take positive action to eliminate racial discrimination and promote equal educational opportunities.	b 1	2	3	4	5	(42)	
(c)	The ILEA should have a multi-ethnic education policy.	c 1	2	3	4	5	(43)	
(d)	It is difficult to devise appropriate policies for schools without statistical monitoring of the ethnic composition of the pupil population.	d 1	2	3	4	5	(44)	
(e)	We should keep records of the ethnic composition of the pupil population.	e 1	2	3	4	5	(45)	
(f)	The curriculum should reflect understanding of the different cultures and races that make up our society.	f 1	2	3	4	5	(46)	
(g)	The school curriculum contains a patronizing and dismissive view of other cultures, religions and societies.	g 1	2	3	4	5	(47)	
(h)	What is needed is a closer scrutiny of factors within the schools that are important in structuring achievement and underachievement.	h 1	2	3	4	5	(48)	
(i)	A multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of minority group children.	i 1	2	3	4	5	(49)	
(j)	Multi-ethnic education reduces the alienation of majority group children.	j 1	2	3	4	5	(50)	
(k)	Multi-ethnic education cannot compensate for aspects of social disadvantage which affect minority group childrens' achievement in schools.	k 1	2	3	4	5	(51)	
(l)	Teaching classes of multi-ethnic pupils is more satisfying than teaching classes of English pupils only.	l 1	2	3	4	5	(52)	
(m)	The aims of multi-ethnic education are not compatible with academic achievement.	m 1	2	3	4	5	(53)	
(n)	A multi-ethnic educational policy will reduce inequality of educational opportunity.	n 1	2	3	4	5	(54)	
(o)	Teaching classes of multi-ethnic pupils is more demanding than teaching classes of English pupils only.	o 1	2	3	4	5	(55)	
(p)	Teachers from ethnic minority groups are likely to cope best with pupils from ethnic minority groups.	p 1	2	3	4	5	(56)	
(q)	Teachers who are not from ethnic minority groups are less likely to cope well with pupils from ethnic minority groups.	q 1	2	3	4	5	(57)	

PART V   ROLE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE AT EAST END HIGH

EAST END HIGH   has had a Multicultural Education Committee since autumn 1978 and membership has always been open to every member of staff.

COLS

Q.19 How familiar are you with the aims and work of the Multicultural Education Committee?

(58)

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

Very familiar ☐   1

Fairly familiar ☐   2

Not very familiar ☐   3

Q.20 Which of the following statements applies to you?

(59)

I attend the Multicultural Education Committee meetings:

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

Regularly ☐   1

Occasionally ☐   2

Have never attended ☐   3

Q.21 To what extent do you feel able to support the aims of the Multicultural Education Committee?

(60)

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

A lot ☐   1

A little ☐   2

Not at all ☐   3

Not sure what the aims are ☐   4

Q.22 How much do you think the Multicultural Education Committee contributes to the life of the school?

(61)

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

A lot ☐   1

A little ☐   2

Not at all ☐   3

It is harmful ☐   4

Not sure ☐   5

Q.23 What is your view of the Multicultural Education Committee's role in examining subject syllabuses at EAST END HIGH ?   PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER.

COLS

(62-65

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
(a) Subject teachers should be in charge of what they teach without interference from the Multicultural Education Committee.	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Subject teachers should exchange views with colleagues about the content of their syllabuses.	1	2	3	4	5
(c) The Multicultural Education Committee can play a positive role in examining syllabuses with a view to encouraging a 'multicultural' dimension where relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
(d) The Multicultural Education Committee has no role to play in relation to subject syllabuses.	1	2	3	4	5

Q.24 Would you like EAST END HIGH   to provide school-based or in-service training for multicultural education?

(66)

Yes ☐   1

No ☐   2

Not sure ☐   3

346

OUO
CARD NO.

COLS

TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION

Q.25 What in your opinion are the main advantages and disadvantages of multi-ethnic education?

<u>Advantages</u>   <u>Disadvantages</u>

1. _____   1. _____   (68-69)
   _____   _____   1 2 3
   _____   _____   4 5 6
   _____   _____   7 8 9
                                                                       0 X Y

2. _____   2. _____   (70-72)
   _____   _____   1 2 3
   _____   _____   4 5 6
   _____   _____   7 8 9
                                                                       0 X Y

3. _____   3. _____   (73-75)
   _____   _____   1 2 3
   _____   _____   4 5 6
   _____   _____   7 3 9
                                                                       0 X Y

PLEASE ADD ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WISH ON MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION: (76-77

_____   1 2 3
_____   4 5 6
_____   7 8 9
_____   0 X Y
_____
_____
_____   (78)
_____   1 2 3
_____   4 5 6
_____   7 8 9
_____   0 X Y
_____
_____
_____   FINAL
_____   COLS
_____   (79-80

ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAPER IF YOU WISH

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP

APPENDIX 6.2
APPENDIX ON TEACHER SURVEY
STABILITY OF STAFFING IN EAST END HIGH
Years of Teaching in East End High:

	No. of Teachers
0-3	19
4-9	24
10-15	9
16+	4
incomplete	2

By far By far the largest group of teachers (43) were those who had worked in EEH for less than 9 years and 19 had been there for less than 3 years. By contrast, only 13 teachers had served for over 10 years. This reflects the high rate of teacher-turnover which Mr. Kay and Mr. Ojukwu said characterised the early 1970s. The figures do indicate, however, that the turnover rate was settling down and 39 teachers had been in EEH for at least 4 years.

TEACHERS' QUALIFICATIONS:

Graduates	36
HNC, HND, Teachers' Cert.	20
Higher Degrees	10

PART-TIME STUDY COMMITMENTS OF STAFF:

Diploma in Education	1
Open University	5
Certificate Course	1
B.Ed.	2
Diploma	1
Higher Degree	3

Staff were highly qualified, with 46 holding first or higher degrees, and 13 were continuing their studies on a part-time basis. These pursuits indicated a fairly serious commitment to professional improvement.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING:

Local Authority Course	4
Teachers' Centre	3
Within School	3
Borough-wide	1
Subject Related	6
Other	1

Teachers participated in a wide range of professsional in-service courses outside school. Altogether staff had attended 18 such courses.

Questions were asked about the type of school the teachers had
themselves attended and the profile of responses is as follows:

SCHOOL TYPE
Fee Paying	12
Comprehensive	6
Grammar/Tech.	22
Secondary Mod.	15
Other	2

Single Sex	42	Denominational	12
Mixed	__ 16__	Non-Denominational	__44__
	58 total		58 total

Twelve teachers had attended fee-paying schools. It would have
been interesting to see if any of those who had been to 'fee
paying' had come from abroad. The spread of school type was
wide. Not surprisingly, a higher proportion had been to
grammar schools, given that comprehensives were only expanding
in the 1960s---too late for this age group.

RACIAL MIX OF TEACHERS' OWN SCHOOL   NUMBERS*
30% or more of racial/ethnic minority	3
Under 30%	20
Nil	33

*This includes schools located abroad, eg. 7 from India and
Pakistan Pakistan which [presumably] had 100% Indian &
Pakistani pupils. The same for West Indians.

The location of teachers' schooling indicated that 26% of
teachers or 15, attended school overseas while 73% or 43 teachers
had attended schools in the United Kingdom, with 27 of these in
the South-East of England. Seven teachers had been to school in
India and Pakistan.

Appendix 6.3

TEACHER FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Focus of questions is on Multi-Cultural Education:

I. Do you think Multi-Cultural Education is important?

'Yes'--Why?
'No' --Why Not,

2. In what ways does your work, or the work of your department
consciously   foster a Multi-Cultural approach?

a- How successful do you think this approach is? What other
approaches do you think appropriate?

3. Describe the ways in which you have consciously attempted to introduce
new materials, curricula,etc., which you think the boys will find
more interesting and relevant to their lives?

Do you find these (above) innovations work?
'Yes'--Why?   'No'--Why Not?

4. Aside from teaching, are you involved in working within East End High
to encourage a Multi-Cultural awareness?   In what way?

5. What are your views as to how successful/unsuccessful the efforts
which have been made here in East End High to have Multi-Cultural
education?

6. Do you think pupils experience racial discrimination? If 'Yes'--In what way/s?

7. Do you think teachers' expectations of pupils affects their achievement?
a- In what way/s?

8. Did your teacher training include any emphasis on Multi-Cultural
issues? Please explain in what way.

9. Have your attitudes toward Multi-Cultural education been changed
by circumstances/experience? OR Have your personal views/aims
been compromised by working conditions?

10. Has you previous experience in other schools included any emphasis
on Multi-Cultural education?

11. What is your view of the ILEA's Multi-Ethnic Education policy?

12. How would you describe your general commitment to multi-racial
harmony in society? (probe on political/ideological commitments
in the widest sense)

FINALLY

13. Can you tell me about your background and career aspirations
in teaching? ie. what other schools you have worked in & for how long?
Career aspirations?   OR Do you want to leave teaching?

If 'Yes'---what would you ideally prefer to do for employment?

APPENDIX 7.1

MR. OGDEN'S 'IDEAS/OBSERVATIONS/OPINIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT FOR A MULTI-RACIAL/MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOL.

Some ideas/observations/opinions on the development of a departmental syllabus for a multi-racial/multi-cultural school.

Without delving deeply into the history of British education the following observations may be advanced.

(1) There is the likelihood that the existing syllabus would have been conceived to serve a largely homogeneous society.

(2) The syllabus would have had as its 'backdrop' the thinking of a conquering imperialist society which not only assumed but actively taught and fostered notions of race and class superiority.

"It is, moreover, to European man that the world owes the incomparable gifts of modern science. To the conquest of nature through knowledge the contributions made by Asiatics have been negligible and by Africans (Egyptians excluded) non-existent. The printing press and the telescope, the steam-engine, the internal combustion engine and the aero- plane, the telegraph and telephone, wireless broadcasting and the cinematograph, the gramophone and television, together with all the leading discoveries in physiology, the circulation of the blood, the laws of respiration and the like, are the result of researches carried out by white men of European stock. It is hardly excessive to say that the material fabric of modern civilized life is the result of the intellectual daring and tenacity of the European peoples".

(A History Of Europe by H.A.L. Fisher).

(3) Britain in particular, and Europe in general may well have been projected as the axis of civilisation.

"It is fashionable to speak today as if European history were devalued: as if historians, in the past, have paid too much attention to it; and as if, nowadays, we should pay less. Undergraduates, seduced, as always, by the changing breath of journalistic fashion, demand that they should be taught the history of black Africa. Perhaps, in the future, there will be some African history to teach. But at present there is none, or very little: there is only the history of the Europeans in Africa. The rest is largely darkness, like the history of pre-European, pre- Columbian America. And darkness is not a subject for history".

(The Rise Of Christian Europe by Hugh Trevor-Roper).

Thus the syllabus might have tended to nurture the belief, if not the conviction that anything of worth must have had its origin in Britain and/or in Europe.

If we examine British education we will observe that it is (a) conser- vative in nature; (b) ideas of learning and teaching were devised for a homogeneous society. The change in the composition of the population must be reflected in the manner of education. The clientele has changed so some adaptation is necessary. It is an accepted fact that children learn more readily where there is some identification with the learning matter or with the teaching materials.

A departmental syllabus in a multi-cultural/multi-racial school should ensure that -

(a) The direction towards which the syllabus tends should enshrine implicitly the flavour of the multi-cultural nature of the society.

(b) The contents of the syllabus including references should be positively and overtly multi-cultural.

(c) The materials used, such as texts, illustrations, examples, should be multi-cultural - decidedly eschewing any matter with racist or discriminatory over/undertones.

In fact all visual aids used should be, as far as possible, consistently multi-cultural/multi-recial.

The fact that the class is multi-cultural, that the school is multi-cultural, that the community is multi-cultural, that the society is multi-cultural, that the nation is multi-cultural, that the world is multi-cultural, should so permeate the entire fabric of the syllabus that all the children would come to accept the multi-cultural nature of the world in which different does not necessarily mean inferior as a matter of course and not as a cancerous monstrosity.

The syllabus should promote an ethos redolent of the multi-cultural nature of British Society.

MR. OGDEN

Appendix 7.2

BS/JA

6th November 1979

<u>To all members of staff.</u>

<u>Festival July 1980.</u>

During this second year of the multi-cultural committee's work one of the major tasks we have set ourselves has been the organisation of a festival to take place during the first weekend of July 1980. It is important to establish the aims of the festival. These are as follows:

1) To involve the school in an exercise which reflects its multi-racial/cultural nature.

2) To promote a deeper enjoyment and appreciation of the differences and similarities among various ethnic groups.

3) To involve the pupils, parents and staff in a venture that would enable people of various cultural backgrounds to work closely together.

It is envisaged that the festival will be held over two days and comprise various activities. The first day will be devoted to outdoor events which will include floats and stalls selling and displaying foods and other items. The evening will be organised around a dance with music and food of different kinds, that is, from various ethnic groups.

Events of the second day will be held in the school building. These could, for example, include poetry readings, drama, art displays, optional discussion groups, films and dance.

At the staff meeting on Monday 12th November part of the agenda will be concerned with the festival. A substantial number of staff have already indicated their support. The object of this letter is to formally state the nature of the festival and to ask for your support at that meeting and in offering help before and during the festival.

M.R. Williams
Chairman Multi-Cultural
Committee.

APPENDIX 7.3

MR. MYLES' INTEGRATED STUDIES SYLLABUS DISCUSSED AT THE
MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION MEETING ON NOVEMBER 19, 1979

IM- mixed ability Integrated Studies

> Discoveries.
> The Exploration of South America
> Textbook;- In History Series
> 'Exploration' by David Smith and
> Derek Newton

Rather than consider an individual lesson, I thought it best to
take as an example one of a series of subjects which the class
are studying through work-cards. This involves some
straightforward reading material from the 'In History' series
aided by some good coloured illustrations. There follow three
work-cards which progress from simple easy questions to a more
advanced writing where the brighter children can stretch their
wings somewhat.

As part of the previous topic (Tribe) IM studies the Secoya
Indians who live in the Amazon Basin ofSouth America. As part of
their study, extracts from Col. P.H.Fawcett's book 'Exploration
Fawcett' were reand and discussed. Fawcett explored some of the
interior of South America in the years between the two world wars
and this gives a useful lead-in to a consideration of the
exploration of the whole of the South American continent. (Note
that Fawcett is actually mention in the text.) As well as
considering this exploration from the purely historical angle,
maps of the area explored are prepared by the pupils thus dealing
with the obvious geographical aspects of the subject.

Much of the format outlines under 'Background' is explained to
the pupils so that they will know where they are going. The use
of the work-cards in conjunction with the text is also explained
(see 'Work-cards'). The text is then reand through by the teacher
with the pupils and is fully discussed in conjunction with the
illustrations. The pupils can then obviously question anything
they do not understand. (As indeed they can at any stage.)

I am unable to provide more than a brief outline of what the
illustrations contain. It is also difficult to provide a copy of
the text book as they are still being used by the class and are
in short supply.

Exploring the Continents.
While sailors explored the Oceans other men explored the
Continents.
South America
Cortes.
(Illustration of Cortes landing in South America at the head of
his men.)
In 1517 the Spaniards discovered the rich civilisation of the
Aztecs on the mainland in Mexico. The Governor of Cuba sent a
fleet of ships commanded by Hernando cortes. Cortes had only
five hundred and eight fighting ment but with them he conquered
the whole Aztec Empire in Mexico. He sentexploring parties
through his new domain, and in 1533 California was discovered,
while other expeditions explored as far a Florida.

Pizarro.

A Spanish farmer in Panama, called Pizarro, heard rumours of another righ empire on the west coast. He set off in 1531 with an army of only two hundred men. In a few months he conquered the Inca Civilisation of Peru.

The Amazon Explored by Orellana.

One of Pizarro's companions Almagro, journeyed southwards across the Andes and explored the country we call Chile, while Pizarro's brother decided to go eastwards across the Andes. With an army of Spaniards and natives he decended into the dense equatorial jungle.

When they reached the River Napo they built a large boat. On Christmas Day 1541, Francisco de Orellana left in it to search for food. (Illustration of Orellana and his party poling their boat along the river.) He and his companions sailed down the Napo until they reached the River Amazon. The river was flowing so swiftly that Orellana knew they culd never sail back upstream. A second ship was built and the two ships sailed on, down this mighty river. Frequently they were attacked by natives. Dangerous rapids and currents threatened to smash their boats. The heat was scorching but on 11th September 1542, after a voyage of over three thousand kilometres, and lasting two hindred and sixty days, they reached the Atlantic. They sailed on to the West Indies. Orellana's information made possible more accurate maps of South America.

Spanish colonies were set up in Venezuela and the river Orinoco was discovered. Between 1536 and 1546 the jungle around the Orinoco was explored thoroughly.

A German, Ulrich Schmeidel, explored the country which we today call Argentina. He arrived at the mouth of the River Plata in 1530. He helped to build the town of Buenos Aires and spent twenty years exploring South America. Pedro Teixalia completed the exploration of the main course of the Amazon in 1638, and by 1800 the main regions of south America had been explored, except for the parts of the Amazon jungle which are too difficult to reach.

Even today there are natives who know little about white men. A great English explorer, Colonel Fawcett, made many journeys into this jungle from 1901 to 1921. Then in 1925 on another expedition he misteriously disappeared in this same jungle. (Illustration of Fawcett and party encountering natuves in jungle.) As late as 1953 an American explorer, Robert Holder, when travelling by motor boat was fired on by hostile Motolore Indians. Workers on the Santa Ana iolfield in Venezuela have to be protected by crack riflemen using telescopic slights.

Here the questions are quite straightforward generally requiring only a sentence for an answer. One tries to encourage pupils to translate answers into their own words and not copy straight from the text. These questions test the pupil's ability to extract the correst pieces of information from the text. Page references are given after each question.

It might be instructive to compare some of the answers fiven by the pupils to these questions. For this purpose I have divided the teaching groups into three sections;-

                     (a) Bright
                     (b) Average

(c) Slow learner.

This division is partly subjective and based on past performance. No attempt has been made to correst mistakes at this stage. We are trying to evaluate understanding based on reading and not punctuation, spelling etc.

The pupils were briefed as to the type of answer expected.

Q.1.

'When did Spain discover theAztec civilisation? (20)

Specimen Answers;-(a) Bright. Spain discovered the Aztecs civilisation in 1517.

(b) Average. Spain discovered the Aztec civilisation in 1517.

(c) Slow L. Spain discovered the Aztec civilisation in 1517.

The level of success is obvious.

Q.2.

'Which civilisation did Pizarro conquer?

Answers;- (a) Pizarro conquered the Aztec civilisation of Peru.

(b) The civilisation that Pizarro conquered ws Incas.

(c) Pizarro conquered the Inca civilisation.

Full house again!

Q.3.

Who explored Chile?

Answers;-(a) Almagro explored Chile.

(b) The man who explored Chile was Almagro.

(c) The man who explored chile was Almagro.

It would become boring to continue in the above vein. It is obvious that the level of understanding gained from the reading has enabled al pupils to answer questions like these with no trouble at all. Although the time taken varied from pupil to pupil even the slowest workers were able to omplete the exercise within one period.

Q.4. What river did Orellana discover and explore?

Q.5. How long did his journey take? (21)

Q.6. Which part of South America did Schmiedel explore? (22)

Q.7. What happened to Robert Holder? (22)

Here the questions are not so straightforward and require a deeper insight into the text. Preparation from the techer should bring these insights out (or partly so) during the initial reading and discussion. Again examples are used as before.

Q.1

Describe the achievements of Hernando cortes. (20)

Answers;- (a) Hernando Cortes achievement was a good one, he was sent by the Governor of Cuba with a fleet of ships and Cortes had only five hundred and eight fighting men, and with them conquered the whole Aztec Empire in Mexico.

(b) The achievement of Hernando Cortes was that Cortes only had 508 fighting men. But he still conquered the whole Aztec Empire in Mexico.

(c) Hernando cortes achievement wer He discovered Aztecs on the mainland of Mexico and conquered it and he discovered Florida, and in 1533 California was discovered.

Again reasonably successful. The pupils have realised what is required and have obviously not been held back by being unable to read and understand the text. Levels of achievement probably reflect personal intellect and level of preparation.

Q.2.

What part did Pizarro play in the exploration of South America? (20)

Answers;- (a) Pizarro played the part of finding the Inca civilisation of Peru after hearing rumours. In 1531 he set out with just an army of two hundred men and found it in a few months time.

(b) The part that Pizarro played was the conquer of the Inca Civilisation of Peru.

(c) The part Pizarro played in the exploration of South America was the part to load his army of two hundred men only to battle.

Q.3. Orellana's adventurers were exciting. Describe them in your own words.

Q.4. What contribution did Schmiedel and Teixeira make to the exploration of South America?

Q.5. There are dangers still in remote parts of South American. Give some examples.

Work-card C involves a piece of creative writing leading into the next set of explorations to be considered. As it does not have a direct bearing on reading the text above I have not considered it here.

It might be instructive to examine the pupils' response to other work-cards later in the book which have not been so thoroughly prepared or indeed, not prepared at all.

Mr. Myles

Discussion paper: —, Staff Some Meetings Tuesday 27 April 80

Towards an Overall Policy for the Involvement of Pupils in the
Running of the School : A Draft Questionnaire

This questionnaire should be completed by every pupil. Whenever it is
necessary assistance should be given to individuals or groups of pupils.

1. Do you think that pupils can/should be involved in making some of
   the decisions in the running of the school?   YES   NO

2. For instance, in which of the following issues should pupils be
   allowed to have a say -
   a) discipline?
   b) uniform?
   c) assemblies?
   d) competitions?
   e) selection and role of prefects?
   f) sanctions?
   g) rewards?
   h) any others? Mention these _____

   _____

3. If you were allowed, would you be willing to assist in making
   decisions about running the school?   YES   NO

4. If your answer to Question 3 is YES, on which issues (See Question 2)
   would you be most interested in making decisions? _____

   _____

   _____

5. What do you think would be the attitude of teachers towards your
   views about running the school? Do you think they would be -
   a) interested?   d) fair?
   b) uninterested?   e) unfair?
   c) indifferent?   f) unfairly biased?
   Briefly, give any other answer which, you think, is appropriate to
   Question 5 _____

   _____

   _____

6. What do you think is the best forum for expressing your views -

a) your tutor group?

b) a year council within your own House?

c) a year council throughout the school?

d) the School Council?

e) house assemblies?

f) main hall assemblies?

If you feel that a combination of forums would be best, mention the combination _____

_____

_____

7. As you see the situation in your school, is (are) there

a) too much/too little discipline?

b) too much/too little homework?

c) too much/too little concern for school uniform?

d) too many of the wrong restrictions/too few of the right restrictions?

If you wish, you may make further comments related to Question 7.

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you care about what people in the neighbourhood think of your school?   YES   NO

9. Do you care about the impression that is given to outsiders on a visit to your school?   YES   NO

10. Do you think that East End High would be a better school, if all the pupils had more responsibility and a regular say in its administration.   YES   NO

11. Or do you think that pupils are incapable of shouldering responsibility, and that school administration should therefore be left entirely to teachers?   YES   NO

APPENDIX 7.5 (PAGES 360-367) REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

Unknown book chapter or article (with illustrations) entitled 'What is prejudice?'

APPENDIX 7.6

Multicultural Education Committee

Tomorrow — 12th May 1981 — being the second Tuesday of the month, we are due for a meeting. One will be held in the library, commencing at 4.00 pm.

Agenda

1. MR. Bryce has left some very important information about the July festival for me to convey to the committee. Everyone should try to attend, in order that we might each know what everyone else has managed to arrange thus far for the festival

2. Teaching against racism:

    Our discussion on this topic and those on the material circulated by MR. Cox is very much overdue.
    Please study the attached ILEA document, which we could use as a starting point for our discussion.

Refreshments will be in attendance

MR. THOMAS 11th May 1981

cancelled
continued for one week
to MAY 18 81

Appendix 7.7

ME/SE.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Minutes of meeting held on <u>3rd November, 1981</u>.

<u>PRESENT</u>:   Mr. Thomas   Ms. Harris
             Mr. Patel   Mr. Bryce
             Mc Elkins   Mr. Harris
             Mr. Singh   Mr. Pappas
             A. Cronin   Mr. Gold
                                 Ms. Sandhu .

1. Appointment of Chairperson for current school year – <u>Mr. Thomas</u> proposed and unanimously elected.

2. Chairman, by way of information, stated that the Headmaster had agreed to release two female members of the committee; viz – Mr. Bryce and Ms. Chantal, to attend one day seminar at   Road Teachers' Centre on Wednesday 11th November in connection with Anti-Sexist Education.

3. Chairman invited members to consider for discussion the role of this committee within the new school and suggested that there need to be active representation and participation in it's membership by Heads of Departments and Years in order to promote committee decisions at Joint Heads meetings. From these discussions, members thought, classroom policies on multi-culturalism could be effected. It was expressed also, that Hall Assemblies should be seen to be promoting the policies and guidelines agreed by the committee.

4. Mr. Singh suggested acquisition of a cash float to offset expenses towards such things as photocopying and circulation of published material on multicultural education to committee members and staff, and probably for the provision of invited speakers to our school/meetings. It was thought that this would be a step forward in projecting the committee as an established entity of the school.

5. Chairman further invited members to give a thought to "what the committee ought to be looking at in terms of education in the new school."
   General ideas were proferred; among these were:
   (a) <u>In-service training</u> for staff – both internal and external – in order to rouse consciousness of entire staff to the problems. Teachers should be encouraged and allowed to attend seminars/conferences and report back on their experiences/usefulness.
   (b) <u>Positive discrimination</u> – to be seen in appointment and promotion of staff. The effect should be a raising of the self-image of black teachers and pupils.
   (c) <u>Teachers attitudes in the classroom.</u>
   ※(d) Provision for <u>mother tongue teaching</u> – Asian! Greek! Turkish!
       Changes in school curriculum to take greater account of the needs and interests of ethnic minority groups.

(e) (Stance on Racism) facist, sexist and racist abuse among boys and also between staff and boys. Colleagues of the school to be consulted for their views
Members suggested parental links/contacts be made along these lines. Community links ought to be established.

(f) A general statement of policy from the top.
This was thought to be necessary — that there should be insistence that positive classroom policies be practised by all teachers — a start to this end should be rearrangement of seating arrangements in classroom to encourage integration.

Finally critism was also levelled at the apparent suggestion of small groups within the Staffroom — the, perhaps, unconscious act of putting chairs in clustered groups — occupied almost exclusively by particular persons. Staff of the new school must be considered on this point.

A further meeting is planned for next Tuesday 10th November when these minutes will be approved and circulated to the committee and interested staff at the other school — the latter to be invited to a joint meeting in the near future.

Meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

M. Bryce
(Recorder)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACER/ILEA. 1982. "West Indian children in our Schools", The Report. London: Afro-Caribbean Education Resources.

ACKER S. 1988. "Teachers, Gender & Resistance". British Journal of Sociology of Education. Vol 9, No. 3, 1988.

ACLAND, H. 1978. "Does Parent Involvement Matter?" in M.J. Wilson (ed): Social and Educational Research in Action. New York: Longman & Open University Press.

AHIER, J. & FLUDE, M. (eds). 1974. Educability, Schools & Ideology. London: Croom Helm.

AHIER, J & FLUDE, M. (eds). 1983. Contemporary Education Policy. London: Croom Helm.

ALIBHAI, Y. 1988. "Tribal Dance". New Statesman & Society. 22 July 1988, pp18-19.

ALTARF. 1978. Teaching & Racism. London: ALTARF.

ALTARF. 1979. Racism in Schools. London: ALTARF.

ALTARF. 1984. Challenging Racism. London: ALTARF.

ALTHUSSER, L. 1971. "Ideology & Ideological State Apparatuses", in Lenin & Philosophy & Other Essays. London: New Left Books.

ANWAR, M. 1980. Ethnic Minorities & the General Election. London: Commission for Racial Equality.

APPLE, M. 1979. Ideology & Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ARNOT, M. (ed). 1985. Race & Gender: Equal Opportunities Policies in Education. Oxford: Pergamon.

ARNOT, M. 1986. Part 1. Race & Education Policy-Making. Module 4 of E333, Policy-Making in Education. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

BAGLEY, C. & VERMA, G. (eds). 1975. Race and Education Across Cultures. London: Heinemann.

BAGLEY, C. & VERMA, G. (eds). 1979. Race, Education & Identity. London: Macmillan.

BAGLEY, C. & VERMA, G. (eds). 1982. Self-Concept & Multiracial Education. London: Macmillan.

BALL, S. J. 1981. Beachside Comprehensive: A Case-Study of Secondary Schooling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BALL, S. J. 1987. The Micro-Politics of the School: Towards a Theory of School Organization. London: Methuen.

BANTON, M. 1977. The Idea of Race. London: Tavistock.

BANTON, M. 1955. The Coloured Quarter: Negro Immigrants in an English City. London: Cape.

BANTON, M. 1979. "The Idea of Race & the Concept of Race" in G. Verma & C. Bagley (eds.), Race, Education & Identity. London: Macmillan.

BARKER, M. 1981 The New Racism. London: Junction Books.

BARKER, R. 1972. Education & Politics 1900-1951: A Study of the Labour Party. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BARNES, J. H. & LUCAS, H. 1975. "Positive Discrimination in Education: Individual, Groups & Institutions" in Educational Priority, Vol 3. London: HMSO.

BARTON, L. & MEIGHAN. R. (eds). 1978. Sociological Interpretations of Schooling & Classrooms: A Reappraisal. Driffield: Nafferton Books.

BARATZ, S. & BARATZ, J. 1970. "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism". Harvard Educational Review, 40 (1), pp 29-50.

BATES, I., CLARKE, J., COHEN, P., FINN, D., MOORE, R. & WILLIS, P. 1984. Schooling for the Dole? The New Vocationalism. London: Macmillan.

BATES, R. 1980 "New Developments in the New Sociology of Education". British Journal of Sociology of Education. Vol 1 No. 1.

BECHER, T. & MACLURE, S. 1978. Accountability in Education. SSRC Education Research Board. Windsor: NFER Publishing Co.

BELL-PHILLIPS, M. et al. 1983. Issues and Resources. Birmingham: AFFOR.

BENTON, T. 1977. Education & Politics. Appendix C in Open University, E202, Block III: Knowledge, Ideology & Curriculum, pp 124-131. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

BENTON, T. 1981. "Objective Interests & the Sociology of Power" in Sociology. Vol 15, No. 2.

BEN-TOVIM, G., GABRIEL, J., LAW, I. & STREDBER, K. 1986. The Local Politics of Race. London: Macmillan.

BEN-TOVIM, G., & GABRIEL, J. 1979. "The Sociology of Race - time to Change Course?". The Social Science Teacher. Vol 8, No. 4.

BENYON,J. (ed). 1984. Scarman & After: Essays reflecting on Lord Scarman's Report, the Riots and their Aftermath. Oxford: Pergamon.

BENYON, J. & SOLOMOS, J. (eds). 1987. The Roots of Urban Unrest. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

BERKSHIRE EDUCATION AUTHORITY. 1982. Education for Equality: A Paper for Discussion in Berkshire.

BERKSHIRE EDUCATION AUTHORITY. 1983. Education For Racial Equality. Policy Paper 1: General Policy; Policy Paper 2: Implications; Policy Paper 3: Support.

BERNSTEIN, B. 1961. "Social Class & Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning", in Halsey, Floud & Anderson (eds), Education, Economy and Society. Toronto: The Free Press, Collier Macmillan.

BERNSTEIN, B. 1970. "A Critique of the Concept of Compulsory Education" in D. Rubenstein & C. Stoneman (eds), Education for Democracy. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

BERNSTEIN, B. 1971. "On the Classification & Framing of Educational Knowledge", in M. Young (ed), Knowledge & Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education. London: Macmillan.

BERNSTEIN, B. 1975. Class, Codes and Control. Vol 3, Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BIRLEY HIGH SCHOOL. 1980. Multicultural Education in the 1980s. Manchester: City of Manchester Education Committee.

BLACKBURN, R. (ed). 1972. Ideology in Social Science. Glasgow: Fontana.

BLUMER, H. 1971. "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead" in School and Society, B.R. Cosin et al. (eds). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

BOOTH, H. 1983. "Ethnic & Racial Questions in the Census: The Home Affairs Committee Report". New Community, Vol XI, Nos. 1/2.

BOURDIEU, P. 1976. "Systems of Education & Systems of Thought", ch. 21 in Dale, Esland, MacDonald (eds), Schooling & Capitalism. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

BOURNE, J. & SIVANANDAN, A. 1980. "Cheerleaders and Ombudsmen: The Sociology of Race Relations in Britain", in Race and Class. Vol. XXI No 4.

BOWLES, S. & GINITIS, H. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BRAHAM, P. Immigrants & Inequality, Open University E361, Unit pp 77-124. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

BRAKE, M. 1980. The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BRIDGES, L. 1981/2. "Keeping the Lid On: British Urban Social Policy: 1975-1981". Race & Class, Vol XXIII, Nos. 2/3.

BRIDGES, L. 1983. "Policing the Urban Wasteland". Race & Class, Vol XXV No. 2.

BRISTOL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION (NUT) 1980. After the Fire: A Report on Education in St. Pauls, Bristol, & Multi-Ethnic Education in Avon. Bristol: NUT.

BROWN, A. 1985. Trials of Honeyford. Centre for Policy Studies, Pilot Paper No. 2.

BROWN, C. 1984. Black & White Britain: The Third PSI Survey. London: Heinemann.

BULLIVANT, B. 1981. The Pluralist Dilemma in Education. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

BULLIVANT, B. 1986. "Towards Radical Multiculturalism: Resolving Tensions in Curriculum and Educational Planning": in Modgil et al, Multicultural Education: The Interminable Debate. Lewes: Falmer Press.

BULMER, M. 1982. The Uses of Social Research: Social Investigation in Public Policy-Making. London: George Allen & Unwin.

BUNYAN, T. 1981/2. "The Police Against the People" in Race & Class. Vol XXIII, Nos. 2/3.

BURGESS, R G. 1984. In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research. London: George Allen & Unwin.

BURGESS, R. G. (ed.) 1985. Field Methods in the Study of Education. Lewes: Falmer Press.

BURGESS, R. G. 1986. Sociology, Education and Schools: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. London: Batsford.

BURTONWOOD, N. 1987. "Anti-Racist Education: A Scientific Revolution?". New Community, Vol XIV Nos 1/2.

CARBY, H. 1980. "Multiculturalism" in Screen Education, No. 34.

CARBY, H. 1982. "Schooling in Babylon", in The Empire Strikes Back, CCCS. London: Hutchinson University Press.

CCCS 1982. The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain. London: Hutchinson.

CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE ACCOUNTANTS (CIPFA). 1988. Performance Indicators. SIS.

CHEVANNES, M. 1979. "Supplementary Education: The Black Arrow Night School Project". The Social Science Teacher. Vol 8, No 4, April.

CHITTY, C. 1989. Towards a New Education System: The Victory of the New Right? Lewes: Falmer Press.

CHIVERS, T. S. (ed). 1987. Race and Culture in Education. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

COARD, B. 1971. How the West Indian Child is made Educationally Subnormal in the British School System. London: New Beacon Books.

COATES, K. & SILBURN, R. 1970. Poverty the Forgotten Englishman. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

COHEN, P. & BAINS, H.S. 1988. Multi-Racist Britain. London: Macmillan.

COLEMAN, J. S. et al. 1966. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

COLEMAN, D.A. 1982. Demography of Immigrants and Minority Groups in UK. London: Academic Press.

COLEMAN, J. S. 1968. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity". Harvard Educational Review, 38 (1) pp 7-22.

COLEMAN, J. S. 1971. School and Society 2nd edition, B.R. Cosin et al. (eds). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

COLEMAN, J.S. 1973. "Equality of Opportunity & Equality of Results". Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43. No. 1.

COLEMAN, J. S. 1975. "What is Meant by 'An Equal Educational Opportunity'?" Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 1. No. 1.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY. 1980. Youth in Multi-Racial Society: The Urgent Need for New Policies, "The Fire Next Time": London: CRE.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY. 1981. Local Authorities and the Educational Implications of Section 71 of the U.R. Act 1976. London: CRE.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY. 1984. Race and Council Housing in Hackney: Report of a Former Investigation. London: CRE.

COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN FROM ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS (Rampton Committee). 1981. West Indian Children in Our Schools (Interim Report). CMND 8273. London: HMSO.

COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN FROM ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS (Swann Committee). 1985. Education for All. CMND 9453. London: HMSO.

COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS' ADVISORY COUNCIL. 1964. Third Report. CMND 2458. London: HMSO.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION. 1974. The Response to the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration. London: HMSO.

CONNOLLY, M. 1984/85. "Achievement of Access and Non-Access Students on a B.Ed. Course". New Community, Vol XII, No. 1.

COX, C. & MARKS, J. 1984. "Educational Attainment in Secondary Schools". Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 10. No.1.

CRAFT, A. & BARDELL, G. (eds). 1984. Curriculum Opportunities in a Multicultural Society. London: Harper & Row.

CRAFT, A. & KLEIN, G. 1986. Agenda for Multicultural Teaching, School Curriculum Development Committee. London: Longman.

CRAFT, M. (ed). 1981. Teaching in a Multicultural Society: The Task for Teacher Education. Lewes: Falmer.

CRONIN, A. 1984. "Supplementary Schools: Their Role in Culture Maintenance, Identity and Underachievement". New Community, Vol XI, No 3, Spring 1984.

CROSS, C. 1978. Ethnic Minorities in the Inner City. London: CRE.

DANIEL, W.W. 1968. Racial Discrimination in England. PEP Report. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

DAVIDSON, B. 1974. Africa in History. London: Paladin.

DAVIES, B. & BERNSTEIN, B. 1972. "Some Sociological Comments on Plowden", from R. Peters (ed), Perspectives on Plowden. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

DAVIES, B. 1982. "Organisational Theory and Schools" in A. Hartnett, (ed), The Social Sciences in Educational Studies. London: Heinemann.

DEAKIN, N. 1970. Colour, Citizenship & British Society. London: Panther.

DEMAINE, J. 1977. "On the New Sociology of Education: A Critique of MFD & Young and the radical attack on the politics of educational knowledge", pp 111-144 in Economy and Society, Vol 6.

DEMAINE, J. 1980. "Sociology of Education, Politics and the Left in Britain". British Journal of the Sociology of Education. Vol. 1. No. 1.

DEMAINE, J. 1981. Contemporary Theories in the Sociology of Education. London: Macmillan.

DEMAINE, J. 1989. "Race, Categorisation & Educational Achievement". British Journal of the Sociology of Education. Vol. 10. No. 2.

DEMAINE, J. & KADODWASA, D. 1988. "Multicultural & Antiracist Education: The Unnecessary Divide". Curriculum. Vol 9. No. 2.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1963. Education For Immigrants. Pamphlet No. 43. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1965. The Education of Immigrants. Circular 7/65. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1971. The Education of Immigrants. Education Survey 13. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1974. Educational Disadvantage and the Educational Needs of Immigrants. CMND 5720. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1975. A Language For Life (The Bullock Report). London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1977. Education in Schools. A Consultative Document. CMND 6809. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1980. Report by HM Inspectors on Educational Provision by the Inner London Education Authority. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1981. The School Curriculum, London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1989. Ethnically-Based Statistics on School Teachers. Circulars No. 8/89 and No. 12/89.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. 1989. Ethnically-Based Statistics on School Pupils. Circular No. 16/89.

DHONDY, F., BEESE, B. & HASSAN, L. 1982. The Black Explosion in British Schools. London: Race Today Publications.

DHONDY, F. 1978. "Teaching Young Blacks". Race Today, pp 80-85.

DODGSON P. & STEWARD, D. 1981. "Multiculturalism in Anti-Racist Teaching: A Question of Alternatives". Multiracial Education, Vol. 9. No. 3, pp 41-52.

DOHERTY, S. 1984. "Anti-Racist teaching policies", pp 213-227 in M. Straker-Welds (ed), Education for a Multicultural Society, London: Bell & Hyman.

DONALD, J. 1981. "Green Paper: Noise of Crisis" in Dale, Esland et al (eds), Schooling and the National Interest. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

DORN, A. 1983. "LEA Policies on Multi-Racial Education". Multi-Ethnic Education Review. Vol. 2. No. 2.

DORN, A. 1985. "Education and the Race Relations Act" in M. Arnot (ed), Race and Gender: Equal Opportunities Policies in Education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

DORN, A. & TROYNA, B. 1982. "Multiracial Education and the Politics of Decision-Making". Oxford Review of Education. Vol. 8 No. 2, pp 175-185.

DUMMETT, A. 1973. A Portrait of English Racism. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

DUMMETT, A. 1985. "An Equal Chance". New Community. Vol. XII, No. 2.

EDGAR, D. 1986. "The Free or the Good" in Levitas, R. (ed), The Ideology of the New Right. Cambridge: Polity Press.

EDWARDS, A.D. & HARGREAVES, D.H. 1971. "The Social Science Base of Academic Radialism", in B.B. Cosin et al (eds), School and Society: A Sociological Reader, 2nd ed. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

EDWARDS, J. 1989. Positive Discrimination: Social Justice & Social Policy. Moral Scrutiny of a Policy Practice. London: Tavistock.

EDWARDS, V.K. 1976. Educational Research. Vol.18. No 2.

EDWARDS, V.K. 1978. Educational Review. Vol.30. No. 1.

EGGLESTON, J., ANJALI, D., DUNN, D. & WRIGHT, C. 1985. Education for Some: The Educational and Vocational Experiences of 15-18 year old Young People of Minority Ethnic Groups. Stoke-On-Trent: Trentham Books.

ENTWISTLE, H. 1979. Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

EYE OF THE STORM. 1979. Concord Films, USA, 35 minutes.

EYSENCK, H.J. 1971. Race, Intelligence and Education. London, Temple Smith.

EYSENCK, H.J. 1975. "Equality and Education: Fact and Fiction". Oxford Review of Education. Vol. 1 No. 1.

EYSENCK, H.J. & KAMIN, L. 1981. Intelligence: The Battle for the Mind. London: Pan.

FENTON, S. 1982. "Multi-Something Education". New Community. Vol X. No. 1.

FILE, N. & HINDS, D.. 1984. "World History at Tulse Hill School", in M. Straker-Welds (ed): Education for a Multicultural Society. London: Bell and Hyman.

FILE, N. & POWER, C. Black Settlers in Britain, 1555-1958. London: Heinemann.

FINCH, J. 1984. Education as Social Policy. London: Longman.

FINCH, J. 1986. Research and Policy: The Uses of Qualitative Methods in Social & Educational Research. Lewes: Falmer.

FINCH, J. 1988. "Ethnography and Public Policy", in Pollard, A., Purvis, J. & Walford, G. (eds): Education, Training and the New Vocationalism. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

FISHER, G. & JOSHUA, H. 1982. "Social Policy and Black Youth" in Cashmore & Troyna (eds) Black Youth in Crisis. London: George Allen & Unwin.

FITZGERALD, M. 1984. Political Parties and Black People. London: The Runnymede Trust.

FLETCHER, R. 1984. Education in Society: The Promethean Fire. A New Essay on the Sociology of Education. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

FLOUD, J., HALSEY A.H. and MARTIN, F. M. 1957. Social Class and Educational Opportunity. London: William Heinemann.

FLEW, A. 1984. Education, Race and Revolution. London: Centre for Policy Studies.

FOOT, P. 1969. The Rise of Enoch Powell. London: Cornmarket Press.

FOSTER, P. 1990. Policy and Practice in Multicultural and Anti-Racist Education. London: Routledge.

FOWLER, G., MORRIS, V. & OZGA, J. (eds). 1973. Decision-Making in British Education. London: Heinemann.

FRANCIS, M. 1984. "Anti-Racist Teaching: General Principles" in Challenging Racism. ALTARF

GILES, R. 1977. The West Indian Experience in British Schools: Multi-Racial Education and Social Disadvantage in London. London: Heinemann.

GILL, B. 1989. "Indicators and Institutional Evaluation" in Multicultural Teaching. Vol. 8 No. 1. pp 8-12.

GILROY, P. 1987. There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack. London: Hutchinson.

GILROY, P. 1982. "You Can't Fool the Youths Race & Class 3 Formation in the 1980s". Race & Class Vol. XXIII, No. 23.

GILROY, P. 1982. "Police & Thieves", in The Empire Strikes Back. London: Hutchinson.

GLASS, D.V. 1954. Social Mobility in Britain. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

GLEESON, D. (ed). 1977. Identity and Structure: Issues on the Sociology of Education. Driffield: Nafferton Books.

GOLDSTEIN, H. 1983. "Different Standards, Different Interpretations". Guardian, 1 November 1983.

GORBUTT, D. 1972. 'The New Sociology of Education' in Education for Teaching. 89.3

GORDON, P. 1988. "The New Right, Race & Education - or how the Black Papers became a White Paper" in Race & Class, Vol XXIX, No. 3.

GORDON, P. 1989. "The New Educational Right". Multicultural Teaching. Vol. 8. No. 1.

GORDON, P. & KLUG, F. 1986. New Right, New Racism. Nottingham: Searchlight Publications.

GORDON, P. & ROSENBERG, D. 1989. Daily Racism: The Press & Black People in Britain. London: Runnymede Trust.

GRACE, E. (ed). 1984. Education and the City: Theory, History and Contemporary Practice. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

GRAMSCI, A. 1971. Prison Notebooks. Q. Hoare & G. Nowell-Smith (eds). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

GREEN, A. 1982. "In Defence of Anti-Racist Teaching". Multicultural Education. Vol 10, No 2.

GREEN, P. 1981. The Pursuit of Inequality. London: Martin Robertson.

GREEN, P. 1982. "Tolerance Teaching and the Self-Concept in The Multiethnic Classroom". Multiethnic Education Review. Vol. 1. No. 1.

GREEN, P. 1985. "Multi-Ethnic Teaching and the Pupils' Self-Concept" in Education For All, Annex B to chapter 2. pp 46-56. CMND 9453. London: HMSO.

GRINTER, R. 1985. "Bridging the Gulf: The Need for Anti-Racist Multicultural Education", pp 7-10 in Multicultural Teaching. Vol III, No. 2.

GUNDARA, J., JONES, C. & KIMBERLEY, K. (eds). Racism, Diversity and Education. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

GUTZMORE, G. 1983. "Capital, 'Black Youth' & Crime" in Race and Class. Vol XXV. No.2.

HALEY, A. 1976. Roots. New York: Doubleday.

HALL, S. & JACQUES, M. (eds). 1983. The Politics of Thatcherism. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

HALL, S. et al. 1978. Policing the Crisis. London: Macmillan.

HALL, S. 1980. "Teaching Race" in Multiracial Education. Vol 9. No. 1.

HALSEY, A.H. 1972. Educational Priority, Vol I EPA Problems and Policies. London: HMSO.

HALSEY, A.H., HEATH, A.C. & RIDGE, J.M. 1980. Origins & Destinations: Family, Class & Education in Modern Britain. London: Clarendon Press.

HALSEY, A.H., FLOUD, J. & ANDERSON, C. 1961. Education, Economy and Society. The Free Press. London: Collier-Macmillan.

HALSTEAD, M. 1988. Education, Justice and Cultural Diversity: An Examination of the Honeyford Affair. Lewes: Falmer.

HAMMERSLEY, M. 1979. Analysisng Ethnographic Data. Part 1, Block 6, Making Sense of Data. Research Methods in Education of the Social Services. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

HAMMERSLEY, M. (ed). 1983. The Ethnography of Schooling. Driffield: Nafferton Books.

HAMMERSLEY, M. & ATKINSON, P. 1983. Ethnography: Principles in Practice. London: Tavistock.

HAMNET, C. Inequality in the City, E361 Block II. Unit 4: Multiple Deprivation. The Inner City. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

HARGREAVES, D. 1967. Social Relations in a Secondary School. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

HARGREAVES, D.H. 1978. "Two Curricula and the Community". Westminster Studies in Education, Vol. 1. pp-31-41.

HARRIS, N. 1986. "Deindustrialisation", Ch.1. in Coates, D. & Hillard, J. (eds) The Economic Decline of Modern Britain. Wheatsheaf Books.

HARRISON, P. 1983. "The Hoxton Creeper Who Can't Go Straight". New Society. 18 August 1983.

HARRISON, P. 1983. "The Victims of Crime". New Society. 25 August 1983.

HARRISON, P. 1983. "The New Poor Law. New Society. 25 August 1983.

HARRISON, P. 1983. Inside the Inner City: Life Under the Cutting Edge. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

HARTLEY, D. 1989. "The House and the School: Paradise Lost?". British Journal of the Sociology of Education, Vol. 10. No. 2.

HASTIE, T. 1981. "Encouraging Tunnel Vision". Times Educational Supplement. 3 May 1985.

HATCHER, R. & SHALLICE, J. 1982. "The Politics of Anti-Racist Education". Multiracial Education, Vol 12. No. 1.

HATCHER, R. 1985. "Some Comments on Chris Mullard's Papers for Name". Unpublished conference paper.

HATCHER, R. 1985. "On Education for Racial Equality". Multiracial Education. Vol 13. No. 1.

HEGARTY, S. & LUCAS, D. 1978. Able to Learn. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

HERSON, L. & BERG, I. 1980. Out of School: Modern Perspectives on Truancy and School Refusal. London: John Wiley & Sons.

HIBBERT, P. 1983. "Section 11 Posts: Review or Reform". Multiracial Education, Vol 12. No. 1.

HIMMELWEIT, H. 1954. "Social Status and Secondary Education since the 1944 Act: Some Data for London", in H. Silver, Equal Opportunity in Education. London: Methuen.

HOLT, J. 1964. How Children Fail. London: Penguin.

HOLTERMAN, S. 1975. "Areas of Urban Deprivation in Great Britain: An analysis of 1971 Census Data". Social Trends, 6. London: HMSO.

HOLTERMAN, S. 1977. "The Welfare Economics of Priority Area Policies". Journal of Social Policy, 7.1 pp 23-40.

HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. Session 1980-81. Racial Disadvantage. Vol 1. Fifth Report of Home Affairs Committee.

HOME OFFICE. 1974. Educational Disadvantage and the Educational Needs of Immigrants. CMND 5720. London: HMSO.

HONEYFORD, R. 1983. "Multi-Ethnic Intolerance". Salisbury Review, pp 12-13.

HOPKINS, A. 1978. The School Debate. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

HOWARD, A. 1987. RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler. London: Jonathan Cape.

HOWES, E. & FULOP, R. 1982. Information on Hackney. Research Note 3. Hackney Borough Council.

HUSBAND, C. (ed). 1982. Race in Britain. London: Hutchinson.

HUSBAND, C. 1982. "Racial" Prejudice and the Concept of Social Identity. Part I, E354 Block 2, Units 5 & 6. Ethnic Minorities and Community Relations. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

ILEA. 1977. 269. Multi-Ethnic Education. 6 October 1977.

ILEA. 1977. Multi-Ethnic Education. Joint Report of the Schools Sub-Committee and the Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee presented to the Education Sub-Committee, 8 November 1977.

ILEA. 1978. Multi-Ethnic Education - Progress. 8379. 15 June 1978.

ILEA. 1978. Multi-Ethnic Newsletter. No. 1, Sept 1978 - No.10, Oct 1980.

ILEA. 1979. Multi-Ethnic Education - Progress Report. 12 June 1979.

ILEA. 1979, 1980. School Examination Results in the ILEA. RS 787/81.

ILEA. 1981. School Examination Results in the ILEA. RS 826/82.

ILEA. 1981. "Equality of Opportunity". Contact. Vol 10. 1 May 1981.

ILEA. 1981. Black British Literacy: A study of teaching attainmment of London black children from 8 to 13 years. RS 776/81.

ILEA. 1981. Achievement in Schools.
                I. Social Class RS 805/81
                II Ethnic Minorities RS 807/81
                III. Sex Differences RS 806/81

ILEA. 1982. "New Bid to End Sexism and Racialism". Contact. Vol 11. 11 June 1982.

ILEA. 1982. Multi-Ethnic Education Review, Vol 1. No.1.

ILEA. 1982. School Examination Results in the ILEA. RS 871/83.

ILEA. 1982. Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools. 7/2248. 2 June 1982.

ILEA. 1983. "Multi-Ethnic Policy Talks". Contact. Vol 11. 18 March 1983.

ILEA. 1983. Race, Sex and Class.

1. Achievement in Schools.
2. Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools.
3. A Policy for Equality : Race.
4. Anti-Racist Statement and Guidelines.
5. Multi-Ethnic Education in Further, Higher and Community Education.
6. A Policy for Equality : Sex.

ILEA. 1983. Multi-Ethnic Education and the School Curriculum. April 1983.

ILEA. 1983. Attendance Survey. RS 895/83.

ILEA. 1983. Delivery of the Authority's Initiative on Multi- Ethnic Education in Schools.

ILEA. EPA Index. RS 858/82, RS 899/83.

ILEA. 1985. Review of Arrangements for Achieving a Comprehensive Intake to Secondary Schools. 5570.

ILEA. 1986. Truancy Reports. RS 1028/86; RS 1072/86.

ILEA. 1986. Educational Priority Index Changes between 1983 & 1985. RS 994/85.

ILEA. 1987. Ethnic Background and Examination Results. RS 8766.

JACK, I. 1985. "A Severed Head?". The Sunday Times Magazine. December 15, 1985.

JACKSON, P. (ed). 1987. Race and Racism. London: Addison-Wesley.

JACKSON, P. & SMITH S.J. (eds). 1981/82. Social Interaction and Ethnic Segregation. Institute of British Geographers Special Publication, No. 12. Academic Press.

JAMDAIGNI, L., PHILLIPS-BELL, M. & WARD, J. (eds). 1982. Talking Chalk. Black pupils, parents and teachers speak about education. Birmingham: AFFOR (All Faiths For One Race).

JEFFCOATE, R. 1979. Positive Image: Towards a Multiracial Curriculum. London: Writers & Readers/Chameleon.

JEFFCOATE, R. 1982. Unit 4: Multicultural Education: Curriculum Issues for Schools. Open University E354. Ethnic Minorities and Community Relations. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

JEFFCOATE, R. 1982. Unit 13. Ethnic Minorities and Educational Policy: 1960-1980. Open University E354. Ethnic Minorities and Community Relations.
Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

JEFFCOATE, R. 1984. Ethnic Minorities and Education. London: Harper and Row.

JEFFCOATE, R. 1984. "Ideologies and Multicultural Education" in M Craft (ed) Education and Cultural Pluralism. Lewes: Falmer.

JENKINS, R. 1971. "The Production of Knowledge at the Institute of Race Relations". Independent Labour Party (21 June 1971).

JENKINS, R. Rt Hon. 1966. Address given by the Home Secretary to a meeting of Voluntary Liaison Committees. London: NCCT.

JENKINS, S. 1988. "Dewsbury Triumph Over Bigotry". Sunday Times. July 17, 1988.

JENCKS, C. 1973. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effort of Family and Schooling. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

JENSEN, A. 1969. "How much can we boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?". Harvard Educational Review, 39 1, 1-22.

JOHN, G. 1988. "Lessons to be Learned". ILEA News. May 19, 1988.

JOHNSON, R.W. 1985. "Who are Le Pen's Legions?". New Society, March 21, 1985.

JONES, J. 1972. Prejudice and Racism. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

JONES, K. 1983. Beyond Progressive Education. London: Macmillan.

JONES, K. 1989. Right Turn: The Conservative Revolution in Education. Hutchinson-Radius.

JORDAN, W.D. 1974. "First Impressions: Initial English Confrontations with Africans", pp 42-58, in C. Husband (ed), Race in Britain. London: Hutchinson.

JORDAN, W.D. 1974. The White Man's Burden. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JOSEPH, K. 1972. Speech to Pre-School Playgroups Association.

KAMIN, L. 1977. The Science and Politics of IQ. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

KARABEL, J. & HALSEY, A.H. (eds). 1977. Power and Ideology in Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KATZNELSON, I. 1976. Black Men, White Cities. Race, Politics, and Migration in the United States, 1990-30, and Britain, 1948-68. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KEDDIE, N. (ed). 1973. Tinker, Tailor: The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

KETTLE, M. & HODGES, L. 1982. Uprising: The Police, the People and the Riots in Britain's Cities. London: Pan.

KHAN, U.S. (ed). 1979. Minority Families in Britain Support and Stress. London: Macmillan.

KIERNAN, V.G. 1972. The Lords of Human Kind. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

KIERNAN, V.G. 1982. "European Attitudes to the Outside World" in C. Husband, (ed): Race in Britain. London: Hutchinson.

KILLIAN, L. 1979. "School Bussing in Britain: Policies and Perceptions". Harvard Educational Review, pp 185-206.

KIRP, D. 1983. "Elusive Equality: Race, Ethnicity and Education in the American Experience", in Glazer, N & Young, K (eds). Ethnic Pluralism & Public Policy: Achieving Equality in the United States and Britain. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

KIRP, D. 1979. Doing Good by Doing Little; Race and Schooling in Britain. Berkley: University California Press.

KLEIN, G. 1985. Multicultural Teaching. Vol II, No. 3.

KLEIN, G. 1988. Multicultural Teaching. Vol 7. No. 1. Editorial p 3.

KLEIN, G. 1982. Resources for Multicultural Education: An Introduction. London: Longman for Schools Council.

KOGAN, M. 1987. "The Plowden Report Twenty Years On". Oxford Review of Education, Vol 13, No. 1. pp 13-21.

KOGAN, M. 1978. The Politics of Educational Change. Glasgow: Fontana.

KYSEL, F. 1986. 1985 Language Census. London ILEA, RS1026/86.

KYSEL, F. 1988. "Ethnic Background and Examination Results", pp 83-89 in Educational Research, Vol 30. No. 2.

LAMOTHE, T. 1984. "Anti-Racist School Policy - Racist School Practice". Multicultural Teaching, Vol II, No. 3.

LAWTON, D. 1980. The Politics of the School Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

LAYTON-HENRY, Z. 1984. The Politics of Race in Britain. London: George Allen & Unwin.

LEWIS, O. 1968. La Vida. Panther Books.

LEWIS, R. 1988. Anti-Racism: A Mania Exposed. London: Quartet Books.

LITTLE, A. 1978. "Schools and Race" in Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain. London: CRE.

LITTLE, A. 1982. "Educational Policies for Multi-Racial Areas" in Open University E354 Unit 13: Ethnic Minorities in Educational Policy 1960-80. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

LITTLE, A. & MABEY, C. 1973. "Reading Attainment and Social & Ethnic Mix of London Primary Schools" Ch. 9. in Donnison, D & Eversley, D. (eds), London: Urban Patterns, Problems and Policies. London: Heinemann.

LITTLE, A. & MABEY, C. 1978. An Index for Designation of Education in Priority Areas". ILEA; in M. Wilson (ed) Social & Educational Research in Britain. London: Longman & Open University Press.

LITTLE, A. & ROBBINS, D. 1982. Loading the Law. London: CRE.

LITTLE, A. 1985. "Education For Whom?". New Community Vol XII, No. 2. pp 228-231.

LITTLE A. & WILLEY, R. 1981. Multi-Ethnic Education: The Way Forward. Schools Council Pamphlet 18.

LODGE, P. & BLACKSTONE, T. 1982. Educational Policy & Educational Inequality. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

LYNCH, J. (ed). 1981. Teaching in the Multi-Cultural School. London: Ward Lock.

MABEY, C. 1981. Black British Literacy: A Study of Reading Attainment of London Black Children from 8 to 15 years. RS776/81. Inner London Education Authority.

MACKINTOSH, N.J. & MASCIE-TAYLOR, C.G.N. 1985. "The I.Q. Question", Ch 3, Annex D of (Swann) Education For All. CMND 9453. London: HMSO.

MACLURE, J. S. 1979. Educational Documents: England and Wales 1816 to the Present Day. London: Methuen, fourth edition.

MARKS, J. & COX, C. 1983. Standards in English Schools. National Council for Educational Standards (NCES) London.

MARKS, J. & COX, C. 1984. "Educational Attainment in Secondary Schools". Oxford Review of Education Vol 10. No. 1.

MARKS, J. 1986. "'Anti-Racism' - Revolution Not Education" in Palmer, F. (ed) Anti-Racism: An Assault on Education and Value. London: Sherwood Press.

MARSHALL, T.H. 1965. Class, Citizenship & Social Development. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co. Inc

MARSHALL, T.H. 1975. Social Policy. London: Hutchinson, 4th edition.

MARTIN, D. 1986. "Thumping the Capitalists". In Times Educational Supplement, 10 January 1986.

MARTIN, D. 1986. Review of J. Stone's Racial Conflict in Contemporary Society. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

MARTINI, R. & MORTIMORE, P. 1985. Analysing Examination Results by Ethnic Background. RS 984/85. Inner London Education Authority.

MIDWINTER, E. 1972. Priority Education. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

MILES, R. 1989. Racism. London: Routledge.

MILLS, C. W. 1970. The Sociological Imagination. Harmondsworth: Penguin

MILLS, R. 1978. A Comprehensive Education: 1965-1975. London: Centerprise Trust Ltd.

MILNER, D. 1982. "Multi-culturalism: The Acceptable Face of Multiracial Education", pp 72-75. New Community, Vol X, No 1, Summer 1982.

MILNER, D. 1982. "Teaching in Multicultural Britain". Multiracial Education Vol 10. No. 3., pp 58-59.

MILNER, D. 1983. Children & Race - 10 Years On. London: Ward Lock Educational.

MODGIL, S., VERMA, G., MALLICK, K. & MODGIL, C. (eds). 1986. Multicultural Education: The Interminable Debate. Lewes: Falmer.

MORTIMORE, J. & BLACKSTONE, T. 1982. Disadvantage & Education. London: Heinemann.

MULLARD, C. 1980. Racism in Society & Schools: Theory, Policy and Practice. Occasional Paper No. 1. Centre for Multicultural Education, University London Institute of Education.

MULLARD, C. 1981. "The Social Context and Meaning of Multicultural Education". Educational Analysis. Vol 3. No. 1.

MULLARD, C. 1982. "Multiracial Education in Britain: from Assimilation to Cultural Pluralism", in Tierney, J. (ed) Race, Migration and Schooling. Holt, Rinehart & Winiston.

MULLARD, C. 1983a. "The Racial Code: Its Feature, Rules and Change", in L. Barton & S. Walker (eds): Race, Class and Education. London: Croom Helm.

MULLARD, C. 1983b. "Racism, Education & The State: the Class-Ethnic formation". Paper given at Institute of Education organised by Sociological Research Unit.

MULLARD, C. 1984a. "The Three Rs: Rampton, Racism and Research". Centre for Multicultural Education and The Thomas Coram Institute. University London Institute Education.

MULLARD, C. 1984b. Anti-Racist Education: The Three O's. Cardiff: National Association For Multicultural Education.

MULLARD, C. 1985. Race, Class & Ideology: some formal Notes. Race Relations Policy & Practice Research Unit. University London Institute of Education.

MULLARD, C., BONNICK, L. & KING, B. 1983. Racial Policy & Practice in Education. A Letter Survey. Working Paper 1. London University Institute of Education.

MULLARD, C., BONNICK, L. & KING, B. 1983. Local Education Authority Policy Documents: A Descriptive Analysis of Contents. Working Paper II. London University Institute of Education.

MULLARD, C., BONNICK, L. & KING, B. 1984. Process, Problem & Prognosis: A Survey of Local Authorities Multicultural Education Policies and Practices. Part One: The Multicultural Process. Working Paper III. London University Institute of Education.

MULLARD, C. 1986. Race, Power & Resistance. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MULLINS, D. 1982. Ethnic Minorities in Hackney. Research & Intelligence Section of Borough of Hackney.

MUSGROVE, P.W. 1979. The Sociology of Education. 3rd edition. London: Methuen.

MYRDAI, G. 1944. An American Dilemma. New York: Pantheon.

McGLYNN, P., GILL, B., DOWNES, B. & JAMES, R. 1984. "Integrated Studies at William Penn School" in M. Straker-Welds (ed), Education for A Multicultural Society: Case Studies in ILEA Schools. London: Bell & Hyman.

McNAY, I. & OZGA, J. (eds). 1985. Policy-Making in Education: The Breakdown of Consensus. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

NAGUIB, M. 1986. "Racism as an Aspect of the Swann Report: A Black Perspective". Multicultural Teaching. Vol 4. No. 2.

NAME. 1985. Name on Swann. Nottingham: National Anti-Racist Movement in Education.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS. 1980. After the Fire: A Report on Education in St Pauls, Bristol and Multi-ethnic Education in Avon. Bristol: NUT.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS. 1980. All Our Children: Race, Education and Intelligence. London: NUT.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS, LONDON. 1983. A Question of Standards: An Evaluation of Standards in English Schools. London: NUT.

OLDMAN, D. 1987. "Plain Speaking and the Pseudo-Science: The 'New Right' attach on antiracism", ch. 3. in Troyna, B. (ed), Racial Inequality in Education, London: Tavistock.

PALMER, F. (ed). 1986. Anti-Racism: An Assault on Education and Value. London: The Sherwood Press.

PAREKH, B. 1982. Block Unit 10. The Experience of Black Minorities in Britain. Ethnic Minorities and Community Relations. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

PAREKH, B. 1983. "Educational Opportunity in Multiethnic Britain", N. Glaser and K. Young (eds), ch 7. pp 85-107, in Ethnic Pluralism and Public Policy. Lexington Books and Heinemann.

PAREKH, B. 1985. "Backdrop to the West Indian Tragedy". Times Educational Supplement. March 22, 1985.

PAREKH, B. 1985. "The Gifts of Diversity". pp 22-23. Times Educational Supplement. March 29, 1985..

PARKINSON, M. 1982. "Politics and Policy-Making in Education Studies" in A. Hartnett, (ed): The Social Sciences in Educational Studies. London: Heinemann.

PEACH, C., ROBINSON, V., SMITH, S. (eds). 1981. Ethnic Segregation in Cities. London: Croom Helm.

PETERS, R. (ed). 1972. Perspectives on Plowden. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PHILLIPS-BELL, M., SEALEY, A. & SUGDEN, C. 1983. Issues and Resources. Birmingham: AFFOR.

PHIZACKLEA, A. & MILES, S. R. 1980. Labour and Racism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PINKER, R. 1968. "The Contribution of the Social Scientist in positive discrimination programmes", in Social and Economic Administration. Vol 2. No. 4.

PLASKOW, M. (ed). 1985. The Life and Death of the Schools Council. Lewes: Falmer Press.

RACE & CLASS Vol XXIII Autumn 81/Winter 82/Nos. 2/3. Special Double Issue: Britain 1981. Rebellion and Repression.

RAISON, F. 1967. "The Plowden Report: Equality Plus Opportunity". New Society, January 12, 1967.

REEVE, A. 1981. "'The Way Forward' of 'The Long and Winding Road'?". Multiracial Education. Vol 9, No. 3 pp 35-41.

REEVES, F. & CHEVANNES, M. 1981. "The Underachievement of Rampton". Multiracial Education, Vol 10. No. 1.

REEVES, F. & CHEVANNES, M. 1983. "The Ideological Constructuring of Black Underachievement". Multiracial Education. Vol 12. No. 1.

REEVES, F. & CHEVANNES, M. 1987. "The Black Voluntary School Movement: Definition, Context & Prospects". pp 147-169, in Troyna, B. (ed). Racial Inequality in Education. London: Tavistock.

REEVES, F. 1983. British Racial Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

REID, K. 1986. Disaffection from School. London: Methuen.

REX, J. 1970. "The Concept of Race in Sociological theory" in S. Zubaida (ed) Race & Racialism. London: Tavistock.

REX, J. 1970. Race Relations in Sociological Theory. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

REX, J. 1979. "Black Militancy & Class Conflict" in R Miles & A. Phizacklea (eds): Racism & Political Action in Britain. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

REX, J. 1984. "Urban Segregation & Inner City Policy in Great Britain" in Peach, C., Robinson, V.& Smith, S. Ethnic Segregation in Cities. London: Croom Helm.

REX, J. & MOORE. 1967. Race, Community & Conflict. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

REX J. & TOMLINSON, S. 1979. Colonial Immigrants in British City. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

REX, J., TROYNA, B. & NAGUIB, M. 1983. The Development of Multicultural Education Policy in Four Local Authority Areas. Unpublished Report submitted to the Swann Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups, Research Unit on Ethnic Relations, Aston University, Birmingham.

RICHARDSON, K. & SPEARS, D. (eds). 1972. Race, Culture & Intelligence. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

RICHMOND, A. 1955. The Colour Problem. London: Penguin

RIST, R.C. 1970. "Student Social Class & Teacher Expectations: the Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Journal, pp 411-51.

RIST, R. 1977. "On Understanding the Process of Schooling: the Contributions of Labelling Theory", in Karabel & Habay (eds): Power & Ideology in Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ROBINSON, P. 1981. Perspectives on the Sociology of Education: An Introduction. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ROGERS, R. 1980. Crowther to Warnock: How 14 Reports Tried To Change Childrens' Lives. London: Heinemann.

ROSE, E.J.B. et al. 1969. Colour and Citizenship. Institute of Race Relations. London: Oxford University Press.

ROSEN, H. & BURGESS, T. 1980. Languages & Dialects of London School Children. London: Ward Lock.

ROSENTHAL, R. & JACOBSON, L. 1968. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

RUBENSTEIN, D. & STONEMAN, C. (eds). 1970. Education for Democracy. See Coates & Silburn "Education in Poverty". Harmondsworth: Penguin.

RUNNYMEDE TRUST. 1981. Employment & Unemployment & The Black Population.

RUNNEYMEDE TRUST BULLETIN. No. 166, 1984. Race & Immigration.

RUTTER, M. & MADGE, N. 1976. Cycles of Disadvantage. London: Heinemann.

RUTTER, M., MAUGHAN, B., MORTIMORE, P. & OUSTON, J. 1979. 15,000 Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children. London: Open Books.

ST JOHN-BROOKS, C. 1984. Why West Indians Fail". New Society, December 13, 1984.

SAMMONDS, P., KYSEL, F. & MORTIMORE, P. 1982. Educational Priority Indices - A New Perspective. ILEA RS 858/82.

SARUP, M. 1986. The Politics of Multiracial Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

SAUNDERS, M. 1982. "Education for a New Community". New Community. Vol X, No. 1.

SAVVIDES, S. 1988. "Problems in Implementing a Multi-Ethnic Education Policy. The findings of a study of teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of Multicultural Education", pp 9-11. Multicultural teaching, Vol 7. No. 1.

SCARMAN REPORT. 1981. The Brixton Disorders. CMND 8427, London: HMSO.

SCARR, S. et al. 1983. "Developmental Status & School Achievements of Minority & Non-Minority Children from birth to 18 years in a British Midlands Town". British Journal of Developmental Psychology. Vol 1. No 1.

SCARR, S. 1984. Race, Social Class & Individual Differences. London: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publications.

SCHATTSCHNEIDER, E.E. 1960. The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

SCHOOLS COUNCIL WORKING PAPER 50. 1973. Multiracial Education: Need and Innovation. The Preliminary Schools Council Education for a Multiracial Society Project. National Foundation for Educational Research, H.E.R. Townsend and E.M. Brittan. London: Evans Methuen Educational.

SCHOOLS COUNCIL ENQUIRY 1. 1968. Young School Leavers. Report of a survey amoung people, parents and teachers by Roma Murton-Williams & Stewart Finch. Government Social Survey. London: HMSO.

SCRUTON, R. 1984. "Who are the Real Racists?". The Times, December 4, 1984.

SCRUTON, R. 1987. "Expressionist Education". Oxford Review of Education. Vol 13, No. 1, pp 39-44.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS AND IMMIGRATION 1969. The Coloured School Leaver. London: HMSO.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS AND IMMIGRATION 1977. The West Indian Community. London: HMSO.

SHALLICE, J. 1983. "Formulating an Anti-Racist Policy at the Skinners' Company's School", in Multi-Ethnic Education Review. Vol 2, No. 2.

SHIPMAN, M. 1980. "The Limits of Positive Discrimination", Ch. 5. in M. Marland (ed.), Education for the Inner City. London: Heinemann.

SHIPMAN, M. 1985. "Local Authorities & the Curriculum" in P. Raggatt & G. Weiner (eds). Curriculum & Assessment. Oxford: Pergamon.

SILLITOE, K. & MELTZER, H. 1985. The West Indian School Leaver. Vol 1, Starting Work. Vol II, The Next 5 Years. OPCS for Department of Employment. London: HMSO.

SILVER, H. 1973. Equal Opportunity in Education: A Reader in Social Class and Educational Opportunity. London: Methuen.

SILVER, H. 1980. Education and the Social Conditions. London: Methuen.

SILVER, H. 1983. Education as History. London: Methuen.

SIMON, B. 1978. Intelligence, Psychology and Education: A Marxist Critique. Revised Edition. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

SIMON, B. 1985. Does Education Matter?. London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd.

SIVANANDAN, R. 1976. Ch 3. The Black Experience in Britain. Race, Class & The State. Race & Class, Vol XVII, No. 4.

SIVANANDAN, R. 1982. A Different Hunger. London: Pluto Press.

SMITH, D.J. & McINTOSH, N. 1974. The Extent of Racial Discrimination. London: PEP Report 547.

SMITH, D. 1977. Racial Disadvantage in Britain. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

STEPAN, N. 1982. The Idea of Race in Science. Great Britain 1800-1960. London: Macmillan.

STRAKER-WELDS, M. (ed). 1984. Education for a Multicultural Society: Case Studies in ILEA Schools. Bell & Hyman.

STREET-PORTER, R. 1978. Race, Children & Cities. Open University. E361 Block V. Education and the Urban Environment. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

TAYLOR, M. 1981. Caught Between. A Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of West Indian Origin. Windsor: NFER- Nelson.

TAYLOR, M. 1988. Worlds Apart? A Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of Cypriot, Italian, Ukranian & Vietnamese origin, Liverpool Blacks and Gypsies. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

TAJFEL, H. 1978. The Social Psychology of Minorities. London: Minority Rights Group.

THANE, P. 1982. The Foundations of the Welfare State. London: Longman.

TIERNEY, J. (ed). 1982. Race, Migration & Schooling. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

TOMLINSON, S. 1978. "West Indian Children & ESN-M Schooling". New Community, Vol 6, No 3.

TOMLINSON, S. 1981. Educational Subnormality: A Study in Decision-Making. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

TOMLINSON, S. (ed). 1983. Ethnic Minorities in British Schools: A review of the Literature 1960-82. Policy Studies Institute. London: Heinemann.

TOMLINSON, S. 1984. Home & School in Multi-Cultural Britain. London: Batsford.

TOMLINSON, S. 1986. "Ethnicity & Educational Achievement" in Modgil et al Multicultural Education: The Interminable Debate. Lewes: Falmer.

TOMLINSON, S. 1987a. "Curriculum Option Choices in Multi-Ethnic Schools" in Troyna, B. (ed) Racial Inequality in Education. London: Tavistock.

TOMLINSON, S. 1987b. "Towards A.D. 2000: The Political Context of Multicultural Education". pp 96-104. New Community. Vol XIV, No.1.

TOWNSEND, H.E.R. 1971. Immigrant Pupils in England: The LEA Response". Slough: NFER.

TROYNA, B. 1982. "The Ideological & Policy Response to Black Pupils in British Schools" in A. Hartnett, (ed): The Social Sciences in Educational Studies. London: Heinemann.

TROYNA, B. & CASHMORE, E. (eds). 1982. Black Youth in Crisis. London: George Allen & Unwin.

TROYNA, B. & CASHMORE, E. 1983. Introduction to Race Relations. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

TROYNA, B. & SMITH, D. (eds). 1983. Racism, School and the Labour Market. Leicester: National Youth Bureau.

TROYNA, B. & BALL, W. 1983. "Multicultural Education Policies: Are They Worth the Paper They're Written On". Times Educational Supplement. 9 December 1983.

TROYNA, B. & BALL, W. 1985a. "Styles of LEA Policy Intervention in Multicultural/Antiracist Education". Educational Review. June 1985.

TROYNA, B. & BALL, W. 1985b. Views from the Chalkface: School Responses to an LEA's Policy on Multicultural Education. Warwick: Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

TROYNA, B. 1984a. "Fact or Artefact? The 'Educational Underachievement' of Black Pupils". British Journal of the Sociology of Education. Vol 5. No. 2.

TROYNA, B. 1984b. "Policy Entrepreneurs and the Development of LEA Multi-Ethnic Education Policies: A Recommendation". Educational Management & Administration. 12 pp 203-212.

TROYNA, B. 1984c. "Multicultural Education Policy in Practice". Background Paper. Runnymede Trust Bulletin Race & Immigration. No. 166.

TROYNA, B. 1985. "The Great Divide: Policies and Practices in Multicultural Education". British Journal of the Sociology of Education. Vol 6. No. 2.

TROYNA, B. 1986 "'Swann's Song' The Origins, Ideology & Implications of Education for All" in Journal of Education Policy. Vol 1. No. 2, pp 171-181.

TROYNA, B. & WILLIAMS, J. 1986. Racism Education and the State; the Racialization of Education Policy. London: Croom Helm.

TROYNA, B. 1987a. "Beyond Multiculturalism: Towards the Enactment of Anti-Racist Education in Policy, Provision & Pedagogy", pp 307-320. Oxford Review of Education. Vol 13. No. 3.

TROYNA, B. (ed). 1987b. Racial Inequality in Education. London: Tavistock.

VALENTINE, C. 1970. Culture & Poverty: Critique & Counter-Proposals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

VANN WOODWARD, C. 1974. The Strange Career of Jim Crow. 3rd revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VERMA, G. with ASHWORTH, B. 1986. Ethnicity & Educational Achievement in British Schools. London: Macmillan.

VERMA, G. 1987. "The Swann Report & Ethnic Achievement: What Next?" in T.S. Chivers (ed), Race & Culture in Education: Issues Arising from the Swann Committee Report. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

WALKER, S. & BARTON, L. (eds). 1986. Youth, Unemployment & Schooling. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

WALLMAN, S. (ed). 1979. Ethnicity at Work. London: Macmillan.

WALVIN, J. 1973. "Black Caricature: The Roots of Racialism" in Husband, C. (ed) Race in Britain. London: Hutchinson.

WESTERGAARD, J. & RESLER, H. 1985. Class in a Capitalist Society. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

WHITTY, G. & EDWARDS, T. 1984. "Evaluating Policy Change: The Assisted Place Scheme" in G. Walford (ed), British Public Schools: Policy & Practice. Lewes: Falmer.

WILBY, P. 1988. "Rag-bag Against Racism". Independent, May 19 1988.

WILLEY, R. 1982. Teaching in Multicultural Britain. York: Longman for Schools Council.

WILLEY, R. 1984a. Race, Equality & Schools. London: Methuen.

WILLEY, R. 1984b. "Policy Responses in Education", in M Craft (ed) Education and Cultural Pluralism. Lewes: Falmer.

WILLIAMS, J. 1979. "Perspectives on the Multi-Cultural Curriculum". The Social Science Teacher. Vol. 8, No. 4, April.

WILLIAMS, J. 1987. "The Construction of Women & Black Students as Educational Problems: Re-evaluating policy on gender and race", in Arnot & Weiner (eds) Gender and The Politics of Schooling. London: Hutchinson.

WILLIAMS, J. 1985. "Redefining Institutional Racism". Journal Ethnic & Racial Studies, Vol 8. No. 3.

WILLIAMS, J. 1986. "Education & Race: The Racialisation of Class Inequalities", pp 135-154. British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol 7. No. 2.

WILLIAMS, J. & CARTER, B. 1985. "'Institutional Racism': New Orthodoxy, Old Ideas". Multiracial Education, Vol 13. No. 1.

WOLPE, A.M. & DONALD, J. (eds.) 1983. Is There Anyone Here from Education?. London: Pluto Press.

WOODS, P. 1975. "On Discipline", in Delamont, S. & Hanan, G. (eds): Frontiers of Classroom Research. Windsor: NFER.

WOODS, P. 1983. Sociology and the School: An Interationist Viewpoint. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

WOODS, P. 1986. **Inside Schools: Ethnography in Educational Research.** London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

WRIGHT, C. 1985. I. "Learning Environment or Battleground?"; II. "Who Succeeds at School - And Who Decides?". **Multicultural Teaching,** 4.1.

WRIGHT, C. 1986. **Education For Some.** Chapter 8. Stoke-On-Trent: Trentham.

YOUNG, J. 1984. "Striking Back Against The Empire", in **Critical Social Policy,** Issue 8, pp 130 - 138.

YOUNG, K. & CONNELLY, N. 1981. **Policy & Practice in the Multi- Racial City.** No. 598. London: Policy Studies Institute.

YOUNG, M.F.D. (ed). 1971. **Knowledge & Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education.** London: Collier-Macmillan.

YOUNG, M., YOUNG, H., SHUTTLEWORTH, E. & TUCKER, W. 1981. **Report from Hackney: A Study of an Inner City Area.** London: Policy Studies Institute, No. 593.

YOUNG, M.F.D. & WHITTY, G. 1977. **Society, State & Schooling. Readings on the possibilities for Radical Education.** Lewes: Falmer.

ZUBAIDA, S. (ed). 1970. **Race & Racism.** London: Tavistock.