Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1987

Beyond Multiculturalism: towards the enactment of anti-racist education in policy, provision and pedagogy [1]

BARRY TROYNA

ABSTRACT *The various ways in which 'racial forms of education' have been conceptualised by policymakers and educationists is presented as a backcloth to a critique of multicultural education (MCE) and its concern with deracialised modes of analysis and strategies. This is followed by a consideration of antiracist education (ARE) and the ways in which research might assist policymakers in the enactment of non-racist criteria in various educational settings.*

RACIAL FORMS OF EDUCATION: SOME CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

There is now a growing body of literature dealing with the ways in which social scientists and others have interpreted the relationship between the UK educational system and black students [2] and how these have been translated into substantive policy statements and provision. Some of this literature has been confined to historical narrative, showing how policy approaches have altered since the presence of black students in UK schools first began to impact on policy-making in the 1960s (Tomlinson, 1983). Others, however, have been concerned with summarising these changes in conceptual terms. At the risk of over-simplification, there would seem to be three dominant conceptual frameworks available for this purpose. In this opening section I want to provide a brief résumé of these approaches. I want then to outline the nature of the current and prevailing 'racial forms of education', to use Chris Mullard's phrase (1984); namely, multicultural and antiracist education. Here I will argue strongly that these are irreconcilable conceptions of educational change. Finally, I want to suggest ways in which the principles of antiracist education might be enacted in a range of educational settings in the UK.

The first of the conceptual frameworks which I want to discuss has been associated particularly with the work of Rosalind Street-Porter (1978), Eric Bolton (1979), Mullard (1982) and Troyna (1982). Essentially, the analytical tools which they use are drawn from the sociology of race relations and specify ideological and policy approaches in terms of assimilation, integration, cultural pluralism and, most recently, antiracism. These phases are periodised from the mid-1960s through to the 1980s, although they are not intended to imply a neat and regular progression. Nor are they intended to denote practices on the 'chalk face'. Rather, their intention is to characterise prevailing ideologies as they are reflected in official rhetoric and policy on education at the level of the local and national state. Each ideological concept embodies a specific 'racial form of education'. As Mullard suggests, the assimilation,

integration and cultural pluralism phases were dominated and exemplified by 'immigrant', 'multiracial' and 'multicultural' forms of education respectively (1984, p. 14). Most significantly, as both Mullard and I have argued, the move towards multicultural definitions of education did not entail any significant departure from the assumptions and principles which underpinned assimilationist conceptions. That is to say, although representing a more liberal variant of the assimilationist model, multicultural education continued to draw its inspiration and rationale from white, middle-class professional understandings of how the educational system might best respond to the perceived 'needs' and 'interests' of black students and their parents. Thus, whichever of these paradigms was in the ascendancy, the power relationship between black and white citizens remained unchallenged. The focus of concern was cultural differences and the extent to which these were regarded as inhibiting the educational careers and experiences of black students. Notably absent from the policy approaches which these paradigms gave rise to was a consideration of the impact of racism on black students' differential access to, experiences in and rewards from the educational system [3].

A second analytical approach to this issue was developed by David Kirp in his controversial book *Doing Good by Doing Little* (1979). Kirp dichotomised ideological and policy responses into 'racially inexplicit' and 'racially explicit' formulations. These terms comprised both descriptive and evaluative elements. To begin with, he characterised the approach in the UK as 'racially inexplicit' to distinguish it from policy formulations in the USA where, since 1954, 'race' had been a salient feature of the educational policy agenda [4]. Since then, Kirp argued, racial inequality has constituted a fulcrum around which policy interventions in the USA have operated. He noted that this contrasted sharply with the way in which policies had been oriented in the UK. Writing in 1979, Kirp suggested that with the conspicuous exception of policies relating to the dispersal of black students in some LEAs, race-related issues had not figured explicitly as policy concerns. Instead, their significance had been diffused through a range of 'racially inexplicit' categories such as language provision, educational disadvantage, cultural deprivation and cultural adjustment. It was within these broadly conceived categories that policymakers had decided to tackle the problems associated with black students. At a substantive level, Kirp's account could not be faulted. What gave cause for concern was his evaluation of the approach adopted by UK policymakers. For him, this deliberately inadvertent strategy could be regarded as 'doing good by stealth'. He insisted that such an approach had much to commend it because it did not contravene the principles of universalism and individualism which underpin social policy in the UK. What is more, by embedding race-related issues within this broader framework for intervention, policymakers pre-empted the possibility of a 'white backlash'. As he put it "... one helps non-whites by *not* favouring them explicitly. The benefits to minorities from such an approach are thought to be real if invisible—or better, real because invisible" (1979 p. 51, original emphasis). Kirp's commitment to the ideology of doing good by doing little has been criticised for its failure to recognise how 'inexplicitness', by its very nature, precludes any engagement with the impact of racism on black students' experiences.

After all, it presumes that existing categories which define modes of policy intervention are capable of capturing and dealing with the full range of disadvantages experienced by young blacks. This is a facile and sanguine interpretation of issues which denies the significance of racism on the lives and opportunities of these youngsters. The fundamental weakness of Kirp's appraisal is that it fails to conceive the education system as a site in which the reproduction of racism is confirmed and

achieved. As such it does not engage with the most obvious of the demands expressed by black groups in the UK; that policymakers develop approaches and forms of provision which acknowledge and tackle racism and the practices which stem from it. To characterise this 'inexplicit' approach as 'good' is to disregard the voice of the black communities and help legitimate an educational system which contributes to their continued oppression and enforced inequality.

The third approach to understanding policy formation was developed in *Racism, Education and the State* (1986) which Jenny Williams and I wrote. It emerged from our reservations about the explanatory power of existing conceptual tools of analysis. Without discarding the assimilation, integration, cultural pluralism framework, we suggested that the development of ideological and policy approaches might best be understood with reference to the deracialisation/racialisation process. Here we drew heavily on Frank Reeves' (1983) definition of these concepts and their application to British racial discourse. We argued that those policies which embraced assimilation, integration or cultural pluralism as their paradigm were classic exemplars of deracialised discourse. By this we meant that policymakers who had framed their policies along these lines had deliberately eschewed overt reference to racial descriptions, evaluations and prescriptions in preference to apparently more legitimate educational imperatives. Thus, we argued that:

> ... the processes of resocialisation, language tuition and correction and dispersal could be argued for on the seemingly 'good' educational grounds that the culture, language and spatial concentration of black students not only impeded their educational advancement but also had the potential to affect negatively the educational progress of their white classmates. (1986,p. 13)

Following on from this we suggested that policy formulations—whether embedded in the ideological framework of assimilation, integration or cultural pluralism—were premised on the assumption that the priority was the *management* of problems thrown up by the presence of black students rather than the mitigation of problems which they encountered precisely because they were black citizens living in a racist society. Thus, the package of reforms introduced in the 1970s concentrated on trying to ensure that the schooling experiences of black students were made more palatable. They were geared towards a representation of their (presumed) life styles in curriculum design and teaching aids. What they ignored were the formal and informal racist processes which constrained the educational opportunities available to these students. This, we concluded, was discrimination by proxy.

We contrasted these deracialised forms of discourse and intervention with the (benign) racialisation of educational policy and debate. Again, following Reeves, we suggested that there were certain contexts where explicit use was made of racial evaluations and categorisations and that these contexts might be benign or malevolent. For example, ethnic record keeping in education would be designated as 'malevolent' if used by the National Front for avowedly racist aims, or 'benign' if used, say, by the Commission for Racial Equality for explicitly antiracist intentions.

We contended that the current trend towards the publication of antiracist education policies at local education authority (LEA) level represented a *benign* form of racialisation in that they reflected a growing awareness of and indignation at racial injustice. In consequence then: "Racial evaluation and prescription is directed at refuting racism and eliminating racialist practices" (Reeves, 1983 p. 175). For Jenny Williams and me, the deracialisation/racialisation framework provided the most

appropriate lens through which to observe and interpret the changing nature and focus of LEAs' ideological and policy positions on race-related matters.

Since we completed the book (in July 1985) the racialisation of educational policy seems to have accelerated. Indeed, when confronted with many of the recent advertisements in the national and specialist press the ubiquitous visitor from Mars might well conclude that the overwhelming majority of policies and practices of local authorities and their education departments have been racialised in a benign form. The publication of LEA policy statements which centralise concepts such as 'racism', 'equality', 'rights' and 'justice', the range and nature of newly created posts associated with policy initiatives in Authorities such as Berkshire, Brent, Haringey, the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) and Manchester, and the apparent increased participation of black professionals and non-professionals in the determination and allocation of service provision imply that antiracist conceptions of educational reform constitute the prevailing orthodoxy at the level of the local state. The visitor from Mars might also be tempted to infer a parallel development at the level of the national state from the tenor of the Swann Committee's report, *Education for All* (1985), and the speech presented to the HMI Hospitality Conference in March 1986 by the then Minister of State for Education, Chris Patten. In the former, Lord Swann and his colleagues drew attention to the 'insidious evil' of racism, outlined how its persistence contributed to the '*mis*-education' of students and recommended that all LEAs declare a commitment "to countering the influence of racism" (1985, p. 770). Although slightly more circumspect in his endorsement of antiracist teaching, Chris Patten drew attention to the value of explicit interventions along these lines to combat the influence of fascist organisations in both urban and rural settings. As he put it:

> Some pupils as a result of a variety of influences seem to develop negative attitudes towards other ethnic groups... A discussion focussing directly on race relations may be particularly desirable if... schools have been the subject of leafleting by extremist organisations whose sole deplorable aim would appear to be the undermining of good race relations. (1986)

Of course, none of these developments should be construed as exemplary of a consensus around the racialisation of educational discourse and policy. The populist appeal which Honeyford (in Bradford) and Savery (in Bristol) attracted in their opposition to this trend alongside the critiques mounted from the right (Flew, 1984; Joseph, 1986; Palmer, 1987) and liberal (Craft, 1986; Jeffcoate, 1984) wings of the educational community provide a salutary reminder of the struggle in which antiracist educationists are engaged.

Nonetheless, the scenario I have sketched above would suggest that the main imperative for educational policymakers in the mid-1980s is to develop practices which focus on the racist underpinnings and operation of white dominated institutions (LEAs, colleges, schools) rather than ethnic minority cultures and lifestyles, and which aim to remove those obstacles which impede the educational advancement of black students.

Whilst this is undoubtedly the rationale underlying the policy orientation of certain LEAs it remains, nevertheless, a muted response. For the overwhelming majority of LEAs which have eschewed 'racially inexplicit' approaches in favour of multicultural education, the context continues to be 'them' rather than 'us'. In short, they persist with a deracialised set of imperatives informed more by cultural pluralism than

antiracism. In the following section I want to consider more fully the relationship between multicultural and antiracist forms of education.

MULTICULTURAL AND ANTIRACIST APPROACHES IN EDUCATION

It is important to emphasise that both multicultural education (MCE) and antiracist education (ARE) are diffuse conceptions of educational reform and it would therefore be misleading to depict either formulation as embracing a single trajectory or motivating force. Indeed, writers such as James Banks (1986) and Brian Bullivant (1986) insist that MCE subsumes within its concerns a consideration of those issues which are prioritised by the ARE perspective. At the same time, multiculturalists such as Robert Jeffcoate (1984) and Maurice Craft (1986) distance themselves emphatically from ARE and the political ideology which underpins it.

Despite the efforts of Banks, and others, to generate an inclusive definition of MCE which takes on board some of the concerns of ARE, it is my contention that the two perspectives are irreconcilable. They imply a different view of the nature and processes of racism which, in turn, prompts the development of different frameworks within which specific priorities for action are embedded. Of course, it is true that some LEAs have racialised their educational policies in so far as racism is now acknowledged as a constituent of the barriers which impede systematically black advancement. Similarly, as I mentioned earlier, the Swann Committee noted the insidious influence of racism in educational settings. The difference, however, lies in the way racism is conceived within MCE and ARE perspectives. In the former, racism is understood primarily as the product of ignorance and perpetuated by negative attitudes and individual prejudices. A critical reading of the Swann Committee's chapter on racism illustrates this point clearly (Carter & Williams, 1987; Troyna 1986). Those favouring ARE, on the other hand, whilst accepting the persistence of stereotypes and prejudices, demand that a thorough analysis of their origins must derive from an interrogation of the social and political structure. These fundamentally different conceptions of racism and the strategies which they give rise to have been dealt with in Mullard's recent work (1984). He characterises MCE as *microscopic* in that its advocates tend to focus narrowly and intently on issues relating to culture. They are concerned with formulating policies to eradicate ignorance of other cultures, undermine the prejudice and discrimination which stems from ignorance, and develop greater understanding and tolerance of members of minority ethnic and cultural groups. The site of change is the school: the nature of change concerns the removal of ethnocentric material from the curriculum and teaching materials and their replacement by more culturally sensitive and appropriate educational aids and stimuli. Most recently, pedagogical considerations have been identified as important to the MCE model and the 'prejudice reduction' movement (King, 1986; Lynch, 1987).

In contrast, ARE had been defined by Mullard as *periscopic*; that is to say it deliberately seeks to make "a connection between *institutional* discriminations and inequalities of race, class and gender" (Mullard, 1984, p. 37, emphasis added). Here it is possible to see a link between Mullard's depiction of ARE and Stuart Hall's prescriptions for teaching 'race' which he outlined in his article for *Multiracial Education* in 1980. Both imply that ARE is intended to probe the manner in which racism rationalises and helps perpetuate injustice and the differential power accorded to groups in society. Both also suggest that for the aims of ARE to be realised the issues of 'race' and racism cannot be abstracted from the broader political, historical

and social processes of society which have institutionalised unequal power. In specific terms, this calls for the development of general theories of oppression and inequality within which the specificity of racism is not obscured. What is more, it implies the forging of alliances between groups both within and beyond the school gates and the identification of school staff and students as responsible for combatting manifest forms of racial, class and gender inequalities. In sum, then, and going further than Mullard, I would suggest that MCE focuses mainly on individual conversion. Moreover, when multiculturalists do take on board the notion of institutional racism, they propose reforms in cultural pluralist terms. ARE, on the other hand, prioritises collective action and conceives strategies for change in explicitly political terms which lead to challenges of existing power relations. However, before elaborating on the ARE agenda for reforms, I want to spend some time engaging critically with MCE. This is important if we are to prepare the ground for the legitimation of ARE.

THE CENTRAL TENETS OF MCE

Despite the gradual move towards ARE, the MCE movement both in the UK and elsewhere has been remarkably resistant to change, except for the occasional genuflection towards racism as an issue to consider. Its central tenets also remain impervious to criticism, perhaps because they appeal to liberal commonsense notions. However, as Stuart Hall has pointed out, the role of social science is to "deconstruct the obvious" (1980, p. 6). This is my goal in this section.

Despite the various inflections of MCE I would suggest that from the following statements (selected from a range of influential sources), it is possible to distil the main tenets of MCE. I want to analyse critically their status in order to demonstrate the impoverished nature of the MCE argument.

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

> For the curriculum to have meaning and relevance for all pupils now in our schools, its content, emphasis and the values and assumptions contained must reflect the wide range of cultures, histories and lifestyles in our multiracial society. (Home Office, 1978, p. 6)

> ... the curriculum in all schools should reflect the fact that Britain is both multiracial and culturally diverse ... the intention of multicultural education is simply to provide all children with a balanced education which reflects the nature of our society. ('Rampton' Report; DES, 1981, p. 27)

> Education for diversity and for social and racial harmony suggests that the richness of cultural variety in Britain, let alone over the world, should be appreciated and utilised in education curricula for all students in widening cultural awareness and in developing sensitivity towards the cultural identity and practices of various groups. (CNAA, 1985, p. 1)

> Cultures should be empathetically described in their own terms and not judged against some notion of 'ethnocentric' or 'Euro-centric' culture. (Schools Council cited in DES, 1985, p. 329)

It seems to me that the essence of these statements crystallises around four central (and admittedly seductive) propositions. In each of the passages they are presented as

unproblematic; however, like the oft-repeated phrase "multicultural education is synonymous with good practices in education" (Duncan, 1986, p. 39), their common-sense appeal conceals their tenuous status in political, theoretical and philosophical contexts. They are:

(1) Britain is a multicultural society;
(2) the curriculum should reflect that substantive fact;
(3) learning about other cultures will benefit all students;
(4) cultural relativism is a desirable and tenable position.

Let us take each of these in turn. The first would seem to be uncontentious. However, at least one writer has questioned the legitimacy of the epithet 'multicultural' in the UK context. Brian Bullivant (1986) has suggested that the assertion demands empirical scrutiny. In his view, distinctive minority cultural groups comprise around 4% of the UK population, tend to originate from three parts of the world (Africa, Asia, the Caribbean) and include a substantial number born and brought up in Britain. For Bullivant, then, the term *tricultural* might be a more accurate description (1986, p. 38). The validity or otherwise of this argument does not concern me here. The point I want to stress is that it is a plausible corrective to the taken-for-granted and most basic premise of MCE. Similar reservations might be expressed about the second proposition. After all, whether or not the school curriculum should reflect cultural diversity is an open question. What we tend to find, however, is a clear example of the philosophical device known as the naturalistic fallacy: that is, deriving an 'ought' from an 'is'. The proposition, in other words, needs to be argued cogently rather than asserted.

The claim that learning about other cultures will benefit all students is also open to question. It is based on two assertions. First, that black students will benefit academically from learning about their own ethnic and cultural lifestyles. This was encapsulated in one school policy on MCE which insisted: 'Multicultural education is a whole curriculum which also involves an attitude to life. It aims to promote a positive self-image and respect for the attitudes and values of others. Such an education will improve academic attainment' (Birley High School, 1980, p. 2). Following the same line of argument, the 'Rampton' report presumed that increased knowledge of their ethnic and cultural origins would help black students achieve equality of opportunity in the search for jobs (see Troyna, 1984, for discussion). Quite clearly, this formulation conflates the presentation of life-styles with the enhancement of life chances and, in the process, obscures the determining impact of racism on the school and post-school experiences and opportunities of black students. To suggest that MCE (as presented in this third proposition) has emancipatory properties which might overcome the debilitating effects of racism in education and occupational contexts is misleading and empirically spurious (Troyna & Smith, 1983; Eggleston *et al.*, 1986).

But what impact might learning about other cultures have on the perceptions and attitudes of white students? Again, the conventional wisdom would lead us to believe that 'prejudice reduction' would be a logical and inevitable outcome. However, Amir's (1969) review of literature on the theme of 'contact hypothesis in ethnic relations' demonstrates the wishful thinking nature of this proposition. Indeed, as Connor has pointed out, increased knowledge of other groups might in fact enhance feelings of 'differentness' and reinforce identification with one's own group. As Connor indicates: 'Minimally, it may be asserted that increasing awareness of a second group is not

certain to promote harmony and is at least likely to produce, on balance, a negative response' (Connor, 1972, p. 344). This is an especially important caveat given the priority accorded this tenet in the canons of MCE.

Finally, we come to the recommendation that cultures should be empathetically treated in their own terms, a position which the Swann committee advocated strongly, as Steve Harrison has noted (1986, pp. 184–185). Taken to its logical extreme, of course, it implies that 'everything and anything goes' provided it has been legitimated in one or more cultural contexts. More likely, however, it presumes the existence of what James Lynch terms 'rational universals' so that any practices at variance with these criteria would be proscribed (1983). But this does not greatly assist the teacher wishing to debate, say, the position of women in certain fundamentalist Muslim societies. Indeed, to debate this issue might, in itself, mean a contravention of Islamic principles. This principle also raises the critical issue of the appropriateness of relativist interpretations. Caroline Ramazanoglu sums up the dilemma in the following passage:

> There is great difficulty in steering interpretations of these arguments between the Scylla of cultural relativism (Muslim women cannot be judged to be oppressed when they are simply celebrating the Muslim way of life—the Western concept of autonomy is irrelevant to their culture) and the Charybdis of positive truth (we know Muslim women are oppressed, even if they do not, because we possess universal criteria of oppression, external to Islam, which identify veiling, the celebration of motherhood and cliterodectomy as oppressive) (1986, p. 259).

This determination to represent cultures empathetically could also lead to an emphasis on broadly sketched caricatures and a corresponding neglect of more individual impulses for change. In other words, there is a danger of lapsing into reductionism along the lines of those drawn by Philip Walkling & Chris Brannigan in their discussion of Muslim girls in the UK education system. Briefly, Walkling & Brannigan juxtaposed the 'transformative' nature of state schools with the 'transmissionist' imperatives of Muslim culture and schools and suggested that this represented a clash between the goals of antisexist education (emancipating women from their oppression) and ARE (complying with the demands of minority communities) (1986). In our response, Bruce Carrington and I have criticised Walkling & Brannigan for their tendency to reproduce cultural stereotypes and their neglect of young Asian women's involvement in the determination of their destinies (Troyna & Carrington, 1987) [5].

I have argued that each of the central tenets of MCE is erected on dubious political, theoretical or philosophical foundations. Despite evidence to the contrary, however, they continue to assume importance in the justification for MCE models of reform. The need for antiracists to challenge the veracity of the multicultural/cultural pluralist paradigm should be self-evident. Its continued adoption, after all, forecloses the possibility of advancing and legitimating antiracist forms of educational, social and political change and provides the rationale for the continuing pre-eminence of what Mullard defines as 'ethnicism' in contemporary debates and policy. The resulting trajectory of policy initiatives and related forms of action has been identified by Mullard in a recent paper:

> As the cultural representation of the ideological form of racism, ethnicism then constitutes a set of representations of *ethnic* differences, peculiarities, cultural biographies, histories and practices, which are used to justify specific

> courses of action that possess the effect of institutionalising ethnic/cultural differences. In doing this ethnicist policies and practices also tend to obfuscate the common experiences, histories and social political conditions of black and (ethnic) minority groups and hence the degree of communality of experience that might exist between these and certain white class groups in society. (1986, p. 11, original emphasis)

However, the retention of MCE as a viable and prevalent paradigm in educational policy and debate draws our attention to the failure of social scientists to engage directly and critically with its presumptions and pretentions. This is a point which Geneva Gay addressed when she noted the failure of social scientists and educationists "to produce hard evidence of its efficacy" (1983, p. 563).

But similar criticisms might be directed towards ARE perspectives and modes of practice. Commentators such as Banks, though broadly sympathetic to ARE, insist that its proponents are "vague and ambitious when they propose strategies for school reform" (1986, p. 224). Jenny Williams and I were also critical of the lack of specificity in the ARE perspectives and suggested a number of reasons for this which I will deal with briefly here. First, policymakers tended to operate with an inadequate grasp of the nature of racism and institutional racism, especially as these operate within educational settings. For instance, institutional racism, we argued, tended to be defined by its consequences so that the phrase became a catch-all formulation for almost all the inadequacies within school which touched on the lives of black students. We insisted that this reductionist approach was over-simplistic and generated an impoverished analysis of the school's role in the reproduction of inequalities. Secondly, we pointed to the absence of a coherent, overarching framework within which policymakers might encourage teachers to operate a locally consistent strategy to combat racial, gender and class inequalities. Thirdly, we suggested that policymakers were reluctant to confront directly the allocative and selective function of schooling and were concerned with the more limited aim of ensuring a more equitable distribution of students throughout the school hierarchy, based on racial, gender or class origins. Finally, we noted that policymakers were hesitant in declaring their support for forms of political education which might expedite a clearer understanding of the ways in which racism was reproduced in local and national contexts (1986, pp. 95–109). These criticisms should not be taken to mean that supporters of ARE have not pinpointed specific strategies. Amongst others, Madan Sarup (1986) and Mullard (1984) have indicated some of the ways in which their own particular definitions of ARE might be translated into action. This is not the place to comment directly on their proposals. Instead, I want to conclude by pointing to two major and recurrent omissions from the ARE agenda, as formulated by academics, practitioners, community activists and policymakers, to provide justification for their enactment and give some initial cues as to how this might be achieved.

ARE: SOME POSSIBLE WAYS FORWARD

The progressive development of racial forms of education from immigrant to antiracist education has been accompanied by a growing awareness of the need to implicate all educational institutions in these changes. This, of course, constituted the essential theme of the Swann Committee's final report and informed the principle of 'Education for All' which it commended to the Secretary of State for Education in March 1985. It

also forms the leitmotif of most LEA policy documents. Despite this, empirical surveys continue to highlight the reluctance of schools with few black students to engage in changes, other than in the most perfunctory manner (Troyna & Ball, 1985). Perhaps one of the reasons is that policymakers and educationists, in general, simply have not given enough thought or emphasis to how the principles of ARE might be implemented in these settings [6]. My current research in the F.E. sector, for instance, has revealed how, despite their impressive policy commitments, the Further Education Unit (FEU), Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE), when provided with the opportunity to exemplify their philosophy in practice fail to do so. This criticism must also be directed at Godfrey Brandt and his book, *The Realisation of Antiracist Teaching* (1986). There, after a formal and elaborated construction of antiracist principles and pedagogy we find that his observations and comments on antiracist teaching are drawn exclusively from ethnically mixed schools. His insistence that he "specifically attempted to find 'ordinary' teachers in 'ordinary' schools" (1986, p. 148) is discrepant with the fact that the "majority of Britain's population does not live in inner cities, nor is it in regular contact with non-white people" (Taylor, 1984–5, p. 1).

Following on from my earlier argument, I want to suggest that the strategy of intervention in these (and other) settings might be constructed around forms of political education. It is a strategy which takes as its starting point the view that racism constitutes one of the ways in which an individual might account for the way things are. It may provide a readily intelligible and plausible explanation for her/his view of the world. For instance, Raymond Cochrane & Michael Billig found in their interviews with white working-class school students in the West Midlands that they conceived of their limited life chances in terms of (unfair) racial competition (1984). Another example might be Honeyford's explanation of the rise of heroin use in Britain in terms of increased contact with Pakistan (1984; see Foster-Carter, 1987, for further discussion). In each case 'social reality' is perceived and interpreted through a racial frame of reference. If these conceptions of reality are to be challenged effectively then it is essential to provide superior and more plausible explanations of these phenomena. This cannot be done if the issues of 'race' and ethnic relations are considered in isolation; rather, they need to be seen and considered as pertinent aspects of the social structure along with, say, class and gender. This demands a more broadly based approach, the rejection of pre-packaged 'teaching about race relations' materials and the generation of key concepts around which teaching sessions might be based. The aim is to ensure that students not only recognise the specific nature of racial inequality but the nature of the inequalities they themselves experience and share with black people as girls, students, young people or as members of the working-class. It is an approach which identifies empathy with rather than sympathy for the oppression of black people as a goal. Further, it concedes that informed collective action constitutes the most effective challenge to racism. The intention, then, is to replace divisions and scapegoating with alliances. Research into this mode of intervention might facilitate the development of models which build upon the principles of ARE.

Another major omission in the formulation of ARE regards the issue of pedagogy. Here I agree with Chris Richards that "pedagogy is a priority and not an issue to be tackled only after getting a definition of anti-racism..." (1986, p. 74). However, pedagogical considerations rarely appear on policy statements (either at LEA or individual school/college level). Indeed, its significance is belittled to the extent that its continued absence from policy agenda is not even commented upon by those who

have claimed to scrutinise critically policy statements. (See Dorn, 1983; Mullard *et al.*, 1983). But as Gordon Allport noted more than 30 years ago:

> If segregation of the sexes or races prevails if authoritarianism and hierarchy dominate the system, the child cannot help but learn that power and status are the dominant factors in human relationships. If, on the other hand, the school system is democratic, if the teacher and child are each respected units, the lesson of respect for the person will easily register. As in society at large, the *structure* of the pedagogical system will blanket and may negate the specific intercultural lessons taught. (1954, p. 511, original emphasis)

More recently, Patricia White has picked up this point and emphasised the need for congruence between the formal and hidden curriculum in the pursuit of social justice, participatory democracy and egalitarian values:

> Guidelines for teaching and the organisational structure of the school are equally necessary, not least since the child acquires a considerable amount of her political knowledge in an informal way through her membership of the educational institution. It would be foolish to have carefully worked out content guidelines whilst leaving teaching procedures and particularly the structure of the school unregulated. (1983, pp. 84–5)

If an explicit goal of ARE is to challenge the practices and history which support racial injusticies and unequal power and, at the same time, to contribute to the development of collective action then didactic approaches in the classroom, the reliance on teacher exposition, the stress on individualism and support for an achievement-oriented ethos all need to be replaced by forms of co-operative learning within a non-competitive environment. In short, the move towards ARE needs to be accompanied closely by greater emphasis on student-centred learning. Naturally, the nature of relationships within student-centred learning contexts, the degree of autonomy accorded students and the impact of these approaches on institutional change need to be examined empirically in a range of educational contexts, if we are to avoid replacing one set of untenable propositions with another.

It should now be clear that ARE, unlike its competing ideology, MCE, constitutes a radical exemplar of political education for it demands a critical examination of those explanations and practices which misinform and oppress people. What is more, it calls for collaboration and co-operation in the process of examination; it also demands greater recognition of students' rights. All of this is likely to threaten established modes of behaviour and relationships within educational institutions. As Francis Dunlop points out, the introduction of more democratic forms of organisation into the educational context must presage a range of challenges to the cultural tasks of education: "... the passing on predominantly by example of values, unformalised skills, appreciations, ways of behaving and so on..." (1979, p. 53). The logical enactment of ARE principles cannot and should not circumvent these matters.

NOTES

[1] This article was prepared originally for the conference, *Third World Perspectives and Social Policy in Contemporary Britain* which was organised in December 1986 by the ESRC International Affairs Committee. A revised version was presented at a seminar at the Centre for Race and Ethnic Studies at the University of Amsterdam in March 1987. I am grateful to participants at both

venues and Bruce Carrington, Richard Hatcher and Jenny Williams for their constructive comments on the earlier versions.

[2] By 'black' I am referring to people of Afro-Caribbean and South Asian origin.

[3] The concept of 'culture', as it has appeared in the debate on multicultural education, has generally focused on life styles. That is to say, multiculturalists have tended to concentrate on the expressive and historical features said to represent particular cultural groups. Translated into imperatives for curriculum reform this has often resulted in the pre-eminence of what I have termed the Three S's Approach: Saris, Samosas and Steel Bands (Troyna, 1983; Troyna & Williams, 1986). More elaborate critiques of this use of the term culture in the debate have been provided by Bullivant (1981) and Burtonwood (1986).

[4] This was the year when the US Supreme Court ruled that segregated education was unconstitutional and in violation of the fourteenth amendment.

[5] Walking & Brannigan do not agree with our criticism and have replied to us in the same issue of the *Journal of Moral Education*, 16(1), 1987.

[6] Jenny Williams and I were also guilty of this as we admitted in the conclusion to *Racism, Education and the State*: "Our approach, even in skeletal form, leaves a number of questions unresolved not least the fact that it is not immediately appropriate for those students in all-white schools or areas" (1986, p. 123).

REFERENCES

ALLPORT, G. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice* (London, Addison-Wesley).

AMIR, Y. (1969) Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations, *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, pp. 319–42.

BANKS, J. (1986) Multicultural education and its critics: Britain and the United States, in: S. MODGIL *et al.* (Eds) *Multicultural Education: the interminable debate*, pp. 221–31 (Lewes, Falmer Press).

BIRLEY HIGH SCHOOL (1980) *Multicultural Education in the 1980s* (Manchester, Manchester Education Committee).

BOLTON, E. (1979) Education in a multiracial society, *Trends in Education*, 4, Winter, pp. 3–7.

BRANDT, G. (1986) *The Realization of Anti-Racist Teaching* (Lewes, Falmer Press).

BULLIVANT, B. (1986) Towards radical multiculturalism: resolving tensions in curriculum and educational planning, in: S. MODGIL *et al.* (Eds), op cit, pp. 33–48.

BURTONWOOD, N. (1986) *The Culture Concept in Educational Studies* (Slough, NFER-Nelson).

CARTER, B. & WILLIAMS, J. (1987) Attacking racism in education, in: B. TROYNA (Ed.) *Racial Inequality in Education*, pp. 170–83 (London, Tavistock).

CNAA (1985) *Notes on Multicultural Education and the Preparation and Inservice Development of Teachers* (London, CNAA).

COCHRANE, R. & BILLIG, M. (1984) I'm not National Front myself, but..., *New Society*, 17 May, pp. 255–58.

CONNOR, W. (1972) Nation-building or nation-destroying? *World Politics: a quarterly journal of international relations*, 24, pp. 319–55.

CRAFT, M. (1984) Education for diversity, in: M. CRAFT (Ed.) *Education and Cultural Pluralism*, pp. 5–25 (Lewes, Falmer Press).

CRAFT, M. (1986) Multicultural education in the United Kingdom, in: J. BANKS & J.

LYNCH (Eds) *Multicultural Education in Western Societies,* pp. 76–97 (London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston).

DES (1977) *Education in Schools: a consultative document,* Cmnd 6869 (London, HMSO).

DES (1981) *West Indian Children in Our Schools* (Rampton Report), Cmnd 8273, (London, HMSO).

DES (1985) *Education for All* (Swann Report), Cmnd 9543 (London, HMSO).

DORN, A. (1983) LEA policies on multi-racial education, *Multi-Ethnic Education Review,* 2(2), pp. 3–5.

DUNCAN, C. (1986) Developing a multicultural approach to the curriculum: the role of the headteacher, in: R. ARORA & C. DUNCAN (Eds), *Multicultural Education: towards good practice,* pp. 36–46 (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul).

DUNLOP, F. (1979) On the democratic organization of schools, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 9, pp. 43–54.

EGGLESTON, J. *et al.* (1986) *Education for Some* (Stoke-on-Trent, Trentham Books).

FLEW, A. (1984) *Education, Race and Revolution* (London, Centre for Policy Studies).

FOSTER-CARTER, O. (1987) The Honeyford affair: political and policy implications, in: B. TROYNA (Ed.), *Racial Inequality in Education,* pp. 44–58 (London, Tavistock).

GAY, G. (1983) Multiethnic education: historical developments and future prospects, *Phi Delta Kappan,* 64, pp. 560–3.

HALL, S. (1980) Teaching race, *Multiracial Education,* 9, pp. 3–12.

HARRISON, S. (1986) Swann: the implications for schools, *Journal of Education Policy,* 1, pp. 183–195.

HOME OFFICE (1978) *The West Indian Community: observations on the Report of the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration,* Cmnd 7186 (London, HMSO).

HONEYFORD, R. (1984) Education and race: an alternative view, *Salisbury Review,* Winter, pp. 30–2.

JEFFCOATE, R. (1984) *Ethnic Minorities and Education* (London, Harper & Row).

JOSEPH, SIR K. (1986) *Without Prejudice: education for an ethnically mixed society,* unpublished speech, 20 May.

KING, E. (1986) Recent experimental strategies for prejudice reduction in American schools and classrooms, *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 18, pp. 331–38.

KIRP, D. (1979) *Doing Good by Doing Little,* (Berkeley, Calif., University of Californian Press).

LYNCH, J. (1983) *The Multicultural Curriculum* (London, Batsford).

LYNCH, J. (1987) *Prejudice Reduction and the Schools* (London, Cassell).

MULLARD, C. (1982) Multiracial education in Britain: from assimilation to cultural pluralism, in: J. TIERNEY (Ed.) *Race, Migration and Schooling* pp. 120–133 (London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston).

MULLARD, C. (1984) *Anti-Racist Education: the three O's* (Cardiff, National Association for Multiracial Education).

MULLARD, C. (1986) *Pluralism, Ethnicism and Ideology: implications for a transformative pedagogy,* Centre for Race and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam, Working Paper 2 (Amsterdam, CRES).

MULLARD, C. *et al.* (1983) *Local Education Authority Policy Documents: a descriptive analysis of contents,* Working Paper 2, Race Relations Policy and Practice Research Unit (London, Institute of Education).

PALMER, F. (1987) *Anti-racism: an assault on education and value* (London, Sherwood Press).

PATTEN, C. (1986) *Swann in the Shires*, unpublished speech, 5–6 March.

RAMAZANOGLU, C. (1986) Gender and Islam—the politics of Muslim feminism, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 9, pp. 258–263.

REEVES, F. (1983) *British Racial Discourse*, (London, Cambridge University Press).

RICHARDS, C. (1986) Anti-racist initiatives, *Screen*, 27(5), pp. 74–9.

SARUP, M. (1986) *The Politics of Multiracial Education*, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).

STREET-PORTER, R. (1978) *Race, Children and Cities*, Unit E361 (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

TAYLOR, B. (1984–5) Multicultural Education in a Monocultural region, *New Community*, 12, pp. 1–8.

TOMLINSON, S. (1983) *Ethnic Minorities in British Schools* (London, Heinemann).

TROYNA, B. (1982) The ideological and policy response to black pupils in British schools, in: A. HARTNETT (Ed.) *The Social Sciences in Educational Studies*, pp. 127–143 (London, Heinemann).

TROYNA, B. (1983) Multicultural education: just another brick in the wall? *New Community*, 10, pp. 424–8.

TROYNA, B. (1984) Multicultural education: emancipation or containment? in: L. BARTON & S. WALKER (Eds), *Social Crisis and Educational Research*, pp. 75–97 (Beckenham, Croom Helm).

TROYNA, B. (1986) 'Swann's song'; the origins, ideology and implications of Education for All, *Journal of Education Policy*, 1, pp. 171–181.

TROYNA, B. (1987) (Ed.) *Racial Inequality in Education*, (London, Tavistock).

TROYNA, B. & BALL, W. (1985) *Views from the Chalk Face: school responses to an LEA Policy on multicultural education*, Policy Papers in Ethnic Relations (1), Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations. University of Warwick.

TROYNA, B. & CARRINGTON, B. (1987) Antisexist/antiracist education—a false dilemma: a reply to Walkling and Brannigan, *Journal of Moral Education*, 16, pp. 61–65.

TROYNA, B. & SMITH, D.I. (1983) (Eds) *Racism, School and the Labour Market* (Leicester, National Youth Bureau).

TROYNA, B. & WILLIAMS, J. (1986) *Racism, Education and the State: the racialisation of education policy* (Beckenham, Croom Helm).

WALKLING, P. & BRANNIGAN, C. (1986) Antisexist/antiracist education: a possible dilemma, *Journal of Moral Education*, 15, pp. 16–25.

WHITE, P. (1983) *Beyond Domination: an essay in the political philosophy of education*, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Correspondence: Barry Troyna, Faculty of Education, Sunderland Polytechnic, Gray Road, Sunderland SR2 7EE, United Kingdom.