

Combating Racism Through Training:
A Review of Approaches to Race Training in Organisations

Mohan Luthra and Robin Oakley

Policy Paper in Ethnic Relations No.22

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

June 1991

Contents

	Preface	1
1.	Introduction	3
2.	Race training - American Roots	5
	Training in the organisational context: the Patrick experiment	6
	Racism Awareness Training in the USA	7
3.	Race Training - The British Experience	8
	Assimilationism: "When in Rome ..."	9
	Pluralistic integration - the 'race/cultural information' approach	9
	Anti-Discrimination Law: the race-equality approach	11
	Municipal Anti-Racism: RAT and ART	13
	Classic liberalism: the educational approach	14
	British & US Experiences Compared	16
4.	General Training and Organisational Issues	17
	General training variables	18
	Organisational variables	18
5.	Models of Race Training Approaches	19
	Key issues	19
	1. Race Information Training	21
	2. Racism Awareness Training	24
	3. Race Equality Training	26
	4. Anti-Racism Training	28
	5. The Educational Approach	30

6.	Race Training - The Way Forward	32	
	Conditions of effectiveness: some hypotheses		33
	Strategy for the future	36	
	A Race Training development Centre?	40	
7.	Conclusion	42	
8.	Bibliography	45	

Preface

An earlier version of this paper was originally prepared for a conference on 'Combating Racism', which was organised by the British Sociological Association and held in September 1987 at North London Polytechnic. Although some of the material has been informally available to and used by trainers and others in the meanwhile, the authors felt that a wider circulation might be useful. Thanks are therefore due to the Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations at the University of Warwick for agreeing to undertake publication.

While the aim of the paper is a broad one of providing an overview of the main training approaches in Britain, and indicating directions for the way forward, the limitations of the paper must also be stressed. Its focus is on staff training for service delivery in public service organisations, and it is primarily concerned with the task of clarifying and delineating the different training approaches or methodologies. As yet, very little systematic evaluation of these approaches has been carried out, and it is in the preliminary task of clarifying objectives and methods that this paper seeks to make a contribution. Although the paper then proceeds to make a series of proposals for the appropriate way forward, some of these are necessarily tentative (given the current state of knowledge) while most apply to the field of race training generally.

The paper also stresses the need to avoid tackling race training in isolation, but rather addressing training issues in the context of strategies and plans for ensuring race equality within the organisation and its service delivery generally. Clearly the scope of training alone to achieve such goals in the face of deep structural inequalities in society is extremely limited. Training therefore needs the fullest backing of wider organisational commitment and resources if it is to be effective in contributing towards redressing the racial inequalities that remain entrenched in British society.

The paper is not based on any systematic empirical study of race training programmes, but draws on existing literature and our own wide-ranging personal experience of designing and conducting race training in many different types of organisations and settings. We have also learned a great deal from fellow-trainers working in this field, and see the main part of the paper as an attempt to distil and codify some of the working knowledge of this group - an attempt which we hope our fellow-trainers will find acceptable and useful. The paper was originally prepared while we were on the staff of the Centre for the Study of Community and Race Relations at Brunel University, and we would like to thank erstwhile colleagues there for their contribution to our thinking. We would also like to thank Wendy Ball of the CRER at Warwick University for her suggestions about appropriate revisions for publication.

Mohan Luthra
Robin Oakley

1. Introduction

From the 1960s onwards, training for staff of public service agencies has been regularly advocated as a means of improving race relations in Britain. Whether for the policy-maker or the practitioner, for the priest or the police officer, training in one form or another has been seen as a necessary weapon in tackling Britain's racial problems (e.g. Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups 1985; Department of the Environment 1984; Home Affairs Committee 1981; Scarman 1981; Ouseley 1981; Broadwater Farm Enquiry 1986). Indeed, there has been a tendency for race training to be seen as the 'panacea' that can cure all ills (Sivanandan 1985).

A wide variety of different training approaches have been introduced, over time and within different organisational contexts. Little attempt has been made to chronicle or codify these different approaches, or to explore the reasons why they have been deployed (though see Lee 1987). Training, moreover, is a costly and time-consuming activity, requiring allocation of resources which could find alternative use elsewhere. In these circumstances above all, it is surprising how little research or evaluation of the effectiveness of training has been carried out in Britain, or indeed elsewhere. The general aim of this paper is to begin to explore the scope and limitations of training as a means of combating racism in agencies and institutions. More specifically, the paper aims:

(a) to attempt to demarcate and describe the principal approaches to race-training (and hence provide an analytical framework for systematic evaluation of their effectiveness).

(b) to demonstrate how each approach has emerged as part of a more general policy response; and

(c) to explore the implications of this analysis of training responses for further policy development in combating racism.

The first part of the paper is accordingly devoted to reviewing the historical development of different training approaches (in both Britain and America) within the broader context of policy responses to race relations generally. The second part is primarily concerned to distinguish five distinct types of training approach, and set out schematic models of the main characteristics of each. The final part of the paper explores some of the implications of our as yet limited knowledge about the potential of race training and its role in more general strategies for combating racism, and makes proposals about how race training can be developed and used more effectively in organisations at the present time.

In order to manage the potential magnitude of this task, the scope of the paper has been limited in several ways. In the first place, attention has been substantially restricted to race training strategies which focus on achieving organisational change directly, rather than those which allocate training resources to members of the excluded or disadvantaged minority. Secondly, no systematic attempt has been made to review specific training courses and programmes across the full range of public service agencies, let alone other types of organisations. Such a review, however, is currently being carried out by the Policy Studies Institute on behalf of the Department of Employment; see Brown and Lawton (forthcoming).

The term 'race training' has been used throughout the paper to group together a range of training responses designed to impact directly or indirectly on problems which are conceived in some manner as 'racial'. In using the term 'race' rather than 'racism' we do not intend to imply any autonomous reality to 'race' (cf. Miles 1982), but rather to allow that different approaches premise

different social constructions of 'race', not all of which identify their target in terms of the word 'racism'. For our own part, however, we use the term 'racism' in the generic sense of any form of evaluation of persons by reference to notions of racial or ethnic identity.

We have also used the term 'black' to refer collectively to all those who are subject to racial categorisation and exclusion from the dominant white majority. This is not to deny the many varieties of the black experience in Britain or the salience of self-defined ethnicity among such groups, nor is it to deny the importance of cultural variability within Britain for public service agencies. Our usage simply reflects the fact that we have chosen to address the specific dimension of 'racism' in British society and the way it has been responded to in training. To address the multi-cultural dimension likewise would be important but would involve a larger enterprise altogether. In our view, however, it is necessary to address the issues of power and inequality first, and for this reason we have focussed our attention specifically on means of tackling the phenomenon of 'race'.

2. Race Training: American Roots

The origins of race training in the USA can be traced back to the mid 1960s, initially with the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and with a further impetus in response to the Kerner Commission Report on the civil disorders in American cities of 1967. The Civil Rights Act laid down federal requirements of non-discrimination and equal treatment for all citizens regardless of race or ethnic origin, and "opened up a floodgate of federal dollars to support race training" (Coffey 1987: 116). There emerged a large body of trainers who operated both within and outside formal organisations, who consisted mainly of civil rights activists, psychologists and psychiatrists, and who provided a service designed to enable organisations to meet federal government requirements flowing from the 1964 legislation. Following the Kerner Commission Report, with its indictment of the degree of prejudice and ignorance among whites with regard to their black fellow Americans, the promotion of awareness and sensitivity among whites became a more predominant training goal. All of these early programmes tended to focus upon group dynamics and personal attitudes, and were strongly influenced by the then popular T-group and encounter-group movements, the essential philosophy of which was located in humanistic psychology (Rogers 1973). Especially in the so-called 'sensitivity training', trainers worked mainly at the affective level, using a mixture of confrontational and facilitative methods as a stimulus to group process.

Both the encounter group movement and the sensitivity training programmes of the period came under fire for what were seen as their excessive emphasis on confrontation, and their attack on personal privacy. During the 1970s, a diversity of approaches began to emerge, some more behaviourally-oriented, others still focussing on attitudes and feelings. The requirement of non-discriminatory practice imposed by federal legislation led agencies increasingly to orient their training towards behavioural goals. Training design itself came to be based on a diagnosis of need linked to a broader programme of organisational development aimed at meeting federal requirements. Knowledge-based programmes, covering the history of black people and of the Civil Rights movement, also came to be introduced. Increasing emphasis came to be placed on the participation of black and other minorities in the design and delivery of training programmes. However, as the 1970s advanced, the focus of legislation shifted towards other axes of discrimination (sex, disability, etc.), and the race dimension began to lose prominence so far as federal training programmes were concerned. During the 1980s, under the Reagan administration, civil rights activity generally was much reduced. At the same time, however, race training has been taken up at state and lower levels, drawing largely on the methods used in federal government programmes during the 1970s.

Despite the scale and variety of the American experience, relatively little formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the different kinds of training approaches used has been carried out, and their potential applicability in the British context remains largely a matter of speculation. Closer attention is warranted, however, to two particular contrasting initiatives, the first chiefly because it is the most comprehensive and fully-documented race training programme to date, and the second because of its peculiarly salient impact on the British scene.

Training in the organisational context: the Patrick experiment

Few instances appear in the literature where a major organisation has attempted to change itself in a comprehensive manner to cater for and operate in a multi-racial society. Of these, the best documented and evaluated is the case of the American military, which in 1971 established a training development agency at the Patrick Air Force Base in Florida, as a policy response to racial disturbances among American troops (Day 1983, Hope 1987, Nordlie 1987, Peppard 1984). Known initially as the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI), and subsequently as the defense Equal Opportunities Management Institute (EOMI), the training agency was charged with developing a compulsory programme "designed to prevent racial unrest, tension and conflict from impairing combat readiness and efficiency" (Day 1983: 244). Courses, initially of six-weeks' duration, were run to equip personnel to implement this programme within their own organisations. The principal method employed was educational, in the form of small-group discussions, although in the initial period a confrontational approach was also employed (Day 1983: 253-4).

The programme developed through three distinct phases, in response to reactions from students and their organisations, and to various external influences. The effectiveness of the initial phase in achieving personal change among students was such that difficulties arose with their re-integration into both work and domestic environments, and DRRI graduates were perceived as 'militants' and over-zealous in their approach. Representations from their commanders led to a toning down of the confrontational approach during the mid-seventies, and increased emphasis on meeting their own organisational concern with race relations gave way to equal opportunities generally, and the emphasis shifted from equipping graduates for a training towards a management role. In 1978, this shift was reflected in the change of name of the agency to EOMI, and with further modifications, this broad approach has persisted up to the present day.

The extensive evaluation studies carried out during the 1970s both fed into these developments and also demonstrate the extent of the programme's effectiveness. The initial problem, as already noted, was that at a personal level the impact of DRRI's educational approach was too great for the disciplined organisations for which it was designed. However, although the balance was then redressed towards impacting on the organisation, the evaluation studies show much unevenness in the attitudinal response among personnel, with cynicism and resistance much in evidence, especially among whites. Senior management commitment appears as a major variable here, both in respect of leadership and of effective deployment of EOMI graduates and training resources. At the behavioural level on the other hand, recruitment and other staffing indicators show considerable progress in the direction of equal opportunities, but how far these are produced by training rather than other factors is almost impossible to tell (Nordlie 1987: 77).

While the evaluation studies undoubtedly have their limitations, this extensively documented experience of the US military is an essential part of the knowledge-base regarding race-training and its effectiveness, despite the distinctive features of the military as a disciplined and non-service providing organisation. The case is also important from the British point of view,

however, because of its role as a model for a comparable initiative set up for the British police, which is referred to below.

Racism Awareness Training in the USA

At much the same time as a more organisationally-oriented approach was being developed at DRRI/EOMI, a contrasting and substantially untested race training programme was being formulated by Judy Katz under the title 'White Awareness Training', the title of a handbook published in 1978. The philosophy underlying Katz's approach (and that of her predecessors) was rooted squarely in the humanistic psychology school, and its methods owed much to the encounter group movement and to sensitivity training as it had been developed in the race relations context. Katz drew on these approaches in formulating a more thoroughgoing 'client-centred' approach, for which the key to change lay fully within the individual.

The approach was based on the premise that racism is a pathological condition from which white people suffer, and by which they are subsequently immobilised. The training programme deploys confrontational methods (which were deemed constructive within the encounter group movements) with strong emphasis on addressing incongruities at the affective level and between behaviour and attitudes), and confronting individuals about these. The key element of this process was the resolution of this pathology with a view to 'helping' the individual. The programme thus concentrates on enabling white people to take responsibility for tackling their own racism and that of other whites at a personal level, and to act on this in their subsequent lives.

No systematic evaluation of this approach appears to have been undertaken, although a small study was published by Katz herself indicating positive outcomes (Katz & Ivey 1977). Available literature suggests that neither this nor any other form of 'racism awareness training' has been widely used in the USA, where during the late 1970s and early 1980s (as already noted) there has been move away from race-specific training towards a more broadly-based and organisational (or other context-specific) approach. RAT does not appear to have been used in local government, and insofar as awareness training has been used in police training, the race component has formed part of a 'human relations' approach. Even within the American military, where the confrontational element was initially present, as indicated above this emphasis on personal development was toned down in order to avoid the alienation of trainees from the organisation and to avoid disruption also in their private lives outside.

Nonetheless, it was the Katzian model - largely untested and unused - that was transported wholesale across the Atlantic to Britain as the prime weapon for combating racism through training in local government and elsewhere.

3. Race Training: The British Experience

The development of race training as a response to post-war black settlement in Britain has followed its own trajectory, although at two points (as already noted) the American experience has intersected with it. As well as playing its part in the narrative therefore, the American experience can serve as a foil to the British one, providing for a comparison which is drawn out below. First, however, the British training response, viewed within the broader policy context which shaped it, and is described in terms of the sequence that this broad policy response has passed through. It must be recognised, of course, that any such delineation of stages is an over-simplification, with successive responses tending to coexist alongside each other in some manner and degree.

Assimilationism: "When in Rome ..."

The origins of race training in Britain need to be understood in terms of the wider response to post-war settlers from Britain's colonial territories. Up until the mid-1960s, the policy response (such as it was) was guided by a philosophy of assimilation. Immigrants were expected to assimilate into their 'host' society, and the responsibility for this task was seen to lie with the immigrants themselves. The introduction of immigration controls in 1962 was presented as facilitating this process, by reducing it in scale and thus relieving the proclaimed pressures on natives. Insofar as any further response was called for to assist change, the need was seen to lie with the immigrants rather than with the indigenous population. "Teach them about us" was the principle underlying it, and although some voluntary groups reached out to adult immigrants (e.g. the voluntary liaison committees set up after 1965 under the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants), its main official application lay in the educational system. The school's role was to provide the training-ground for young immigrants to become British, although with its ill-conceived dispersal policy, the government showed it was more concerned to avoid disruption of indigenous children than to meet the needs of the immigrants. Although official guidance was provided on English language teaching from 1963 onwards, it was only with the establishment of the Leeds Project in 1966 that teachers gained any practical support for their assimilationist role, in the form of language-teaching materials to use in the classroom and in professional training (Derrick 1966, Rose 1969).

Pluralistic integration - the 'race/cultural information' approach

In 1966 Home Secretary Roy Jenkins expounded a new official philosophy - of 'pluralistic' integration - which was to replace 'assimilation' as the overt policy goal. This envisaged that immigrant cultures within British society would persist and should be respected. Whether 'other cultures' were to find acceptance at more than a superficial level, or in more than a transitional stage towards assimilation, remained (and still remains) open to debate. However, the shift in thinking both encouraged and legitimated a new policy response in service-providing agencies, which focussed upon the need for service-providers to be properly informed about 'immigrant cultures', and to be aware that immigrants themselves might have 'special needs' deriving from their cultural difference. Thus from the late 1960s onwards, "learning about them" began to be identified as a training need for service professionals and agencies, notably within social work (Rose 1969: 339; FitzHerbert 1967) and again in teacher training, (e.g. Oakley 1968, Morrish 1968).

In those areas and agencies in which 'immigrants' (or as they increasingly became known, in accordance with this perspective 'ethnic minorities') had become an issue of concern, training - and training specifically addressed towards immigrant cultures - was through the 1970s the predominant (and often sole) agency response to be encountered. Most such training consisted of the provision of 'cultural information' about ethnic minorities, delivered by 'experts' or by 'representatives' of such groups, to a practitioner body drawn exclusively from the self-defined majority. Especially where the agency was concerned more with service provision at the collective rather than the personal level (e.g. the police), courses might also include some input under the heading of 'race relations', which would commonly consist of factual inputs on the extent of racial discrimination and disadvantage, and/or an account of psychological theories of racial prejudice. Here again, however, the method used was predominantly that of the expert lecture, with little if any attempt to apply the knowledge to practical situations and experience.

The limitations and indeed dangers of the information-based training approach became particularly visible from the late 1970s onwards, as the assumptions underlying the philosophy of what had come to be termed 'multi-culturalism' came increasingly under attack. The debate focussed around the concept of 'multi-

cultural education', which was attacked as a superficial and largely tokenistic dogma, and accused of masking (if not colluding in) the reality of racial disadvantage and racial discrimination, not only by community and academic commentators, but also in one official (though controversial) government-sponsored report (CIECEMG 1981); also Coard 1971, Stone 1981). Information-based training was vulnerable likewise to the critique that it did little to address issues of justice and equality, but was liable instead to reinforce stereotyping through its ethnocentric and uncritical approach. Not all culturally-oriented training is equally vulnerable to such criticisms, however. It is not the notion of a 'multicultural society' as such that is in question, but the particular understanding of 'cultural' and of the relations between cultural groups that goes with it. In some training approaches, the need has been firmly defined not as one for information about 'them' (i.e. the minorities), but for awareness about 'us' and the unconscious ethnocentrism that obtains at personal and institutional levels (e.g. Kent 1965 for an early example), or - with another approach - for skills in inter-cultural communication (as in the work of some Industrial Language Training Units). Such training approaches alone, however, do not address the issue of power relations between groups, or - in a more potent word - 'racism'.

Anti-Discrimination Law: the race-equality approach

Despite earlier legislation against racial discrimination and the recommendations of various reports on the subject (e.g. Rose 1969, Hiro 1971: 277), it was not until the Race Relations Act of 1976 that effective measures were introduced to address discrimination on the part of agencies rather than individuals, and to address training as a means towards this end. The 1976 Act prohibits indirect as well as direct forms of discrimination, and empowers the Commission for Racial Equality to make formal investigations of agencies where there is reason to suppose discrimination has been taking place. At the policy level, therefore, the 1976 Act marks the beginning of a new stage, insofar as it places the goal of racial equality more squarely on the policy agenda at the institutional level.

Training as such, however, is not required of any agency under the legislation, and the sections which refer to training are only permissive rather than mandatory in nature (s, 35, 37, 38), and relate to the employment rather than the service-delivery sphere. Furthermore, no specific funding was provided by central government for race training in support of this legislation, although under separate legislation (e.g. Section 11 or Urban Aid), local authorities - though not the private sector - can apply for part-funding at their discretion. The private sector was offered no incentives under the legislation, although a Race Relations Unit at the Department of Employment was established to promote private sector training. By contrast, the legislation places a duty (s.71) on local authorities to combat racial discrimination in their areas, but there are no sanctions on authorities which choose not to comply (FitzGerald 1986). Through issuing Codes of Practice, however, the Commission for Racial Equality seeks to promote good practice in training and other areas, and to a modest extent (varying between different sectors) agencies have taken such recommendations on board (CRE 1987).

Training geared to preventing discrimination from occurring has consequently increased in scale since the end of the 1970s, though far less so than took place in response to the legislation in the U.S.A. In its earliest forms, such training typically comprised isolated inputs, consisting of information-provision about racial inequalities and the 'psychology of prejudice'. The introduction of 'race equality units' in many local authorities from the late 1970s onwards (Young & Connelly 1981) contributed to the growing emphasis on staff training as a means of implementing race equality policies, both in the employment sphere and with regard to service delivery (DOE 1984; and for an example, Ouseley 1981: 138). As noted below, some local authorities moved well

beyond the requirements of the legislation in formulating more fundamental anti-racist policy goals.

Despite the advocacy of the Commission for Racial Equality, progress with the development of race equality policies - and the training programmes designed to implement these - has been much slower outside the local authorities, or at least those where party or community politics led them to be introduced. Although the Department of Employment's Race Relations Advisory Service has offered a training facility to employers in both public and private sectors, this has been small in scale, and central government has only recently begun to address race equality issues within its own 'civil service' bureaucracy. In other parts of the public sector too, the development of race equality policy has tended to be recent at best, as for example in the police service, where even the lead provided by the Metropolitan Police has been restricted to the employment sphere rather than also to service delivery (Oakley 1988, 1989; GLARE 1987). An attempt to promote training-led change, sponsored by the Home Office following recommendations of the Scarman Report, proved to have limited impact in the absence of clear organisational commitment in police forces on race equality issues (Scarman 1981; PTC 1983; Oakley 1989). And in the private sector, where response is essentially voluntaristic, initiatives still remain few and far between, with most employers uninterested in if not hostile to such policy commitments (Jenkins 1987).

Despite the scope for race equality training if the 1976 Act is to be effectively complied with, progress is so far limited although it appears to be increasing. Many current initiatives, however, give less salience to race issues specifically, subsuming them within a broader 'equal opportunities' approach. Even within some of the once high-profile local authorities, this tendency can now be observed. 'Race equality training' is therefore tending to give way to more generic forms of 'equal opportunity training' in support of legislative compliance, especially where external pressures for commitment to race-related goals are absent or no longer strong.

Municipal Anti-Racism: RAT and ART

The 1981 disturbances gave fresh impetus to agencies to address race issues, including tackling these through training. At the national level, the policy response was mediated by the Scarman report and its recommendations. Except in the case of the police, the state's response to 1981 was to resist the calls for race-specific strategies, and to adopt policies and fund training developments that did not distinguish the needs of black and ethnic minorities as different from those of inner city residents and young people in general - despite the emerging evidence of differential access, e.g. to apprenticeship skills and youth training schemes (e.g. Cross 1987).

The new initiatives came primarily at the local level. As the number of authorities with policy commitments increased, and some at least began to couch these in terms of strategy for tackling racism generally, so the demand for specialist trainers grew. In the absence of a centrally led strategy to promote and staff race-training initiatives, there emerged a variety of ad hoc and often individual responses by a rising cadre of entrepreneurial race trainers. A prominent and controversial position within the training response came to be occupied by 'Racism Awareness Training' (RAT) on the Katzian model, due to the prominent role of Racism Awareness Programme Unit (RAPU) and other racism-awareness trainers in undertaking race training programmes. Not only local authorities, but also voluntary organisations (and even the police) hastened to set up racism awareness training programmes for their staff (LSPU 1987; Southgate 1984). Indeed, in some quarters during the early 1980s, RAT seemed to be viewed as the 'ultimate solution' for racism, provided the dose was administered widely and strongly enough. (In practice though, it was rarely administered beyond a white-collar clientele).

The popularity of RAT was remarkably short-lived, however, for by the mid-1980s, a counter-RAT movement had developed, on the basis of three main critical strands. The first was on political grounds, and pointed to the tokenistic and hence distractive effect of making training provision for whites as against supporting and providing resources directly to the black community. The second objection was against the individual-centred approach of RAT, which was felt to divert attention from the organisational and institutional issues. The third was that the perceived confrontational approach, which induced strong resistance and resentment among trainees or at best led to feelings of guilt and self-blame. The outcome tended to be the alienation and immobilisation of trainees, except where a degree of commitment was already present, and the occasional trainee might be fuelled for a 'crusader' role (Sivanandan 1985; Gurnah 1984; Bakhsh & Oakley 1990).

Despite these criticisms, sometimes amplified by media reports and moral panics, modified variants of RAT, often combined with more organisationally-oriented training approaches, continue to be widely deployed, especially in the local authority and voluntary sectors. The two approaches tend to have come together to the greatest extent in those agencies which have committed themselves to combating racism in the fullest sense, i.e. at both individual employee and institutional levels. Within the framework of a broad anti-racist strategy of this kind, the training approach which addresses both personal and organisational goals has come to be described as 'anti-racism training' (ART). Such training will be seen as an integral component of a process of policy implementation within the organisation, with the policy justifying it and determining the form it should take. Its objective, therefore, is to establish not merely non-discriminatory competence among staff but also commitment to the goals and implementation of the anti-racist policy as such (Tonkin 1987; Alibhai 1988).

Classic liberalism: the educational approach

This account of British training responses would not be complete without some reference to an approach which fits ill under the heading of 'training', given its essentially non-directive character. The reasoning behind this approach is drawn from a particular educational philosophy, and holds that if 'learning' is the goal of training programmes, this will be most effectively achieved if learners discover knowledge for themselves rather than having it imposed upon them (e.g. Schon 1983). At a deeper level it is rooted in the social philosophy of classic liberalism, which denies the right of others to impose their views on the individual, and which implicitly maintains an almost naive faith in the potential fairness and justice of humanity. So far as training is concerned, therefore, the approach is antithetical to notions of 'instruction' and 'confrontation', and indeed in its pure form is opposed to forms of direction of any kind. The role of the trainer is to act strictly as a facilitator of group process and/or individual learning. Within race training, moral and political commitments have precluded this approach from being given a leading role in more than a few instances, although, as noted above, it was incorporated to a substantial degree within the American military race training programme at EOMI.

In the British context, an early instance of the application (and evaluation) of this approach in the race field was in the Humanities Curriculum Project led by Stenhouse and other colleagues from the University of East Anglia (Stenhouse 1984). This tested several different educational strategies for increasing racial understanding and tolerance among 14-16 year-old secondary school students, and found positive effects at the personal level resulting from the project. Given the levels of racial prejudice revealed, and the media and other external pressures on youngsters, the authors were cautious about making claims for wider or long-term impact (cf. Hall 1980).

A more substantial experiment in this approach was adopted in a police training initiative located at Brunel University. Funded by the Home Office in response to Scarman and the 1981 disturbances, the project was designed as a support centre for police training in community and race relations, modelled along similar lines to EOMI (Police Training Council 1983). Given the lack of organisational strategies in police forces geared to race equality goals, the Brunel Centre decided to adopt an educational approach aimed at equipping training staff with understanding and motivation to become curriculum development leaders within their own organisations. Any effects of setting up a change process of this kind would necessarily be long-term, but as yet no impact evaluation of this initiative has been conducted. However, in the short-term, the Brunel Centre was perceived by its client group as failing to meet their immediate needs (for skills and materials to deliver existing training curricula), and having failed to gain police confidence, the initiative foundered and was discontinued in that particular form (Oakley 1989).*

The potential strength of the educational approach is long-term in nature, in that it allows individuals to develop understanding and commitment at their own pace, and without the obstacles of resentment and resistance generated by didactic or confrontational methods, which have been much in evidence in professional race training within the British cultural context. From the point of view of achieving race-related goals in an organisational context, however, two major weaknesses are evident. The first is that, at least in the pure form of the approach, there can be no guarantee that race issues will be adequately addressed at all, and for them merely to be put on the agenda (or merely perceived to be there) is often to induce the very reactions among trainees the approach seeks to avoid. Secondly, even if the method succeeds at the personal level, then just as with Katzian RAT and the early experience at DRRI/EOMI, there will be no impact at the organisational level unless that organisation is supportive of - or at least receptive to - the changes that trainees seek. Experience suggests, therefore, that unless the organisational climate is itself open and committed to basic egalitarian values, the liberal educational approach, despite its potential, is insufficient in itself to achieve race equality goals, at least in most organisational contexts and in the short run.

British & US Experiences Compared

This review of the British experience of race training, influenced as it has been by the American experience, nonetheless shows marked contrasts with the latter in a number of ways. These can be drawn out and summarised in the following manner.

First of all, training initiatives in Britain emerged mainly at local government or agency level, not that of central government. In Britain there has been a lack of clear commitment on race and equal opportunity issues by the state, and there have been no strong state sanctions or rewards. The main impetus has come from uprisings rather than political movements (e.g. the American Civil Rights movement), so that no sustained and institutionalised pressure has resulted. Furthermore, the key arms of the central state lack black participation, so that by contrast with the USA there has been an absence of pressure from within as well. Hence no comprehensive strategies such as those at DRRI/EOMI have emerged in Britain, with the possible exception of that of the GLC which was abolished by the central state before it could fully develop.

Secondly, racism in Britain has been largely viewed as a matter of private attitudes, and not a realm into which the state or other agencies should intervene. Personal awareness and affectively-oriented forms of training have therefore met with opposition and resistance, which has crystallised in the form of an anti-'anti-racist' counter-attack by intellectuals of the Right (Gordon & Klug 1986; Palmer 1986). The dominance of the Katzian model has tended to distract from experimentation in other approaches, and there has not emerged any

accepted knowledge-base about race-training derived from research and evaluation.

Finally, the attempt to establish race-training initiatives in Britain has taken place in an era of economic austerity and non-interventionism - a somewhat different context from the era in which race training first began to flower in the United States. The resource problem common among all agencies thus combined with the preceding factors to further restrict the prospects for the development of race training in Britain by contrast with that in the USA.

The outcome of these factors generally has been a far weaker and more uneven thrust in the use of training as a weapon in combating racism in Britain, by comparison with that in the USA. Despite being seen at times as a panacea, the fact remains that race training has tended to develop in ad hoc ways, and largely in isolation from the current debates and professional organisation of training generally. If race training is to be adequately understood and its effectiveness evaluated, there is need for more systematic delineation of the main approaches employed, with reference particularly to their key characteristics as training strategies and the manner in which they relate to wider organisational structure and process. The following sections of this paper seek to set out a preliminary framework of this kind, as first step towards what would need to be a more systematic survey and appraisal of race training approaches in Britain.

4. General Training & Organisational Issues

Although race training can be demarcated as a specific field in terms of its aim and content, many of the issues which arise in evaluating its effectiveness are issues with regard to the nature and role of training generally. Recent debates in this area have focussed around a spectrum of issues, which call attention to key variables governing the effectiveness of training in promoting organisational change. These variables can be grouped under the broad headings of 'training' and 'organisational' variables, as follows:

General training variables

- (a) The style and objectives of training (e.g. whether oriented towards attitude or behaviour change), including the distinction between training and education (historically derived, and now institutionally sustained);
- (b) The extent of general commitment to training/education as a worthwhile activity;
- (c) The extent of availability of an established body of knowledge about particular training approaches and their effectiveness;
- (d) The extent to which there is an orientation towards experimentation and evaluation within the training field;
- (e) Strategy for the allocation of training resources: whether towards client or employee empowerment/enablement or towards organisational change as such;

Organisational variables

- (f) The nature of the organisational context; e.g. whether the organisation is disciplined or accountable, etc.;

(g) The compatibility/receptivity of the culture/ethos of the organisation with regard to training in general, and to the particular training approach;

(h) The availability of relevant/appropriate data to establish ownership of the training need;

(i) The administrative structure of training: whether it is a central or peripheral activity within the organisation, and whether a 'top down' or other model is employed;

(j) Organisational support for training: whether it is adequately resourced, and whether it has the backing of management and supervisors in the work setting.

The above list identifies a set of general issues that must be addressed in any full consideration of race training strategies and their effectiveness. Most of the issues have been touched on, to some extent at least, in the account just given. It should be noted, however, that on few of these issues is there anything approaching consensus, and there is certainly no overall training philosophy or approach which commands support in Britain nationally. This lack of consensus or established body of knowledge about training approaches generally, renders doubly difficult the task of assessing the different race training strategies in particular.

The section which follows is concerned essentially with the first of the general training variables set out above, i.e. the nature and style of different forms of race training in particular. From the point of view of this paper, the remaining variables are contextual in character, and are not considered directly in the delineation of race training approaches that is delineated below.

5. Models of Training Approaches

In order to clarify the conceptualisation of different approaches to training and to provide a framework for their evaluation, ideal-typical models of the five main distinctive training approaches identified in the previous section of this paper are delineated:

- * race information training
- * racism awareness training
- * race equality training
- * anti-racism training
- * educational approach

Key issues

The following key issues are raised in order to characterise and assess each training response:

(a) What is the premise of the training approach? How is the 'problem' conceived, and what goal needs to be achieved to overcome it? In particular, what conception of the nature and manifestations of racism is premised by the approach?

(b) What training methods are used? What kind of relationship is there between trainer and trainee? What pedagogical assumptions are made? What training techniques are employed?

(c) At what level is the training strategy targetted? Is it the level of the individual or the agency or organisation? Insofar as it is the individual, is

it targetted at cognitive, affective or behavioural levels? Insofar as it is behaviourally oriented, is it norm-oriented or skill-oriented?

(d) On what site or location is training conducted? Is it conducted within a classroom format, or in seminars or conferences, or within the work setting itself? Are the activities training-specific, or is training conducted simultaneously with other tasks?

(e) How are issues of law and policy dealt with in the training programme? Are they excluded or included, and if the latter, how far do they frame the training approach?

(f) How is race-oriented training located within the wider training curriculum? Is it wholly divorced from other training activity, does it have 'special slots' (with or without some degree of integration), or does the racial dimension actually 'permeate' the curriculum?

(g) What appear to be the known effects of the particular training strategy? What changes appear to result from the training intervention, and over what time-scale? How do they interact with other forces combating or sustaining racism? How far are these 'known effects' based on systematic evaluation?

(h) What appear to be the conditions of effectiveness of the various training approaches? With what types of individuals or organisations do they appear effective? What other environmental conditions of the training intervention appear necessary for or conducive to effectiveness?

(i) What are the principal examples of the type of training intervention? In what range of contexts has the approach been implemented, and to what extent has it been applied systematically in the pure form outlined?

The principal features of each of the five race-oriented training approaches are set out schematically on page 22, and in a greater detail in the text below.

1. Race Information Training

The Race Information approach to training was the predominant approach adopted from the late 1960s through until the late 1970s, insofar as the training response had any race-oriented component rather than being purely concerned with cultural information provision. Although this approach may now no longer be advocated by trainers, it is not uncommon to find practitioners indicating that this approach would be preferable and sufficient. Its principal features may be characterised as follows:

(a) The premise of the approach is that most white people are as fair and just as any other humans, but that they are often unaware of the extent of racial discrimination and its impact upon the lives of black people. Training is therefore required to inform them about racial discrimination and racial disadvantage in society, so that they will then be disposed to support and implement measures to tackle it wherever it occurs.

(b) The training method used in this approach is typically didactic. Outside experts on 'race relations' are invited to give lectures, which will be evaluated by the audience in terms of the 'credibility' of the lecturer, and the extent to which any 'new' or 'relevant' information was imparted.

(c) The level at which the training is targetted is essentially cognitive. On this model, attitudes are not in question; any necessary behaviour change is presumed to follow from the provision of appropriate information. The training is aimed at the individual actor rather than the organisation, the presumption

again being that service delivery will be enhanced as a result of individual staff being better informed.

(d) The location in which such training is conducted is the traditional classroom setting, with speaker standing and facing a 'mass' seated audience. The location is separate from that of the workplace; and the experience is seen as an external input, to be taken back for use in the workplace on conclusion of the training event or course.

(e) Law and policy issues are included as part of the information content of the training, but do not in any way frame the training approach.

(f) The place of such training within the wider training curriculum is one of occupying 'special slots' - specific to the subject of 'race relations' and independent of other sessions within the overall training curriculum. They may comprise free-standing events, or one or more sessions within a more broadly-framed course. In the latter case, typically they are recent additions, and are located at the end of the programme ("the Friday afternoon slot").

(g) The effects of this type of training approach are generally recognised to be that it may inform those who are seeking information, and that it may enhance the effectiveness of their work insofar as the information is relevant to the task. There is no reason, however, to believe that either attitudes or basic dispositions towards behaviour are likely to be affected by such training. Information alone is as likely to sustain as it is to counter existing prejudices, and the outcome will be dependent on the receptivity of the trainee.

(h) The conditions of effectiveness of information-based training are therefore likely to be where it forms part of a broader approach which involves addressing attitudes and behaviour also. Only when favourable attitudes exist, or self-awareness and sensitivity to race issues have been developed, is an information-based component in training likely to be potentially effective in combating racism. For this potential to be realised, the information element will also need to be job- or task-related and relevant to the circumstances in which this is carried out. Such information is likely to be effective either at an initial stage - to establish 'ownership' of a training need - or at a later stage in a training programme, when a disposition for behaviour change is capable of being translated into practical action.

(i) For examples of this approach to training, it is necessary to look only at most of the training provided during the 1960s and 1970s. Although during the 1960s even this type of training was unusual, during the 1970s a wide range of service agencies in multi-racial areas began to provide some response of this kind to at least some of their staff. During the 1980s, this approach continues, though alongside or incorporated in other training approaches indicated below.

2. Racism Awareness Training

The racism awareness training approach is treated here as typified by the approach adopted by Katz in the USA, and by trainers in Britain who follow closely Katz's model. Within the last few years many trainers in Britain have developed modifications of Katz's approach, and have combined elements of it with other strategies. The principal characteristics of Racism Awareness Training are as follows:

(a) The premise of Racism Awareness Training is that racism, whatever its various manifestations, has its ultimate source in white people: it operates in their interests, it is they who benefit from it and sustain it, and it is therefore their responsibility to tackle it. Furthermore, racism is seen as a property of all white people as individuals, who need accordingly to be made aware of their own racism as a precondition of being able to tackle the problem in their own lives.

(b) The methods of racism awareness training involves the use of techniques designed to induce self-awareness within a group setting, with the trainer taking an active (and sometimes personally confrontational) role in leading participants to 'own' their own racism. Role-play and other formal self-awareness exercises are commonly used to assist in this process.

(c) In this type of training, the focus of attention is on the attitudes of the individual person, and especially on the affective dimension - the feelings and values that white people have with regard to black people. The training thus aims to create a heightened awareness of racism within each participant, and largely presumes this will itself give rise to motivation at the behavioural level. So far as it addresses behaviour, Racism Awareness Training is strongly norm-oriented rather than being skill-oriented.

(d) Like race information training, racism awareness training is also classroom-based, either literally or by withdrawal to some other special location where group-work can be conducted in isolation. However, the size of the group is normally small, and the relationships between group members and trainer are more active and personal in manner.

(e) Since the focus of attention is on personal attitudes, there is no intrinsic role for consideration of law and policy issues in this type of training, though these could always be introduced for illustrative or contextual purposes.

(f) Even more so than Race Information Training, Racism Awareness Training is normally conducted quite independently of the rest of the training curriculum. Very commonly, staff are withdrawn either voluntarily or compulsorily for one to three-day courses, which are free-standing, and without any integration into either a training programme - or indeed any more general strategy for combating racism on the part of the organisation.

(g) The known effects of this type of training, as established by research and experience in Britain and the USA, are that where participants are not left alienated or resistant, they may be either disabled by guilt or loss of confidence, or alternatively become positively committed crusaders for the cause. All of these personal responses may present difficulties at the organisational level in utilising the outcomes of such training for the purpose of effecting change.

(h) The conditions of effectiveness of racism awareness training, at least in its Katzian and isolated form, would appear to be the presence of already (or potentially) committed participants capable of self-disclosure, combined with sensitive and skilled trainers who can foster rather than destroy such dispositions. However, the more such awareness sessions are appropriately integrated into a programme of job-related training, the more participants may accept the relevance of personal awareness raising to obtaining practical benefits at work. Little attempt (let alone success) has been recorded of Racism Awareness Training being conducted with lower level officers in service-providing agencies, such as housing caretakers.

(i) Racism Awareness Training was mainly introduced into Britain in its Katzian form by RAPI in the early 1980s; this group and its offshoots and other followers of Katz have worked with a variety of service agency and professional groups (including the GLC in its initial period, and also the police).

3. Race Equality Training

The race equality training strategy is an approach which draws its legitimacy and methods very directly from the fact that racial discrimination is illegal

under statute, and that agencies, as employers as well as service-providers, have a legal obligation to practice racial equality. Such training provision may form part of a wider training programme, framed in terms of the concept of 'equal opportunities training', which combines responses to other legal requirements such as in relation to discrimination on grounds of gender or disability. The notion of Race Equality Training normally embraces employment-oriented training provision as well as that aimed at service delivery (and the term - or that of 'Equal Opportunities Training' - may sometimes be used to refer solely to the employment context). Race Equality Training is unlikely to constitute a programme of training in isolation, but normally forms part of a wider organisational strategy aimed at achieving racial equality or equal opportunity goals. The rationale for pursuit of such goals may not come solely from legal obligations, but may derive to some extent also from party-political or other kinds of policy commitments of agencies, or from professional ethics. The chief characteristics of this approach have been:

(a) The premise of Race Equality Training is that the law proscribes racial discrimination, and it is therefore incumbent upon agencies and professionals to ensure that discrimination, whether by intention or by effect, does not occur. The actual extent or the causes of such discrimination are of less interest than the simple recognition that it is liable to occur, and that agencies need to have positive, systematic and effective strategies to identify and prevent it.

(b) The training methods used are aimed to first establish 'ownership' of the possibility of discrimination and the need to address it, and secondly to design and implement a strategy to respond to it. At the initial stage, the method must be one of 'selling' the idea to managers or policy-makers, or engaging in 'conversion' work with them. At a second stage, a combination is required of didactic method to provide technical information, and facilitated planning exercises in order to develop appropriate strategy. Finally in a third stage, the emphasis must be on technical instruction and skills development for practitioners to apply procedures and exercise necessary discretion (in employment as well as in service delivery).

(c) Racial Equality Training is designed strictly to affect behaviour. The training will target the cognitive level also as a means of access to affecting behaviour, but is likely to specifically avoid tackling racial attitudes. Essentially, the strategy aims to by-pass attitudinal obstacles by treating them as a private (job irrelevant) matter, and to simply 'instruct' officers in legally or professionally appropriate behaviour. This is defined as precisely as possible in terms of first norm, and then of required skills to deliver this.

(d) Different locations correspond to different stages of a programme. Conferences and seminars are appropriate to the initial sales/conversion stage, backed perhaps by external support campaigns. For the second stage of strategy formulation, workplace planning meetings with external advice and facilitation are used. For the third stage, classroom instruction and exercises relating to written guidelines or procedures should then feed into supervised and monitored work situations.

(e) In Race Equality Training, issues of law and policy are of central importance, and frame the entire training (and organisational) approach.

(f) At the stage of the formation of policy, and its initial implementation, training provision will need to be specifically targetted and largely self-contained in delivery. Subsequently, the 'race equality' training provision may become built into routine training provision for new entrants, and for those changing rank, function or locality.

(g) Race Equality Training may readily be observed to produce declarations of commitment to race equality or equal opportunity goals (e.g. in the form of

Equal Opportunity Statements), and to some extent also to produce more detailed policy or strategy on paper. The behavioural effects of such training remain questionable, however, in line with the more generally observed shortcomings in the extent to which organisations have proved capable of implementing equal opportunity policies effectively.

(h) Organisations subject to legal and consumer pressures would appear to be those most likely to attain ownership of 'race equality' goals, and to proceed to more specific policy and strategy formation. A range of organisational factors may limit the effectiveness of implementation of such policy, even where external pressure is strong, and senior management commitment in evidence. Decentralisation and multi-racial staffing may assist in overcoming some of the 'resistance' to top-down implementation that is often manifest in training sessions with front-line staff.

(i) Race Equality Training as outlined above has been broadly the approach used and advocated by the Commission for Racial Equality, in accordance with its terms of reference under the Race Relations Acts. Under the influence of the Commission and its Code of Practice (aimed primarily at equality in employment rather than service delivery), many public sector agencies (both statutory and voluntary) and some private sector agencies (e.g. large commercial enterprises) have provided some degree of race equality training within a broader equal opportunities strategy. Within the last few years, a number of agencies have moved to Race Equality Training after rejecting the Racism Awareness Training approach; on the other hand, other agencies (such as the GLC in the early years of the Labour administration) moved away from Race Equality Training to Anti-Racism Training.

4. Anti-Racism Training

The notion of anti-racism training proves less easy to typify than the other approaches delineated here, partly because the notion is more recent than others, and partly because it does not (at least yet) refer to a single clearly identifiable strategy. Rather, it seems to represent an approach developed in the wake of disillusion with Racism Awareness Training, which on the one hand retains the strong commitment to combating racism directly, while on the other seeks to impact directly on practice within the organisation rather than concentrating on individual self-awareness. The principal characteristics of this approach, as it currently seems to be developing, are as follows:

(a) The premise of Anti-Racism Training is that racism cannot simply be reduced to a problem of (white) individuals, yet neither can it be tackled purely in terms of discriminatory behaviour without addressing the level of personal attitudes and awareness. For this approach, racism is endemic within the culture and institutions of the society, and individuals are the carriers and producers of it. The goal, therefore, is to secure the initiative and support of individuals in challenging and eliminating this endemic racism, and Anti-Racism Training forms part of an organisational strategy designed to pursue this aim.

(b) The training method involves the use of both didactic and confrontational techniques, but within a collaborative rather than judgemental framework. Exercises are geared to developing both self-awareness and job performance.

(c) Although the behavioural level is the target, the tackling of attitudes especially at the affective level is seen as a necessary condition of effective behaviour change. Change at the level of organisational behaviour is thus seen as dependent upon the presence of appropriate attitudes in individuals. These cannot be 'by-passed' without the risk (or likelihood) of resistance and covert deviancy. Thus both normative and skill-orientations are both strongly present,

and the approach seeks to integrate these at both individual and organisational levels.

(d) Locations will be varied according to the nature of stage of the task, and in addition to classroom and workshop-seminar settings, will include work-place sessions and wider issue-based campaigns.

(e) Law and policy issues are viewed as important and are incorporated within the training programme. However, they do not themselves frame the approach which, as indicated, is led by a commitment to combat racism at all levels and not just the overt points of service delivery or of employer action.

(f) Anti-Racism Training tends, like Racism Awareness Training, to consist of specially-targetted independent programmes of training. However, it should be capable of integration within routine training provision especially insofar as its goal, like other training, is to enhance practice. Moreover, if 'anti-racism' can be read as referring to a disposition towards a (race) dimension of everyday practice (rather than some special area of practice), then 'anti-racism' should be capable of 'permeating' the whole of training provision as appropriate.

(g) Since Anti-Racism Training is both recent and perhaps difficult to define precisely, it is difficult to suggest precise conditions for the effectiveness of this approach. Moreover, the tendency for Anti-Racism Training to be an integral component of a broader organisational strategy in combating racism renders it especially difficult to devise any method of training evaluation that would be capable of isolating those effects specifically attributable to training. It will be noted, however, that Anti-Racism Training has been introduced precisely in order to overcome some of the perceived limitations of effectiveness of the several preceding training approaches, though how far it is actually successful in improving upon these remains an open question.

(h) For the same reasons stated above, even impressionistic evidence is largely lacking as regards the conditions for effectiveness of Anti-Racism Training. Given the aims of such training, however, it will be clear that a necessary condition of even launching a broad anti-racism strategy in any organisation will require a high degree of organisational commitment both to the policy goal, and also a commitment and willingness to achieve organisational change.

(i) The adoption of Anti-Racism Training in the sense described above has been a very recent development, and has been confined principally to the GLC in its final years and to a few local authorities, with the possible addition of some committed voluntary organisations.

5. The Educational Approach

The educational approach stands apart from the other approaches for several reasons: its race-orientation may be minimal, yet it claims the more radical power to change; it seeks long-term rather than short-term effects; and there appear to have been few attempts as yet to implement it. It offers a general model of training-led change, within which a race-specific component may be but one among many possible foci of educational concern to client groups. It should be noted that the notion of 'education' as employed here is more fundamental and indeed more literal (in its meaning) than what is usually practiced within modern 'schooling' systems, whose pedagogy has often been closer to that of the 'race information training' as delineated above. The principal characteristics of this 'educational' approach are as follows:

(a) The premise of the Educational approach is that whatever the nature and sources of racism, self-sustaining change will only come about through the

personal development of individuals. Change will be most effective where those individuals have themselves identified the need for change, and have developed their own means for achieving it. The more individuals have the need and the direction for change forced on them by others, the less likely they are to produce sustained behaviour change in that direction. Hence the paradox arises that the effectiveness of training-induced change is likely to vary inversely with the degree to which the training is directive - a paradox that translates itself into a practical dilemma where the objective of the training intervention is quite specifically to combat racism.

(b) The methods used in the Educational approach are essentially ones devised to assist in personal development, and involve a collaborative personal relationship between trained and trainees. Small group discussions, facilitated but with minimal direction, will predominate, and be accompanied by emphasis also on learning through personal reflection.

(c) The principal level at which the approach is targetted is attitudinal, though with the emphasis on the cognitive dimension, both for its own sake and as a means through which values can be identified and analysed. This of course operates at the level of the individual rather than that of the organisation. The approach is wholly antithetical to normative prescription in any way (other than it being a possible object of study). Nor does it seek to intervene at the level of behavioural skills either - skills development being seen rather as a possible end-on training requirement.

(d) While the location for educational work may (and has traditionally been) the classroom, it may also be located in the workplace for indeed anywhere where unconstrained intellectual reflection may take place, especially in conditions which provide for personal privacy.

(e) Within the Educational approach, issues of law and policy have no special place, in view of the non-prescriptive character of such programmes. They do not frame the approach at all, and whether they are included will be a result of the discretion of the student.

(f) Insofar as 'race' issues are included in an educational curriculum, they are potentially an integral element of that programme, though whether such a dimension becomes explicit is non-directive and a matter for discretion. On the other hand, some elements in an educational curriculum may be prescribed as addressing the topic of race, although again, the manner in which the topic is treated would be non-directive.

(g) Few attempts have been made to measure the effects of the educational approach on race relations, and this would prove difficult anyway in view of the absence of overt objectives against which change could be assessed. In addition the changes sought are long-term in time-scale of operation, thus producing a further difficulty in the way of impact evaluation. Given that those seeking change are generally seeking it in the short rather than the long term, the chances of such strategies being sufficiently well supported over the time period also cast doubt upon the capacity of this approach (at least in isolation) to be effective.

(h) Given what has been said above, the conditions of effectiveness of the Educational approach are likely to be where long-term commitment and support is forthcoming, and where there is environmental receptivity to change as such, even though its scale and direction may be highly uncertain.

(i) The two documented examples of race-focussed educational approaches are the Schools Council project on teaching race relations in secondary schools reported by Stenhouse, and the programme for the development of police training

in community and race relations conducted at the Centre for the Study for Community and Race Relations at Brunel University.

6. Race Training: The Way Forward

The five models set out above are not intended to exhaust the possible approaches to race training, nor to suggest that one approach is mutually exclusive of another. The aim is rather to identify a number of main tendencies, each with its own internal consistency, which in the form of abstract models can be a useful tool for analysis of either a descriptive or theoretical kind. Without conceptual tools of this kind, there can be no agreed point of reference for defining particular forms of training, and no basis for comparison or for the evaluation of particular training effects.

The typology provides not only the basis for the evaluation of particular training strategies, but also for consideration of the appropriateness of different training strategies according to the type of agency concerned. Similar types of organisation (within a similar environment, and at a similar stage of policy development) may be seen as likely to require a similar training strategy. Other types of organisation are correspondingly likely to require a different training approach, e.g. as between local authority departments and voluntary agencies. A diversity of potential training approaches is therefore likely to be beneficial, provided they are clearly demarcated, and there is an ethos of experimentation/evaluation which is capable of producing a developing body of knowledge regarding the effectiveness of different approaches in different contexts. Such a body of knowledge will need to take account of the full range of general training and organisational variables identified earlier.

Conditions of effectiveness: some hypotheses

Given the current lack of knowledge regarding the effectiveness of race training there is urgent need to formulate working hypotheses on the subject, even if at the present stage these are based more on subjective appraisal of training experience than on the evidence of systematic research. Such hypotheses can in the meantime become the basis of future programmes, which if adequately evaluated may themselves become the quasi-experimental foundations on which more reliable knowledge may be built. The hypotheses which follow are linked where possible to such systematic evidence as is available, but the authors have also drawn directly on their own subjective training experience and that of many other trainers who have shared their experience with them.

(a) No training programme is likely to be effective in combating racism without at least some race awareness element. Even though general values of justice and fairness may be presumed or advocated, the need for active monitoring and ownership of racism as an actual or potential obstacle to achieving these may not have been acknowledged, and as a result the existence of such obstacles may have been overlooked or condoned. As noted earlier, this poses a clear dilemma for a fully non-directive 'educational' approach, since there can be no guarantee that race issues will emerge onto the group's agenda, with the result that this approach is especially vulnerable to condonation of racism in this way.

(b) Cognitive race awareness training alone will not be sufficient to effect change at the personal level: affective awareness is also necessary as a pre-condition of personal change. Resistance in one form or another is the normal experience of trainers working in this area, resistance rooted in the same feelings that shape racial stereotypes and attitudes widely among the population. Without some technique of eliciting such feelings and examining them, there can be no prospect of achieving change at the personal level if it is to be induced within the training environment.

(c) An affective race awareness element alone is not sufficient to produce change at organisational level: cognitive awareness is also necessary, backed by organisational receptivity and support. However aware and well-motivated trainees may become, to achieve organisational change they must have a good understanding of race issues and of the organisational response to them, so that they can analyse the task that lies ahead. Without the support of the organisation, and an understanding of both the potential and the limitations of their own role, they are likely to become ineffective and frustrated, and either withdraw or become discredited for their abrasive and 'crusading' style.

(d) Race training will have its greatest long-term effect where self-sustaining behavioural change is induced through an 'educational' approach: whereas short-term behavioural change will be best achieved where 'instruction' demonstrates procedures which are supervised and backed by sanctions. Although different approaches tend to be more suited to different types of organisations (see below), as a general proposition this poses a serious dilemma for designers of race training strategies. Ideally both long-term and short-term considerations would be taken into account, but resources generally preclude this, while the short-term is usually seen as the priority for action not least because of pressure to produce visible results. Yet short-term changes depend strongly on the effectiveness of management and supervision - though it is common for shortcomings in training still to receive the blame. Close coordination between training and other aspects of the organisation is therefore essential if in the short-term training is to have its maximal effect.

(e) Race training will be most effective generally where its goals are compatible with an explicit code of organisational or professional ethics, where there is a clear commitment to equal opportunities throughout the specific agency and where the need for a race-specific response within this framework has been clearly established by systematic monitoring and research. These points reflect the many difficulties experienced by race trainers working in organisations which do not have explicit commitment to appropriate goals, and in which attempts at race training are ineffective because there is no prior ownership of any problem in this area. Consequently, many race trainers now restrict their work to organisations that are 'committed'. Circumstances may vary, however, over whether it is appropriate to present race training in a specific, high-profile manner, or whether it is more effective to sidestep possible negative preconceptions by use of alternative terminology or through integration within a more inclusive equal opportunities training strategy.

(f) Race training will be the more effective at the personal level, the more its goals are seen as of practical job benefit to trainees, the more it is integrated into the general training curriculum, and the more it is rooted in personal experience - and especially of black people. Such evaluative studies as have so far been carried out, strongly emphasise the need for practical relevance of such training, and the negative response which results where isolated training inputs are conducted with no apparent relation to the wider training curriculum or workplace concerns. A reflective approach to experience and the involvement of black people in the design and delivery of training (both in classroom and community settings) are essential means of enhancing the experiential component within the curriculum.

(g) Race training will be the more effective at the organisational level, the more trainees can be equipped and motivated to act as 'change agents' within their own agency, both individually and through networking with other committed persons both within and outside the organisation. Training needs to be conceived not simply as a passive means of implementing policy, but as an active element in an organisation's strategy for change. Race training should therefore aim to assist trainees in developing skills to effect change in organisations, and should be designed wherever possible to coordinate with existing developmental strategies in the organisation at large. How far

particular organisational structures and professional styles will permit or encourage such approaches is likely to be very variable.

(h) Democratic/collegial/voluntary organisations are likely to be responsive to affect-oriented training-led change; whereas training efficacy in disciplined-accountable organisations is likely where training is oriented cognitively towards authority-sanctioned behaviour change. The variability noted above calls for somewhat different race training approaches if the training intervention is to achieve its maximum effect, and the two-part categorisation above provides only an initial differentiation between organisational types. Organisations are inevitably far more complex in reality, and it is important to take account of a range of variables in considering the most appropriate training strategy for each. Many race training initiatives, however, has been much weakened in their impact due to inadequate consideration of organisational context, or to naive assumptions that what works well in one context must necessarily be effective everywhere else.

(i) The training skills required of race trainers may be different in degree, though are not different in kind, from other forms of personal skills training, though the knowledge and understanding required are specific to the race field. The shortcoming of much existing race training provision is the lack of skills and confidence possessed by race trainers. Many professional trainers experience lack of confidence in this area and feel that special skills are therefore required. The real problem, however, is that their knowledge and understanding of the issues is at fault, frequently combined with more general shortcomings in their capacity to train staff in the social and personal aspects of professional practice. The former problem can be directly addressed by drawing in larger numbers of black trainers, though it is likely that these will only become marginalised and discredited unless they too are adequately skilled for the task in hand.

Strategy for the future

Given the options available and the current knowledge as to their efficacy, what should be the way forward in race training within organisations? Obviously, the ideal solution would be to adopt the strategy which appears to be most successful in attaining the training goals, regardless of resource constraints. However, in proposing a way forward, it is essential to bear in mind that training resources are far from unlimited, and in present circumstances of financial austerity, the first principle in designing race training programmes should be to use minimum effort, to obtain maximum effect.

In the present climate, then, four further principles - each important under any circumstances - seem to carry particular weight:

(a) Work only with organisations that are committed. Without organisational commitment, training innovations are likely to be ineffective and to flounder through lack of impact. Unless authority within the organisation is decentralised to a substantial degree and there is commitment to training generally, the effort to achieve change should not be directed towards training strategies, but towards securing the necessary prior political commitment at the centre.

(b) Empower black trainers to undertake training. This principle is based not on employment considerations, but directly on training grounds. The first is the need to secure maximum commitment to combating racism from trainers as individuals. This requirement does not entail that black trainers alone should undertake training, but rather that black trainers should be strongly represented in any training team. This representation should include women and men, young and old, and different ethnic backgrounds, so as to reflect the diversity as well as the commonality of the black experience. The requirement

also entails that white trainers must be correspondingly committed, with the presence of black colleagues catalysing and sustaining this commitment. The second consideration is to ensure that the experience of racism is brought into the training context to the maximum degree. Although there are a variety of ways in which this may be done (e.g. visiting speakers, visits, videos, etc.), only through the presence of blacks as core members of the planning and delivery team will the black experience permeate the training curriculum as a whole.

(c) Involve black practitioners as trainers. In austere times, training resources may be reduced or minimal, and race training may be a prime target for cuts. While there is danger of overloading particular individuals, the necessity of finding alternative training resources may be turned into a virtue. Black practitioners within the organisation already know that organisation and the form that institutional racism takes within it. With effective job design, these (and indeed other) practitioners can have a training function worked into their job descriptions. This enhances the capacity of training to integrate with, and thus impact on, the work of the organisation generally. As in (b) above, such roles need not be confined solely to black practitioners, but should also be carried out in coordination by committed whites as well.

(d) Empower race trainers as change agents. This follows from the previous proposal that training and practitioner roles can effectively be combined. While practitioners can participate in the design and execution of training, and assist to implement it within the organisation (especially where it has an on-the-job rather than classroom location), trainers themselves need to be involved in the design and management of organisational development. This entails involvement in, and coordination with a range of other organisational activities, including policy development, recruitment and promotion, discipline and complaints, and of course management and administration generally. Trainers especially need to become involved in the way in which the organisation formulates its overall approach to the training function (just as they need to link in also to multi-function race relations units). In short, trainers need to view themselves as change agents within the organisation, and to view their trainees as change agents likewise. Correspondingly, the curriculum of race training needs to be oriented towards providing skills for the initiation and management of constant change. In this way training can assist in setting up a network of 'multiple centres' of agents committed to combating racism, thus compensating for what is likely to be a shortage of resources for specialist race-oriented positions within the formal structure of the organisation.

In support of the above four-fold strategy, which is strongly geared to securing maximum results from present limited resources and commitment, a number of additional moves need to be considered, as possible ways to enhance the effectiveness of race training in the organisational setting.

(e) Training contracts should be organisational not personal. At present there is often an element of voluntarism about participation in race training, and with both personal awareness and educational models of training, there is an ethos at classroom level at least that the training contract is personal between trainer and trainee. If race training is to be effectively integrated into the organisational process, it needs to be clear at all times that the training contract of both trainee and trainer is primarily with the organisation, and that it is solely for this reason and within this context that the two parties come together personally. (This is in no way to deny the importance of the personal 'contract' that should subsequently be built up, to the extent appropriate, as part of the training method.)

(f) Black activists should be involved in training. This suggestion needs to be considered from the point of view not just of achieving internal organisational change, but from the point of view also of the organisation's relation with its environment. As suggested above, the deployment of black

trainers and practitioners is essential as a means of bringing black experience into the training arena. However, black staff of the organisation will of necessity tend to be less fully integrated into campaigning work against racism on the wider front, and in presenting a black perspective will be concerned not to jeopardise their own effectiveness elsewhere within the organisational context. There are grounds, therefore, for engaging 'external' black activists and practitioners to participate in the design and execution of race training, to press without constraint for the representation of black experience in the most appropriate manner, and to articulate the needs and wants of the black constituency among the organisation's clientele. Their role in training, however, is not to directly 'represent' the views of constituents (as in a policy- or decision-making process) but to contribute as individuals to a constructive learning process. At the same time, they can also remind those staff in race-oriented posts that the existence of such posts is largely due to the efforts of outside campaigners, and that close collaboration with those involved in combating racism from outside the organisation is essential if they are to be effective in their common aim.

(g) Training should be cross-professional. There are disadvantages in viewing the development of race training within different types of organisation as if agencies are totally isolated from and independent of one another. There is need to recognise that agencies using race training operate in a common environment and can benefit from inter- or multi-agency cooperation. Training development needs to be conceived and planned across a range of agencies operating in pluralistic settings. The identification of training needs (whether race-specific, or community-related generally) in all these agencies needs to be rooted in an appreciation of the social and economic environment (e.g. inner-city decay) and the factors which shape it, as well as an appreciation of the different actual and potential roles of the various agencies operating in such areas. Training (and also policy development) strategies which do not also involve a range of different professional groups with linked roles are unlikely to be effective in producing a coordinated service delivery.

(h) Race training should be carefully named. Current names have acquired public images (and sometimes negative connotations) which may set up misleading or unwanted expectations on the part of prospective trainees. Good briefing may overcome this problem, but the naming of courses should be carefully considered, as to how appropriate it is e.g. to indicate overt targetting of racism (or to deny it) in the title. Where race-oriented training components are integrated within the wider training curriculum, this problem is removed, and its inverse appears: viz, how to ensure that the race dimension is kept sufficiently prominent in the image of training.

(i) Training should be monitored and evaluated. This proposal should be acceptable enough in principle, and especially so in a time of severe resource constraints. Questions arise, though, as to how, by whom, and to what purpose? At present, available techniques are limited and often do not inspire confidence among trainers. Trainers need to be empowered to undertake their own evaluation work, and link their conclusions into both the organisational process and a professional body of knowledge. This suggestion links to others made above and below.

(j) Training issues should be removed from the party political arena. So far as possible, common ground should be sought between competing party political interests for constructive training initiatives which include a race focus or dimension. Training is neither a campaigning nor a political bargaining process, and many valuable race training initiatives have foundered (often before they began) because they were perceived or presented in political terms. If there is to be any campaigning or other political dimension, this must be provided (and sanctioned) by the overall organisational policy or strategy of which the training initiative forms a part. Apart from such contexts, training

initiatives are likely to be the more effective, the more they are perceived and experienced as politically neutral. Campaigns should be working rather to achieve a cross-political consensus within which such initiatives can take place.

One presumption threaded throughout the above set of suggestions is that resource-effective training strategies are needed, and that results are needed now. The emphasis is therefore on producing training effects economically strictly within the short-term. In consequence, the strategies to be adopted are likely to be 'anti-racism training' within those organisations with a broad anti-racist policy commitment, and 'race equality training' where that fuller commitment is absent, and there is voluntary or enforced commitment under the aegis of the race relations law. The question that must be faced is how far are the training effects set up by such programmes likely to be self-sustaining? If self-sustenance at the personal level is sought, then there is need to look also at the 'educational' approach. Whether organisations will be prepared to regard taking a longer-term view as within their interests (and again bearing in mind resource constraints) is another matter. If a case can be made for employing the educational approach in combating racism, then initiatives may need to be taken outside the immediate organisational sphere.

A Race Training Development Centre?

If the above represent some of the possible ways forward, by what means is progress to be made? For the most part, change can only come about through the struggles of client groups and employees to put pressure on individual agencies and organisations to address race issues, and to address them in training in particular.

Insofar as this pressure is training-oriented, however, there are two respects in which its impact may be limited as a result of its fragmentation. The first is through the lack of coordination of the efforts of those seeking change, while the second is through the lack of any central agency for the promotion and assessment of race-training developments. The two functions could be combined within a Race Training Development Centre, charged to undertake a range of additional derived tasks. Among the key functions of such a centre could be:

(a) to coordinate nationally the work of race trainers, including holding seminars and conferences, publishing lists of trainers, disseminating information about current initiatives, etc.

(b) compiling and disseminating information about training techniques and strategies for trainers and organisations, so that a professional body of knowledge (incorporating the results of research) on race training can be developed.

(c) advising on monitoring and evaluation, so that trainers and organisations can obtain maximum benefit from race training programmes.

(d) encouraging new initiatives and an experimental attitude within race training work, so that knowledge of a range of possible approaches appropriate for different settings becomes available, and so that this body of knowledge is dynamic and reflects developing experience and changing social and organisational environments.

(e) to link professionals and activists interested in training, so that their different approaches to combating racism, and their different experiences can be more effectively communicated and coordinated.

(f) to promote appropriate and effective cross-professional training so that the work of different agencies operating in inner-city and other parts of the

pluralistic society can better understand and coordinate their approaches to racism through training initiatives.

(g) to develop and evaluate longer-term educational strategies for combating racism, probably in centres outside particular service-providing agencies themselves, which may be expected to limit themselves to training approaches with potential short-term effects.

In exploring further the potential for such a Centre, the past and present experience of a number of particular groups or agencies who have attempted to meet part of such a brief should be drawn on. These could include the Commission for Racial Equality; local and regional race training groups such as the Northern Race Training Unit; units dealing with particular professions or organisations (e.g. the National Institute for Social Work and the Local Government Training Board); the erstwhile Centre for the Study for Community and Race Relations at Brunel University (charged with pursuing a number of the above goals with the police service in particular); and the London-based Group for the Evaluation and Development of Anti-Racism Training (GEDART) which sought to address most of the above functions, but which became dormant having been unsuccessful in obtaining funding.

Building on this experience, and following the principles set out above, an institutional framework for training development could be developed which would be politically neutral, independent of particular types of agency or organisation, and drawing in consumer representatives/interests and the expertise/experience of practitioners from a variety of different professional or occupational settings. To maintain such neutrality and balance, multiple funding rather than one single funding source would be essential. This multi-professional approach would have the benefit of being able to give a wider policy focus to development work in particular agencies; and in addition, it could cross-fertilise ideas, and educate staff across a range of otherwise isolated agencies. Finally, such a Centre might draw in groups, e.g. black workers, who may not be attracted if the focus were on a single agency such as the police alone.

7. Conclusion

This paper has focussed on race training strategies aimed at changing organisational behaviour in public service agencies. The main aim of the paper has been to delineate five broad training approaches that appear to have characterised race training in Britain. The purpose of delineating these approaches has been to clarify the objectives, methods and internal coherence of each one individually, to enable greater clarity of comprehension by potential consumers of race training as well as by trainers themselves, and also to provide a typology of training approaches which can be used in systematic evaluation studies. In addition the paper has set out a number of tentative hypotheses about conditions of effectiveness of race training, and has added to these a series of proposals for moving race training forward in the immediate future.

Race training, it has been emphasised, is not a panacea for society's ills. Many agencies, however, have in practice treated it as such, by relying solely or primarily upon staff training as the means to ensure racial equality in service delivery. Such training sought to have impact on staff at the individual level, either through providing information or through challenging personal attitudes. Even where training did target actual behaviour, it commonly lacked organisational support. At best, such training often functioned as a 'token' response by the organisation to race equality issues. At worst, its poor and inappropriate quality has alienated staff, and sometimes heightened the very racial prejudice it was supposed to overcome. The quality of training

is always more important than its quantity, and nowhere is this more true than when dealing with staff training on the subject of 'race'.

To be effective, race training needs to be planned and executed at the organisational level: in the context of organisational development, and as part of a planned strategy to attain the organisation's specific race equality goals. It is essential to recognise not only the importance of training, but also the limited impact of training as such. The importance of training is that it is a key tool of management in the implementation of organisational policy: it is the means whereby that policy is communicated to staff and legitimated by them, and the means also whereby the necessary skills and confidence to translate the policy into practice can be acquired. The limitation of training from an organisational perspective, however, is that the impact on staff of any one training intervention is likely to be modest and short-lived. Race training therefore requires reinforcement, either by follow-up training, or at least by other forms of organisational support (e.g. in the form of leadership, supervision and sanctions - both positive and negative).

Given this organisational perspective on training, it is paradoxical that many of those agencies which initially responded with a training-led approach should in present, more financially astringent times see race training as dispensable, rather than as a crucial corporate activity in a period of organisational and environmental change. The effectiveness of training as a weapon in combating deep-seated structural inequalities must of itself be minimal, unless it is sustained and properly resourced and supported as an integral component of the service delivery strategy of the agency as a whole. Only in such circumstances is race training to be expected to play any significant contribution to the redress of those forms of discrimination and injustice it is designed to oppose.

Given present circumstances, and within the overall framework set out in the paper, we would identify two priority areas for particular attention by policy makers and others concerned with the development and deployment of race training. First, there is the need to promote maximum short-run effectiveness in using existing (or potentially existing) training resources along lines set out above. Secondly, there is the need to plan ways of using race-training more effectively in the longer run: by promoting evaluation and experimentation, through multi-disciplinary initiatives, through exploring longer-term educational strategy, and through establishing an independent race training development centre. Such future developments need to be conceived within the broader framework of social policy interventions, and with special priority attached to the needs of inner city areas.

In addressing organisational needs, however, the paper has largely excluded consideration of training strategies for enabling and empowering employees and those outside. This brings us back to the major question previously noted but not directly addressed within this paper, viz, the allocation of training (and other) resources as between black minorities and the organisations themselves. It has already been suggested that race training interventions will only be effective if black trainers are used, and if training can link into black practitioner experience. This already makes training initiatives dependent on some degree of effectiveness of equal opportunity programmes. Beyond this comment, we would repeat a point made earlier: viz, that the existence of most race-training programmes, and the jobs of the trainers themselves, have been products of the wider thrust of the black community against racism. Training is not the instigator of change - it generally is introduced in the aftermath of the challenge, and while it is capable of becoming a vehicle of change, it is capable also of being used towards the reestablishment of organisational control and the status quo. If race training is to be effective in combating racism, then of course it needs resources, but unless resources are made available to empower black people within and outside the organisation also, the potential of

training to effect or facilitate change is likely to be seriously weakened, if not lost.

Bibliography

- Alibhai Y (1988), "The Reality of Race Training", *New Society* 29 January 1988
- Bakhsh Q and Oakley R ed (1990), *Racism Awareness Training*, London Borough of Waltham Forest Race Equality Unit
- Broadwater Farm Inquiry (1986), *Report of the Independent Inquiry into Disturbances of October 1985 at the Broadwater Farm Estate*, Tottenham, London: Karia Press
- Brown C & Lawton J (forthcoming), *Training for Equality*, London: Policy Studies Institute
- Coard B (1971), *How the West Indian Child is Made ESN in the British School System*, London: New Beacon Books
- Coffey J (1987), "Race Training in the United States: an Overview" in Shaw et al (1987)
- Commission for Racial Equality (1987), *Training: the implementation of equal opportunities at work*, London: CRE
- Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (CIECEMG) (1981), *West Indian Children in our Schools*, London: HMSO
- Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (CIECEMG) (1986), *Education for All*, London: HMSO
- Cross M (1987), "Equality of Opportunity and Inequality of Outcome: the MSC, ethnic minorities and training policy", in Jenkins & Solomos (1987)
- Day H R (1983), "Race Relations Training in the US Military", in Landis D & Brislin R ed., *Handbook of Intercultural Training, Vol. II: Issues in Training Methodology*, New York: Pergamon Press
- Department of the Environment (DOE) (1984), *Local Authorities and Racial Disadvantage*, London: DOE
- Derrick J (1966), *Teaching English to Immigrants*, London: Longman
- Fitzgerald M (1986), *Section 71 of the Race Relations Act: a case-study*, London: Commission for Racial Equality
- Fitzherbert K (1967), *West Indian Children in London*, London: Bell
- Greater London Action for Racial Equality (GLARE) (1987), *A Fair Cop: Policing and Racial Equality*, London: GLARE
- Gordon P & Klug F (1986), *New Right, New Racism*, London: Searchlight
- Gurnah A (1984), "The Politics of Racism Awareness Training", *Critical Social Policy*, 11 (Winter 1984)
- Hall S (1980), "Teaching Race", *Multicultural Education*, Vol. 9, Part 1, pp.3-13
- Hiro D (1971), *Black British, White British*, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode
- Home Affairs Committee (1981), *Racial Disadvantage*, London: HMSO

- Hope R (1987), "The Defence Equal Opportunity Management Institute", in Shaw et al (1987)
- Jenkins R (1987), Equal Opportunity in the Private Sector: the limits of voluntarism", in Jenkins & Solomos (1987)
- Jenkins R & Solomos J ed (1987), Racism and Equal Opportunity Policies in the 1980s, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Katz J (1978), White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racism Trainers, Oklahoma University Press
- Katz J & Ivey A (1977), "White Awareness: the Frontier of Racism Awareness Training", Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol.55, No.8, pp.485-89
- Kent B (1965), "The Social Worker's Cultural Pattern as it Affects Casework with Immigrants", Social Work, Vol.22, No.4
- Lee G (1987), "Training and Organisational Change: the target racism", in Jenkins & Solomos ed (1987)
- London Strategic Policy Unit (LSPU) (1987), Racism Awareness Training, London: LSPU
- Miles R (1982), Racism and Migrant Labour, London: Routledge
- Morrish I (1968), The Background of Immigrant Children, London: Unwin
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission) (1968), Report, New York: Bantam
- Nordlie P G (1987), "The Evolution of Race Relations Training in the US Army", in Shaw et al (1987)
- Oakley R (1968), New Backgrounds: the immigrant child at home and at school, London: Oxford University Press
- Oakley R (1988), Employment in Police Forces: a survey of equal opportunities, London: Commission for Racial Equality
- Oakley R (1989), "Community and Race Relations Training for the Police: a review of developments", New Community, Vol.16, No.1, pp.61-79
- Ouseley H (1981), The System, London: Runnymede Trust
- Palmer F ed (1986), Anti-Racism: an Assault on Education and Value, London: Sherwood Press
- Peppard N (1980), "Towards Effective Race Relations Training", New Community, Vol.8, No.2, pp.99-106
- Peppard N (1984), "Race Relations Training: the Patrick Experiment", New Community, Vol.9, No.3, pp.312-316
- Police Training Council (PTC) (1983), Community and Race Relations Training for the Police, London: Home Office
- Rogers C R (1973), Encounter Groups, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Rose E J B (1969), Colour and Citizenship, London: Oxford University Press

Scarman L (1981), *The Brixton Disorders, 10-12 April 1981*, London: HMSO

Schon D (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, London: Temple Smith

Shaw J et al (1987), *Strategies for Improving Race Relations: the Anglo-American Experience*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Sivanandan A (1985), "RAT and the Degradation of the Black Struggle", *Race and Class*, Vol.26, No.4, pp.1-33

Southgate P (1984), *Racism Awareness Training for the Police*, London: Home Office

Stenhouse L et al (1984), *Teaching about Race Relations*, London: Routledge

Stone M (1981), *The Education of the Black Child in Britain*, London: Fontana

Tonkin B (1987), "State of the Art", *Community Care* 12 March 1987

Young K & Connelly N, *Policy and Practice in the Multi-Racial City*, London: Policy Studies Institute

Ideal-typical Models of Training Approaches for Combating Racism

	Race Information Educational	Racism Awareness	Race Equality	Anti-Racism
PREMISE	Most whites are fair but proscribes Racism is endemic in the unaware of discrimination; inform them, and they will people must be taught help eradicate it. how to combat it	Most whites are fair but Racism is endemic in the culture/institutions: racism & must be made aware of their racism; only education can lead it is a white problem to permanent change	All white people are Racism is a historical legacy in WASP culture: aware of their racism; professionals should only education can lead it is a white problem uphold spirit/letter to permanent change	The law Racism is a historical legacy in WASP culture: professionals should uphold spirit/letter
METHOD	Didactic: expert gives lectures collaborative awareness exercises reflection	Confrontational/didactic role-play and self-discussions, personal awareness exercises action exercises	Confrontational, using Collaborative; group missionary; lectures, within planning exercises	Salespersonship/ within frame: awareness and reflection
LEVEL	Cognitive; personal/Affective/behavioural organisational personal/organisational and skill	Affective; personal; Cognitive/affective; strongly normative personal/organisational - both norm & skill	Cognitive/behavioural; Cognitive/affective; organisational; norm	(no norm or skill)
LOCATION	Classroom Classroom/seminals/work-support campaigns	Classroom	Conferences/seminars; Classroom/workplace/place/wider campaigns	private reflection
LAW/POLICY	Included in inform-emphasis/frames ation content	Incorporated, but do to individuals	Not integral; left No special place training approach	Strong not frame approach
CURRICULUM	Special slots; may be slots; with Integrated; might include isolated or integrated integration special slots also	Special slots; no integration	Special slots; no integration	Special or without
EFFECTS	May inform, but not (difficult to isolate change (though may heighten) disposition program) with environment?	Disabling or Slow since aims at long-crusading paper; behavioural effect questionable	Delivers policy on training often integral	
CONDITIONS	Only as initial stage Committed organisation of broader strategy; & support, + environmental otherwise may have receptivity to change negative/token effect	Committed persons Long-term commitment capable of self-disclosure pressures	Organisations with legal & consumer commitment to organisational change	with strong
EXAMPLES	Much 1970s provision some LAs Schools Council Project, client groups,	RAPU; variety of CRE, early GLC CSCRR (Brunel Univ.)		GLC,

incl. GLC/police

* Significantly, a replacement training support centre for the police was established late in 1989 with an ex-staff member of EOMI as Director, and an organisation-oriented approach modelled directly on that used in the American military (see above).