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Richard Race*

‘... there has been a significant growth in the number of independent faith schools. There are now around 300 such schools including 50 Jewish schools, around 100 Muslim schools and over 100 Evangelical Christian Schools. To an extent this mirrors the growth in certain sectors of the population and increasing confidence in pursuing traditional beliefs and way of life in a multi-cultural Britain. I believe that it is right that parents should be able to choose how their children are educated and should be able to pay to do so. That is the mark of a free and open society. Yet, on the other hand, faith should not be blind. I worry that many young people are being educated in faith-based schools, with little appreciation of their wider responsibilities and obligations to British Society.’


‘Equal access to education is crucial for achieving equality of opportunity. Really high quality education for all is vital, especially for ethnic groups that may be disadvantaged initially by poverty, English as a second language, and so forth. Our policies to improve quality and access to education and training are therefore especially important to many ethnic minority communities. We are committed in particular to... Ensuring that faith schools reflect the diversity of their local community by operating a fair admissions policy and teaching the national curriculum. It is essential that schools cater for local pupils and do not contribute to social or cultural divisiveness.’


* Address all communications to: Richard Race, School of Business and Social Sciences, Southlands College, Roehampton University, 80 Roehampton Lane, London, SW15 5SL, e-mail: r.race@roehampton.ac.uk and richard.race1@btopenworld.com.

Many thanks to Professor Chris Phillipson at Keele University who continues to allow me to develop these ideas teaching on the Urban Change and Conflict module, Department of Social Relations, 2001-2005.


Abstract: This research reviews the historical evolution of English ethnic education policy-making. The social provision of education when examining the implications on ethnic majorities and minorities raises many important issues and pose the following questions: Does the education system exclude sections of the population i.e. ethnic minorities? Can cultural diversity be taught and promoted? The research explores the implications these questions raise for Afro-Caribbean, Asian and Muslim communities. Assimilationist, integrationist and multicultural education policies are analysed. By examining education and social policy documents and reports, the objective of this research is to make the reader think about how education policy shapes society and what consequences this can have on teaching ethnic educational issues concerning cultural diversity and institutionalised racism.

Assimilationist and Integrationist Education Policy

In 1965, a policy document was published by the Department of Education and Science (DES) entitled The Education of Immigrants that was published again as a Circular in 1971. The aim of the policy document seems to underline the significance of absorbing and assimilating Commonwealth children into the education system. It is interesting to note that ‘educational difficulties’ are highlighted as a problem generated by immigrant children rather than problems residing within the education system itself. The DES document goes further and actually implies that ethnic families are to blame for failures within the classroom. It is West Indian and Asian stereotypes that are being reinforced and highlighted here rather than the inability of the education system to cope

1 See: Department of Education and Science (DES) (1965) The Education of Immigrants (Circular 7/65) London, HMSO; DES (1971) The Education of Immigrants, London, HMSO. The 1971 DES document begins: ‘Some schools before 1960 had a cosmopolitan range of nationalities among their pupils but had found relatively little difficulty in absorbing and educating children of the earlier post-war European immigrants. In the 1960’s however, the concentration and rapid build-up in the numbers of children arriving from Commonwealth countries and entering the schools at different ages and at all times throughout the school year began to create serious educational difficulties (DES, 1971:1).’

4 ‘For the West Indian child… The environment is one in which marriage is not always considered important in providing a secure basis for raising children … to join his mother from whom he may be separated for several years … the unknown father with whom his mother may be living, and perhaps, is very young, sent out to child-minders while his parents go out to work … Asian mothers’ tendency to live a withdrawn life and not to make outside contacts does not help … Many [Asian parents] are shy at the thought of mixing with White parents with whom they have little or no contact out of school (DES, 1971: 4-6).’
with the influx of immigrant children. West Indian and Asian children, as well as their parents, are seen as the cause of educational problems. Possible and sensible solutions seem to be missing from this education policy document. \(^5\)

*The Education of Immigrants* highlights the ‘problems’ of ethnic minorities. The questions relating to whose responsibilities, rights and duties the education service is supposed to teach immigrant children raises interesting issues about the nature of the education system. ‘Responsibilities’ refers to the majority ethnic population and how best to run the education system which promotes majority rights and duties. Both Circular’s acknowledge the concern with the assimilation of immigrant pupils and show anxiety about the responses of white parents to the concentration of immigrant children in schools. The system seems to be upholding English, white notions of nation and ethnic minorities have to be assimilated or integrated by the education system into the state and society generally. In this way minority education is undermined. There are uncomfortable parallels with David Bell’s citizenship speech and quote that begins this work. Bell uses the term ‘responsibility’ again, forty years on from the publication of Circular 7/65, the obligations again being to the majority rather than minority community. From the minority communities’ perspective, Fitzherbert was arguing in the 1960s, the vital importance of education for West Indian communities and children. \(^6\) Fitzherbert projects a positive image of education for minority communities and highlights the importance placed on education by Afro-Caribbean parents for their children. Meeting white children on equal terms and acquiring qualifications and skills for the workplace was and is vital.

The year 1968 witnessed educational expenditure falling for the first time since the end of the Second World War which increased wider social, economic and political pressures. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Roy Jenkins, introduced integration as a general social policy into political debate in 1966. Integrationist ideals did not mean an ideological break with assimilationist values. The integrationist education policies of the 1970s highlight

\(^5\) The document finishes with the following interesting recommendation: ‘The education service can make its best contribution to the county’s future in this situation by helping each individual immigrant to become a citizen who can take his or her place in society, fully and properly equipped to accept responsibilities, exercise rights and perform duties’ (DES, 1971:12).

\(^6\) Fitzherbert (1968: 7-8) argued: ‘School represents their means of access to full membership of the community. First, it is the place where they meet English children on equal terms: second, it is the place where they learn to understand and maybe accept English values. Third, and most important, it is the place where they can acquire the qualifications and skills needed to compete on equal terms with English adults in the job market’. See: Fitzherbert, K. ‘The West Indian Background’, in Oakley, R. (ed.) New Backgrounds: the immigrant child at home and at schools, Institute of Race Relations, Oxford University Press, London, 1-22.
Marxist concepts of exploitation and alienation. The aim here was to bring immigrant children into the life of the school with minimal and conditional cultural diversity. Achievement, or rather underachievement, became an important education policy issue. Educational achievement is the level a student reaches as measured by test scores or exam results. Afro-Caribbean children had tended to score less in exams than their White or Asian counterparts. The education system offers an insight into why underachievement became such an important issue. Although the 1960s and 1970s witnessed increased comprehensive re-organisation to the secondary system of education, children were leaving school at 15 until 1973, when the school leaving age was raised to 16 but schools still maintained policies of streaming and selection. What would this mean to ethnic minority children who had limited access to educational qualifications? Would it be unrealistic to ask ethnic minority communities to

---


support an education system that denied them access to educational qualifications?

Educational underachievement highlights the problems that black children faced within education. The official agenda during the 1960s and 1970s was framed in such a way that ‘the problem’ of black students and the problems confronted by black students became the rationale for policy intervention. Assimilationist and integrationist education policies directed the problems away from the education system and toward the black child that meant greater alienation and exploitation in both the classroom and society. These policies are illustrated by Harrison who examined the Inner City London Borough of Hackney. He argued that educational attainment relates to the housing and local economy of the area i.e. the child’s social environment. Hackney itself had one of the highest proportion of children from families originating from New Commonwealth families. Harrison examined two schools, one of them being Hackney Downs, which as he argued in 1978 when the author was in the field, still achieved the best academic results in Hackney. Nevertheless, truancy and vandalism in Hackney Downs was high, while teacher morale was low. Harrison highlighted the social and economic problems that concern both children and families within the urban as related to educational achievement for all inner city children. The problem did not lie with the ethnic minority child, but the social environment that surrounded the child. It seems that the educational circular, *Education for Immigrants*, had done little to solve the educational problem of underachievement. At least Harrison underlined the ways

---

9 As Troyna and Williams (ibid: 22) argue, ‘… to make the educational experience of Black students more palatable, racism … was not challenged; neither was its profound and fundamental effect on the life chances of Black students brought into the debate … the 3 Ss (saris, samosas and steel bands) interpretation of multiculturalism was advanced as the operational mode through which the 3 Rs (resistance, rejection and rebellion) would be explicable in terms of assimilationist imperatives.’ See also Jenny Williams recent work: Hickley, T., Williams, J. (eds.) (1996) *Language, education and society in a changing world*, Dublin, Multilingual Matters; Williams, J. (ed.) (1997) *Negotiating access to higher education: the discourse of selectivity and equity*, Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and The Open University Press; Anderson, P., Williams, J. (2001) *Identity and difference in higher education: ‘outsiders within’*, Aldershot, Ashgate Press.


12 Harrison (ibid: 298) offers the following important conclusion to his analysis of Hackney Schools: ‘… whatever the school does, it can never be the major educational influence in the pupils’ lives. Most children spend the crucial early years at home. By the time those from poor homes start primary school, irreparable damage will have been done to their potential through poor nutrition, lack of stimulation and verbalisation, and emotional disturbance. The family is a more potent influence than the primary school, the street is more potent than secondary school, and television is more potent than either level. The poor neighbourhood is itself the principle school for its children, its inhabitants are the chief instructors. It is a disastrous environment for learning or discipline.’

180
to attack the problems surrounding urban poverty and consequently education for inner city children. Social policy had to address the problems of improving urban housing, the economy and education together. With social problems and tensions increasing in urban ethnic minority communities during the 1970s, education policy was incrementally forced to change.

Multicultural Education Policy

During the 1970s the general trend towards multiculturalism had started in Britain. Multiculturalism marks a move away from the education policies of assimilation and integration toward a concept of cultural diversity. According to Straker-Welds, ‘… the Inner London Education Authority had first circulated its initial papers in 1977 on multi-ethnic education.’


disorder in the early 1980s, in areas such as: Brixton; Tottenham; Small Heath and Toxteth shed light on the need for urban policies to include rather than exclude ethnic minorities. The Scarman Report\(^{15}\) examined urban conditions and put forward recommendations for urban regeneration. Interestingly, even though Scarman acknowledged the existence of institutionalised racism, he refused to define the term as a concept. Institutionalised racism involves cultural and individual factors coming together within institutional environments which for the benefit of the ethnic majority rather than the ethnic minority. When combating institutional racism, social gatekeepers and the public at large need to be re-educated and become ethnically aware.\(^{16}\) Twitchin and Demuth\(^{17}\) suggest that although, ‘… the concept of institutional racism is a new idea to many people [we] need to think about institutional pressures, particularly in the exercise of power over decision-making in the school system.’

With regard to education policy, *Education for All* was the major education policy document on ethnic minorities during the 1980s. The final report took eight years to publish, changed its chairperson – Rampton to Swann – and had numerous changes of committee members because of disputes regarding the nature of the material being examined which covered specific ethnic minority examples. These difficulties highlight the controversial nature of the policy document. The focus of *Education for All* was on internal and external problems concerning ethnic minority education.\(^{18}\) This fact indicates a small advance from

---


\(^{18}\) DES (1985: vii) *Education for All: the report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups*, London, HMSO. The policy document, ‘… reviewed in relation to schools the educational needs and attainment of children from ethnic minority groups taking accounts, as necessary, of factors outside the formal education
the educational circulars of the 1960s and 1970s. The educational problems, contrary to Harrison’s (1988) suggestions, were directed toward both the school and the child, not on the inner-city urban environment. The terminology seems not to have changed from the 1960s and 1970s. West Indian children are still being associated with underachievement. The main difference with the previous decades is that the education system is also partly blamed for the problem. Having said that, the focus of the education problem still lies with the black child. The recommendations of *Education for All*, (1985: xii) ‘... views the task for education in meeting the needs of ethnic minority pupils and preparing all pupils, both ethnic majority and ethnic minority, for life in a society which is both multi-racial and culturally diverse.’ This is a major change in terminology, as the education policy document distances itself from previous assimilationist and integrationist education policies. However, the education system is not supposedly preparing all children for a life in a culturally diverse society, which could be achieved within a more multicultural curriculum. Jones highlights the Development Programme for Race Equality within several Inner London Education Authority areas during the latter part of the 1980s. The programmes’ aim as Jones argues was one of race equality: ‘The attempt was eminently justifiable in educational terms: it linked school based-learning to ‘real-life’ experience.’ However, a combination of central and local political pressure and the right-wing press worked against these initiatives. Three years after the publication of an education report which attempted to provide greater cultural diversity within the education system of England, the 1988 Education Reform Act introduced the national curriculum relevant to school performance, including influences, in early childhood and prospects for school leavers.’

19 DES (ibid: viiii) *Education for All* refers to West Indian children as, ‘... underachieving in relation to their peers ... There is no single cause ... but rather a network of widely differing attitudes and expectations on the part of the teachers and the education system as a whole, and on the part of the West Indian child to have particular difficulties and face particular hurdles in achieving his or her full potential.’


of three core and several foundation subjects which was designed to achieve a
great deal more than simply improving education standards. Allegedly, the
national curriculum would broaden the mind and body and provide children
with a firm moral and spiritual basis. But whose moral and spiritual basis was
the national curriculum aimed toward? Again, the policy discourse seems to
favour national notions of white, British identity, rather than a more rounded
consideration of both majority and minority identities within the national
curriculum.22

Movement Toward Greater Cultural Diversity?

The 1980s and 1990s theoretically saw a more realistic and positive outlook to
the role of education in ethnic minority communities.23 Unfortunately, the old
stereotypes and problems remained. Barber24 highlighted the continued prob-

---


lems surrounding Hackney Downs School. By 1994 after school inspection, Hackney Council decided to close the school down. Barber used the school as an example of failure. The only ethnic minority mentioned in relation to Hackney Downs were the Turkish community who showed some of the best exam successes but had received no teaching in Turkish within the school. No other ethnic minority community were mentioned in the analysis. The standard of teaching is heavily criticised and the negative connotations are not just centred on Hackney Downs School but on the whole of the Inner London Borough of Hackney. Teachers, pupils and parents all seem to be the causes of educational problems. Drugs seem to be a real social problem within Hackney Borough. The solutions offered for Hackney Downs and ‘falling schools’ in general is firm management and improved methods that theoretically lead to good teaching. This constitutes again a movement away from Harrison’s (1988) linkage of poor education with socio-economic factors and the related suggestions of eliminating poverty and improving housing to change urban education for the better of both ethnic minority and majority communities. The culture of both the staffroom of Hackney Downs and Hackney Borough are seen as the real problems but the sociology of Hackney itself is not seen as the root cause of the problem or a possible solution. Indeed, Hackney Downs was closed in 1996 and the 200 or so children who remained were moved to another secondary school within Hackney. O’Conner et al. (1999) highlight the negative effects of ‘naming and shaming’, the deterioration of school maintenance, the indifference, indecision and ineptness of Hackney local education authority in relation to the closure of the school.

A more general academic focus during the 1990s seemed to be moving from underachievement and falling to effective schools and schools who are employing new methods within culturally diverse urban communities. The National Commission of Education (NCE) (1996: 1-5) identified education underachievement as an ‘acute problem’. The Commission claimed that ... ‘schools are constantly blamed as a cause rather than a symptom of social and economic problems – the British media perennially run stories about crises in inner city schools.’ The NCE attempted to find out how effective schools in disadvantaged areas have become more successful. Schools, with large ethnic minority communities who had not benefited from the delegation of funding, competing

23 Barber (1997:116) argues, ‘In the absence of the leadership qualities that Hackney Downs required it had simply imploded. The school’s circumstances were challenging. Many of its pupils had suffered the double blow of disadvantaged home circumstances and several years – often from the start of primary schooling onwards – of poor, demotivating education based on a destructive mixture of low expectations and patronising sympathy. Drugs were and are rife in the area. Inevitably this affects some of the pupils and therefore the school. Some of the most difficult pupils in the school came from homes where the parents were addicts or dealers.’

for the number of pupils, declining support from local government and the creation of league tables. These were all results of the 1988 Education Act and underline that the recommendations of the Swann Report which demanded greater cultural diversity in schools had not been reflected in the creation of a national curriculum. The NCE examined inner city schools e.g. Columbia Primary School in Tower Hamlets, London and Burntwood Secondary Girls School in Wandsworth, London. In the case of Burntwood, the NCE (1996:159-167) used, ‘Clarity of aims and ethos of the school; focusing on learning and achievement; high expectations; focus on quality; and, collegiality’ as criteria to define success. School leadership and management, communication, monitoring, participatory decision-making involving the older students and parental and community involvement are mechanisms devised by the NCE for achievement. Both schools examined within the NCE study have large ethnic minority communities and are mentioned in the analysis, although not directly in relation to the criteria of success and achievement in the schools. The only mention of Burntwood and ethnic minority comes within the chapter abstract which describes the ‘success of this multi-ethnic school’ which is being heavy oversubscribed but has an excellent academic record. The ethnic background in the school is mentioned in a statistical table. What happens to the other inner city schools which have minority students and are undersubscribed? Unfortunately, minority priorities seemed to have been lost within the new management terminology. Management structures, targets, spending more efficiently and effectively and improving school environments are all very well. Yet, ethnic minority education issues seem to have almost escaped the research. A change of focus away from urban secondary schools to primary schools might be necessary but it misses the point. The education sector which needs improvement the most is still the secondary system of schools, highlighted in the research carried out concerning Hackney Downs from the 1970s through to the 1990s. In this respect, there remains little information in these studies of the wider social and economic problems concerning both inner

---

cities and ethnic minority communities. However, despite highlighting the problems of schooling within inner cities, the NCE (1996) underline potential solutions that promote greater cultural diversity and generally promote effective schooling in a positive light. This was reinforced by Maden et al. 28 who revisited the schools from the initial NCE study. The focus was balanced on both the reality in the schools and innovatory methods which explained how teachers were carrying out within the classroom that were helping ethnic majority and minority students.

Conclusions

Let us return to the two questions posed in the abstract of this research, the first being: Does the education system exclude sections of the population i.e. ethnic minorities? Recommendation 67 of the MacPherson Report into the Steven Lawrence Inquiry 29 states: ‘That consideration be given to the amendment of the National Curriculum aimed at valuing cultural diversity and preventing racism, in order better to reflect the needs of a diverse society.’ If we look back at the Swann Report which also recommended greater cultural diversity in education in the mid-1980s, it seems very little has actually changed within education for ethnic minority communities. Interestingly, within the MacPherson Report, the London Metropolitan Police force are being accused of institutionalised racism, a term originally coined by the black American activist Stokley Carmichael 30 in the 1960s. Carmichael defined institutionised racism as: the collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin’. Institutional racism was acknowledged by the Scarman Report into the Brixton and Toxteth inner city riots of the 1980s but was not defined in a British context. It took the death of Steven Lawrence, 18 years after Scarman for that definition to materialise. Institutional racism applies to all institutions including the education system. What implications does this have for teachers, schools

and universities, as well as students in ethnic minority and majority communities? Gillborn argued that the English education system in the 1990s was still scared by racism, inequalities still existed and in some areas, the situation was getting worse, not better. It seems that assimilation, integrationist and the national curriculum attempted to preserve notions of nation and identity which have alienated ethnic minority urban communities. The process has been defined as racialisation which could witness a return to integrationist education policy. The return to a wider general policy of equal opportunity, cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance is problematic. The term mutual tolerance has its dangers because if the majority are tolerant of the minority, they might acknowledge but not except cultural diversity. David Bell’s OFSTED focus on the obligations and responsibilities of minority communities to Britain also neglects minority cultures which will widen social divisions. So, in answer to the question, yes, the education system still excludes sections of minority communities. Racism threatens to return to the past with increased ethnic surveillance, social control and exclusion. In this respect, Gillborn raises the fact that on average minority youth still do not start on an equal footing because of racism and social poverty. Education policy continues to adopt an approach which promotes racial inequality.

This raises the final question: Can cultural diversity be taught and promoted? From the Education of Immigrants, through the inner city riots of the 1980s and the publication of the Scarman and Swann Reports, considering the national curriculum and despite the more positive outlook of the 1990s, it seems there is still a long way to go. What does the future hold? The Prime Minister in 1997 and 2001 talked about a campaign to eliminate child poverty in twenty years, which is the beginnings of a movement toward the

wider urban analysis and possibilities that Harrison (1988) was discussing nearly twenty years ago. The NCE (1996, Maden et al, 2001) especially highlighted how urban schools have attempted to introduce a multi-racial curriculum alongside the national curriculum. May has argued that there needs to be a global dialogue on multiculturalism. Multicultural education has been criticised for a simplistic and naïve view of wider social and cultural power relations in a postmodern world. Some authors go as far as suggesting that multiculturalism is not enough and antiracism is ultimately needed. In a more global environment, we seem to need more co-operation, understanding and acceptance within the classroom and lecture theatre of ethnic cultures rather than being indifferent, afraid or institutionally racist of those around us. Parekh recommends that racism’s should be addressed, disadvantage should be tackled and there must be a vigorous commitment concerning the systematic representation of ethnic minorities on public bodies. The danger, as Olsen argues, is a movement from a multicultural to a citizenship curriculum or a socialist to a more liberal interpretation of society. This is a backward step in educational terms from a multicultural back to an integrationist education curriculum underlining the social issue of what has changed historically and by how much society is changing. Social history warns us of an even bigger danger by returning to assimilationist education policy which fundamentally eliminates minority identities in favour of the majority. Cultural diversity cannot be taught within an assimilationist or integrationist devised national curriculum. It is interesting to compare and contrast the educational consequences of the OFSTED policy document and the Liberal Democratic manifesto quoted at the beginning of this work. As well as acknowledging faith schools, greater equality of opportunities the manifesto recom-

---


mends better investment into improving early years education and the elimination of tuition fees for those entering higher education. These policies would benefit both ethnic majority and minority communities. However, the national curriculum remains untouched within the Liberal Democratic Manifesto. One of the continuing questions that remains partly unanswered is: Can cultural diversity be taught or and promoted within the English national curriculum? Cultural diversity is about recognition, acceptance and celebration of numerous identities. Without being politically correct or naïve and it might take generations to achieve, the answer to this question has to be yes and education, be it within a multicultural / antiracist curriculum, is a potential and possible way in which cultural diversity can and must be achieved.

---

37 In February 2005, the Department of Education and Skills published the 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper. The working group on 14-19 reform, chaired by Sir Mike Tomlinson, published in October 2004, called for a major change to the national curriculum at Key Stages 3 and 4, encouraging a more vocational, varied and diverse curriculum, based upon the model of the French Baccalaureate. The system of GCSE’s and A/S levels, which encompass the 14-19 curriculum will remain. Achieving functional skills in English and Maths, two of the three core curriculum subjects are still a key objective. For more information see: www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/14-19educationandskills/docs/14-19whitepaper.doc.