

The Educational Needs of a Multiracial Society

Barry Troyna, University of Warwick

Viv Edwards, University of Reading

Occasional Paper No.9

Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL.

April 1993

The present paper is based on research undertaken as part of ESRC project X201312002

Barry Troyna is a Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Warwick and was co-director of the ESRC-funded project, 'Race relations in the primary school'. A former secondary school teacher and Senior Research Fellow at the ESRC's Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, he is author of a number of books and articles on antiracist education. His latest publications include *Education, racism and reform* (Routledge 1990) which he wrote with Bruce Carrington; *Racism in children's lives* (Routledge 1992) with Richard Hatcher; and *Racism and Education: research perspectives* (1993) which appears in the *Modern Educational Thought* series published by the Open University Press. He is chair of governors of a multiracial community primary school and a governor of a multiracial comprehensive school, both in Coventry.

Viv Edwards is the director of the Centre for Reading and Language Information at the University of Reading. Prior to this appointment, she was Reader in Language in Education at Birkbeck College, University of London. She is co-editor of *Language in Education: an international journal* and her main publications focus on minority languages. They include *Language in Multicultural Classrooms* (Batsford 1983); *Language in a Black Community* (Multilingual Matters 1986); *Multilingualism in the British Isles* (Longman 1990), two volumes of papers edited with Safder Alladina; and *The world in a classroom: language in education in Britain and Canada*, co-authored with Angela Redfern. She is a parent and chair of governors at a multiracial primary school in Reading.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Education and Cultural Diversity	2
The Conceptual Muddle	5
Multilingual Education	8
Research Enquiries on Multicultural Education	13
Research Methodology	22
Conclusions	25
Appendix A	32
References	36

Introduction

Over the last thirty years, there has been a growing realisation that schools are failing to meet the legitimate needs of many different groups, including girls, working class children and, more recently, pupils from ethnic minority communities. For some time, it was assumed that the nature and provision of education was sacrosanct and that any differences in educational performance were attributable to deficiencies in the group in question. While it would be naive to suggest that this 'blaming the victim' perspective has been totally abandoned, an increasing number of educationists are now actively seeking causes for the persistent 'underachievement' of pupils within the routine processes of schooling and the embedded assumptions of teachers.

Our present focus is on the educational experiences and outcomes of children from ethnic minority backgrounds. The relatively poorer educational performance of pupils from certain ethnic minority backgrounds, compared to their white counterparts, attracted increasing attention from the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s. It was against this background that, in 1979, the then Secretary of State for Education, Shirley Williams, established a committee of inquiry to look into the role of education in a multicultural society. The committee's interim report focused on the educational experiences and outcomes of pupils of Afro-Caribbean origin (DES 1981). The final report, *Education for all* (DES 1985), assumed a much wider brief. Extending to over 800 pages, the report specified that all schools, irrespective of their geographical location or the ethnic mix of their pupil population, had a responsibility to ensure that 'all children, both ethnic minority and majority,' are prepared 'for life in today's society' through a 'common educational experience' (DES 1985: 317). Central to the principles of *Education for all* was a concern that all LEAs and their individual schools should 'produce clear policy statements' on this issue (DES 1985, pp. 364-365). What continued to tantalise educational policy-makers and teachers, however, were two fundamental questions: what form should this 'common educational experience' assume; and what strategies were necessary to put it into practice?

Clearly, research had a significant role to play in shedding light on these questions, and in 1988 the ESRC launched a research initiative in the area of multicultural education. It funded seven projects, some of which centred on the significance of cultural and perceived racial difference in the learning experiences of children, while others looked more closely at language-related topics. In this report we take the opportunity to discuss the developments which led up to the initiative. In particular, we look at the philosophical debate on cultural diversity which has shaped practices and procedures in schools in the post-war period. We also look at the ways in which this debate has influenced the formulation of language policy.

Shifting philosophical perspectives have also shaped the choice of research inquiry; these, in turn, have generated different methodologies. We look at both the range of issues around which research has crystallised and the methodologies which have been used. The changes which have taken place are, of course, of interest in themselves and allow us to locate the ESRC projects on a continuum of change.

Finally, we attempt to look outwards from the initiative to consider the implications for theory, methodology and educational policy. In particular, we consider some potential pathways for future research.

Education and Cultural Diversity

'There is usually agreement, at the level of public rhetoric at any rate', argue Crispin Jones and Keith Kimberley, 'that racist practices are evil and should be challenged. However, where pluralism is perceived as potentially threatening to the state, policy and practice may be specifically constructed to sustain singularity and reject pluralism, with direct racist consequences' (1991: 8).

This appraisal of the state's response to the presence of diverse ethnic and cultural groups within its national boundaries captures many of the enduring, some might say defining, characteristics of the multicultural debate. If we accept Maurice Kogan's characterisation of policies as 'statements of intent' (1975: 65) then the tension inherent in the state's response becomes clear. A few examples from Britain should be sufficient to sustain this argument.

First, the last few decades have witnessed the introduction of progressively more stringent and racially selective immigration laws at the same time as the evolution of increasingly protective race relations legislation.

Second, while cultural pluralism has been regarded as legitimate in the private domain, it has been allowed only differential incorporation into the public sphere. In Britain, the recent controversies over the status of multicultural education in Bradford, Cleveland and Dewsbury testify to this contrasting picture. As we will now see, in each of these educational settings doubts were expressed about the appropriateness of multicultural education. In Bradford, in the mid-1980s, Raymond Honeyford, headteacher of a multiracial, middle school, refused to implement the LEA's policy on multicultural education. This was part of his campaign to challenge, what he called in the title of one of his many articles, 'multiracial myths'. In both Dewsbury and Cleveland the controversy centred on the refusal of white parents to allow their children to be educated in multicultural schools precisely because of the culturally diverse curriculum which these schools offer.

The third of these ongoing tensions arises from the state's endorsement of the 'legitimacy of difference' at the same time as it supports notions of conditional citizenship. A clear example of this arose in the controversy around the Salman Rushdie affair, where the state refused to extend the blasphemy laws to tackle the alleged violation of fundamental Islamic tenets. Other examples are to be found in education. These include the progressive constraints on the teaching of community languages in schools and the reluctance of the Conservative government to ascribe voluntary aided status to Muslim schools whilst permitting Church of England, Catholic and Jewish schools to enjoy this privilege.

The final tension can be found in the limited understanding of 'national culture,' exemplified in the National Curriculum, especially the prescribed programmes of study for English and History. Many aspects of these documents endorse the notion of 'Little Englandism.' They are 'a recognition and celebration of "us" and "our" national identity; a consolidation of "our" shared values' (Troyna and Hatcher 1991: 283). This is out of step with the celebration of cultural diversity, Europeanism and internationalism found within these same documents.

The interlocking and mutually contradictory themes which run through these examples help define the frame of reference in which questions about the role of education in a democratic, multicultural society are structured. It is a discourse in which multiculturalism operates both as a social prescription for reform and as a social description of the way things are in culturally diverse societies. Responsibility for the resolution of the implicit tension within and between these two conceptions of multiculturalism is often devolved to the education system. The dilemma can be simply stated: too much allowance for diversity can lead to fragmentation; too little, to alienation and unrest.

In Britain, this tension is thrown into sharp relief with the introduction of the National Curriculum. While official documentation on the 1988 Education Reform Act (including the National Curriculum) includes the muted playing of the cultural pluralism refrain, the substantive detail and orientation of the legislation represents a denial of the value of multiculturalism. As we have already hinted, the curriculum documents are underpinned by a reassertion of assimilationist imperatives in which adaptation to the 'British way of life' is seen as the only way forward to integration. It is difficult to dissent from the view that the Education Reform Act has turned the clock back to the 1960s when a perception of ethnic minority pupils as 'trainee whites' permeated policy and practice. Let us elaborate.

The initial educational policy response in Britain was formulated on the host/immigrant model of race relations. The imperative was to ensure that 'they' became, to all intents and purposes, like 'us'. Monocultural education, as this ideological stance came to be called, embraced two distinctive and allegedly complementary components. The first was the teaching of English as a Second

Language, primarily to pupils of South Asian origin. The assumption here was that once these pupils were functionally competent in English they would be able to compete on an equal footing with white indigenous children in the meritocratic educational system. (This is a theme to which we will return later).

The second major policy was based on what is known as the 'contact hypothesis'; namely, that everyday interaction between pupils from ethnic minority and majority backgrounds would attenuate racial prejudice and discrimination and contribute to the development of a harmonious multiracial society. Under this educational regime, the distinctive values, traditions and histories of ethnic minority pupils were, at best, ignored, at worse, suppressed. Implicit in this idea was that any residual racial conflict could be attributed to the ethnic minority communities.

Faith in the credo of monocultural education began to wane in the late 1960s. For some writers, such as John Rex (1986), this was the logical outcome from the then Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins', insistence in 1966 that integration should be given priority as a social and political goal in the formulation of the state's race relations policy. Integration, according to Jenkins, was not 'a flattening process of assimilation' but 'equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance' (cited in Carter 1986: 78-9). On its own, however, Jenkins' declaration had little strategic or pedagogic value to commend it to educationists and it was left to others to translate the political rhetoric into substantive educational policy and practice. Two developments were particularly important in this respect, one in research, the other in policy making. First, the research of David Milner (1975), pointed to the allegedly causal link between the negative self-image of children of Afro-Caribbean origin and their relative 'underachievement' in educational performance. This prompted educationists to reflect on the efficacy of monoculturalism as an educational ideology. Second, the recommendation in Lord Bullock's report, *A Language for Life* (1975), that the curriculum should take into account the ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds of pupils. This provided institutional backing for the promotion of multicultural education.

In its initial incarnation, multicultural education assumed a particularistic stance: an educational response to the perceived needs of pupils from ethnic minority backgrounds. But the exclusivity of this approach was challenged by Lord Swann and his committee. *Education for all* (1985) shifted the ground and proposed a universalistic conception of multiculturalism; that is, the provision of educational experiences based on cultural pluralist ideals to all schools and pupils. As we will soon see, however, there remains an unresolved tension between the particularistic and universalistic understandings of multicultural education.

The Conceptual Muddle

Studies of the educational response to cultural diversity have explored a number of substantive themes against a bewildering backcloth of contradictory understandings of key conceptual and theoretical ideas. If researchers tend to be out on a definitional limb in their attempts to come to terms with the protean concept, multicultural education (and cognate labels such as multiracial education, multiethnic education, intercultural education, polytechnic education, antiracist education and education for prejudice reduction), this is not surprising. After all, they derive from concepts which, burdened with the weight of ideological baggage in the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, philosophy and politics, fail to travel well either within or between these disciplines. 'Keywords' they may be (Cashmore, 1989; Williams, 1986) in the lexicon of 'race relations', nonetheless, they remain diffuse, highly complex and contested terms.

Some educational researchers have admonished their peers for failing to explicate the denotative and connotative meanings of multicultural education (and its variants) when used as explanatory or analytical tools. It is easy to see why. On some occasions, terms such as multicultural, multiethnic and multiracial education are used interchangeably and synonymously. On others, particular concepts are assigned privileged status in the definition, execution and dissemination of research, but remain ill-defined. Social theorists such as Stuart Hall insist that theoretical formulations are important because they 'enable us to grasp, understand and explain - to produce a more adequate knowledge of the historical world and its processes; and thereby to inform our practice so that we might transform it' (1989: 36).

But other educational researchers are impatient with efforts to consolidate conceptual clarity. This particular exercise, according to the American educationist, Judy Katz, is simply one of the 'games educators play'. In this scenario, the participants 'go around and around' in their attempt to define

terms but never arrive at a 'consensus definition' with the result that 'there is much discussion and little visible action' (Katz 1982: 12).

One of the coping strategies which has emerged in the literature is for researchers to rely on pithily expressed slogans. This is typified in the operational definitions found in the writings of James Banks in the United States and Carlton Duncan, in Britain. For the former, multicultural education constitutes 'a generic term which implies systematic school reform' (Banks, 1981: 55). Duncan's resolution of this complex issue treads an even simpler path. 'Multicultural education', he asserts, 'is synonymous with good education' (1986: 39). In our view, these propositions obscure rather than clarify meanings and provide more questions than answers.

There is a further complication, especially for those researchers and practitioners involved in comparative studies. This relates to the limited exportability of terms across national and cultural boundaries. In Britain, for example, concepts such as 'black', 'racism' and 'antiracism' have become naturalised in the discourse of 'race' and education. The terminology, in other words, is heavily racialised, in contrast to the discourse operating in other Western European contexts (Neveu 1992). What is more, 'immigration' and 'integration', amongst other terms, have assumed a specific denotative (and connotative) status in British race relations, which is not necessarily shared by others in Western Europe or beyond (Lloyd 1992).

This conceptual muddle is paralleled in the literature on multilingualism. There, terms such as mother tongues, community languages and home languages are often used interchangeably without explanation or precision.

In spite of this terminological and conceptual confusion, there is some common ground. Undoubtedly, multicultural education assumes a view of an ethnically and culturally diverse society to which the education system should respond in a positive manner. In this sense, it may be distinguished from the notion of monocultural education and its attendant ideology of assimilation. Furthermore, as we have already indicated, it is generally accepted that multicultural education embraces two distinct and complementary imperatives: firstly, meeting the particular educational needs of ethnic minority children and, secondly, the broader issue of preparing all pupils for life in a multi-racial society (Department of Education and Science, 1985: 199).

Of particular interest to researchers, policymakers and teachers is the level of articulation between these particularistic and universalistic components of multicultural education, and their relative contribution to the realisation of equality of opportunity in education. If the 'multiracial society' is interpreted as social description then it could be argued that de facto structural assimilation offers the more expeditious road to equality of opportunity. It assumes an educational experience which is concerned primarily with conserving the organisation of the school, pedagogy, assessment and curriculum content. In short, this is transmissionist education, more compatible with the endorsement of cultural hegemony than with the legitimation of cultural pluralism (Troyna and Hatcher 1991). This ideology permeated the state response to linguistic and cultural diversity in the early years of post-war immigration from the New Commonwealth and, after a period of relative decline, would now appear to be once more in the ascendancy through the influence of the 1988 Education Reform Act in England and Wales.

The alternative stance is adopted by those who see the 'multiracial society' as demanding a transformative education; that is, an education which is reconstituted to ensure that cultural pluralist and antiracist ideals are normalised in administrative, pedagogical, appraisal and curricular procedures. The emphasis here is on the self-empowerment of pupils 'to broaden their

understanding of themselves, the world, and the possibilities for transforming the taken-for-granted assumptions about the way we live' (Giroux 1988: 189).

Multilingual Education

As we have seen, the debate which has taken place around appropriate educational responses to cultural diversity has been both heated and complex. Language is a vital element in this cultural diversity to which we have already alluded. It is a symbol of group identity, as real as differences in skin colour, styles of dress or dietary preferences. It is also the subject of great polarisation: it can be perceived as a source of enrichment or as an obstacle to clear communication between groups.

When the focus is shifted from culture to language, two main issues permeate the educational literature of the last thirty years: the teaching of English; and the status of minority languages. The same tensions which underlie discussions of 'multicultural education' are to be found in relation to linguistic diversity. The same evolution from transmissionist to transformative models can be detected in relation to language in multilingual classrooms.

The teaching of English

While the importance of English for life in Britain has never been at issue, opinions about how fluency should be achieved have changed a great deal over time. The various theoretical positions can be related to two main influences: first, philosophies on education for diversity; second, the wider debate within language teaching about effective pedagogy.

In the 1950s and 1960s, English teaching was promoted as the key to assimilation. Linguistic minority children were seen as having problems which could only be resolved through intensive English teaching in isolation from the mainstream. The most important focus within language learning during this period was on the grammatical structures of English and the learning of sentence patterns through drilling. There was no place at all for children's first languages in this approach and it was not uncommon for teachers to advise parents that it was in their children's best interests for the family to speak only English at home (Alladina and Edwards 1990).

By the early 1970s there had been a marked shift from approaches which attempted to 'assimilate' ethnic minority children to a more pluralist, multicultural stance. The exclusive focus on ESL provision as a means of meeting ethnic minority needs was gradually replaced by arguments that minority children should be encouraged to maintain and develop their own linguistic and cultural resources within the school.

Worries about the divisive nature of withdrawal classes for English teaching were widespread. When provision was organised in this way, the only native English-speaking model available to language learners was the teacher and there was no other opportunity for interaction with fluent speakers of English. Many writers (Cummins 1984; Dulay et al. 1982) began to argue that language is learned more effectively when it is used in order to communicate.

There was also gradual realisation of the racist implications of this form of delivery (Chatwin 1985; CRE 1986), since children taught in isolation or withdrawn from the mainstream for considerable periods did not have access to a full curriculum. Teachers were beginning to suggest that all children - immigrant and indigenous - should be educated for life in a multicultural society. By the early 1980s, the need for an urgent appraisal of the organisation and content of ESL was becoming clear.

The move towards mainstreaming received a considerable boost with the publication of Education For All (DES 1985). It recommended that the needs of bilingual learners should be met within the mainstream school as part of a comprehensive policy of language education for all children and that all teachers share responsibility for bilingual pupils. Attempts to integrate second language learners raised a number of uncomfortable questions. The interests of language learners would not be well-served by transplanting them unsupported into the traditional, didactic classroom setting. Various curriculum development projects attempted to provide materials and a framework for the move away from segregated provision. For the first time, specialist teachers began to work collaboratively with class or subject teachers.

The current situation is far from satisfactory. There are many islands of excellence where teachers have adapted their resources and classroom management strategies to meet the challenges of mainstreaming. However, the needs of many bilingual pupils, particularly at secondary school, are often poorly served (Edwards & Redfern 1992; Troyna and Siraj-Blatchford, 1993). Far too many children are being channelled to Special Needs departments, where teachers have little or no experience of second language acquisition, or are left to flounder in classrooms where no attempt is made to develop collaborative learning techniques.

The complex interweaving of linguistic and cultural issues to which we have already referred is further underlined by the new criteria for assigning Section 11 monies which, since 1966, have been targeted at schools with significant numbers of pupils from New Commonwealth backgrounds. As more transformative ideologies gained ground, the teaching of English as a Second Language expanded to include a range of other cognate areas, including antiracist teaching for all children. The new regulations, however, mark a return to the old transmissionist agenda where the sole emphasis is on teaching English.

Community language teaching

The second strand in the discussion on multilingualism in education concerns the status of minority or community languages. Community language teaching has always been the primary responsibility of the communities themselves. There was a rapid burgeoning of classes in the private domain during the late 1960s and early 1970s, made possible by the initiatives of religious groups and embassies in Britain. The current level of activity remains high.

Community provision did not attract interest until the 1980s with the work of writers like Saifullah Khan (1980), LMP (1985), Taylor (1986), Bourne (1989) and Alladina and Edwards (1990). The debate arising from the 1977 Directive on the Education of Children of Migrant Workers issued by the Council of the European Community (EC) acted as a catalyst for this scholarly attention. The Directive had called upon member states to offer tuition 'in accordance with their national circumstances and legal systems' and required them to 'promote' community language teaching. While considerable scepticism has been expressed about government willingness or ability to achieve even these modest aims, the flurry of activity surrounding the Directive at least succeeded in placing community language teaching on the agenda of mainstream educators. It also prompted LEAs to recognise the legitimacy and relevance of community-run language classes.

Within mainstream education, community languages have achieved greater prominence partly through language awareness activities, which acknowledge the multilingual composition of present day Britain, and partly by making them an element of the regular curriculum as subjects in their own right. Support for these initiatives has come from research findings which suggest that certain cognitive skills can be transferred from one language to another and that a good foundation in the first language is a prerequisite for success in second and subsequent languages.

Various problems have emerged, however, regarding the status and organisation of community language teaching in schools (Bourne 1989; Edwards & Redfern 1992). There has also been concern about the amount of control which is exercised over what is taught. Most communities feel that classes should address the history, culture and religion of the pupils in question. The position currently taken by the government, however, is that the teaching of a (community) language should not be equated with the promotion of a particular religious or political viewpoint (DES 1990: 97).

The implementation of a National Curriculum raises further issues. In the secondary sector, languages which can be taught were originally divided into two schedules. All schools were required to offer at least one of the eight working languages of the European Community which made up Schedule 1 languages. After this obligation had been met, schools could offer a Schedule 2 language which included Arabic, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Japanese, Mandarin or Cantonese Chinese, Modern Hebrew, Panjabi, Russian, Turkish or Urdu. Criticism of the two list format and its implied hierarchy has led to the replacement of Schedules 1 and 2 with a single list of languages (DES 1990: para 11.5). However, it is still the case that languages other than EC working languages can only be offered when the school already provides teaching in an EC working language.

Over the last 30 years we have moved away from the promotion of English teaching as the route to the effective assimilation of immigrants, an activity which took place in isolation from the mainstream and in which minority languages had no part to play. The current consensus is that English is learned most effectively within the mainstream and that all teachers should share responsibility for the development of bilingual learners. At the same time there has been a growing awareness of the importance of maintaining community languages and according them recognition within the school. Against this background it was perhaps

inevitable that schools should start to replace English language with bilingual classroom support.

Bilingual support is found most frequently in primary schools, though some initiatives have taken place at the secondary level. It tends to take three forms, with teachers or 'assistants' undertaking all three at different times. These are: helping individual pupils; translating notices; and working with the whole class. As a newly developing area, bilingual support teaching is, not surprisingly, beset with difficulties. On a practical level, some bilingual support teachers complain that they have received no adequate job descriptions or that they are not sufficiently involved in lesson preparation. There are also questions of status since many bilingual support teachers are actually unqualified assistants - a scenario which hardly helps to enhance the prestige of bilingualism in schools.

Clearly, there has been significant movement throughout the 1980s towards the notion of 'multilingual education'. The aim of this is to encourage children to make use of the full range of their linguistic repertoire in communication and in learning, with the support of multilingual teachers, assistants, parents and appropriate resources. This approach in no way challenges the centrality of English as the main medium of education and the importance of providing English language support for bilingual children across the curriculum.

There is, however, a growing tension between the official view of what constitutes appropriate education for bilingual pupils and the view of many teachers and community organisations. It has become increasingly clear that central government considers the use of home languages as a bridge to the acquisition of English, and not as a legitimate educational activity in its own right. The Swann Report (DES 1985), for instance, considered that bilingual support was appropriate in primary education, but it paid no attention to its possible status or application in secondary schools. As we implied earlier, this position has been consolidated by the new criteria for Section 11 funding which are likely to result in significant cuts in community language and bilingual provision.

Research enquiries on multicultural education

Although not always structured explicitly in these terms, research into the educational needs of a multicultural society has tended to crystallise around the contentious matter of whether schools (and tertiary institutions, to a lesser extent) should adopt a transmissionist or transformative stance in their functions as selection and socialisation agencies. This is why research has tended to centre on the following empirical enquiries: curriculum development; language; the 'racial' attitudes of teachers and pupils; pupil-teacher interaction; comparative academic performance along ethnic lines; and, the relationship between espoused aims and consequences of institutional policies on multicultural education.

In each of these enquiries the main aim has been to assess the nature and effects of the implementation of cultural pluralist and antiracist principles in the two main spheres of education: selection and socialisation. On the one hand, considerable research energy has been committed to identifying the principles which inform the way pupils are allocated into the hierarchy of ability groups. For this reason, the relationship between ethnicity and achievement has been a dominant feature on the research agenda. On the other hand, research has attempted to tease out the role of the school in developing (or counteracting) the images and understandings which pupils develop about themselves and their social world. Of course, the distinction between the selection and socialisation aspects of education can only be maintained at an analytical level. Nonetheless, it helps to clarify the aims of researchers engaged in this area of enquiry.

The common priority of the ESRC-funded research teams was to specify ways in which schools might re-orient their socialisation functions with regard to pedagogy, organisation of learning groups and curriculum content. The teams were also united by the conviction that research in this area should harness the 'language of possibility' to the 'language of critique', to use Henri Giroux's terms (1988). Each project team, then, was guided by the proposition that teachers, both individually and collectively, have the potential to make strategic interventions into the experiences of children in ways which would advance the realisation of a democratic, multicultural society. Their policy recommendations derive from research based in the different phases of pre-16 settings, from nursery schools upwards.

The Strathclyde project

The project team of Rudolph Schaffer, William Cheyne and Gustav Jahoda worked in eight multi-ethnic nursery schools in Strathclyde, staffed exclusively by white adults. The researchers contrived a series of 'key' situations to enable them to observe and analyse, through quantitative methods, staff-pupil interactions. Although the sex of the child and the ethnic mix of the school were moderating influences in this process, the analysis pointed to a fairly coherent picture of differential treatment of children according to their ethnicity. In each of the situations observed, teachers assumed a more controlling style with pupils of South Asian origin compared to their white counterparts.

In one-to-one conversations with children of South Asian origin, teachers adopted a more didactic style. Although the staff members tended to ask the children of South Asian origin more questions, these constrained rather than facilitated the pupils' contributions. In short, they were fixed-choice questions prompting yes/no responses. Interactions between white adults and children from South Asian backgrounds during the taught task sessions developed along the same lines. They were characterised by relatively greater emphasis on directives, physical control and negative feedback. In this situation, where questions were used to prompt action responses, white Scottish children were the favoured recipients.

Finally, in group sessions, teachers tended to be more responsive to the 'bids' of white Scottish children. The research team concluded that this differential mode of interaction along ethnic lines is detrimental to the linguistic, cognitive and social development of children of South Asian origin. This pattern of results, according to the researchers, is partly explicable in terms of the organisation of the nursery school system in which there is little room for one-to-one interaction. However, the main explanation adduced by the team is that neither the LEA nor the individual nursery schools had responded to Swann's exhortation for action. They had not, in other words, developed policies or guidelines for staff on multicultural education. In the context of this institutional inertia, superficial and stereotypical assumptions about pupils of South Asian origin prevailed whilst the difficulties which these children experienced in English language were underestimated by teachers. As the research team emphasised, educationists' commitment to the 'we treat them all the same' ideology reflects an insensitivity to the differential positioning of pupils to the curriculum. It also has the potential to consolidate forms of racial inequality in education.

The Birkbeck project

Like the Strathclyde project, Netta Biggs and Viv Edwards' research, based at Birkbeck College, London, explored the effects of ethnicity on classroom discourse. The children in this study were slightly older, between the ages of five and six, and in their first year of compulsory schooling. The focus was on teacher-pupil interactions and a distinction was made between those initiated by teachers and those by pupils. The premise underpinning the data collection and analysis was that communication is a two-way process where all participants

carry responsibility. In this, their study departed from other models which define success in communication as conformity to the patterns and expectations of the dominant group (Singh et al. 1988).

The analysis of teacher-initiated interactions showed that ethnicity was statistically significant in relationships with three separate explanatory variables. The total number of interactions initiated by teachers with black pupils was significantly fewer than those initiated with their white peers. Teachers had fewer extended exchanges with black children than with their white counterparts. They also spent less time with them discussing the particular task which had been set.

In contrast, the analysis of pupil-initiated interactions showed no evidence of an ethnic effect. The model originally proposed - that communication is a two way process in which both parties must take responsibility for the outcomes - is seriously challenged by these findings. The Birkbeck researchers argue that the fact that different amounts of time and different kinds of interaction are associated with different groups of children must be recognised as the responsibility of the teacher alone.

Biggs and Edwards explored the implications of this position in greater depth by drawing on observational data which pointed to a negative teacher view of ethnic minority children. Like the Strathclyde team, the Birkbeck researchers argue for the need to look critically and in depth at the effects of our socialisation on the stereotypes which we may hold and at the wider role of what has come to be known as institutional racism. They draw attention to the need to sensitise teachers to the ways in which they interact in subtly different ways with different groups of pupils and to the implications of these patterns of behaviour for different educational outcomes.

The Bangor project

The Bangor team, consisting of Carl James, Peter Garrett, Marianne Jones and Yvonne Griffiths, also considered pedagogical issues, though in this case the focus was on the possible benefits of using the mother tongue in the classroom. They set out to examine the effects of using minority children's mother tongue as part of writing tasks in the English language classroom. The project was both small-scale and short-term involving two schools in Gwynedd and one in Lancashire. Children's dominant language was assessed and, over a period of twelve weeks, one group of children in each school did their pre-writing preparation for one hour a week in English, the other in Welsh (in the Gwynedd schools) or Panjabi (in the Lancashire school). At the start and the end of this period, children were engaged in two writing tasks: one transactional (playing a game and then writing about how to play it) and one narrative (discussing a picture and then basing a story on it). Children were also asked to complete a questionnaire covering some 15 different attitudes and perceptions.

Few statistically significant differences were found between the mother tongue and English groups in either the content or the organisation of writing over the twelve week period. The picture which emerged is difficult to interpret. In a small number of cases, increased scores were noted for the English group and decreased scores for the mother tongue groups. On other occasions, there was marked variation in the performance of both groups of children in different schools.

The researchers advanced a number of possible explanations for these findings. It is highly probable that the effects of such limited intervention over so short a period would be too subtle to detect. They also point to other possible effects including differences in teacher style and the kind of language to which the children were exposed. In the Gwynedd schools, for instance, the teachers tended to use a 'classroom register' very different from the everyday language of the children. In Lancashire, the teacher did not share the same dialect of Panjabi. Some children also mentioned the fact that they would have preferred preparing in English if they were going to write in English.

Interestingly, however, although the intervention had few discernible effects on performance, there were statistically significant differences on five of the 15 attitude scales. Attitudes to writing, self, ethnic identity, school and Britain all became more favourable over time for the mother tongue groups and were steady or less favourable for the English groups.

The study also threw some interesting light on the ongoing debate as to whether bilingualism in Wales has implications for bilingualism in other parts of Britain. The picture which emerges is one of considerable differences between, on the one hand, the first Welsh school and the Lancashire school and, on the other hand, the second Welsh school and the Lancashire school. While the Bangor team agrees with other researchers in this field that it is dangerous to generalise from one bilingual situation to another, its findings suggest that developments in Wales may have relevance for other bilingual settings.

One clear implication from the findings of this study is the need for more ambitious longitudinal studies. The Bangor team also argues that future research should consider the advantages of using a mixture of both languages in pre-writing work. Finally, they point to the need for researchers to pay closer attention to how policies are interpreted and implemented in the classroom.

The Lancaster project

There has been a good deal of discussion about the desirability of 'bilingual support' which will allow bilingual children access to the curriculum in the early years of primary education (cf. DES 1985). However, there is a dearth of research on bilingual classroom processes in a British context. The Lancaster team of Marilyn Martyn-Jones, Mokul Saxena, David Barton and Roz Ivanic addressed this lacuna with their project on 'Bilingual resources in primary classroom interaction.'

The main focus of the project was the development of a bilingual assistant scheme in Lancashire primary schools. In-depth interviews with LEA staff implementing the scheme, observation of local training programmes, questionnaire data and classroom observation made it clear that the role of the bilingual assistant was defined in different ways by different schools and that there was an absence of clear guidelines. The amount and content of training and support for the bilingual assistants also varied considerably.

The Lancaster team was not, however, concerned simply with job descriptions and training. They were also anxious to identify ways in which the use of community languages makes a difference to both the nature of classroom discourse and the nature of children's responses to learning opportunities. In doing so, they integrated descriptive frameworks from recent research on bilingual code-switching, emergent literacy and classroom discourse.

The data for this part of the project were collected over a two year period of ethnographic observation of teaching and learning events conducted bilingually. It emerged that bilingual support was organised in a variety of ways: in some classrooms, bilingual assistants led the event, either on their own or in the presence of a monolingual adult. In other classes, they worked alongside the

class teacher, the language support teacher or the nursery nurse. In some such cases, the bilingual assistant would make a contribution in the child's home language which was then followed by a contribution from the monolingual adult in English; in other cases, English would be used first and then the bilingual teacher would translate and/or reformulate in the child's home language.

Analysis of a wide range of bilingual classroom discourse pointed to the ways in which bilingual support teachers act as buffers between the children, their families and the mainstream school, leading to oscillation between curriculum-oriented and learner-oriented discourse. The Lancaster researchers argue that their code-switching should be seen as a significant communicative resource for managing the conflicting demands which they face in their work. They also point to the urgent need to examine the existing pedagogic practice in classrooms where bilingual assistants work: if the organisation and assumptions of the classroom are not supportive of the language learning needs of emergent bilingual children, the presence of a bilingual assistant can be no more than a palliative. Finally, while the Lancaster team recognises the low priority currently being given to initiatives of this kind, they make a strong case for developing bilingual classroom practices which allow children to learn and explore ideas through talk in the home or community language.

The Sheffield project

Along with the Strathclyde, Birkbeck, Bangor and Lancaster projects, the team based at Sheffield (Peter Smith, Michael Boulton and Helen Cowie) also explored pedagogical questions. At the risk of oversimplification, the Sheffield team saw potential in 'bottom-up' rather than 'top-down' strategies for institutional change and innovation. Curiously, the Swann report was silent on the relationship between classroom organisation, teaching styles and multicultural education. Yet as other researchers, within and outside the ESRC projects, have emphasised, the role of pedagogy cannot and should not be ignored in this context.

The Sheffield research might be characterised as interventionist. The aim: to assess the effectiveness of a curricular programme designed to enhance inter-racial co-operation and encourage positive attitudes towards one's own and other ethnic groups. The team worked with three middle school teachers who had attended specific in-service courses on co-operative group work (CGW). The concern with process rather than content was pre-eminent in assessing how far CGW approaches facilitated changes along desired lines. The researchers were cautious in the interpretation of the data from this small-scale study. Nonetheless, on the basis of results derived from a range of measures tried and tested by other researchers to elicit children's racial attitudes, they conclude that CGW has the potential to tackle racial prejudice and enhance inter-racial co-operation. Compared to their counterparts following the normal curriculum in the three schools, children who experienced CGW tended to show a greater liking for classmates irrespective of ethnicity or gender. The researchers also found that the teachers of CGW became progressively committed to this teaching style.

The Warwick project

The Sheffield researchers based their assessment of the CGW on changes in children's racial attitudes as derived from a battery of convergent and, on the whole, experimental measures: sociometry, liking ratings, photographs, and self-esteem profiles. The starting point for the Warwick research team of Barry Troyna, Richard Hatcher and David Berridge was that these quantitative measurements of racial attitudes are limited, perhaps even inappropriate. At best they can only provide answers to what is happening in the complex relations between children. But they are inappropriately framed to elicit data on the reasons why and how relations in school tend to be circumscribed by ethnicity (and gender). It was partly for this reason that the Warwick researchers eschewed conventional quantitative methods for investigating the salience of 'race' in children's lives. As an alternative, the researchers held discussions with 160 nine, ten and 11 year old children in three mainly white primary schools in England. Their aim was to uncover the main conditions which prompt children to operationalise 'race' as an organising principle and explanatory framework for their everyday actions and judgements. It was the team's contention that this complex matter could only be addressed by a series of penetrative discussions which located the issue of 'race' in the context of children's cultures. It was from this perspective that the research shed some light on the range of situations in which children used racist name-calling.

Primarily, this form of abuse was selected from within children's interactional repertoire in an attempt to assert dominance over their schoolmates. It emerged in 'hot' situations where children, often with racially egalitarian views, used it spontaneously during heated arguments. For some, it was seen as a legitimate defence strategy; for others, it led to feelings of remorse and guilt. 'Cold' situations, by contrast, involved children deliberately teasing or harassing other children, usually as part of a game. Whatever the context, white and black children recognised racist name-calling as the most potent form of abuse available in their interactional repertoire.

This research project differed from others in the ESRC initiative in that it focused mainly on children rather than adults. But there were areas of commonality. For instance, it shared the conviction of the Sheffield team that the efficacy of multicultural education policies does not necessarily derive from 'top-down' strategies. As we will now see the Warwick project also linked with the NFER research in secondary schools in highlighting the significance of children's friendship groups in understanding the conditional status of racism in children's lives.

The NFER project

The NFER team of Monica Taylor and Rani Dayaramani was especially interested in the ways in which LEAs and schools had responded to Swann's call for action. The researchers employed an eclectic approach to the collection of their data: analysis of policy documents, structured and unstructured interviews with pupils, LEA advisors and school staff; shadowing and non-participant observation. In general terms, their study aimed to tease out the relationship, if any, between LEA and secondary school policies on multicultural education (MCE) and pastoral care/personal and social education (PSE) More specifically, they were concerned with identifying problematic and divergent areas in this relationship as well as highlighting good practice in those schools which had moved some way towards the integration of MCE and PSE.

After completing a general survey of LEA policy positions on these issues the research team focused on four schools (in three LEAs) containing different proportions of ethnic minority pupils. This enabled the researchers to take a closer look at the extent to which school policies on MCE and PSE had made a

discernible impact on the ethos of the institution, as interpreted by staff and perceived by pupils.

The conclusions give serious cause for concern. In its national sample, the research team found that LEAs were more likely to have developed an MCE than a PSE policy. But the research also confirmed that MCE means all things to all people. This was highlighted by the significant variations in the conceptualisation, content and status of the policies as well as in their potential for practical implementation. The limited impact of Swann's orthodoxy of 'Education for all' on the educational landscape could, however, be discerned from the LEAs' predilection to endorse and diffuse a particularistic rather than universalistic understanding of MCE. The policies were more likely to be in place in LEAs with a significant ethnic minority population and were oriented mainly to the perceived educational needs of these children. Equally disturbing was the lack of articulation between MCE and PSE policies. A few LEAs made gestural acknowledgements in this direction but, on the whole, the relationship was incoherent and implicit.

This discontinuity was replicated at school level. The research team spent time in four secondary schools interviewing teachers and pupils, attending meetings and observing lessons. Here, it found no direct correspondence either between LEA and school (or within-school) policies on these issues. Nor was any correspondence perceived by the third year pupils with whom the researchers made contact. MCE had simply failed to suffuse the PSE policies or practices within the schools and in the absence of a permeating culture of MCE (or, more significantly, antiracist education) pupils spoke of their need to develop their own strategies to cope with the perceived unfairness and racism they experienced within and beyond the school gates. The research team concluded by emphasising the 'glaring need' for in-service education courses which address and attempt to resolve the complex and controversial issues to be found on the PSE/MCE interface.

The underlying assumption shared by this and some of the other ESRC projects is that institutional policies, at LEA and school level, have the potential to shape and legitimate multicultural practices as a routine feature of life in schools. However, these policies are modified and mediated by school staff in different ways. What emerges from this process, then, forms the basis for teachers' everyday judgements and actions.

Research Methodology

It is possible to identify two dominant trends in the literature on research methodology. The 'classic' text book approach exemplified by Moser and Kalton (1957), Cohen and Manion (1980) and Bell (1987) revolves around idealised versions of 'how to do research' and sanctions, implicitly or otherwise, the 'myth of objectivity' in research (Medawar 1963). The main function of this paradigm is to specify the various qualitative and quantitative methods of research and to lay bare the allegedly logical and sequential phases of its conception, execution and dissemination. The influences of this paradigm can be discerned in the Strathclyde, Bangor and Sheffield projects.

The alternative genre centres on more reflexive accounts of the research process. From this 'postpositivist' perspective, research is not construed as something pristine but is reported as 'something carried out by flesh and blood figures who are engaged in real life activities. The research field itself is full of ideology, politics and conflict' (Jacubowicz 1991: 5). A classic expression of this genre is to be found in William Foot Whyte's appendix to his ethnographically-based study, *Street Corner Society* (1955). More recent reflexive, or autobiographical accounts of social and educational research are contained in edited collections by Adelman (1984), Burgess (1985; 1989) Walford (1991) and Bell and Newby (1977). Further, the recent seminar series funded by the ESRC and co-ordinated by Barry Troyna and David Halpin at the University of Warwick is designed to emphasise this perspective in current research on the 1988 ERA. The Slough, Lancaster and, to a lesser extent, Warwick, teams developed research paradigms which approximate more or less to the postpositivist genre while the Birkbeck team used a more eclectic approach, drawing on ethnographic data to help interpret the quantitative findings.

A recurrent interest of those working within the reflexive paradigm is to highlight and discuss the ways in which researchers grapple with the ethical and political dilemmas associated with their empirical research projects. However, one of the characteristic weaknesses of at least some of the writers in this genre is the tendency to focus too intently and exclusively on their own experiences. That is to say, they provide idiosyncratic accounts of their research experience and pay relatively little regard to the more general methodological implications of their encounters and dilemmas. While there is a rich seam of critical reflection in the area of feminist research (including antisexist education), postpositivist accounts of research into multicultural education are few and far between. The reflexive accounts of Ball (1991), Bhavnani (1988), Essed (1991), Mac an Ghaill (1989) and Troyna and Carrington (1989), which interrogate their own and others' methodological practice in this area, are exceptional in this regard.

Of the seven ESRC-funded projects, three give some consideration to the ethical issues linked to the research process. Amongst these, it is the NFER team which gives the matter greatest thought. A significant element of the team's final report to the ESRC addresses the ethical issues raised in each of the developmental phases of the project: decisions about staffing, access to research sites, content of interviews, relationship with interviewees and dissemination. In particular the project members reflect on the appointment of a black researcher; relationships with respondents and respect for anonymity, confidentiality and 'off the record' remarks. The team also reflects on the ethical implications of putting questions to pupils about fairness, authority and justice which have the potential to encourage the young people to call into doubt the normative power of the school. It is unfortunate, however, that these profoundly interesting questions are treated in an idiosyncratic manner in the research report and not articulated with the emerging literature on ethics in social and educational research (e.g. Burgess, 1989; Denscombe and Aubrook 1992; Homan, 1992).

The Birkbeck team of Biggs and Edwards also draws attention to ethical matters. The researchers point, for instance, to the very real tension which emerged during the fieldwork between trust and what might be perceived as betrayal. On the one hand, teachers had been generous enough to open up their classrooms and expose themselves to scrutiny. On the other, it was very likely that staff would not be able to handle the observations which the researchers might want to make about the way teachers sometimes interacted with children from ethnic minority backgrounds.

The Birkbeck researchers point to a real dilemma. They argue that the obvious solution to this conundrum is to embark on research with teachers where triangulation is more formally part and parcel of the agreement. But this raises

a host of other problems. Teachers who were prepared to take part under these conditions would almost certainly be those who were already engaged in 'good practice'. Those who felt insecure would be more likely to hold back.

They also point to certain practical problems, arguing that an action research project of this kind would need to be a long-term exercise in order to ensure the mutual trust and support necessary for success. While this solution would have many research benefits it also raises problems for both teachers and researchers. Teachers already feel under siege from the many demands currently made on them and the researchers know that they are more likely to obtain funding for a short-term low budget project than for a more costly long-term study.

Questions of confidentiality and anonymity and 'informed consent' constituted an underlying, sometimes overt, concern in the research based at Strathclyde and Warwick. Despite the cautious tenor of the Strathclyde report (and associated publications) subsequent meetings between the team and the staff in the sample nursery schools and LEA resulted in precisely the situation which the Birkbeck researchers anticipated; namely a critical, even defensive reaction from the teachers and advisers. Indeed, the Strathclyde team has found it difficult to negotiate further access to the LEA's schools to follow up some of the issues raised in the research.

The Warwick team found that the press response to the announcement of their project played some part in the decision of one LEA to withdraw its co-operation prior to the start of fieldwork. Despite finding a replacement for this LEA, the episode raises the crucial ethical question of 'informed consent' - how much researchers reveal about the nature of their proposed study in deliberations over access to institutions, staff and pupils.

On a related matter the central methodological tools used in the Sheffield research - sociometry, liking ratings and photographs to elicit attitudes to children's own and other ethnic groups - have come under fire from both black and white researchers. Of particular importance here is the ethical matter of how far researchers who use these methodological tools are guilty of manipulating the research process in ways which encourage children to naturalise 'race' (and gender) in their choices of favoured images (see Troyna, 1993 for further discussion).

Conclusions

By way of conclusion, we would like to focus on three main areas of concern arising from this ESRC initiative: promising avenues for future research on multicultural education, basic and applied; questions of appropriate methodologies; and the role of black researchers.

Directions for future research

Various themes emerge both from the research undertaken as part of the ESRC initiative and from enquiries which have taken place in parallel, which point to likely avenues for further exploration. Whichever of these is pursued, it is our conviction that researchers continue to be guided by what Stuart Hall typifies as the main imperative of the social sciences. In his view, social scientists should focus their attention on 'deconstructing the obvious' and attempt to show 'people that the things they immediately feel to be "just like that" aren't quite "just like that"' (1980: 6). In this final section of the report, we want to give some flavour of the theoretical and methodological issues which might shape and influence future research initiatives in this area of enquiry. Let us begin by pointing to some of the changes which have taken place since the launching of the ESRC initiative in 1988 and consider how these might impact on the drafting of a future research agenda.

One of the most important changes since 1988 has been the growing understanding that research needs to move away from the traditional emphasis on 'race' (defined in terms of the social significance ascribed to phenotypical differences) to a more broadly conceived understanding of the role of education in the production and reproduction of inequality. In the USA particularly, this understanding has assumed a specific idiom. There, recent theoretical work has moved away from the exclusionist concern with 'racial' inequalities. Taking its place is a determination to embed the experiences of non-white and white children in a more broadly conceived understanding of the role of education in the production and reproduction of inequality. What now compels the attention of an increasing number of researchers is whether inequalities of 'race', class and gender operate incrementally, in parallel, or in a more complex non-synchronous manner. So far the research has only scratched the surface of this complex phenomenon and the time is now ripe for further theoretical and empirical investigation (Apple and Weis 1983; Crichlow and McCarthy 1993; McCarthy 1990)

The setting up of the single European community in 1992 also prompts us to reflect on the current inflection of research on this theme. To begin with, of course, the closer links with mainland Europe have thrown into sharp relief what some see as the parochial and anachronistic nature of the race relations debate in Britain. We have already noted that some of the taken-for-granted terms of this discourse do not transfer easily into other European settings (Neveu 1992). What is more, the formation of the single European market raises new questions about the shifting boundaries of identity and their relation to immigration and domestic policies. In this new scenario, it is clear that research framed around race relations and education can no longer be distilled into the black/white couplet which has dominated the debate in Britain. This reductionist approach to the study of relations within multicultural societies goes against the grain of research taking place on mainland Europe as well as the emergent postmodernist writings in Britain (e.g. Rattansi 1992; Rutherford 1990).

Another important change since the launching of the initiative is the passing of the Education Reform Act (1988) in England and Wales, and the proposals contained in the 1992 White Paper on education, Choice and Diversity. Set alongside radical changes to the criteria governing Section 11 grants, these developments help to provide a fresh agenda for researchers. Questions surrounding the orientation and content of the National Curriculum; forms of assessment; admissions, recruitment and suspensions policies within the framework of school-based management; and the implications of 'parental choice' and opting-out for issues of equality of opportunity have already attracted the attention of researchers and will continue to do so.

But changes of this kind need to be closely linked to some of the theoretical concerns we have highlighted in this report. For instance, research on these substantive themes need also to address the wider question of the relative status and weighting given to transmissionist and transformative forms of education under the ERA. It is customary for researchers committed to social justice principles to point out that the ERA has the potential, wittingly or otherwise, to encourage a regression back to transmissionist principles and practice, to give legitimacy, in other words, to an educational setting in which assimilation is once again in the ascendancy. As a corollary, the status of transformative forms of education (including the celebration of cultural pluralism and the pursuit of antiracist education) as legitimate educational principles comes under serious threat.

In broad terms, the ERA and associated initiatives destabilise the role played by education in culturally diverse societies. The positioning of education as a public concern, provided for, debated over and controlled in the political arena will prompt some members of ethnic minority groups to oppose the orientation of the ERA. Why? Because they are implacably hostile to structural assimilation. What is more, they see their demands as non-negotiable. They maintain that the

cultural and religious needs of their children should be met within mainstream schools; if not, they will establish their own separate schools - state funded, or otherwise.

On the other hand, the orientation of the ERA and the 1992 White Paper on education, Choice and Diversity, owe a great deal to the growing influence of cultural restorationists who have campaigned vigorously and quite successfully for transmissionist forms of education (Ball 1990; Troyna and Carrington 1990). For them, equality of opportunity can only derive from knowledge of, and competence in, a 'common culture and a common heritage', to use Kenneth Baker's terms (cited in Ball and Troyna 1989: 27). It is against this background that the struggle for the legitimisation of a transformative education for a multicultural society is currently being waged.

Each of these two developments - the formation of the single market and the passing of the ERA and related legislation - provides fruitful research paths to follow. But their convergence suggests that another of the priorities for research in the 1990s should be to explore the role of education in the creation and consolidation of privileged 'national' identities. The contrived versions of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' which currently prevail and are likely to be reinforced within and beyond the educational terrain have hegemonised common-sense understandings of national culture, identity and the sense of belongingness.

The need for any research question to be firmly linked to the development of theory goes without saying. There is also a need, however, for applied research which explores the interface between the findings of more theoretical research and their implementation at the level of the school and classroom. Several of the projects which make up the ESRC initiative place considerable emphasis on the need for in-service education which raises teacher's consciousness of the complex and controversial issues surrounding multicultural education. The Strathclyde project, for instance, indicates that when policies and guidelines for multicultural education are not in place, the inevitable consequence is that stereotypical assumptions about children from other ethnic backgrounds abound. The project also highlights the lack of clarity as to ethnic minority children's most pressing learning needs. The Birkbeck researchers, too, talk of the importance of sensitising teachers to ways in which they interact in subtly different ways with different groups and to the implications of these patterns of behaviour for different educational outcomes. By the same token, the NFER researchers underline 'the glaring need' for in-service which addresses the ways in which policies for multicultural education impinge on PSE.

Although the other projects do not discuss the need for in-service as an issue of particular concern, implicit in the nature of their investigations and findings is the notion that teacher awareness of the issues must be raised. The calls for in-service education, however, are seldom linked - within or outside the initiative - to discussion of the most appropriate models for training and professional development (see Bagley 1992). We would argue that there is an urgent need for applied research which documents the process of change (cf. Massey 1991; Edwards & Redfern 1992), which encourages critical reflection on the part of all participants in the research process, and which attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of different kinds of intervention.

Methodology

We have drawn attention in this report to some of the strengths and weaknesses reflected in the ESRC projects. We have two particular concerns about the direction of current research enterprises. First, it is our conviction that research should move away from the experimental paradigm which has dominated this area since the 1960s. This is not the place to rehearse our objections to this paradigm. Suffice it to say that research structured along these lines has the potential to be superficial and exclusionist. While we recognise that policy-makers tend to 'seek methodologies which are well-established, non-controversial and statistically based' (Wenger 1987: 205) we would hope that the

ESRC would provide sufficient room for manoeuvre for researchers to develop more innovative social science research models, such as those pioneered by action researchers, critical ethnographers and those working within the model of emancipatory research (see Ball 1991; Troyna 1991; Troyna and Carrington 1989).

We are also concerned with the enduring fragmented nature of research into multicultural and multilingual education. It could be argued that this is a function of the traditional emphasis on single rather than interdisciplinary research. The result, however, looks something like this: the description of language and language use has been undertaken by linguists; pedagogical concerns have been discussed by teachers; sociologists of education have focused on philosophical and policy matters; and psychologists have structured their research around interpersonal and intergroup encounters. The emergence of themes such as 'language in education' as an area of cross-disciplinary research provides clues to the way in which future initiatives might be organised.

The role of black researchers

One of the more uncomfortable questions facing researchers into multicultural education, both within and outside the ESRC initiative, is who should undertake inquiries in this area (see Alladina 1988; Edwards in press; Troyna 1993). While it would be foolish to suggest that any particular ethnic group - minority or majority - has a monopoly of insight into the complex issues raised by education in multicultural societies, there is, nonetheless, a broad consensus that research teams should include wherever possible representatives of the group(s) implicated in the study. Within the ESRC initiative, several researchers were bilingual and came from ethnic minority backgrounds; in very few cases, however, did these researchers focus on their own communities. And even the projects which employed personnel from ethnic minority communities raised questions of status since, in all cases, the senior researchers were white.

Issues of this kind generated a great deal of discussion within and between projects and led participants to identify a number of conditions fundamental to change. First, those who fund research should, as a matter of policy, give priority to the training of ethnic minority candidates. Second, there must be a recognition that ethnic minority researchers, particularly in the field of education, will often have a career profile rather different from those of white colleagues. Many (though certainly not all) white researchers have pursued an academic path and will have come to education via other subject routes, such as sociology, psychology and linguistics. In contrast, many black researchers arrive via their experience as reflective classroom practitioners. This basic difference in career paths has important practical implications: because many black people consider the possibility of doing research after a number of years in the classroom, their family and financial commitments may make it impossible for them to consider seriously the lower salaries associated with research posts.

Many white researchers feel that issues concerning black colleagues can no longer be dismissed as unfortunate but unavoidable. There is a growing awareness that, until structural questions such as training and salary levels are addressed, the present situation will remain unchanged. Therefore there is a need for the ESRC to look carefully at the policy implications. Until this happens, the Council is in danger of perpetuating many of the injustices which it is setting out to address through its funding of projects and initiatives such as the one reported here.

One example should suffice. It is ironic that the present initiative concentrated in every case on white children and their counterparts from South Asian backgrounds and that none addressed directly the experiences or needs of pupils from Afro-Caribbean origin whose educational performance has been a defining characteristic of the multicultural debate in Britain. It is even more

ironic that the seminar convened to review the progress of the initiative included researchers of Afro-Caribbean origin who would have been well placed to undertake research in this area. Such a lacuna is a symptom of the unintentional or institutionalised racism which was first given credence in an educational context in the early 1980s (DES 1981). It can only be corrected by the development of a policy which explicitly and self-consciously addresses the centrality of black academics to the research process.

Appendix A
Publications arising from the initiative

The Bangor project

Garrett, P., Griffiths, Y. James, C. & Schofield, P. (1991) Effects of mother tongue use in the second language classroom on the writing performance and attitudes of bilingual UK school children: an experimental study. Bangor Research Papers in Linguistics 3, Linguistics Department, University of Wales Bangor.

Garrett, P., Griffiths, Y. James, C. & Schofield, P. (1991) Scoring and content in transactional writing: from atomisation to audience awareness. Bangor Research Papers in Linguistics 3, Linguistics Department University of Wales Bangor.

Garrett, P. Schofield, P. Griffiths, Y. & James, C. (1992) Evolution of a coding scheme for content in transactional writing: from atomisation to audience awareness. In S. Efstathiadis (ed.) Assessment and evaluation. Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference of the Greek Applied Linguistics Association, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Garrett, P., Griffiths, Y. James, C. & Schofield, P. (forthcoming) Differences and similarities between and within bilingual settings: some British data.

The Birkbeck project

Biggs, N. & Edwards, V. (1992) 'I treat them all the same': teacher-pupil talk in multi-ethnic classrooms. Language and Education 5 (3): 161-76.

Edwards, V. (in press) A question of relative priorities. International Journal of the Sociology of Language.

Biggs, N. & Edwards, V. (forthcoming) Teacher perceptions of ethnicity.

Biggs, N. & Edwards, V. (forthcoming) Working in classrooms: some ethical considerations.

The Lancaster project

Martin-Jones, M. and Saxena, M. (1989) Developing a partnership with bilingual classroom assistants. Working Paper 16. Centre for Language in Social Life, University of Lancaster.

Martin-Jones, M. (1990) Codeswitching in the classroom: a review of research on bilingual education. European Science Foundation Network on Codeswitching and Language Contact: Papers from the Workshop on the Impact and Consequences of Codeswitching, Brussels, November 1990. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.

Martin-Jones, M. and Saxena, M. (1991) Codeswitching in the classroom. European Science Foundation Network on Codeswitching in Bilingual Studies: Theory, Significance and Perspectives. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.

Saxena, M. (1992) Transcribing bilingual classroom discourse. Working paper 33. Centre for Language in Social Life, University of Lancaster.

Martin-Jones, M. and Saxena, M. (eds.)(forthcoming) Bilingual support in the mainstream classroom. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Martin-Jones, M. and Saxena, M. (forthcoming) Supporting bilingualism? A close look at teaching/learning events in primary classrooms. In J. Tollefson (ed.) Language, Power and Inequality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin-Jones, M. (forthcoming) Codeswitching in the multilingual classrooms: two decades of research. In G. Ludi, L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The NFER project

Taylor, M. (1992) Learning fairness through empathy: pupils' perspectives on putting policy into practice. In M. Leicester and M. Taylor (eds.), *Ethics, ethnicity and education*. London: Kogan Page, pp. 146-75.

The Sheffield project

Boulton, M. & Smith, P. (1992) Ethnic preferences and perceptions among Asian and white British middle school children. *Social Development* 1: 55-66.

Boulton, M. & Underwood, K. (1992) Bully/victim problems among middle school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 62: 73-87.

Boulton, M. & Smith, P. (in press) Ethnic and gender partner and activity preferences in mixed race schools in the UK: playground observations. In C.Hart (ed.) *Children in playgrounds: research perspectives and applications*, NY: SUNY press.

Smith, P., Boulton, M. & Cowie, H. (in press) The impact of co-operative group on ethnic relations in the middle school. *Social Psychology International*.

The following book draws on and fully acknowledges work done on the project:

Cowie, H. & Ruddock, J. (1990) *Co-operative group work in the multi-ethnic classroom*. London: BP Educational Service.

The Strathclyde project

Ogilvy, C., Boath, E., Cheyne, W., Jahoda, G. and Schaffer, H.R. (1992) Staff-child interaction styles in multi-ethnic nursery schools. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 10: 85-97.

Ogilvy, C., Boath, E., Cheyne, W., Jahoda, G. and Schaffer, H.R. (1990) Staff attitudes and perceptions in multicultural nursery schools. *Early Child Development and Care* 64: 1-13.

The Warwick project

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1990) Racial harassment in schools. *Highlight* 92 (National Children's Bureau).

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1991) Racist incidents in schools: a framework for analysis. *Journal of Educational Policy* 6 (1): 17-31. Reprinted in D. Gill, B. Mayor and M. Blair (eds.) (1992) *Racism and education: structures and strategies*, London: Sage, pp.187-207.

Troyna, B. (1991) Children, 'Race' and racism: the limitations of research and policy. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 39 (4): 425-36.

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1992) *Racism in children's lives*. London: Routledge.

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1992) Names can always hurt me. *Times Educational Supplement* 24 January: 25.

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1992) It's only words: understanding 'racial' and racist incidents. *New Community* 18 (3): 493-6.

Hatcher, R. & Troyna, B. (in press) Racialisation and children. In W. Crichlow and C. McCarthy (eds.) *Race, identity and representation in education*, New York: Routledge.

Troyna, B. (forthcoming) Racist harassment. In. E. Cashmore (ed.) *Dictionary of race and ethnic relations*. Third edition. London: Routledge.

References

- Adelman, C. (1984) (ed.) *The politics and ethics of evaluation*, Beckenham: Croom Helm.
- Alladina, S. and Edwards, V. (1990) *Multilingualism in the British Isles*. 2 vols. London: Longman.
- Alladina, S. (1986) Black people's language in Britain - a historical and contemporary perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7(5): 349-360.
- Apple, M. W. and Weis, L. (1983) (eds.) *Ideology and practice in Schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bagley, C.A (1992) In-service provision and teacher resistance to whole school change. In D. Gill, B. Mayor and M. Blair (eds.) *Racism and education: structures and strategies*, London: Sage, pp. 226-47.
- Ball, S. (1990) *Politics and policy-making in education*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, W. (1991) The ethics and politics of doing antiracist research in education: key debates and dilemmas. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies* 2, 1:35-50.
- Ball, W. and Troyna, B. (1989) The dawn of a new ERA? The Education Reform Act, "race" and LEAs. *Educational Management and Administration*, 17: 23-31.
- Banks, J. (1981) *Multiethnic education: theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bell, J. (1987) *Doing your research project*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Bell, C. and Newby, H. (eds.) (1977) *Doing sociological research*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bhavnani, K-K (1988) Empowerment and social research: some comments. *Text* 8 (1): 41-50.
- Bourne, J. (1989) *Moving into the mainstream: LEA provision for bilingual pupils*. Windsor: NFER/Nelson.
- Bullock, Lord (1975) *A language for life*. London: HMSO
- Burgess, R.G. (ed.) (1985) *Issues in educational research: qualitative research*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Burgess, R.G. (ed.) (1989) *The ethics of educational research*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Carter, T. (1986) *Shattering illusions: West Indians in British politics*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Cashmore, E.E. (ed.) (1989) *Dictionary of race and ethnic relations*. Second edition. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Chatwin, R. (1985) Can ESL teaching be racist? In C. Brumfit et al. (eds.) *English as a second Language in the United Kingdom*, Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 181-6.
- Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) (1986) *The teaching of English as a second language*. London: HMSO.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1980) *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Crichlow, W and McCarthy, C. (eds.) (1993) *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (1984) *Bilingualism and special Education: issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Denscombe, M. and Aubrook, L. (1992) "It's just another piece of schoolwork": the ethics of questionnaire research on pupils in schools. *British Educational Research Journal* 18 (2): 113-131.
- Department of Education and Science (1981) *West Indian children in our schools*. London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) *Education for all*. London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1988) *Education Reform Act 1988*. London: HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1990) *Teaching modern foreign languages for ages 11-16*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Education (1992) *Choice and diversity: a new framework for schools*. London: HMSO.

- Dulay, H., Burt, M., and Krashen, S. (1982) *Language two*. NY: OUP.
- Duncan, C. (1986) *Pastoral care: an antiracist/multicultural perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edwards, V. (in press) *Edwards on Edwards: a question of relative priorities*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Edwards, V. & Redfern, A. (1992) *The world in a classroom: language in education in Britain and Canada*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Essed, P. (1991) *Understanding everyday racism*. London: Sage.
- European Communities (EC)(1977) *Council directive on the education of children of migrant workers: 77.486*. Brussels: EC.
- Giroux, H. (1988) *Schooling for democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1980) *Teaching race*. *Multiracial Britain* 9: 3-13.
- Hall, S. (1989) *The toad in the garden: Thatcherism among the theorists*. In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. London: Macmillan, pp 35-58.
- Homan, R. (1992) *The Ethics of Social Research*. Harlow: Longman.
- Jacobowicz, A. (1991) *Race research and ethnic relations in pluralist societies*. *Research and Policy Papers 1*, The Race Relations Unit, University of Bradford.
- Jones, C. and Kimberley, K. (1991) *Intercultural perspectives on the National Curriculum for England and Wales*. *Occasional Paper 7*, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Katz, J. (1982) 'Multicultural education: games educators play' *Multiracial Education* 10 (2): 11-18.
- Kogan, M. (1975) *Educational policy-making*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Linguistic Minorities Project (LMP)(1985) *The other languages of England*. London: Routledge.
- Lloyd, C. (1992) *New approaches to immigration and minority policy*. Paper presented to the 'Ethnic mobilisation in Europe in the 1990s' conference, University of Warwick, 3-5 April.
- Mac an Ghaill, M. (1989) *Beyond the white norm: the use of qualitative methods in the study of black youth's schooling*. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 2 (2): 175-189.
- McCarthy, C. (1990) *Race and curriculum*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Medwar, P. (1963) *Is the scientific paper a fraud?* *Listener*: 12, September.
- Milner, D. (1975) *Children and race*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Moser, C. and Kalton, G. (1957) *Survey methods and social investigation*. London: Heinemann.
- Neveu, C. (1992) *The exportability of the British category "Black" to Europe*. Paper presented to the 'Ethnic mobilisation in Europe in the 1990s' conference, University of Warwick, 3-5 April.
- Rattansi, A. (1992) *Changing the subject ? Racism, culture and education*. In J. Donald and A. Rattansi (eds.) *'Race, culture and difference*. London: Sage, pp. 11-48.
- Rex, J. (1986) *Race and ethnicity*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Rutherford, J. (ed.)(1990) *Identity: community, culture and difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Saifullah Khan, V. (1980) *The mother-tongue of linguistic minorities in multicultural England*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1(i): 71-88.
- Singh, R. Lele, J. Martohardjono, G. (1988) *Communication in a multilingual society: some missed opportunities*. *Language in Society* 17(1): 43-59.
- Taylor, M. (1986) *Chinese pupils in Britain*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Troyna, B. (1991) *Children, 'race' and racism: the limitations of research and policy*. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 39 (4): 425-436.
- Troyna, B. (1993) *Racism and education: research perspectives* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Troyna, B. and Carrington, B. (1989) *Whose side are we on? Ethical dilemmas in research on 'race' and education*. In R.G. Burgess (ed.)(1989), pp. 205-23.
- Troyna, B. and Hatcher, R. (1991) *British schools for British citizens?* *Oxford Review of Education* 17(3): 287-299.

Troyna, B. and Siraj-Blatchford, I. (1993) Providing support or denying access ? The experiences of students designated as "ESL" and "SN" in a multiethnic secondary school. Educational Review. Vol.45, No.1, pp.3-11.

Walford, G. (ed.)(1991) Doing educational research. London: Routledge.

Wenger, C.G. (1987) Establishing a dialogue. In G. C. Wenger (ed.),The research relationship, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 198-219.

Whyte, W.F. (1957) Street Corner Society. Second edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Williams, R. (1986) Keywords. London: Fontana.