SECTION 11 AND
EDUCATIONAL PROVISION

A Thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Ph.D. in the Faculty of Education.

Jo Jolliffe
Research and Graduate School
Faculty of Education 1994

ProQuest Number: 10758727

ProQuest 10758727

Contents

Chapter 4

The Present Research

Chapter 5

Abstract

This research focuses on educational provision under Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act which was introduced as a response to increasing immigration from the New Commonwealth in the post war period.

On the one hand, New Commonwealth citizens were needed to provide the labour force in factories, hospitals and transport, yet on the other hand their presence created discontent. Attempting to appease the anti-immigration lobby, Section 11 was introduced to provide compensatory funding for those Local Authorities where 'immigrants' had settled.

This study traces the political responses to immigration from the New Commonwealth and Pakistan and examines the history and development of Section 11 provision and the role of Section 11 staff in education.

Evidence from this research has shown that the misuse of Section 11 staff in the 1970s and 1980s has given way to an ethos of 'value added' accountability. And, although Section 11 staff formerly felt marginalised and deskilled there is an entirely different situation in the 1990s with well qualified, highly skilled staff feeling valued by schools. Section 11 provision for pupils with a range of educational needs is clearly targeted and monitored at Local Authority and Home Office levels. The evidence points to the 1990 Home Office guidelines and the establishment on a centrally managed service as instrumental in bringing about these changes.

5

Section 11 provision was seen as important and valued in schools, particularly by headteachers although insufficient parents knew about Section 11. Once considered as a marginal, additional resource, Section 11 provision was seen as an essential measure to help black and ethnic minority pupils access the curriculum and achieve their potential. Headteachers and Section 11 staff raised concerns over the serious consequences of planned government cuts in Section 11 provision on black and ethnic minority pupils in terms of their educational achievement and life chances.

A multi-method approach was adopted for the research into Section 11 provision in schools in one Local Authority, drawing on qualitative data from interviews and quantitative data from a survey of Section 11 staff by questionnaire as well as Service data.

The study makes recommendations to further improve the Section 11 service in schools in the Local Authority concerned and reflects on the implications of the newly introduced Single Regeneration Budget for educational provision for black and ethnic minority communities.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other University or Institute of learning.

Note on Copyright

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Dedication

For Section 11 workers and for my family.

Acknowledgements

List of Abbreviations

ACE	Advisory Centre for Education
AGC	Assistant Group Co-ordinator
ALA	Association of London Authorities
BI	Bilingual Instructor
CRC	Community Relations Commission
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
CWI	Commonwealth Immigrant
DES	Department of Education and Science
DFE	Department for Education
DoE	Department of the Environment
DPRE	(Brent) Development Project for Racial Equality
EEC	European Economic Community
EPA	Education Priority Area
ESG	Education Support Grant
ESL	English as a Second Language
FTE	Full-Time equivalent
GC	Group Co-ordinator
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
GLARE	Greater London Action for Race Equality
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector/Inspectorate
HO	Home Office
HSL	Home School Liaison
ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
LA	Local Authority
LARRIE	Local Authorities Race Relations Information Exchange
LEA	Local Education Authority
LMS	Local Management of Schools
LSPU	London Strategic Policy Unit
MP	Member of Parliament
NACRC	National Association of Community Relations Councils
NASSE	Northern Association of Section 11 Services in Education
NC	National Curriculum
NCVO	National Council for Voluntary Organisations
NCWI	New Commonwealth Immigrant
NFER	National Foundation for Educational Research

NN	Nursery Nurse
NUT	National Union of Teachers
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
PGCE	Post Graduate Certificate in Education
PT	Part-Time
QP	(Section 11) Qualifying Pupils
QPWT	Qualifying Pupils Weighted Total
REC	Racial Equality Council
REPG	Race Equality Policy Group
S11	Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act
SATs	Standard Assessment Tasks
SECTION 11	Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act
SELA	Stage(s) of English Language Acquisition
SRB	Single Regeneration Budget
SS	Standard Scale (Teacher)
TESOL	Teaching English as a Second Language
UK	United Kingdom
UMCESE	University of Manchester Centre for Ethnic Studies in Education
W/O	Without

The Author

The author worked in multi-racial schools for fourteen years including ten years as head of modern languages in a High School, and as Deputy Headteacher of a Comprehensive school in Brixton. She is now Head of a Section 11 Service in a Local Authority in the North West. She has written of number of articles on Section 11 and race related issues and has been a speaker at Local and National Conferences on Section 11.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and Background

The main focus of this research is to examine Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act and its use for educational provision, with particular reference to one Local Authority. The present chapter seeks to provide an introduction to the area of research and to give an outline of the study.

Any educational development takes place within a social, political and historical context. Thus, it is important to analyse the development of Section 11 provision in education in relation to demographic and political changes following post war immigration. Since the 1960s, issues have been raised and measures have been taken, regarding the education of black and ethnic minority children. Over a period of almost three decades, Section 11 has been responsible for many of the multi-cultural and anti-racist initiatives in schools, This inquiry examines the importance and role played by Section 11 and Section 11 staff in helping schools to better meet the educational needs of black and ethnic minority pupils. It also considers the impact of the government's decision to reduce Section 11 provision due to the current 'economic climate' in the country.

Section 11 of the Local Government Act, 1966, was introduced by a Labour Government in the political climate of the 1960s when immigration from the New Commonwealth was increasing rapidly, and amidst a growing anti-immigration lobby. Although it has been referred to, as 'the only funding aimed at reducing racial disadvantage', Section 11

was initially intended as a compensatory measure to appease those Local Authorities who felt they were 'bearing the brunt' of 'immigration'. According to Dorn and Hibbert (1987, p.63). "The distinction between providing for special needs and 'compensating' local authorities for the immigrant burden was blurred from the outset." Only since the 1980's can it be claimed that Section 11 has been used as a means of improving access for black and ethnic minority communities, to Local Government Services.

Until the introduction of the 1993 Local Government Amendment Act, Section 11 could only be used for those communities from the New Commonwealth and Pakistan (Appendix 1). Section 11 provided for staffing costs and could not be used for running costs. Total expenditure under Section 11 rose from £3.2 million in 1967 - 1968 to £130 million in 1993 - 1994. Approximately three quarters of the total expenditure has been used for education, mainly for the purpose of providing additional teaching staff.

In an analysis of ethnic groups by age and population, a report by the Policy Studies Institute (Jones, 1993) showed a growing young ethnic minority population. Whilst 34 per cent of ethnic minorities were aged under 15 years, only 19 per cent of the white population were in the same age group. The statistics showed that the rate of unemployment amongst the black and ethnic minority population was much higher than that of the white population and, "it is a salient feature in many societies that if unemployment increases, ethnic minorities suffer disproportionately" (Mallick, 1992, p.60). In the present economic recession, black and ethnic minority communities have suffered the worst effects of unemployment and low paid jobs and according to the 1993 report of the Policy Studies

Institute "it is likely that a part of the disadvantage faced by racial minorities in Britain is related to their education" (Jones, 1993, p.31).

Yet, due to cutbacks in Government expenditure in the public sector, the level of provision under Section 11 is to be significantly reduced from April 1994 after having remained unchanged for twenty five years. In a letter to Local Authorities (November, 1992) the Home Office wrote,

> *The Government remains firmly committed to the reduction of racial disadvantage which inhibits members of ethnic minorities from playing a full part in the social and economic life of this country. The payment of grant to local authorities under Section 11 plays a central role in the Home Secretary's programme by helping local authorities to meet the costs of employing additional staff required to enable members of New Commonwealth ethnic minorities to overcome linguistic or cultural barriers and thus to gain full access to mainstream services and facilities.*

The language of communication in the learning process in schools is usually English. Section 11 funding in education has been aimed primarily, until recently, at the development of English language skills for pupils whose first language is not English. More recently, Section 11 in education has been used not just for English language support, but also to give support across the curriculum, pastoral support and support in raising achievement.

The Swann Report (DES, 1985) found that many schools failed their pupils in preparing them for their social and economic role in a multiracial society. If an important role of education is to prepare children for adult life, through the whole school curriculum, then a

18

predominantly Eurocentric National Curriculum will not provide all pupils with a sense of belonging and a positive racial identity (Duncan, 1988; Verma, 1990). Many black and ethnic minority pupils will therefore be disadvantaged, failing to achieve educationally and be prevented from accessing higher education and employment opportunities which give greater socio-economic power.

Pastoral care underpins the whole school curriculum (Duncan, 1988). If pupils are to succeed, then the school must give careful thought to the whole school curriculum and the pastoral care it wishes to establish. The school needs to create a secure and comfortable environment in which black and ethnic minority pupils can learn and achieve their potential. Assessment procedures, teaching styles, home-school links, classroom organisation, staffing and resources are all important factors which need to be taken into consideration.

Section 11 staff can help the schools in many of these ways. Often they have skills and have received training which equip them to support developments in schools which better meet the needs of black and ethnic minority pupils. They work in partnership with mainstream staff, adapting teaching and learning styles, resources, classroom organisation and other school practices so that black and ethnic minority pupils can better access the school curriculum.

An important matter for schools since the introduction of the 1988 Education Act has been the monitoring of school and pupil performance. OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education), the body now responsible for the inspection of standards in education, will soon require those schools with 10 per cent or more ethnic minority pupils to analyse school

data such as SAT's (Standard Assessment Tasks) and GCSE's (General Certificate of Secondary Education) by ethnic group, so that educational achievement can be monitored with regard to ethnicity. It is already a Home office requirement that the achievement of Section 11 qualifying pupils is closely monitored and Section 11 funded services therefore annually collect data such as stages of English language acquisition, SATs and GCSEs by ethnic group. However, the process of ethnic analysis is not as simple as it might appear.

> *It is compounded by a number of factors, some of which are the product of the social sciences which classify (or misclassify) individuals into specific categories or groups of people* (Verma and Ashworth, 1986, p.38).

They argue that if the role of ethnicity in relation to the process of educational achievement is to be meaningful, a number of issues must be taken into consideration, including sharper definitions of ethnic groups, which has implications for better and more accurate record keeping, standardisation of data collection, and a moral obligation to use data for proper purposes, so that for instance it is not used to construct stereotypes of particular ethnic minority groups, such as the 'underachievement' of African-Caribbean boys.

Figueroa (1991, p.151) has argued that educational inequality is socially constructed, "in so far as it is largely a function and consequence of social arrangements, processes and behaviour", and that schools and the education system itself contribute to the maintenance of inequality. Or, as Gurnah (1987, p.15) put it, "black parents are convinced that schools 'underachieve' their children". The writer would agree, that to a large extent, the education system has worked in such a way as to disadvantage

black and ethnic minority children. Herein lies a criticism of Section 11 funding, in that the responsibility for issues concerning the achievement of black and ethnic minority pupils, in the context of mainstream educational practice, has often been left to this marginal resource. Dorn and Hibbert (1987) have argued that Section 11 has been used to maintain inequality rather than to dismantle it. For instance, school decisions concerning issues such as resourcing and setting are not within the control of Section 11 staff, although where the Section 11 teacher is well regarded or fairly influential in a school, her or his views may well be taken into account. And of course, in matters such as the ethos of the school, the school development plan and the development of school policies, Section 11 staff might play anything from a minor to a significant role, depending on the context of the school and the value placed on her or him by the headteacher and mainstream colleagues. The scope given to a Section 11 teacher can vary vastly from school to school.

There have been few studies of Section 11, particularly in the field of education. The writer draws attention to an important article by Dorn and Hibbert entitled "Section 11, A Comedy of Errors". A master piece of cynicism, the article takes an irreverent look at Section 11 and the role of the Home Office. Containing very persuasive arguments, the reader might easily be swayed by their view that:

> *The long-running saga of Section 11 funding exhibits*
> *many of the characteristics of a television soap opera.*
> *Tragedy, farce, pathos, melodrama, and a script in which*
> *the actors appear unable to control the world around*
> *them. Unlike the fantasy world of 'Dallas' and 'Dynasty'*
> *however, the bizarre world of section 11 is for real, as are*
> *the people and money involved* (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987,*
> p.59).

21

This article has been of key importance in developing the present thesis, which infact takes a contrary view. Nevertheless, Dorn and Hibbert's 'tongue in cheek' analysis of Section 11 represents the frustrations of many radicals working in the field of race in the mid 1980's. Dorn and Hibbert have commented that Section 11 was "very much a child of the 1960's", and the views they present very much represent a 1980's view of Section 11 albeit an important part of the history and development of Section 11. However, it is vital that readers are aware of significant developments in Section 11 since 1989, when a Home Office Scrutiny of Section 11 took place. This led to the production of new guidelines in 1990 and a major overhaul of Section 11 provision in 1992. The writer has therefore tried to place criticisms of Section 11 in their historical context and of course, she has had the benefit of hindsight. The writer argues in this thesis that whilst criticisms of Section 11 over almost two decades were justified, the 1990 Home Office guidelines have made a significant difference to the effectiveness of Section 11 provision in education.

In order to appreciate any changes or improvements in Section 11 provision and practice since the implementation of the guidelines in 1992, it has been crucial to present in the first section of this thesis, a picture of conditions beforehand. Chapters 2 and 3 are therefore intended to provide the reader with the necessary historical background and an understanding of Section 11 by bringing together relevant documentation and literature concerning immigration from the New Commonwealth and in particular, Section 11 as a political response to black immigration. It is important to note that by historical, the researcher intends that this is a contextual component based upon a review of the available literature, circulars and other documentation in

order to give a 'flavour' of the period concerned. By synthesising the available documentation and literature, an important backdrop is provided for the development of this thesis and gives the reader a better appreciation of the issues.

In constructing the context, it has been important to use terminology which was current in the 1960's and 1970's but with which the writer and those with a similar understanding and appreciation of race issues will feel uncomfortable. Nevertheless, terms such as 'immigrant', whilst carrying pejorative connotations, were ones in common use in the 1960's and 1970's. Indeed, it is an inescapable fact that Section 11 was intended originally, as a measure for the assimilation of 'immigrants'. If the reader feels some discomfort with terms such as 'immigrants', 'race riots', 'problems', 'aliens', then the writer must also admit to experiencing the same discomfort. Other terms used in this research such as 'black', 'Asian', 'ethnic minority' are no more likely to meet with the approval of all members of particular Black or Asian Communities. In using these labels, it is not the intention to imply that they should be accepted. The term 'black' refers in this thesis to members of the African and African/Caribbean communities and 'ethnic minorities' refers to all non-white minority groups who are the subjects of racial discrimination.

Chapter 2 presents the background of immigration from those parts of the world now known as the New Commonwealth and Pakistan. Post War Britain, eager to meet the demands of a newly emerging consumer society gave right of entry and the promise of employment to what amounted, over a period of time, to millions of Citizens of the New Commonwealth and Pakistan. In presenting this background the writer

has attempted not only to describe patterns of immigration, but to set immigration in a political context, since one of the political responses to 'black' immigration in the 1960s and 1970s was Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act. It is therefore of key importance that the reader is given an overview of political developments surrounding immigration, if an appreciation of the purpose and usefulness or otherwise of Section 11 is to be established.

Chapter 3 focuses on Section 11, its origins, implementation, shortcomings and practices. The writer has traced the social and political pressures on the Labour Government in the mid 1960s which led to the formation of race policies on which Section 11 was founded. These policies have been seen as dualistic, if not contradictory in that they sought on the one hand to restrict immigration whilst on the other hand to 'absorb' those immigrants already here.

Assimilationist and integrationist philosophies and approaches were adopted by schools and local authorities in the 1960s and early 1970s. Section 11 was seen by them as a mechanism for dealing with what they saw as the social and economic 'problems' of immigration. However as attitudes changed and different approaches to the education of black and ethnic minority pupils evolved, there emerged a growing awareness amongst educators and the black and ethnic minority communities themselves, of the shortcomings of Section 11 and its administration.

Chapter 3 also tracks the Home Office's attempts to deal with basic flaws in the legislation and respond to criticisms through the introduction of a series of circulars providing administration guidelines. Criticisms of Section 11 included; the uneven take-up of grant by Local Authorities,

the absence of any monitoring of Section 11 and the 'unidentifiability' of posts, the racist and assimilationist philosophies underpinning the legislation and the Home Office guidelines; the lack of consultation with communities and the marginalisation of Section 11 staff and their work. A number of serious attempts to replace Section 11 legislation failed and many of the Home Office's measures intended to try to 'put things right' met with still further criticism.

Whilst the 1990 guidelines, which resulted from the Scrutiny of Section 11 in 1989 appear to have effectively tackled many of the criticisms of Section 11, ironically for the first time since its introduction in 1966, Section 11 provision has come under serious threat. This is not because it is being replaced with plans for a better alternative, but because of swinging government cuts. This climate of cuts has been an important strand in this study since it has had an impact on the morale of Section 11 staff as well as perceptions concerning future provision. The introduction of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) has also created some concern. The SRB is a mechanism intended to deal corporately with 20 government funding programmes, including Section 11, but which signally fails to identify specific Section 11 monies within its overall budget.

Some consideration is given in Chapter 3 to the meaning of the 'needs' of black and ethnic minority communities and the notion of 'special', attempting to see if there is any correlation between need and expenditure. The Chapter also looks at Section 11 in relation to Section 71 of the 1976 Race Relations Act, since the expectation of the Home Office is that Local Authorities will consider the place of Section 11 in the context of their overall equal opportunity strategy and statutory

25

obligations.

A private member's bill to amend Section 11 in September 1993 has been seen as a landmark in the history of Section 11. The Local Government (Amendment) Act 1993, which amends Section 11 of the Local Government Act, is no longer aimed just at black communities. Since Section 11 can now be used in principle, for instance to support the children of wealthy European businessmen/women whose first language is not English, it is debatable whether or not Section 11 can be regarded as a mechanism for helping achieve race equality for black communities.

The research focuses very much on the personal views and experiences of Section 11 staff and headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools. Chapter 4 discusses the rationale, design and conduct of the research. Qualitative and quantitative data were gathered through the use of questionnaire and interview. Limited use was made of service data where appropriate. The chosen methodology and research instruments are considered together with their relative advantages and disadvantages.

The same chapter also seeks to contextualise the research by providing information on the structures, practices and aims of the Section 11 Service on which this study focuses. In doing so, it provides the reader with important detail which prepares the groundwork for the chapter which follows. Issues to which this research addresses itself are stated and clarified. The main issues can be organised into two main areas. Firstly, the quality of Section 11 staff, their role and experiences in Section 11 work. Secondly, Section 11 provision, changes in provision, the value

placed on provision, the effectiveness and the impact of cuts on schools and pupils.

Chapter 5 sets out and discusses findings from the analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire completed by Section 11 staff, and the interviews with Section 11 staff and headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools. In all, 148 participants took part in this research. Of the 138 Section 11 staff who completed questionnaires, a sample of 20 were also interviewed. 10 headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools also took part in interviews. It was in discovering their views and experiences which are either shared or individual that issues or patterns emerged which proved to be of interest.

Since Section 11 provides only for staffing a central concern of the present research has been the role of Section 11 staff as educational providers for black and ethnic minority pupils, and the context in which they work. It must be remembered however, that whilst Section 11 provides additional staffing to help black and ethnic minority pupils access mainstream provision, schools remain legally responsible for ensuring that all pupils are catered for with due regard to their linguistic, pastoral and cultural needs.

In undertaking the fieldwork in this research, key issues relating to Section 11 and educational provision were examined. In particular, the writer wished to make a comparison between Section 11 provision before and after the implementation in April 1992 of the 1990 Home Office guidelines. The 'modus operandi' of Section 11 staff was given some consideration. What type of work were Section 11 staff involved in and how did they carry it out? The difficulties and barriers encountered by

Section 11 staff in carrying out their duties were also of interest to the writer. What made this work 'special' or different to mainstream work? The understanding of and the value placed on Section 11 and Section 11 staff by other members of the school community has come under scrutiny, as has its value to black and ethnic minority pupils and schools. The impact of the proposed cuts has also been assessed.

Quantitative data were gathered from the questionnaire to provide a broad picture of Section 11 staff, Section 11 provision and Section 11 practices. Following analysis of this data, an interview schedule was developed so that the interviewer could confirm or elaborate on findings from the questionnaire. The interviews also provided a further opportunity to raise issues which had not been taken into consideration at the questionnaire stage. The evidence from the questionnaires and the interviews was presented holistically and thematically rather than separately.

In Chapter 6, the writer summarises the conclusions from Chapter 5, reflects on the present research and makes recommendations, drawing on the results of the study and her own experience and involvement in Section 11 work.

It is pertinent to state here, that the writer is head of the Section 11 service which is the subject of this study. She has responsibility for managing 157 staff, 145 of whom are Section 11 funded. She is responsible for the management of the human, financial and physical resources of the service. This includes the allocation of Section 11 staff to schools, liaison between schools, the local authority and the Home office, the setting and achievement of service targets and the professional

development of staff.

Since the writer is involved in Section 11 in a management position, her role in this case study, as discussed in Chapter 4, is one of 'action - researcher'. Her hopes are therefore to examine in detail the experiences and practices of the Section 11 service in question and to produce some realistic recommendations which can lead to an amelioration of school based Section 11 provision in the local authority concerned.

Finally, the reasons for which the writer chose this particular area of research requires some explanation since they go beyond that of professional interest. The writer has worked in multi-racial schools since 1973 and as a volunteer ESL teacher in ethnic minority communities. As described in Chapter 3, the writer was first appointed to a Section 11 post in 1986, without being aware of that fact and despite having asked at interview. This was an experience shared by many others. Suffice it to say in this brief introduction, that such experiences had serious implications for the delivery of the work, the morale of the writer and other Section 11 staff, and for the black and ethnic minority communities themselves. It also contributed to the 'chaos' described in Chapter 3 and evidenced in Chapter 5.

Since this period in the mid 1980's the writer has witnessed a process of change in Section 11 practice, a process which is a focus of the present study. In particular she is interested in examining and illustrating current Section 11 practice since the 1990 guidelines were implemented in 1992 and comparing this with practice in the 1980s.

Section 11 is currently at a 'crossroads'. The proposed cuts and the role of

the Single Regeneration Budget are expected to have serious implications for Section 11 staff and for the black and ethnic minority communities they serve. Chapter 6 discusses the implications in more detail. Nevertheless, this study hopes to show that Section 11 is not marginal but essential provision in schools and, that the changes brought about by the 1990 Home Office guidelines have meant that the provision is more effective and the role of Section 11 staff clearer. Above all, the writer hopes to demonstrate, that Section 11 provision does make a difference to the achievement of black and ethnic minority pupils and that a reduction in that support will seriously affect their educational achievement and ultimately, their life chances and the communities to which they belong.

CHAPTER 2

Political Responses to Immigration from The New Commonwealth

Since Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act is a product of race policies in the 1960s, in order to understand this legislation it is necessary to look at events and prevalent attitudes which led to its formulation. This Chapter therefore traces social and political responses to postwar immigration from the New Commonwealth, which culminated in the insertion of Section 11 in the 1966 Local Government Act.

Until the end of the Second World War Britain's Immigration policies were largely concerned with the control of 'aliens'. Legislative powers under the Aliens Order 1905, the Aliens Restriction Act 1914 and subsequent related acts restricted the entry and access to employment of non-U.K. citizens. British subjects in the colonies and dominions retained the right to enter and settle in Britain. The British Nationality Act 1948 confirmed this right, but distinguished two categories of citizens; those who were citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies and those who were Commonwealth Citizens (Evans, 1983; Bevan 1986; Miles and Solomos, 1987). Citizens of the Irish Republic maintained the right of unrestricted entry and settlement.

Until 1954, the majority of 'immigrants' came from Europe (Jackson, 1963; Deakin, 1970). In May 1948, 400 'immigrants' arrived on the S.S. Empire Windrush which had set sail from Jamaica. Mainly ex-servicemen who were returning to Britain after serving the 'mother country' in World War II, their arrival has been seen as a significant event in the history of British Immigration.

A new era in the history of immigration had begun - and

*A new era in the history of immigration had begun - and
one which was to test her unwitting politicians far more
than any previous one* (Foot, 1965, p.123).

During the post-war period, the British Government positively
encouraged the use of European migrant workers to meet the labour
shortage following the war. The majority of immigrants entering the
country were from 'white' Old Commonwealth Countries, Europe and
particularly Ireland (Jackson, 1963). But the increasing numbers of black
citizens from the New Commonwealth became the focus of immigration
debate (Patterson, 1969). This period is now seen as one in which the
issue of immigration was 'racialised' (Rose et al, 1969; Miles and
Solomos, 1987) concerns having concentrated almost entirely on 'black'
immigration. Whilst the immigrants had come from a variety of
religious, linguistic and cultural backgrounds, the visible difference from
the host community and the only factor they had in common, was the
colour of their skin.

*This colour, rather than ethnic or national origin,
gradually developed into the major factor in race
relations in Britain. It became the central issue in the
political and social controversy surrounding the whole
subject of immigration* (Hill, 1970, p.6).

Although the period between the 1948 Nationality Act and the 1962
Commonwealth Immigrants Act is often perceived as one in which the
principle of free entry of British subjects was reluctantly relinquished,
Cabinet papers have revealed that this was not the case (Crossman, 1975).
On the contrary,

*The debate was never about principle. Labour and
Conservative Governments had by 1952 instituted a
number of covert and sometimes illegal, administrative*

32

measures to discourage black immigration (Carter, Harris
and Joshi, citied in Miles and Solomos, 1987, p.90).

The debate concerning the need to control black immigration began in
earnest in the 1950's. Whilst the Notting Hill 'race riots' in 1958 served
to heighten the debate, it has been shown that the issue of control was
already on the political agenda (Sivanandan, 1982). However, following
the disturbances, important debate took place in Parliament regarding
the revision of the 1948 Nationality Act so as to introduce measures to
reduce the numbers of black people who came to live and work in the
U.K. Around the same time, further debate connected the problems
related to housing, unemployment and crime with the increase in black
immigration. The linking of immigration to social problems became a
common theme, ultimately influencing British Immigration Policy and
legislation.

The economic boom which followed a brief period of austerity after the
war created a serious labour shortage. Unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in
particular were difficult to fill.

*The main factor was the post-war reconstruction and the
subsequent expansion of the Western European
economies. This factor coupled with a fall in the
economically active population, because of death or
injury in the war and an increase in the number of the
old and the retired, created a shortage of labour in
Western Europe. Migrant labour was needed* (CRE, 1985,
p.1).

33

And as Tierney put it:

> *British capitalism was therefore compelled to recruit from overseas, and the ex-colonies, with their vast and cheap sources of labour, were an attractive proposition* (Tierney, 1982, p.20).

Immigration from the New Commonwealth therefore increased rapidly in response to the economic demands of British Capitalism. Numbers differed each year, roughly corresponding to the employment situation. In retrospect this was but a brief period of growth. Large numbers of Citizens from the New Commonwealth and Colonies were attracted by recruitment-drives of public and private organisations, to travel half way around the world to fill positions which were largely unwanted by the indigenous British labour force (Foot 1965; Tierney 1982). The National Health Service wanted nurses and other hospital staff, Transport wanted bus drivers and conductors, whilst Industry needed, machine and tool operators. Tierney (1982) reported that the practice of overseas recruitment was encouraged not least of all by Enoch Powell when he was Minister of Health (1960-1963). Although these public and private organisations were encouraged in their attempts to exploit this cheap source of overseas labour, no provision was planned to meet the social or other needs of newly arrived Citizens. Immigrants would often take low-paid, menial jobs but were usually forced to live in and pay high rents for, poor housing in decaying Inner City areas (Foot, 1965; Tierney, 1982).

New Commonwealth Citizens had long had the right to enter and settle in Britain.

> *The odd thing about the recent migration of large*
> *numbers of people from the tropical Commonwealth to*
> *Britain is not that it took place when it did, or that it took*
> *place at all, but why it did not happen before*
> (Hill, 1970, p.3).

Indeed one Junior Conservative Minister, David Renton was quoted as follows:

> *It (Citizenship) is simply a fact which we have taken for*
> *granted from the earliest days in which our forebears*
> *ventured forth across the seas*
> (5th December 1958 Cited in Foot, 1965, p.125).

Until 1914 there had not been any formal declaration apart from a statement in 1608 by Lord Chief Justice Ellesmore that "King James 1 is one King over all his subjects in whatsoever of his dominions they were born." (Cited in Hiro, 1991, p.197), that all subjects in the British Empire had automatic Citizenship. As Foot (1965) pointed out, no one apparently foresaw the one crucial privilege which Citizenship entailed - the obvious right of a British Citizen to come freely and live in Britain. The growing presence of black immigrants in Britain in the 1960's then, must be seen in the context of the Commonwealth and the history of British Imperialism.

The British Commonwealth of Nations was formally established in 1931 by the Statute of Westminster. By the Second World War, the British Empire was divided into the Commonwealth, India, the colonies and protectorates. Although India won Independence in 1947, it was agreed that it would remain within the Commonwealth. The Labour Government paternalistically wished to retain India as part of the

Commonwealth and hence introduced the British Nationality Act of 1948 which, although it defined two categories of citizenship as mentioned earlier, offered the common status of British Subject to everyone.

There seems to have been no attempt to tap into the vast human resources of the Commonwealth until June 1946 when Jim Callaghan, then a very young Labour MP, called for immigration as an answer to a critical labour shortage. Employers eagerly leaped at the opportunity to fill their vacancies. This period in the 1950's was:

> *Notable for high idealism in regard to the New Commonwealth, blended with a self-congratulatory mood. To have transformed Britain's hitherto Imperial role into leadership of its former colonies - freely bestowed on it by the latter - pleased and excited its leaders* (Hiro, 1991, p.200).

Unlike the European labour force, Commonwealth Citizens could enter Britain unhindered by the Aliens Act. For the "Labour hungry employers, this must have seemed a heaven-sent gift" (Foot, 1965).

Although the immigrant workforce from the New Commonwealth was generally welcomed on the one hand, as already mentioned the Tory Government had no strategy or programme to facilitate their settlement. No arrangements were made to advise them, meet them, transport them to their onward destination or accommodate them. There were no health checks, no language provision. In what Foot (1965) saw as 'The exploiters' paradise', all the problems were left for local authorities to deal with.

> *The Government could sit back, happily relieved of the*
> *desperate shortage of labour, while a handful of harassed*
> *local authorities grappled with the problems of absorbing*
> *tens of thousands of immigrants into their areas*
> (Foot, 1965, p.126).

Indeed, a voluntary organisation, the British Caribbean Welfare Service, was left to try to cope with giving help to the newly arrived immigrants. Later, local voluntary liaison committees were set up to assist the integration of the newcomers.

The immigrants met with what must have been a confusing and contradictory situation. On the one hand there was held in the host community, a sense of fair play, and a belief in human rights and equality of treatment; yet on the other hand, there were deep seated prejudices based largely on ignorance and racist assumptions (Dummett and Dummett, 1987). Nevertheless, as the numbers of immigrants grew, debate about whether or not to control black immigration began and persisted for around a decade (Hiro, 1991). Government documents which have been released show that some of the prevarication resulted from the fear of potential embarrassment to Britain as leader of the Commonwealth (Deakin, 1968; Miles and Phizacklea, 1984). However, in the period between the 1958 'race riots' and the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill 1961, some of the most important parliamentary debates on immigration took place (Miles and Solomos, 1987). A number of Conservative M.P.s, of whom the most vociferous was Cyril Osborne, led a campaign to stop immigration. Although the official line taken by the Labour opposition was against immigration control, there were nevertheless Labour politicians who supported it (Layton-Henry, 1984). However, within both the Tory and Labour parties, there were elements who believed ideologically in the Commonwealth and the freeflow of its

Citizens. Within the Tory party, there existed those who understood the economic case for immigration and who resisted any attempts to control the entry of Commonwealth Citizens into Britain. Cyril Osborne's early attempts to racialise the debate were dismissed even by his own party.

> *Snubbed by his own front bench - Eden and Macmillan treated his queries about unemployment and disease among immigrants with undisguised contempt.* (Foot, 1965, p.130).

However, Osborne continued to forge a powerful backbench anti-immigration campaign and exploited the media whenever and wherever possible. One example of the inflammatory letters he wrote to the press was entitled "Immigration Lunacy. Ever nearer an Afro-Asian Britain" (Daily Telegraph, 11th October, 1961. Cited in Foot, 1965, p.137). Whilst Fenner Brockway had tried to get a Bill through parliament making incitement and racial discrimination offences as early as 1953, the Bill as well as subsequent Bills, failed. The fact that there was no serious support until 1965 to outlaw the flagrant racialism of Osborne and others, is an indication of the degree of ideological and political ambiguity which existed during this period.

The 1958 'Racial Disturbances' in Nottingham served Osborne's cause well. George Rogers, Labour M.P. representing North Kensington, which includes Notting Hill, demanded legislation to cut 'coloured' immigration. Perhaps the first most crucial sign which led to the legitimisation of Osborne's and Roger's views came from Lord Home (later Sir Alec Douglas Home) who was Minister of State for Commonwealth Relations. At a conference in Vancouver he declared that "Curbs will have to be put on the unrestricted flow of immigrants to Britain from the West Indies" (Foot, 1965, p.131). Encouraged by this,

Osborne put forward a Private Members Bill to control immigration which did not gain support. In the meantime, the main thrust on immigration was still tied up with the need to protect the ideology of the Commonwealth. Although there was reluctance to introduce controls, the practical answer to the immigrant 'problem' of the British Government was to try to prevent it at source, which required the collusion and co-operation of the Commonwealth countries and dominions themselves (Tierney, 1982). By April 1961, the Government was still against control. Tory M.P. Sir Edward Boyle told The Birmingham Immigration Control Association "It is impossible that the Government will introduce Immigration Control" (Birmingham Evening Dispatch, 6th April 1961, cited in Foot, 1965 p.132).

The economic boom of the late 1950's did not last long and the number of immigrants became far higher than the number of job vacancies. Rumours that the government were to introduce controls created a rush of relatives of those already here (Foot, 1965; Tierney, 1982). There have been many critics, for example Dummett and Dummett (1987) who have blamed the sudden increase in immigration directly on the control measures themselves. As the numbers increased, Osborne became more confident of achieving his objective of stopping immigration (Foot, 1965; Rose et al, 1969). In 1959 and 1960 the total number of immigrants had been 21,600 and 57,000 respectively, whilst in 1961 they rose sharply to 136,400 (Foot 1965). The liberal line of uncontrolled immigration was not held on to for much longer. As already mentioned, even the Labour Party, which had consistently opposed restrictions, particularly under the leadership of Gaitskell, had its dissidents.

On 31st October 1961, The Queen's speech indicated the Tory Government's intention of introducing restrictions. The Bill was published the very next day. It gave immigration officers the right to refuse entry to those who did not hold a labour voucher and gave the courts the power to recommend deportation of Commonwealth immigrants. It also increased from one year to five years the period before which a Commonwealth Citizen living in this country could be registered as a British Citizen (Rose et al, 1969). Citizens of the Irish Republic continued to enjoy entry and access to employment. The reason given was, that it was impossible to police the borders. (Foot, 1965; Rose et al, 1969). Despite fierce opposition to the Bill from within the Tory Party and both opposition parties at the second and third readings, it became law on the first of June 1962. Osborne who had persistently fought for restrictions was knighted soon after its introduction.

In a major speech in Bradford, in October 1962 Lord Home asserted:

> *What had been a trickle of immigrants from the Commonwealth was developing into a flood. We saw that if it was not brought under control it would create very serious social and economic problems - problems of employment, housing and education, for instance... Most people will agree that it is necessary to keep the conditions and the number of permits under the strictest review, and to strengthen the safeguards against evasion* (Cited in Foot, 1965, p.148).

In fact, because the mechanism for control was through the number of labour vouchers issued, but not necessarily used, it was not possible to predict the actual number of immigrants. The fact that the immigration

figures dropped significantly immediately after the Act was introduced, could in part have been due to thousands of people, including some who may never have intended to come at all, rushing to beat the deadline.

Whilst the Labour Party leadership remained committed to free entry, it became increasingly questionable whether or not the party could resist the pressure of popular opinion (Dummett and Dummett, 1987). Following Hugh Gaitskell's death in January 1963, Harold Wilson became leader of the Labour Party and he immediately showed a willingness to compromise to suit an electorally popular stance on immigration (Hiro, 1991). With the 1964 elections on the horizon, he and others in the Labour shadow cabinet became conscious of their electorally compromising stand on immigration (Crossman, 1975) and therefore gradually retreated. This retreat from the earlier principles of the Labour party on immigration was further evidence of the institutionalisation of the increasing hostility towards immigrants. Although Labour won the 1964 elections, the party was ideologically compromised.

> *From then on, the Labour Government was firmly set on*
> *the course of yielding with alacrity to each fresh outburst*
> *of clamour for restricting Commonwealth immigration.*
> (Dummett and Dummett, 1987, p.118).

The loss of a safe labour seat in Smethwick to Peter Griffiths who had fought an aggressive anti-immigration campaign (Foot, 1965) caused a serious shock to the party. This blow, precipitated the White Paper on Immigration from the Commonwealth, which has been interpreted as an act of appeasement of the electorate (Foot, 1965; Rose et al 1969; Miles and Solomos, 1987).

The two main political parties of the time have been accused of 'out-trumping' each other (Crossman, 1975) and whilst it has been claimed that Labour was seemingly determined to lose its reputation for 'softness' on race and immigration (Dummett and Dummett, 1987), the shift in immigration policy during this decade has been seen as 'State racism' (Sivanandan, 1976; Ben-Tovim and Gabriel, 1987). An alternative analysis has been to explain the change as a pragmatic response to the altering overall economic conditions of post-war Britain, since Britain's earlier labour shortage was now over (Dummett and Dummett, 1987).

In 1965, the White paper which announced drastic measures to reduce immigration was introduced. According to Ben-Tovim and Gabriel (1987) this was yet another measure which resulted in state racism. According to Hiro (1991), were among those who approved of the White Paper Sir Cyril Osborne and Peter Griffiths, the victor of Somethwick." Perhaps a Gallup poll indicated that while 88 per cent of the population supported the White Paper only 5 per cent were against.

However, there was a policy contradiction in that whilst there were drastic measures to reduce New Commonwealth Immigration the issue of Irish Immigration was ignored.

In April 1965, the Government produced a Race Race Relations Bill which was intended to prevent racial discrimination in public places. This Bill was widely criticised for its failure to address the important areas of housing and employment (Dummett and Dummett, 1987). Moreover, the Tory opposition would not support it since they objected to racial discrimination being classed as a criminal offence. The Home

Secretary, Sir Frank Soskice, announced a compromise, by changing the proposed criminal measures in the legislation, to conciliatory measures. This served to considerably weaken the powers of the legislation and prevent the Race Relations Board from effectively combating the perpetrators of discrimination.

> *The field of relevance for the Board was severely limited to specified places of public resort, which mainly meant public houses. Potentially, an even more serious weakness was that the Board had no express powers to investigate complaints or undertake conciliation to achieve settlement* (Cohen, 1971, p.269).

Nevertheless, the compromise met with the approval of Tory members, for a Labour Bill.

> *Taken together, the 1965 White Paper and the 1965 Race Relations Act signalled the convergence of the two major political parties on the issues of immigration control and racial justice* (Hiro, 1991, p.211).

By 1965, leading Labour politicians including Wilson, Crossman and Hattersley, were openly advocating a problem centred view of black immigrants. In the Commons on 23rd March 1965, Hattersley stated:

> *I now believe that there are social as well as economic arguments and I believe that unrestricted immigration can only produce additional problems, additional suffering and additional hardship unless some kind of limitation is imposed and continued* (Cited in Foot, 1965, p.192).

Such beliefs led very rapidly to 'assimilationist' measures, which attempted to deny or even destroy the linguistic and cultural identities of ethnic minorities (Patterson, 1971).

By the time the 1966 General Election took place, Labour had gained electoral credibility on immigration to the extent that Smethwick returned a Labour candidate in preference to Peter Griffiths. In the meantime two opposing groups of organisations focusing on the issue of race emerged. On the one side were anti-immigration organisations such as the British National Party, the Greater British movement, the U.K. Defence League and even the British Klu Klux Klan. On the other side were organisations such as the Campaign against Racial Discrimination (CARD), the Lester Group (lead by a barrister, Anthony Lester) and the Yellow Star movement (Kushnik, 1971).

The 1966 Labour Government immediately set out to meet promises made in its election manifesto concerning immigration which were essentially, to limit immigration on the one hand, whilst taking measures to encourage integration on the other. Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act was a key measure; introduced in order to appease Local Authorities where there were large numbers of immigrants. It enabled substantial grants to Local Authorities for the purpose of 'special provision' for immigrants in order to facilitate their integration. Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act will be fully discussed in the following chapter, but it is important to note here that its origins were ideologically rooted in the 1965 White Paper.

Whilst the right wing, the press and the British voters were quietened for the time being, this was not to last long (Hiro, 1991). Following the

General Election of 1966 when Labour were returned to power, Roy Jenkins (the Home Secretary) began to establish the case for extending the 1965 Race Relations Act which was by now seen as tokenism (Kushnik, 1971). As a reformist, Jenkins attempted to strengthen the Act considerably, but when Callaghan took over at the Home Office in 1968, some of the proposed powers of enforcement were considerably diluted according to Kushnik, (1971). The Bill was finally enacted on 24 October 1968.

One factor which led to right wing support for the weaker legislation, was an unexpected wave of immigration from Kenya in 1967. Without any warning the Kenyan Government had passed legislation which resulted in Kenyan Asians who had opted for British rather than Kenyan Citizenship being classed as aliens, with a right to work and live only temporarily in Kenya, (Runnymede and Radical Statistics Group, 1980). Many of these Kenyan Asians chose to exercise their right to settle in Britain. Certain Tory politicians began predicting the arrival of at least 250,000 East African Asians, although in fact by 1968 the number was only 66,000 (Hiro, 1992).

> *The Conservative party demanded, amongst other things,*
> *that the entry of Kenyan Asians holding UK passports be*
> *phased. The Labour government went further: it*
> *removed the right of entry* (The Runnymede and Radical
> Statistics Group, 1980, p.33).

During the course of the debate concerning increasing immigration control, perhaps the best known speech on race in British history was given by Enoch Powell, M.P. In his speech, in Birmingham on 20th April 1968 he claimed:

> *In this country, in fifteen or twenty years time the black*
> *man will have the whip hand over the white man. As I*
> *look ahead, I am filled with foreboding. Like the*
> *Romans, I seem to see 'The River Tiber foaming with*
> *much blood'* (Powell, 1968, p.99).

Powell's expression of extreme anti-immigration views gained widespread public support. According to Hiro, (1991), one national poll showed 82 percent supported the views expressed in his speech. Thousands of workers went on strike and participated in demonstrations to support his views (Ramdin, 1987; Hiro, 1991).

Powell's speech was well timed, taking place just three days before the parliamentary debate on the Race Relation Bill. Pressure from the anti-immigration camp succeeded in sabotaging efforts to strengthen the bill's clauses concerning enforcement. The Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968 was rushed through Parliament from start to finish in three days. The Act withdrew the right to enter and settle in Britain for those United Kingdom passport holders who did not have a 'close connection' (which was defined as birth in the United Kingdom or descent from a parent or grandparent born in the United Kingdom, or of naturalisation, registration in the United Kingdom and Colonies, or adoption in the United Kingdom). Even stricter limitations on the number of employment voucher holders were also imposed. More pressure came from Powell who demanded that the government should restrict the entry of dependants (Hiro, 1991). Similar demands were made by Edward Heath in January 1969. Only a few months later an amendment was introduced to the Immigration Appeals Bill 1969 which had given a right of appeal to those refused entry. This amendment required dependants of Commonwealth immigrants to obtain entry certificates before

entering Britain. This had the intended effect of reducing the entry of the number of dependants still further. Still tighter control was introduced when employers were required to prove that no suitable local labour was available to fill any vacancy.

The Conservative manifesto for June 1970 proposed yet further control, which was enforced in 1971 when the Conservatives regained power. The Immigration Act, 1971 replaced the 1914 Aliens Restrictions Act, the 1962 and 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Acts and the 1969 Immigration Act. Under the 1971 Act, the onus was placed on the intending immigrant to prove a substantial connection with the U.K., for instance, a parent or grandparent born in the U.K. This resulted in immigrants being subjected to:

> *insecurity and harassment from state agencies (such as immigration officials, the police, the Illegal Immigration Intelligence Units, Health and Social Security Staff) and involving deportation, detention without trial, family separation, shuttlecocking, interminable delays, and all the associated personal suffering and indignities, of which the 'virginity tests' revealed publicly in 'The Guardian' (1 st February 1970) are only the most extreme example* (Ben-Tovim and Gabriel, 1987, p.143).

With the exception of the entry of Ugandan Asians who were allowed to settle in 1972, following their expulsion from Uganda by Idi Amin, immigration rules issued by the Home Secretary increasingly tightened control (Macdonald, 1983). Further legislation to control immigration (British Nationality Act 1981; Immigration Act 1988) and anti-discriminatory measures (Race Relations Act 1986) served to further progress the dualistic policies first established by Labour in the 1965 White Paper.

Twenty years on, the 1985 CRE report on the patterns of settlement of Ethnic Minorities in Britain noted that Primary Immigration dropped from 18 thousand in 1972 to 6.4 thousand in 1983. During the same period secondary immigration dropped from 50 thousand to 19.6 thousand. Overall immigration from the New Commonwealth (including Pakistan) which had peaked in 1972 at 68 thousand, dropped to 26 thousand in 1985 (CRE, 1985).

The first British Census which collected data on the ethnic make-up of the population rather than broader categories, took place in 1991. The 1981 census had identified those persons who had been born in the New Commonwealth and Pakistan and first generation immigrants. This failed to provide detailed information on the growing numbers of ethnic minorities who did not fall into these categories particularly those who were British born. The 1991 Census found the population of Great Britain to be almost 54.9 million. However, it has been recognised (Owen, 1992) that there was significant non co-operation in the 1991 census resulting in an estimated overall undercount of around 965 thousand. The census figures showed that just over 3 million of the population belonged to ethnic minorities (Owen, 1992). Almost half of these people were of South Asian origin of whom the largest group was Indian. The second largest ethnic minority was the African Caribbean group.

It was found that more than half of the ethnic minority population live in South East England with 44.8 percent in greater London. The other main concentration of ethnic minorities is in the West Midlands, particularly around Birmingham. West Yorkshire and the Greater

Manchester areas also contained some of the highest relative concentrations of ethnic minorities (Owen, 1993).

Although the statistics available do not permit a direct comparison of the ethnic composition of the population between 1971, 1981 and 1991, it is possible to compare the numbers of ethnic minorities in the 1991 Census, with the number of people who had a family connection with the New Commonwealth and Pakistan in the 1971 and 1981 Censuses. Whilst the total population during this twenty year period grew by nearly 5 percent, the geographical distribution appears to have remained much the same, although there has been an increasing tendancy for ethnic minorities to concentrate in the larger Urban settlements (Owen, 1993).

Many studies have shown that ethnic minorities have continued to suffer disproportionately in the areas of housing, education and employment, compared with the white population (Smith, 1977; Brown, 1984; Brown and Gay, 1985; Jones, 1993). The 1993 Labour Force Survey demonstrated that over thirty years after the earliest waves of immigration from the New Commonwealth, there are wide variations in disadvantage experienced by different ethnic minority groups:

> *There is an increasing disparity between the*
> *circumstances of specific groups. The findings suggest*
> *that the South Asian population contains both the most*
> *and the least successful of the ethnic minority groups.*
> (Jones, 1993, p.157).

The most successful groups, were the African Asians and Indians who were found to have attained educationally and professionally at least as well as whites. The least successful groups with low educational

attainment, high unemployment rates were the Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. The research indicated that African-Caribbeans tended to fall somewhere in the middle. The evidence therefore indicated the need to reassess what was perhaps previously a stereotypical perception of the relationship between ethnic minorities, discrimination and disadvantage.

The essential diversity of the different ethnic groups is perhaps overcoming the role in which immigrants were cast by British Society (Jones, 1993, p.151).

In attempting to answer the question of differential disadvantage between minority groups, Jones (1993) supports the view that certain groups are in a better position to develop ways of overcoming the disadvantages of discrimination. Not only does the survey draw attention to disparities between different ethnic minority groups, but also within those specific groups. In particular, the discrepancies between males and females within ethnic groups were shown to be disproportionate. And for instance, whilst there is high economic activity amongst African Caribbean women there is low economic activity amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani women, who are generally Muslim and therefore arguably more affected by religious and cultural constraints.

Of the ethnic minority population in 1991 as a whole, 46 percent were found to be born in the U.K. compared with 97 percent of the white population. The group most likely to be born outside the U.K. was the Chinese. 26 percent of ethnic minorities were born outside the New Commonwealth and Pakistan, this is likely to include refugee groups such as Vietnamese and Somalis.

Perhaps most significantly, despite the fears concerning immigration in the 1960's expressed in Enoch Powell's warnings of 'excessive' numbers of black people, the 1991 Census has shown that "Britain is still overwhelmingly white in character, with ethnic minorities accounting for 5.5. percent of the population" (Owen, 1992, p.1).

CHAPTER 3

The Origins and Development of Section 11

The Background

In the preceding chapter, government responses to the growing presence of immigrants from the New Commonwealth were discussed. The 1966, Local Government Act was introduced to help those local authorities with an 'immigrant' presence to meet their needs through a grant from central government , administered by the Home Office. (Appendix 2 provides a chronological list of events relating to the introduction and implementation of Section 11). The majority of Section 11 grant, since its implementation in 1967, has been used for educational provision. The purpose of this chapter is to look at the introduction, implementation and use of Section 11 funding, particularly as an educational response to the needs of ethnic minority communities.

The political climate, and the issue of race and immigration in the early 1960s is the background against which Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act is set. Open racism was at that time "seen to pay electoral dividends" (Hiro, 1991, p.44). Despite winning the 1964 General Election, Labour had lost 'safe' seats to Conservative candidates who had campaigned on a racist, anti-immigration 'ticket'. The loss of Smethwick, a seat previously held with a 12,000 majority, was particularly symbolic of the political climate and the concern regarding immigration within the electorate and the Labour Government itself. The reaction of the local people of Smethwick to the 'immigrant' population was commonly expressed in comments such as:

I've nothing whatsoever against the black people... but these people are ruining our town... the houses are falling apart

and they have a very high rate of T.B. Their habits are pretty
terrible. They use the front garden as a rubbish dump and
heaven knows what they do in the garden (Foot, 1965, p.36)

It was in this climate, and in response to such xenophobia that Local
Authorities sought compensation from Central Government for the
social and economic 'burden' placed on them by the increasing numbers
of immigrants. Subsequently, Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government
Act was introduced by the Labour Government to placate, as well as
compensate, those Local Authorities affected by immigration.

Despite what has been described as "Labour's softness on the issue of
immigration" (Bagley, 1992, p.2), the Labour Government, after having
won the 1965 election, began increasing immigration control. The 1965
White Paper "Immigration from the Commonwealth" (Home Office,
1965) formed the political and ideological basis upon which Section 11
was built. This policy emerged through the perceived need to control the
number of immigrants (Commonwealth Immigrants Acts 1962, 1968 and
later the Immigration Act 1971) whilst assimilating and integrating those
immigrants already in the country (Race Relations Acts of 1965, 1968
and 1976).

This policy has two aspects: one relating to control on the
entry of immigrants so that it does not outrun Britain's
capacity to absorb them; the other relating to the positive
measures designed to secure for the immigrants and their
children their rightful place in our society and to assist local
authorities... in areas of high immigration in dealing with
certain problems which have arisen (Home Office, 1965, p.2).

This approach was, perhaps best summed up in Roy Hattersley's words
"without integration limitation is inexcusable, without limitation

integration is impossible" (citied in Dorn and Hibbert, 1987,P.60). It was subsequent to the 1965 paper, that the 1966 Local Government Act was introduced. Section 11 of this Act stated:

> 1.   *Subject to the provision of this section the Secretary of State may pay to Local Authorities who in his opinion are required to make special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence within their areas of substantial numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language or customs differ from those of the community, grants of such amounts as he may with the consent of the Treasury determine on account of expenditure of such description (being expenditure in respect of the employment of staff) as he may so determine.*
> 2.   *No grant shall be paid under this section in respect of expenditure incurred before 1st April, 1967* **(Local Government Act, 1966).**

This dualistic policy has been described as "possibly the most logically incoherent Government paper ever produced" (Dummett and Dummett, 1987 p.119). Yet the contradictions contained therein have formed the basis on which subsequent race policy and legislation have developed.

Although the Government provided financial aid for urban areas through the Local Authority rate support grant and some specific resources such as the Urban Aid programme, little was achieved in combating racial disadvantage (Dummett and Dummett, 1987). Section 11 of the Local Government Act was the first major intervention by Government intended to provide specific assistance to multi-racial towns and cities. Through Section 11, Local Authorities could apply for grant aid, originally at the rate of 50 per cent and later in 1969, at the rate of 75 per cent of salary costs. Administered by the Home Office, the grant

could be used to make special provision for "immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language or customs differed from those of the community." (Home Office, 1967). Although the grant covered staffing costs in any Local Authority service, it has in the main been utilised by Education Departments and to a lesser extent, Social Services. For the purpose of the grant it was agreed with Local Authority Associations that:

A Commonwealth immigrant will normally be a person, adult or child born in another country of the Commonwealth who has been ordinarily resident in the United Kingdom for less than 10 years or the child of such a person (Home Office, 1967. Circular No. 15/1967).

This Home Office advice in circular 15/1967 established the assumption that as a measure to combat racial disadvantage Section 11 would only be of a short term nature. This simplistic assumption in fact lead to long term criticism of Section 11 as a mechanism for addressing the needs of ethnic minorities. It was also determined that a Local Authority qualified for grant if 2 per cent or more of its entire school population were children of Commonwealth immigrants. This rule was intended to clarify the "substantial numbers" referred to in the legislation. This was known as the '2 per cent rule' and applied until 1990.

In the original circular to Local Authorities (Home Office, Circular no. 15/1967), the Home Office indicated that 46 Authorities had a 'prima facie' case for claiming Section 11 grant, though application was voluntaristic rather than needs based. The amount of grant concerned involved significant sums. For instance, by the 1985/6 financial year, around £110 million was granted to Local Authorities, the majority

going to Education Departments, and in 1992/3 Local Authorities were claiming grant of around £129 million, (LARRIE, 1992).

Assimilation and integration

Dispersal and assimilation were seen in the 1960's as effective means of absorbing and integrating 'immigrants.' This view is illustrated in a DES pamphlet entitled "Spreading the Children" which stated:

> *It is inevitable that, as the proportion of immigrant children in a school or class increases, the problems will become more difficult to resolve, and the chances of assimilation more remote. How far any given portion of immigrant children can be absorbed with benefit to both sides depends on, among other of immigrant children who are proficient in English (sic); the dividing line cannot be precisely defined. Experience suggests however that... up to a fifth of immigrant children in any group fit in with reasonable ease, but that, if the proportion goes over about one third either in the school as a whole or in any one class, serious strains arise. It is therefore desirable that the catchment areas of schools should wherever possible, be arranged to avoid undue concentration of immigrant children. Where this proves impracticable simply because the school serves an area which is occupied largely by immigrants, every effort should be made to disperse the immigrant children around a greater number of schools and to meet such problems of transport as may arise* (DES, 1965, p.193).

Ever mindful of containing 'the problem' and allaying the fears of the white population, the same circular continued:

> *It will be helpful if the parents of non-immigrant children can see that practical measures have been taken to deal with the problems in the schools, and that the progress of their own children is not being restricted by the undue*

preoccupation of the teaching staff with the linguistic and other difficulties of immigrant children.

This is clear evidence of a problem centred view of immigrants. Leading members of the government, such as Roy Hattersley held political ideologies and expressed views on immigration which supported assimilationist theories. Section 11 was seen by them as a social and economic mechanism for assimilating immigrants in order that they might become less visible and therefore, less of a problem.

> *I hope that, when the money under Section 11 is distributed, the Secretary of State will bear in mind, that as well as providing smaller classes in which English can be adequately taught, as well as providing extra visitors to remind parents of their new obligations in Britain, it is essential to teach these children basic British customs, basic British habits and, if one likes, basic British prejudices- all those things which they need to know if they are to live happily and successfully in an integrated way in this community* (Hansard 1966, Col.1336).

Until 1971 the collection of statistics on immigrant children from form 7(i) provided the necessary information to ascertain whether or not a Local Authority qualified for Section 11 grant. However, grant was allocated according to mere presence of immigrants rather than on the number of those assessed to be in need of support, which added support for a "problem centred perception of ethnic minority pupils" (DES, 1985, p.194). Section 11 grant has therefore been seen ideologically and politically as a response not only to the needs of ethnic minority pupils, compensating them for their 'deficiencies', but also as a means of preventing any upset to the education of white children. It is this assimilationist approach, for which Section 11 was originally designed,

that failed to recognise or acknowledge the changing nature of British society. This strategy of dealing with the assimilation of 'immigrants' through Section 11 funding has been described as:

> *Very much a child of the 1960's and its current problems and persistent contradiction must be seen as emanating from the race relations policy ideologies that prevailed at that time. Whereas other policies and practices regarding 'race' and education have evolved (albeit painfully and partially) from assimilation to anti-racism, Section 11 itself has remained relatively static in its conception and application* (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987, p.60).

Despite this view, there have been numerous Home Office efforts to revise the policy criteria and guidelines on Section 11 funding in order to adapt to changing needs. These changes have been communicated to Local Authorities through a series of Home Office circulars which will be dealt with in more detail later. Nevertheless, the statute itself has constrained the Home Office considerably in their attempts to apply the particular law with due consideration for its inadequacies. Whilst assimilation was an important aspect of Government race policies in the early and mid 1960's, many teachers in multi-racial schools realised the necessity to acknowledge children's different cultures, religions and languages in the school curriculum. This approach came to be known as 'integrationist' since the main aim was still to enable immigrants to adapt and change. The majority community was not expected to adapt, but merely to have some knowledge of the immigrant communities' history and culture:

In effect there was little difference in expected or intended outcome between assimilation and integration since

It (Integration) failed to consider the broader implications for the traditional perception of the 'British way of life' which the presence of communities with such diverse backgrounds might have in the longer term (DES, 1985, p.127).

The integrationist approach also persisted in the belief that it was the immigrant's newness to this society and lack of familiarity with the language and culture which created the disadvantage. This perception is highly questionable particularly in the light of the experience of Liverpool blacks for whom racial disadvantage has not disappeared with the passage of time (DES, 1985), yet under Section 11 guidelines, Liverpool blacks and other third generation immigrants did not qualify for Section 11 support, until September 1993.

Interpretation of Section 11

Not only have perceptions of the needs of immigrants caused difficulty historically, the interpretation of Section 11 has also created much concern and debate. The detailed conditions under which Section 11 is payable were first set out in Home Office circular 15/1967 and it has been in the course of administering the grant, under the conditions set out in this and subsequent circulars, that problems became evident. In order to see the difficulties which have arisen, it is illuminating to look at this piece of legislation and the Home Office attempts at clarification to deal with its inadequacies through a series of circulars.

Local Authorities had discretionary powers over what constituted 'special provision.' Indeed the circular stated that Local Education Authorities might not be able to identify the specific posts which were intended to meet special need. The early Home Office circulars failed to

give sufficient guidance as to what constituted 'special provision'. This was interpreted by local authorities as the 'greenlight' to use funding in such a flexible way that it amounted at best to misuse and at worst to blatant abuse. Hibbert (1982) has accused the Home Office and the Government of deliberate "funding inexplicitness."

As previously mentioned, the required "substantial numbers" of immigrants was agreed by Local Authorities to be 2 per cent. There were however problems with this definition since it prevented Local Authorities with 'pockets' of immigrants, but without an overall population of 2 per cent or more, from claiming Section 11 grant. Another difficulty with the 2 per cent rule after 1973 arose from the DES decision not to collect data on the number of ethnic minority pupils. This prevented effective needs based targeting of the grant and merely led to a list of eligible authorities.

Further difficulty was experienced because of the limitation of Section 11 to support only those immigrants of Commonwealth heritage. This was amended in 1986 to include all those born in another country of the Commonwealth or from Pakistan before it left the Commonwealth in 1972 however long they had been resident in the UK, and their immediate descendants.

The term 'immigrants' has also been criticised. With the passage of time and the changing make up of the immigrant communities, this definition became inadequate, restrictive and inappropriate. (In September 1993 a Bill presented by Neil Gerard M.P. to lift this restriction was enacted although no funding was made available to respond to the need involved due to the widening of the criteria). Yet another criticism

of the legislation was, that by inserting in the Act the phrase, "Whose language and culture differ from those of the community". A view was presented that immigrants were not part of the community and were therefore to be treated differently. Although wording of the legislation was not amended, future Home Office circulars were quietly amended so that they read: "Whose language and culture differ from those of the rest of the community".

It is perhaps these basic flaws in the legislation which have lead to the abuse and consequent criticism of Section 11. This historical criticism and widespread mistrust amongst the black community seems to have prevented any objective analysis of the benefits of Section 11 provision as it is currently administered and delivered. It is therefore important to look at the criticisms which have been levelled at Section 11 and then to examine the Home Office's attempts to address any shortcomings in the legislation and its application, although these efforts have often been dismissed as 'tinkering' with the legislation. Whilst basic flaws in the Act do exist, it has been the basic ideology, the administration and use of the grant which has attracted most of the criticism.

Use of Special Funding

As already pointed out, Section 11 funded provision was intended to cater for the 'special need' of the 'immigrant' community. Bakhsh and Walker (1980 p.14) argue that 'special' funding for any particular group is not meant to give unfair advantage but "rather it must be seen as part of a commitment to redress the imbalance caused by racial disadvantage."

They further add that:

These funds (Section 11) were made available on the assumption that in tackling urban disadvantage the problems of racial disadvantage would be solved too
(Bakhsh and Walker, 1980, p.14).

Perceptions and definitions of 'special need' have evolved way beyond the original intention of the 1966 legislation. In the early years of Section 11 funding, it was the 'newness' of immigrants which was perceived as special. It was therefore assumed that through the provision of English Language support and the adaptation of existing services there would be a process of assimilation into the 'British way of life.'

At least in the first two decades of funding, it was generally accepted that 'need' was usually determined by Local Authority officers, (Hibbert, 1983). Consultation with the intended beneficiaries so that they could at least give their own view of the type of service needed only later became an issue of importance. Views of ethnic minority or 'immigrant' need have differed widely. There are those who have expressed the view that need is different in degree, but not in kind (Baksh and Walker, 1980). That is, they experience the same disadvantages as certain indigenous groups who are less well off socially and economically but to a greater extent. DES Survey 13 "The Education of immigrants" observed that:

They (immigrants) share all the difficulties of environmental deprivation known to native-born children living in these same areas. They frequently appear to suffer the same emotional disturbance, the same inarticulateness and difficulty with language, the same insecure approach to school and work, the same unsatisfactory attitudes in social relationships- all of

which affect their life and general progress at school (DES, 1971, p.5).

Alternatively it might be argued that cultural maintenance requires the preservation of difference and therefore 'special provision' includes measures such as the teaching of community languages. Others argue that 'special needs' arise from the damaging effect of racism and that intervention is necessary in order to deal with discrimination and inequalities.

Further research has suggested that the 'needs' of ethnic minorities should be analysed within an equal opportunities framework in terms of "the membership of stigmatised or excluded groups" (Johnson, Cox and Cross, 1989 p.373).

In their research into the use of Section 11 by Social Services Departments, Johnson, Cox and Cross (1989) found that respondents to their survey had difficulty with the concept of 'special need.' Respondents would sometimes perceive distinctions of "mystifying complexity" when trying to disentangle what was *additional*, what was *mainstream* and what was *special*. Such confusion has typically caused considerable difficulty determining what is eligible under Section 11 and in the utilisation of the grant. Differing definitions and perceptions of 'need' as well as the restrictive nature of the original Act, inevitably increased pressure on the Home Office to review guidelines in order to extend permissible provision under the legislation.

The 'civil disturbances' of 1981 in towns and cities with large ethnic minority populations were particularly significant in shaping political attitudes and the Home Office view of 'acceptable' provision. The Rampton Report (DES, 1981), and the Swann Report (DES, 1985)

widened the education debate on the educational response to the needs of ethnic minority children. These reports significantly raised the awareness of educationalists to the shortcomings of the provision at that time as well as making recommendations in order to address the inadequacies.

Whilst Section 11 provision was clearly intended to be needs based, Local Authorities generally determined the exact nature of the provision without consulting the intended beneficiaries. The provision therefore often related to their own perceptions of ethnic minority needs and their perception that the immigrants should be assimilated into the 'British way of life'. Even worse, some Local Authorities used Section 11 as an opportunity to attract external funding to prop up mainstream services.

> *Many Local Authorities saw this as an opportunity to use Home Office funds to reduce the cost of normal staffing within their schools, with absolutely no benefit for the people for whom benefit was intended* (Duncan, 1988, p.15).

The paternalistic, assimilationist view of the needs of 'immigrant' children in the 1960's entirely dominated the attitudes and practices of educationalists. Duncan (1988) is critical of the designation of the majority of Section 11 posts up until the 1980's. He expressed the view that these jobs were created:

> *With no imagination whatsoever, the only need that could be identified on behalf of black children was for English to be taught to them as a second language... and even this was done rather badly* (Duncan, 1988, p.15).

Dorn and Hibbert (1987 p.64) are equally critical of this "narrowness of

utilisation" due in part to the Home Office's lack of specific guidance as to what exactly constituted 'special provision.' The assimilationist view and the restricted application of Section 11, led many Local Authorities to set up 'immigrant centres' or 'language centres' in the 1960's where immigrant children were separated from the rest of the community. Even in cases where these children were either based in or received back into mainstream education, they were often withdrawn from class. In DES survey 13 (1971) "The Education of Immigrants", the Government continued to place emphasis on the teaching of English as: "the most urgent single challenge facing schools." The report continued:

> *Pressure on schools has been relieved, and with considerable success, by special arrangements for the reception of immigrant children and for teaching them English up to a certain standard before they are admitted to schools they will attend full time. Such arrangements... include the establishment of reception and language centres (whose numbers have increased considerably in the past five years) and withdrawal classes... Thus, it has been possible for authorities to alleviate for their schools a situation in which large numbers of immigrant children might otherwise create a serious teaching problem* (DES, 1971, p.19).

The staff of these centres tended on the whole to be Section 11 or Urban Aid funded. As late as 1981, it was reported (DES, 1981) that "English as a second language was still widely regarded as the central priority" Meanwhile, the needs of Section 11 qualifying children of West Indian (African Caribbean) heritage were either put lower down the list of priorities or largely misidentified (Duncan, 1988). The Rampton Report found that they were often either provided with English as a Second Language Support (ESL), which was primarily designed and intended for

pupils of Asian heritage), or were placed in 'remedial' classes. DES Report 3 (1981) recommended withdrawal groups for 'West Indian' children.

This racially separatist, deficit model was one on which negative stereotypes of the African Caribbean child were built (DES, 1981). It is therefore of little surprise that such perspectives and analyses have been powerfully rejected from an academic standpoint, (Figueroa 1991) and that the African Caribbean communities, who have seen themselves being mislabelled, misunderstood and disenfranchised from the rest of the community, have protested.

The first decade

In November 1977, the NUT carried out a national survey on the use of Section 11 funding in Education Departments. This survey requested from Chief Education Officers, information regarding: the amount of grant claimed for each of the previous five years to employ additional staff in the Education Service; an estimate of the claim to be made for the current financial year; the number and categories of staff employed from Section 11 funding. The resulting report (NUT, 1978, indicated that ninety four L.E.As completed the questionnaire, fifty one indicated that they had not made a Section 11 claim over the previous 5 years and that they did not intend to make a claim during that financial year 1977-78. Seven Authorities indicated that they provided some support for 'immigrant' pupils but did not use Section 11 funding for this purpose. One Authority expressed concern that it was ineligible for Section 11 funding due to the '2 per cent rule' despite the existence within the Authority of areas of high immigration. Forty three Authorities stated in their replies that they had made claims under Section 11 and that they would be claiming in the same financial year. These forty three

Authorities provided information on the categories of staff funded under Section 11. It is interesting that the largest category was teachers but other categories included a pool attendant, caretakers, cleaners and bus wardens.

There were also 'unspecified' posts, that is, those which increased the workforce but not necessarily in relation to ethnic minorities. Only a small number of Authorities created specific posts, and according to the NUT, these same Authorities were also responsible for the establishment of language resource units, teachers of West Indian groups, English language reception centres and other specific posts or teams relating specifically to the needs set out under Section 11.

It was noted by the House of Commons (1981) Home Affairs Committee that: "There is no single aspect of Section 11 which has escaped criticism." Paul Boateng M.P. has been quoted as asking sardonically, "Why is Section 11 like an iceberg? Because there's a lot of it around, you can't see much of it, and it's very very white" (cited in Dorn and Hibbert, 1987, p.64). But perhaps the most common abuse of Section 11 funding until 1982, was its use for the purpose of additional but unidentifiable staff carrying out unidentifiable tasks. This dubious practice was without doubt the cause of one of the most serious criticisms of Section 11 (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). Home Office circular 15/1967 which failed to specify the type of provision Local Authorities might provide under Section 11, allowed Local Authorities discretion in respect of the type of posts they could employ in response to perceived 'need.' Whilst the Home Office circular stated that most posts would be identifiable, it accepted that it would not be possible to identify other posts and indeed that, it might be better not to identify "individual officers as being specifically employed

to deal with extra pressures created by differences of language and customs" (Home Office, 1967, para 10).

Many Section 11 funded staff had no idea, sometimes for many years, that they were not mainstream funded. One college lecturer informed the writer that he discovered in 1983, after carrying out some personal investigation, that he had been Section 11 funded for nine years without knowing so. The writer herself discovered she was Section 11 funded one month after taking up post in 1986 and despite having been clearly informed at interview that the post for which she had applied was mainstream funded. These cases are typical and illustrate the reluctance or inability of Local Authorities to clarify Section 11 or identify postholders until relatively recently.

Local Authorities used paragraph 10 in the 1967 Home Office Circular to great benefit, employing large numbers of staff, particularly teachers, who were to all intent and purpose, simply enhancing the staff-pupil ratio in the 'immigrant' school. This had a long term negative effect on perceptions as well as the utilisation of Section 11 funding. Certain Authorities exploited paragraph 10 with the agreement of the Home Office. For example, the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) received a grant for more than 1,000 unidentifiable teachers in 1981-1982 based on Educational Priority Area (EPA), social deprivation indices. A special agreement between the Home Office and the ILEA took into account the fact that this arrangement was not entirely acceptable (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987), therefore grant was set at 60 per cent in this case instead of the usual 75 per cent. In other service areas formula payments agreed by the Home Office contributed to the Local Authorities' inability to account for their Section 11 funding. Fitzgerald found that:

By the mid 1970's it was commonly acknowledged that
Section 11 was being used largely to prop up mainstream
budgets and- as Government financial restrictions began
to bite more- particularly, to save Local Education
Authorities from cutting pupil-teacher ratios
(Fitzgerald, 1986, p.266).

Bakhsh and Walker (1980) found that whilst many Local Authority treasurers knew of the existence of Section 11, Headteachers were often ignorant of the fact that they had Section 11 funded teachers on their staff. It was suggested by Bakhsh and Walker that ignorance of Section 11 was a likely reason for grant not necessarily being taken up for special provision. Indeed one Chief Education Officer asked the NUT for information about Section 11 before agreeing to submit his Department's response to their survey (NUT, 1978).

According to a Community Relations Commission Report (1976), only 18 out of 54 Local Authorities who replied to a survey indicated that Section 11 posts were utilised for specific purposes relating to the needs of ethnic minorities. Only a small number of Authorities had established specific needs-related posts. Those Authorities included as provision: language resource units; teachers of West Indian children and English language reception classes. The majority of posts overall, were denoted as 'unspecified.'

The NUT (1978) survey confirmed that some Local Authorities included Section 11 teachers in the school establishment rather than counting them as extra to establishment. Dorn and Hibbert (1987, p.64) were also critical not only of the Home Office but also of Local Authorities who, they found, tended "to see Section 11 as a 'pump primer' for mainstream provision in multi-ethnic schools and as a way

of improving pupil-teacher ratios"

Whilst it had been recognised by the Home Office that funding might be used to enhance the size of the workforce in order to cope with the 'extra pressures' due to the presence of 'immigrants,' this became a 'loophole' for diverting funding from its intended purpose, particularly since in the early period the Home Office had allowed Local Authorities a great deal of discretion in creating and monitoring posts. Yet another 'loophole' which permitted Local Authorities to be less than specific about posts was the guideline which indicated that Section 11 staff need only work with 'immigrants' for 50 per cent of their time. It has been suggested that:

> *Local Authorities are now taking a more cynical*
> *approach, deliberately using the complexities of Section*
> *11 and the 'inexplicitness' of its language to mask the use*
> *of grants* (Hibbert, 1982, p.13).

Section 11 has been criticised by black communities and race workers for its restriction to staffing costs. (Section 11 cannot be used for running costs, building or equipment). However, under the traditional Urban Aid programme, applications were made for specific provision for ethnic minorities other than staffing. A further source of funding for the supply of resources for teachers was Educational Support Grant (ESG) from the then Department of Education and Science (DES). Under the category "Resources for a multicultural society" Education Departments could apply for grant for specific projects, for instance, appropriate classroom materials.

The NFER (Bourne, 1989) carried out research into educational provision for bilingual pupils. As part of this, Section 11 take up in six

Local Authorities was examined. This showed that funding was used for: ESL staff; bilingual staff; interpreters and translators; teachers of community languages; special schools and remedial teachers; educational psychologists; home-liaison teachers; the directors and staff of language and multicultural centres; additional payments to heads and deputies; Section 11 administrators.

From this, it seems that these LEAs built much if not all of their multicultural initiatives and provision on Section 11 funding. There is further support for this view:

> *In other words, while many have argued that Section 11 may not in itself offer a progressive strategy for equality and justice in Education, to date all the structures set up in order to work within authorities for reappraisal and reform appear to depend almost totally upon this funding* (Bourne , 1987, p.6).

The 1980 Home Affairs Sub Committee on Race Relations and Immigration, stated that:

> *The general approach of successive governments has been that the most fundamental needs of ethnic minorities are essentially the same as those of the population as a whole and that it is through the general expenditure of central and local government that these needs should be met. It has however been recognised that these programmes need to be adapted to the presence of ethnic minorities and to be sensitive to the special difficulties arising from language and cultural differences. To encourage this process, Governments have paid specific grants to local Authorities to help meet these problems.* (Home Office, memorandum, June 1980).

It is clear from this statement that Section 11 was intended as a 'pump primer' and not as a means of providing what mainstream should have been funding. In its reply to the above statements, the Government responded as follows: "... Local Authorities should be obliged to submit a statement setting out their long-term plans when applying for Section 11 Funding" (Home Office, 1982).

Section 71 of the Race Relations Act (1976) imposes a duty on local Authorities to make appropriate arrangements within their functions to ensure the elimination of unlawful racial discrimination and the promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. Home Office circular 72/1986 pointed out the duty of all Local Authorities to make appropriate provision for ethnic minorities under Section 71 of the 1976 Race Relations Act and to ensure that Section 11 was part of a coherent policy and strategy to achieve racial equality and the delivery of more responsive services. The CRE's "Code of Practice for Local Authorities for Section 11" (CRE, Southampton 1986) suggested that such an overall strategy should contain the following basic elements:

i.   it will cover the whole Local Authority;

ii.   it will be developed and will continue to be developed in consultation with ethnic minority communities;

iii.   its purpose and aims will be clearly stated and will contain specific reference to the need for:

- equality of opportunity in service delivery including- a recognition of special needs in ethnic minority communities;

- equality of access to provision;

- equality of opportunity in employment and training;
- positive action (using the permissive provision of the 1976 Race Relations Act) in both service delivery and employment and training;
- Local Authority support for ethnic minority voluntary organisations;
- sufficient and relevant training for all staff and officers.

iv. The implementation of the policy will be monitored and this will require a coordinated approach to ensure that it is implemented to the same standards both between departments and within each division of each department.

The CRE (1986) Code of Practice also suggested that the procedures should be set up for monitoring the policy and strategy and that this should assess:

i. the levels of access to services and employment opportunities;

ii. the effectiveness of measures designed to ensure that ethnic minorities achieve equality of access;

iii. the effectiveness of measures designed to enable staff to deliver services equally (e.g. equal opportunities/anti-racist training);

iv. the effectiveness of support to the ethnic minority voluntary organisations.

Whilst the initial intention of Section 11 of the Local Government Act may have been to cater for the 'short term' needs of immigrants, the view which seems to have evolved through Home Office circulars, is that Local Authorities are expected to systematically assimilate either the posts or the provision into mainstream services. In reality, this rarely happens and the opportunity to use the grant to bring about change has

been lost:

> *Local Authorities have a vested interest in minimising its*
> *mainstream provision for black and Asian citizens*
> *because it thereby appears to maximise its case for*
> *supplementary support. If Section 11 was linked,*
> *however, to Section 71 of the 1976 Act this would not be*
> *so. Section 11 becomes the means to prime the pump to*
> *produce a flow of equal opportunities* (Johnson et al,
> 1989, p.373).

Yet another aspect of Section 11 which has caused concern, has been the uneven take up of grant. As already mentioned, until 1973, when it was abolished, the 2 per cent figure was calculated, based on information provided by schools in form 7(i) annual returns to the DES. However, the decision to apply for grant was at the discretion of the Local Authority. The NUT survey (1978) found that take up "varied enormously between Authorities," bearing little relationship to actual numbers of 'immigrants.' For instance, the survey revealed that one Authority with an immigrant population of 6 per cent received £150,000 for 1972-1973 whilst another similar sized Authority with an immigrant population of 25 per cent received £269,000. Other Authorities with immigrant populations, failed to make any application or use of Section 11 funding at all.

Without ethnic monitoring and record keeping which was abandoned in 1973, the relationship between the numbers of immigrants and Section 11 funding inevitably became even less logical. Whilst some Local Authorities were not able to take advantage of the funding since they did not meet the 2 per cent rule, others did not see the provision as essential in terms of their own financial outlay. Still other Authorities were able to 'top up' the grant with European Economic Community (EEC)

funding. In 1974, the Home Office had submitted a claim to the EEC's Social Fund to support language provision for the children of immigrants. With the additional finance received from the EEC Social Fund, the Home Office began to reimburse Local Authorities respectively with part of their 25 per cent contribution to Section 11 expenditure. The drawback to the EEC funding was that it was not consistent and depended on the success or otherwise of bids, in the context of the prioritised needs of all member countries.

Whilst the prospect of receiving 100 per cent of the staffing costs for provision directed towards immigrants may well have encouraged some Local Authorities which had previously been deterred, to take up Section 11 grant, it indicated the low level of prioritisation those Authorities placed on the needs of their immigrant communities.

As mentioned earlier, it was possible under the formula system to obtain Section 11 funding without specifying posts. When in 1982 Local Authorities were required in Home Office circular 97/1982 to identify Section 11 postholders, many teachers and other staff were asked or instructed arbitrarily to become Section 11 funded. Beneath are some of the comments collected from Section 11 funded teachers (Issues, Spring, 1987, p.9).

- **Statement:** "I've put your name down on this Section 11 document so I can keep you."
  Context: Head in school with falling role talking to teacher.

- **Statement:** "I've found my name on this Section 11 document."
  Context: Secondary teacher to colleague.

- **Statement:**   "One of you has got to be Section 11."

  Context: Inspector asking remedial department to identify

  Section 11 person.

These examples are quite typical of the ways in which many teachers became Section 11 funded. Still others were identified without knowing it themselves. The fact that many staff had 'inadvertently' become Section 11 funded also meant that they did not necessarily bring with them any culturally or linguistically appropriate skills or knowledge with which to effectively carry out their Section 11 duties. Teachers often complained of becoming 'marginalised' and 'de-skilled.' They often found it difficult to go back into mainstream work. Very often, schools would contribute to this process of marginalisation. ISSUES, (Spring, 1987, p.14) quoted one Section 11 teacher as saying "When the teachers come cheap the employment practice is cheap too."

Johnson et al, (1989) found that with reducing opportunities on the job market many Section 11 staff were staying longer in the same posts and despite the professional expertise or qualifications they possessed or acquired, the vast majority of Section 11 staff were on scale 1 (formerly the lowest of 5 scales of pay) and many were on temporary contracts (ISSUES, Spring, 1987). Consequently, Section 11 staff had fewer career opportunities than mainstream staff.

It was also found that any issue covering 'race' or any ethnic minority child in a school was often seen as the Section 11 worker's responsibility (Fitzgerald, 1986). This meant that mainstream colleagues often failed to acknowledge their own responsibilities leaving Section 11 staff,

particularly black workers, to deal with these matters alone. The marginalisation of Section 11 and Section 11 staff was a major issue during the mid 1980's. For instance, at a conference held in Manchester in May 1986, Section 11 workers urged the Local Authority to clarify the role of Section 11 staff and their relationship to 'mainstream'. As a result, the Council established a Section 11 Policy and Strategy which was agreed with the black communities, (MCC, 1986).

The way in which some Local Authorities persisted in treating Section 11 staff lead to the perceived 'downgrading' of posts. Examples of abuse of Section 11 staff include one given by Matthews (1982, p.31) where a teacher of an 'A' Level subject was identified as Section 11 "because of teacher shortage" in that particular subject area.

Another common occurrence in schools was to find Section 11 staff to undertake their work with children not in classrooms, but in corridors or store cupboards (for example, ISSUES Spring, 1987, p.14). This often created a dilemma for the staff concerned since such practices not only ensured that their work was not given sufficient status but also prevented mainstream practice becoming more responsive to the needs of the children.

Johnson et al (1989) found that financial as well as staffing marginalisation existed. Local Authorities would often see Section 11 funding as the only means of serving the needs of ethnic minorities. Hence, it could be said that Section 11 legislation had the unintended effect of compounding the unequal position of ethnic minorities.

Section 11 funding powerfully reinforces some of these structural and strategic priorities of employers in giving black employees both a high profile and restricted responsibilities (Johnson et al, 1989, p.383).

Examples such as those given above, were indicative not only of abuses of Section 11 funding, but also of the lack of monitoring either by Local Government or the Home Office. Whilst monitoring did significantly improve, inadequate monitoring of Section 11 funding persisted for many years and certainly until 1986 when the Home Office Review of S.11 took place.

Many factors contributed towards this situation. Crispin and Hibbert (1986) found that there were insufficient staff in the Home Office dealing with Section 11 matters to cope with the volume of work. Moreover, the Home Office's failure to produce clear guidance until 1990 (although this was tackled to some extent in 1982 and 1986) as to how monitoring should take place, enabled Local Authorities to do as they wished with posts, irrespective of intention.

Not only was self assessment inadequate; there was considerable reluctance on the part of Local Authorities to undertake any kind of monitoring exercise (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). The earlier practice of Local Authorities submitting claims to the Home Office retrospectively did nothing to facilitate the targeting or monitoring of special provision. The only monitoring in effect which took place at national level was the financial audit; leaving the rest to the discretion of the Local Authority. Needless to say, had effective monitoring mechanisms been established by the Home Office, Local Authorities would at least have been less likely to abuse and misuse the funding.

With increasing financial constraints on Local Authorities throughout the 1980s, this lack of 'explicitness' as well as the lack of monitoring, permitted the use of this 'marginal' resource to 'top up' or even replace mainstream services (Hibbert, 1982). Whereas in the 1960's and 1970's, there had been ignorance of the potential of Section 11 funding on the part of Local Authorities, many now sought to use it to its full extent and even beyond!

> *And, as Government financial restrictions began to bite more deeply still, Local Authorities generally began to cast around ever more desperately for additional sources of funding to keep up levels of staffing and thereby service delivery. Many discovered the potential of Section 11 in non-education areas and its use and abuse if anything, grew* (Fitzgerald, 1986, p.226).

Indeed, Local Education Authorities such as Tower Hamlets and Southwark appointed independent consultants to give advice on maximising Section 11 funding.

Perhaps the greatest criticism of Section 11 funding from the point of view of black communities was the failure of Local Authorities to consult them (Bakhsh and Walker, 1980; Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). In the early years of Section 11 funding, Local Authorities were not expected to consult with their immigrant communities. As already discussed, it was in the main, the prerogative of Local Authority officers to determine the needs of the ethnic minority local population. Studies such as that of the NUT (1978) and Bakhsh and Walker (1980) served to highlight, amongst other things, the failure on the part of Local Authorities to consider these needs in relation to the intended beneficiaries own

perceptions. Any consultation which might have taken place, if at all, was of a very superficial nature. Crispin and Hibbert (1986) found that out of seven Local Education Authorities, only four had carried out a consultation exercise and one of these consulted with only eight out of the one hundred and fifty recognised ethnic minority groups.

The Home Office guidelines in circular 97/1982 sought to encourage Local Authorities to consult with New Commonwealth Communities by stating that they would be required to demonstrate how they had carried out consultation with the the local ethnic minority community or the local Community Relations Council. Apparently, the purpose of the consultation was to enable an overview of the posts in the context of the Authorities' general strategy on equal opportunity. There was no specific guidance about how the consultation should take place. Local Authorities were permitted to choose (as they still are) with whom they should consult, problems were thus inadvertently created. Where both Community Relations Councils and specialist race posts or race units existed, there was often competition rather than cooperation as to who should be consulted (Johnson et al, 1989). Local Authority officers retained the power and helped create divisions sometimes unintentionally, other times deliberately between community groups (Gibson, 1987). Gibson also found that a fundamental contradiction could exist within a consultation exercise or process, and that consultation was often symbolic rather than genuine.

Home Office circular 72/1986 required more clearly and definitely than previously, consultation with the intended beneficiaries of Section 11 funding. "Local Authorities will need to show that they have consulted with representatives of the intended beneficiaries of the special

provision" (Home Office, 72/1986). However, once again there was lack of attention as to how this consultation should take place, permitting Local Authority officers to continue to determine the mechanisms for consultation as well as the groups with whom they would consult. Inevitably, the quality of consultation varied from Authority to Authority. Johnson et al (1989) found that there were, on the whole, three types of consultation, although a combination of these might be used. These types were, either to rely on the local Community Relations Council, to buy in consultants specialising in race, or to carry out 'ad hoc' consultation meetings. On the whole it was found that "The consultation requirement served to buttress and justify the role of those consulted" (Johnson et al 1989, p.384).

Gibson, (1987) found that in a number of Authorities there was vying for the role of 'consultant.' As described above, this often happened where there was both a CRC and specialist Race Officers or Ethnic Minority Consultative Committees. 'Consultation' meetings could be used either to 'play off' different groups or to undermine groups or units. Such divisive outcomes were possibly unintended, but were certainly unfortunate products of the Home Office's requirement to consult whilst failing to provide guidelines. The mechanism for consultation would vary widely from authority to authority. For instance, in one Greater Manchester Authority a small group of interested community members were nominated by officers to be 'consulted' on Section 11, whereas in Manchester, the Race Sub-Committee with a good deal of politically delegated 'clout' was established with elected representation from the various ethnic minority groups. As a sub-committee of the council with political as well as community representation, decisions would be fed directly to Chief Officers in the Authority. However, most consultation

exercises were not particularly influential in shaping Section 11 provision. Where Local Authority officers were reluctant to carry out genuine consultation, efforts were made to discredit local CRC members (CRE Memo, 1987). Community concerns would often be neutralised due to the fact that they were being dealt with in "an individual and piecemeal way" (ISSUES, Spring 1987, p.6). Perhaps worse still, certain Local Authorities seem to have made no attempt to consult the local ethnic communities or even to consult a chosen few "... the council has never attempted any review of Section 11 funding, as directed by the Home Office, let alone any public consultation" (Indian Workers Association, 1987, p.6) .

Hibbert (1983, p.46) questioned the "great faith put in the ability of Local Authorities to initiate consultation." Perhaps they recognised, as suggested by Hibbert that "consultation is a two edged sword.... a potential source of embarrassment to them." For instance, the Bedford Council for Racial Equality expressed serious concern about the policies and practices of Bedford Local Education Authority in relation to Section 11. Indeed, with regard to monitoring posts they stated:

> *Neither the spirit or the intention of the Home Office's guidelines have been observed by the Education Service in the deployment of Section 11 staff in the past. As BCRE understands those guidelines, the sole beneficiaries of Section 11 funding should be members of the community of NCW origin. This has been far from the case for several years in Bedfordshire* (Bedford Council for Racial Equality, Memo, 15/6/87).

Gibson's study (1987) of "The consultation process with ethnic minority communities in Milltown" equally illustrated concerns about the

genuineness of Local Education Authorities. Gibson poses the question whether the transfer of only "a semblance of power" is sufficient in considering whether consultation has taken place? His contention is that:

> *The requirement for the transfer of power from the consultors to the consulted is crucial within any genuine consultation process, or indeed one which is not seeking merely to maintain its own integrity* (Gibson, 1987, p.78).

Gibson found that the consultation process in "Milltown", was little more than a cosmetic exercise. For example, officers presented a long and detailed report to community members at a meeting on Section 11. There was insufficient time to read and consider the report, yet representatives were asked to 'rubber stamp' it. Despite the fact that the minutes showed that concerns had been raised, the same minutes show that no satisfactory answers were provided by officers. In considering the attempts by Local Education Officers to consult ethnic minority communities about Section 11 funding, Collett (1985, p.19) asks: "Is it being cynical to suspect that the word 'consultation' in public affairs has taken on overtones at least patronising, and at worst, totally cosmetic?" Indeed in many cases where ethnic minority representatives have little or no power, the extent to which they are able to make changes or have influence is severely limited.

Bagley (1992) also reports extensively on Local Authorities' failure to carry out meaningful and genuine consultation. Bagley concludes that "RECs believed that when it came to consultation and Section 11 bids it was in effect a 'fait accompli', with them participating in discussions and commenting on decisions that had already been made" (p.19). Bagley

also found in his study that despite the requests of REC's for copies of Section 11 bids for some months before the 1991 Home Office deadline, they received copies so late that they had little real opportunity to analyse and comment. Whilst these delays may well have been administrative oversights, it might be construed as a deliberate ploy to marginalise the RECs and prevent them and the ethnic minority communities from making a contribution in terms of shaping and influencing Section 11 provision.

The LARRIE research report (1992) found that few bids failed in 1990 due to inadequate consultation, yet a number of respondents to the LARRIE survey reported their difficulties concerning this part of the process. Race Officers, especially those who were Local Authority employees, were placed in the dilemma of either 'playing the game' or 'sticking to principles' thus losing precious funding from which the local community would have benefited.

Perhaps the most ironic outcome of consultation with local black communities on Section 11 is that

> *Finally (and ironically), improved consultation with black people themselves may well prove to be the catch 22 in all this. The London Borough of Brent, which was more conscientious than most in its consultation and guidelines, received the clear message that black people felt marginalised by Section 11 and wanted the borough to give up the £5 million per annum it was claiming in their name* (Fitzgerald, 1986, p.270).

Home Office Administration

The Home Office's role in administering and monitoring the grant has

often been called into question. They have been savagely criticised for any involvement in Section 11. This has not simply been a question of accusations of 'misinterpretation' or 'maladministration.' At the very heart of this particular criticism is the perceived inappropriacy of this Government Department to deal with an issue relating to supporting and caring for black communities. (Dummett and Dummett, 1987; Dorn and Hibbert, 1987).

> *The Home Office should lose its present tight hold on the empire of immigration policy, and the responsibility should become a joint one between the ministries concerned with Housing, Employment and Productivity, Health, Social Security and Education. Great damage has been done in many instances simply because the Home Office, with a mentality attuned to the police, prisons, security and probation among it's many responsibilities, has had sole responsibility for immigration...*
> (Dummett and Dummett, 1987, p.135).

Although Home Office circulars in 1982 and 1986 as well as the 1990 review introduced changes to improve monitoring and increase accountability, this early history of mismanagement caused serious long term damage to the credibility of Section 11, particularly amongst the black communities themselves. Successive attempts by the Home Office to introduce tighter administration and monitoring to prevent some of the widespread abuse , had the unintended side effects of making Section 11 staff feel increasingly more insecure (Johnson et al, 1989).

It has been suggested on a number of occasions (CRC 1976; NUT, 1978), that Section 11 funding would best be placed in the relevant Government departments. The argument has been that the Home Office are not 'expert' in specific service delivery areas such as Education and

therefore all Education posts, for instance, should come under the control of the Department for Education (DFE).

The Home Office's 'anonymity' has caused some disquiet, whereas in fact where difficulties have arisen between Local Authorities and black communities or race officers, their role could have given them greater credibility. " If local clashes do occur it will be interesting, and a testament to the sincerity of government to see whose side they take" (Hibbert, 1983, p.46).

Responses and Reforms

Although there was some early disquiet concerning Section 11 funding on the part of some members of the black communities, it took some considerable time before the abuses and fundamental flaws of the legislation became serious issues. In the meantime, the Home Office dealt with any criticism by changes in the administrative arrangements. As already described, these were communicated by means of Home Office circulars. However, by 1976, the Community Relations Council had published their national strategy for funding multi-racial education. In their report (CRC, 1976) a new form of central funding for LEAs was proposed which would differ from Section 11 in three ways. Firstly, reimbursement would be at 90 per cent, instead of 75 per cent, as with other major awards; secondly, the funding would assist with capital expenditure and overheads in addition to staffing; and thirdly, the scale of financial support for these specific purposes would be increased due to the extended provision. It was proposed that the combination of the census data and the Registrar General's figures of births, according to the birth place of the mother, should form the basis for establishing criteria for distribution of the central fund. Whilst some minor inaccuracies

might have been present in the data (for instance white people born in the New Commonwealth would have been included), it was felt that overall, these figures would have been much more accurate than the DES statistics which were collected until 1973, and would permit needs based allocation of grant, unlike Section 11.

On 25th April 1978, an attempt was made by an all-party group of MPs to insert a new clause in the 'Inner Urban Areas Bill' which would have provided a further opportunity for designated district authorities to determine the extent of special needs arising from differences in customs, language and culture and prepare annual proposals to meet those needs.

There were still concerns about the clause in that it still referred to 'immigrants', and that the administrative responsibilities continued to be with the Home Office with the designated authorities monitoring their own services. However, the Speaker ruled the proposed clause out of order, principally because the inner urban areas were the subject of the Bill, whereas Section 11 concerned all types of councils.

In November 1978, the Home Office issued a Consultative Document proposing to replace Section 11 grant with wider and more flexible powers. The consultative document acknowledged that Section 11 had "met with increasing criticism" and was now "ill-suited to our present times" (Home Office, 1978). The document leaned heavily on the findings of the Government's 1975 White Paper "Racial Discrimination" (Home Office, 1975) which recognised the need for a more comprehensive strategy to deal with related problems of disadvantage. The Race Relations Act, 1976, was intended as the main instrument for

dealing with discrimination. However, in terms of resourcing, it was acknowledged that Local Authorities needed support to enable the adjustment of mainstream services to the needs of ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, it was stated quite clearly that all 'special needs' should not be met through 'special funding' and that essentially they should be met through mainstream expenditure programmes. Section 11 was, in the Government's eyes, but a useful "supplement to the resources of Local Authorities." This circular, a consultative document, added that:

> *Racial disadvantage is often too persistent to be capable of being dealt with merely by short-term measures and the ethnic minority communities have special needs of a continuous kind. The Government now sees the main priority to be to help Local Authorities to ensure that their long-term main expenditure programmes are responsive to ethnic minority needs as a whole while at the same time providing resources to help meet unique needs (such as English Language teaching) and any additional costs involved in ensuring that the delivery of these services to ethnic minorities is as effective as it is for the community generally* (Home office, Nov, 1978).

The document saw the main defects of Section 11 as being its exclusion of the third generation non-Commonwealth groups, also the uncoordinated approach to the needs of ethnic minorities. The proposed new grant would be paid to Local Authorities with groups:

> *distinguished by race, colour, nationality or ethnic or national origin for the purpose of enabling them to devise and carry out programmes designed:*
> - *to alleviate any special feature of social and educational disadvantage;*
> *and*
> - *to promote equality of opportunity and good relations*

between such groups and the general population.
(Home Office, 1978)

This grant was planned to cover all areas of Local Authority services including housing: social services: education and health services, with no statutory restrictions on its use. Whilst the grant was to continue at 75 per cent and to be administered by the Home Office, additional public expenditure was envisaged. It was anticipated that the Section 11 expenditure of £3.5 - £4 million would have increased by £10 million in 1981-82. The plan was devised to encourage Local Authorities to make their programmes more sensitive to the needs of ethnic minorities and help eradicate racial disadvantage without adversely affecting the rate payer. The proposals stated that " this new grant should be regarded as an additional weapon available to Local Authorities for combating disadvantage" (Home Office, 1978). This consultative document formed the basis of the Local Governments Grants (Ethnic Groups) Bill which reached its' second reading on 12th March 1979. However, the Bill was at Committee stage when Parliament was dissolved in April 1979 and the bill was lost.

Many Race Officers have continued to regret the loss of this Bill which they saw as a much improved alternative to Section 11 (Baksh and Walker, 1980; Dorn and Hibbert, 1987).

> *Although the proposed Bill would not have met all the*
> *expectations of 'underprivileged' minority groups, it*
> *would have certainly improved substantially on the*
> *previous situation* (Bakhsh and Walker, 1980, p.20).

When the Conservative Government took power, the Bill was buried for good. Instead, attempts were made over subsequent years to make

89

further adjustments to the administration of Section 11 in response to criticisms. In June 1980, the Home Office announced that it was reviewing Section 11 having already rejected its expansion.

In April 1981 came the Inner City 'uprisings' in areas such as Handsworth, Brixton and Moss Side causing considerable concern in Government. In June of the same year, the Rampton Committee (DES, 1981) published its report on the impact of racial disadvantage on children and young people of African-Caribbean heritage. These were significant events for the Home Affairs Sub Committee on Race Relations and Immigration which had been given responsibility for producing the White Paper on Racial Disadvantage, 5th Report of the Home Affairs Committee July 1981 (Home Office, 1982). Although the report, commented that "there is no single aspect of Section 11 grant which has escaped criticism" the Government decided that: "Section 11 should remain the major vehicle of Central Government financial support for Local Authorities to combat racial disadvantage". It was also recommended that:

> *Legislation be introduced as soon as convenient to remove the present restrictions to Commonwealth immigrants and to salary costs. The 10 year and 2 per cent rules should be abandoned. Formula payments should be phased out* (Home Office, Nov, 1982).

By the time the Government had replied to the White Paper, the 1981 uprisings had taken place. These events "forced the problems of young black people, however variously defined- squarely onto the political agenda" (Fitzgerald, 1986, p.267). In the meantime, it was decided that although there was no immediate prospect of fresh legislation, a number

of changes would be introduced through the administrative arrangements governing Section 11.

After consultation, the Home Office issued two new sets of guidelines in 1982 and 1983, corresponding closely to the Government recommendations in response to the 1981 White Paper on racial discrimination. The main features of the new rules introduced by Home Office circular 97/1982 were the abolition of the 'two per cent rule', the ten Year Rule and the redefinition of 'commonwealth immigrant' (CWI) which was extended to include all first generation immigrants from the Commonwealth, no matter how long their residence in this country, all immigrants born in Pakistan before 1972, all children of the above, aged twenty or less; The term 'substantial numbers' remained undefined, instead the Home Office indicated that it would exercise 'maximum flexibility.' Local Authorities with small and/or concentrated ethnic minority populations were also encouraged to claim the grant. Grant was only to be available for posts which were designed to meet the needs of New Commonwealth 'immigrants' and had to, represent 'special provision'. The duties of new posts had to be clearly specified, and, Section 11 postholders were to be identifiable.

Section 11 posts could not be seconded to non-Local Authority organisations. But applications were to be considered for posts on 'detached duty' (i.e. not working in Local Authority premises but directly accountable to Local Authority management). Local Authorities were strongly encouraged to consult with Commonwealth 'immigrant' communities and the local Community Relations Councils (CRCs) before submitting an application.

Local Authorities were asked to indicate how they proposed to monitor the effectiveness of posts and all new posts were subject to a three year (renewable) time limit on the duration of funding. Existing posts were also to be subject to review. Home Office Circular 94/1983 set out the arrangements for the review of all existing posts and the arrangements for the renewal of all posts.

The review was to be carried out in two stages. At the first stage Local Authorities were required to reassess the need for their 'existing posts'. In the second stage, the Home Office was to conduct its own assessment of Local Authority review reports. Local Authorities were required to show that existing posts met the criteria for funding outlined in Home Office circular 97/1982. Most importantly, Local Authorities were required to reassess their existing provision in the context of their 'general strategy' for meeting the needs of Commonwealth 'immigrants' and in the light of consultation with local communities and CRC's. Authorities were also asked to consider their arrangements for monitoring the effectiveness of their existing provision. Where posts no longer fulfilled the new criteria set out in circular 97/1982, Local Authorities could make replacement bids. Local Authorities were required to submit by 31st March 1984. These were to include:

- a statement of the objectives of the post or individual schemes with an indication as to the extent to which those objectives had been met;

- a comprehensive picture of the type of provision being delivered under Section 11;

- a clear indication as to the number of Section 11 posts and their location;

- descriptions of the duties carried out by Section 11 postholders;

- a statement by the Authority indicating the number of posts which, in its opinion, should continue to receive grant aid.

In spite of these more stringent requirements many Local Authorities found ways of continuing to exploit the funding (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). Many of the named staff under the review had little or no understanding of the needs of 'immigrants'. They were neither properly informed nor briefed. Needless to say, the criticisms of Section 11 did not cease or even die down as a result of the administrative changes introduced in circulars 97/1982 and 94/1983. If anything, the debate around Section 11 intensified and, "There remained continued reluctance to consider section 11 funded posts as a special and strategic resource to meet the needs of the Commonwealth immigrants" (Bakhsh, 1986).

In 1985, Government concern over racial tensions and racial disadvantages again came to the political forefront due to further Inner City uprisings. Also, "Education For All" (DES, 1985) was published, in which Section 11 again came 'under fire' for its statutory and administrative inadequacies as well as its failure to respond to the needs of black and ethnic minority children. In March 1986 a further draft circular was issued by the Home Office for consultation. This was an attempt to respond to the criticism. It was anticipated that new guidelines would come into force on 1st October. In the meantime no new Section 11 applications were to be considered. Indeed there already existed quite a backlog of applications (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). The circulars issued in 1982 and 1986 created such volumes of work that the Home office was insufficiently staffed to cope with monitoring. At times it took up to 9 months to receive an acknowledgement from the Home

Office. From January 1986 until October 1986, 786 bids were approved whilst 723 were rejected. However, in the same period in 1987 (ie, after the new guidelines) only 124 posts were approved whilst 428 posts were rejected. For instance, out of 50 applications made by the London Borough of Waltham Forest, only one post was successful. An analysis of the reasons for rejection (CRE, 1987) showed that there seemed to be more subjectivity than objectivity on the part of the Home Office in assessing posts in the context of their own guidelines and criteria. Local Authorities who had already made plans for the financial year 1986-87 on the assumption of the continuation of the old arrangement, were quick to protest.

> *After the elections (of 1986), new administrations with manifesto commitments based on similar assumptions were stopped in their tracks, and the complaints rose to such a pitch that the Home Office conceded that it would consider cases which were deemed most exceptional* (Fitzgerald, 1986, p268).

The changes proposed in the draft circular were of considerable significance since for the first time a Central Government department required Local Authorities to adopt practices which had been argued and recommended by CRE over a long period of time. In particular, emphasis was placed on the Local Authorities' duty to monitor, consult and take positive action within an overall strategy as set out in Section 71 of the Race Relations Act. The new guidelines which came into force in October 1986 in circular 72/1986 stated that it was necessary to " improve the targeting of Section 11 grant to those areas and those types of provision which it will be most effective in meeting special needs." The guidelines differed little from those in the draft consultation document except in that the initial monitoring period was extended from 12

94

months to 2 years and much more significantly, Local Authorities were urged to dismantle unnecessary barriers to black people gaining Section 11 employment by applying Sections 37 and 38 of the 1976 Race Relations Act. Moreover, the circular drew attention to Section 5 of the Race Relations Act to encourage the appointment of members of particular racial groups where membership was seen as "a genuine occupational qualification" for the job.

More emphasis than ever before was placed on monitoring by circular 72/1986. Local Authorities were required to develop 'output measures' and 'performance indicators' for each post. The monitoring of posts was perhaps the most contentious of all the changes. Local Authorities frantically reviewed provision producing Section 11 staffing lists, job descriptions, output measures and performance indicators in order to satisfy the Home office. Dorn and Hibbert (1987, p.70) have accused Local Authorities of producing "masterpieces of fiction" in response to the circular.

Teachers and Teacher Unions were concerned that the introduction of output measures and performance indicators was a 'backdoor' route to appraisal. The Home Office was quick to point out that it was the post which was being monitored and not the Postholder, as if the two were somehow separable.

The 72/1986 Home Office circular abolished the three year review cycle replacing it with arrangements to receive reports from Local Authorities as required and to carry out a rolling programme of visits. A number of critics, for instance, Dorn and Hibbert (1987) seriously doubted the Home Office's ability to effect any kind of review, and in fact the process

outlined in the 72/1986 circular was never carried out due to "a lack of resources" (Home Office, 1990).

Local Authorities were given until November 1987 to review their existing Section 11 posts for the following two years i.e. October 1986 to September 1988, in terms of their continued requirements. As with the 1982 review, Local Authorities took much longer than the given time, but overall, these 1986 guidelines constituted a more serious attempt on the part of the Home Office, not only to tighten up administration, but also to give clearer guidance on the use of Section 11 particularly in relation to tackling racial inequalities within the context of Section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976. The measures introduced in the new guidelines proved to be very effective in some instances. According to Guy and Menter (1992), following the difficulties experiences with the Education Department in Avon in 1981, Bristol Council for Racial Equality had consistently tried to clarify the purpose and functions of Section 11 funded posts in the Authority. By 1987 Bristol CRE remained unconvinced that Avon Education Department's Section 11 claim was legitimate and reported that the Department was using teachers as part of the normal establishment although their funding was identified as Section 11. The teachers identified as Section 11 were not required to carry out any special duties, nor were they chosen because of their specialist background or training.

In the Spring of 1987, Avon, as it previously had done, attempted to persuade existing teachers to become Section 11 postholders.

> *In order to bolster the claim that new provision was being delivered, a limited amount of in-service training was devised. The reason why Avon clung to this*

improbable interpretation of the guidelines was very simple: failure to retain Section 11 grant would mean a loss of funding to the Service as a whole (Guy and Menter, 1992, p.155).

Apparently, although the Local Authority was concerned, the belief was held that they would 'get away with it' despite the condemnation of teachers and governors who saw the Authority's attempts as "dishonest and futile" (Guy and Menter, 1992). In the event, the Home Office withdrew grant and a report to the Education Committee on July 1987 admitted that:

Grant aid for 43.5 FTE (full time equivalent) school-based teaching posts was withdrawn by the Home Office on the grounds that they did not meet the criteria. This loss of grant amounted to £399,800 at November 1986 prices.... only 38.3 of the Section 11 funded posts can currently be demonstrated to be additional to basic need. (Cited in Guy and Menter, 1992, p.156).

According to Guy and Mentor, a final attempt by Avon to have the posts accepted was rejected by the Home Office who replied that they could not see the benefit of further discussion.

Troyna and Williams (1986) found that since 1981 the numbers of Section 11 funded Home-School Liaison posts, mother tongue teachers and multi-cultural advisers/inspectors was increasing, but whilst in theory it had been possible for Local Authorities to employ detached Section 11 posts in the community, this had neither been encouraged nor occurred much. According to Home Office sources the take up of detached posts in the communities has continued to be low. The Home Office suggested in circular 72/1986 that detached posts would be

In a position to deliver services to members of their own communities in ways more appropriate to their circumstances than the Local Authority's own machinery (Home Office, 72/1986).

However, in practice it was very difficult to have these posts approved. For instance, the London Borough of Waltham Forest applied for three such posts which were all rejected. The London Strategic Policy Unit (LSPU) found that:

In a number of areas this is not happening, partly because of difficulties over the management of the detached worker, partly because Local Authorities have not informed black organisations about the detached worker provision, but mainly because some Local Authorities do not believe that special needs exist and so refuse to put in the claim (LSPU, 1988, p.7).

Whilst the guidelines in Circular 72/1986 were welcomed as moving nearer to a more acceptable interpretation of the statute, there remained nevertheless certain problems which the critics of Section 11 were quick to identify and exploit (e.g. Dorn and Hibbert, 1987). For such critics, nothing short of the total abolition of Section 11 would now suffice. Any changes to administrative arrangements they argued, failed to address the real problem:

With each successive reform of procedures and arrangements for grant aid we are forced back to the originating and anachronistic notions of the problem of "immigrants" and their "special needs." These remained unchanged and rooted in 1960's race relations ideology (Dorn and Hibbert, 1987, p.75).

Indeed, without legislative change, the benefits of the grant remained fairly restricted, Local Authorities being unable to use it, for instance, for Vietnamese or Somali refugees who were particularly in need of similar support. Johnson et al (1989) pointed out that "The problem now is that administrative rules have possibly stretched the original legislation as far as they will go". In fact, for many New Commonwealth 'immigrants, their 'newness' had disappeared yet problems, particularly that of racial discrimination, were still being experienced by the third generation.

Despite severe cutbacks of other grants such as the Urban Programme, Section 11 remained unscathed by cash restrictions. However, the attack on abuse together with attempts by Local Authorities to access as much external funding as possible inevitably placed financial pressure on the Government's ability to provide grant. As Fitzgerald pointed out:

Considerable expansion of Section 11 funding would appear inevitable, therefore, unless a ceiling is put on it, and the draft guidelines have already set warning bells ringing in the minds of the more suspicious (Fitzgerald, 1986, p.270).

There is now greater need for Local Authorities to prioritise than ever before. With pressure on schools and Local Authorities to reduce budgets whilst fulfilling statutory requirements, such as the national curriculum, non statutory provision risks being perceived as 'less essential' hence creating a further dilemma within the context of severe economic restraint. The more suspicious in the 1980s were indeed to be proved right.

The political climate of the mid-1980s

It was perhaps in Brent, and focusing on the Section 11 provision, that the politics of race in the mid-1980s came to a climax.

It is important in the first instance to outline the national framework in which Brent's policies on race were situated. Troyna (1992) stated that, "During the 1970's and 1980's Local Authorities rather than Central Government assumed the main responsibility for the formulation and implementation of race-related policies". He argued that whilst the decentralised education system permitted local responses, these responses were limited by national State policies. Troyna also pointed to the increased pressure from local black communities and to the way in which racism within the education system restricts academic progress and therefore the life chances of black children.

> *During the 1980s their calls for action were articulated more vociferously and with greater fervour. The growth of black supplementary and separate schools, the publication of empirical evidence pointing to inequalities in black and white achievement levels, threats of secessions and boycotts, and the forging of alliances between black groups and various local and national anti-racist organisations all prompted a shift in the thinking and provision of LEAs in different parts of the country* (Troyna, 1992, p.76).

The anti-racist policies which emerged were a social and political product of the 1980s. Labour controlled Authorities, where there were large black communities were quick to adopt these policies, sometimes influenced by the need to attract support from amongst the black electorate. However, there was also an awareness both at local and national level that youth unemployment particularly amongst young black people was

potentially a "social time bomb" (Troyna, 1992 p.79). The inevitable link was made between 'black underachievement' in school and unemployment. As a policy concern therefore, Education Departments, particularly in left wing Councils such as Brent, Sheffield and Manchester, committed themselves to anti-racist education. However, whilst the Rampton Report (DES,1981) had shown that racism played an important role in the 'underachievement' of pupils of African-Caribbean heritage, Ministers for Education in the 1980s, including Sir Keith Joseph denied any necessity for national intervention, despite Government 'concern' over the inner city 'uprisings' of 1981 and 1985 in areas with large black and ethnic minority populations (Troyna, 1992).

In Local Authorities which were also the biggest recipients of Section 11 funding, race policies became a crucial factor in developing educational responses to racism. Section 11 was sometimes seen by these Authorities, and in keeping with the Home Office's requirement, as part of the overall strategy to promote equality of opportunity (Troyna, 1992). However, some Local Authorities used the funding as the only vehicle for tackling racial inequality (Issues, Spring, 1987). It is perhaps important to note at this point that many schools were facing pressures between 1985 and 1986 due to industrial dispute. Morale was low and school managers struggled to keep schools running, staff discussion and debate with school managers was minimal and not conducive to the development of new policies. The introduction of the 1986 and 1988 Education Acts served only to intensify pressures and problems. The increasing demands on schools to implement the curriculum changes made it difficult to prioritise Local Authority demands to implement new Race policies. It was amidst this local and national political climate that Brent set up the Development Programme for Racial Equality

(DPRE).

The Section 11 funded DPRE was set up during 1986 following the Labour victory in the Local Elections of May 1986. The Section 11 funded project comprised 177 posts in all: 103 posts in schools (primary/secondary coordinators); 66 posts in project teams (curriculum development, projects outside); 8 posts in the directorate (1 Head, 2 Assistant Heads, 5 In-Service Tutors). The DPRE's statement of aims was as follows: "To enable schools to develop methodologies, structures and curricular which will improve the attainment and life chances of black pupils, and thereby create greater race equality" (Richardson, 1993). The programme was based on the perceived need to bring about changes in curriculum, staff development and organisational development. According to a briefing paper, (Brent 1986), the CRC had already expressed concerns in the annual report that African and Asian children were not fully benefiting from either Section 11 or mainstream education provision and expressed concern about high levels of underachievement. The 1986 briefing paper stated that CRC opinion was that: "Headteachers in Brent schools cannot assess the 'normal' needs of African and Asian children, hence they cannot be expected to assess the 'special needs' of these children." A major inspection of Brent schools by Her Majesty's Inspectors took place in the autumn of 1986 and the Spring of 1987. The report, (DES, 1987), found that problems affecting the quality of schooling in Brent included administrative incompetence, low teacher expectation, massive under achievement in certain schools. Inadequate identification of educational needs, lack of strong leadership in Primary Schools and the absence in secondary Schools of differentiated teaching and learning strategies were all identified as contributing to the poor educational standards in Brent. The DPRE

sought to help address these problems.

The project had only just begun when, a front page story headed "Race Spies Shock" appeared in the "Mail on Sunday." The article, using provocative language began:

> *Race Commissaries in a Left-wing Borough are recruiting*
> *180 Thought Police to patrol schools for prejudice.... Brent*
> *plans to put a Race Adviser in every school in January.*
> *They will be backed by project teams who will move in at*
> *the first hint of prejudice. The 180 Advisers will have the*
> *power to interfere in every aspect of school life, from*
> *discipline to curriculum* (Mail on Sunday, 19th Oct, 1986
> Cited in Richardson, 1992, p.136).

It was claimed that: "Councils up and down the country have discovered this Act (Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act) as a way of getting money for extremely dubious purposes." Other right-wing papers quickly followed in the same vein. According to Richardson (1992) the national agenda expressed and reported through the press campaign against the DPRE, had five main elements which were:

\:

National party politics, and the strong probability of a general election within the following nine months; the powers of Central Government vis a vis Local Government; racism in mainstream British culture and legislation; the use and role of Section 11 funding; the promotion of the Education Reform Act, both to the public at large and also inside the Conservative Party.

Richardson (1992, p.139) realised that there was, more than ever before, an attempt to restrict Section 11 for the purpose of "assimilation of

ethnic minority people to the 'British Educational ethos'." According to Richardson, not a single member of any of these newspapers ever contacted Brent in order to check their facts. Yet these uninformed press reports served to increase many white people's anxieties and did little to promote racial harmony.

An internal, memo (Brent, 1986) saw the media coverage as a deliberate campaign to discredit the DPRE "to prevent it being imitated by other Local Authorities." The same memo suggested that the hostile press coverage seemed "motivated by a desire to prevent the DPRE from being successful, and from achieving its basic overall purpose of enhancing the attainment and life chances of black pupils."

The press coverage created a difficult climate in which staff of the DPRE had to work. Although existing staff were well qualified, experienced and committed the damaging publicity made it more difficult to recruit and maintain quality staff to the project (Richardson, 1992).

At the invitation of Brent, two independent studies were made of the DPRE after it had been in operation for about twelve months. One study was carried out by a team of Her Majesty's Inspectors (DES, 1988) and the other by Sir David Lane on behalf of the Home Office (1988). In his report Sir David Lane, a former Conservative M.P. considered the original press reports in relation to DPRE as "outrageous" and "disgraceful". He further exonerated the programme stating: "The DPRE are in no sense 'spies', but are seeking to play their proper role as catalyst and stimulators of new ideas and practices" (Lane, 1988, p.37). The HMI Report echoed Lane's support for DPRE staff: "DPRE teachers have overall been welcomed in the schools in which they work, and many

positive comments were made by Heads and other staff about their contributions" (DES, 1988 p.13).

Despite this support, much damage had already been done which led to a Home Office decision to suspend funding of the programme. A further report in the form of a Committee of Enquiry chaired by Baroness Cox was set up in order to further investigate and monitor the programme. The interim report (Home Office, 1990) provided further independent support for the DPRE and recommended that the Home office should continue funding. But, by then:

> *The programme had been virtually strangled at its birth by lies in the Right wing press, and had been starved of entirely legal and legitimate funds by Central Government for most of its life; its ending came through the withdrawal of local support, both at officer and political level* (Richardson, 1992, p.142).

Consequently, Section 11 was used less and less to promote race equality and in Bagley's (1992) view more and more to continue assimilationist practices. Ironically, whilst the DPRE was associated with Left wing party politics, the original plans to set up the programme had enjoyed clear all-party support until May 1986.

Other LEAs observing the antagonism and problems surrounding Brent's serious attempts to deal with racial equality were, as intended, intimidated by the right wing press and the fear that the Home Office might withdraw Section 11 funding, thus exacerbating the already difficult financial situation of Local Authorities. Inevitably, Local Authorities feared losing precious resources more than they wished to 'fight out' the issue in public and hence quietly accepted the Home

Office's tendency to reject all but ESL posts.

> *As the likelihood of securing Section 11 funding for*
> *projects to combat racism or remove discrimination*
> *diminished, so Authorities tended not to apply for grant*
> *in this area* (Bagley, 1992, p.6).

In the meantime, Race Officers were not idly standing by. Their strategy seems to have been to try to raise the level of the debate in response to the attack from the Right wing press. Their strategy for Race Equality, which included Section 11 was carefully planned so as not to engage in a bitter and uncontrolled debate. In May 1987, the National Association of Community Relations Councils (NACRC) and Greater London Action for Race Equality (GLARE) planned to issue a carefully worked joint press release. The statement called upon the future Government, (to be elected on 11th June 1987), to introduce "constructive measures for reducing racial inequality in a way that will encourage all-party support" (NACRC and GLARE, 15, May 1987). The statement which they jointly issued pointed out that issues of racial inequality and discrimination are often distorted and misrepresented. It was critical of "the crude prejudice of some sections of the media" and "politicians of whatever party who regard race as a game of political football."

The press release called on the leaders of all the political parties: "to counter this prejudice and political opportunism and to lift the national debate on race issues to a more serious and responsible level." It called upon the new Government to take action which "ought not to be contentious and might attract all-party support". The proposals included recommendations for improvements to Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966, to help make it more effective.

Whilst the briefing paper attached to the press release stated that Section 11 was, on its own, "an inadequate instrument," it acknowledged that "Section 11 funding, properly used, remains an important instrument by which the Home Office can encourage and assist Local Authorities to promote racial equality." It further added that some of the historical defects of Section 11 had been removed by Home Office Circular 72/1986 and welcomed the contextualisation of Section 11 within the Local Authority's responsibilities under the Race Relations Act of 1976. At the same time, the new Government were called upon to make certain changes to Section 11. These were to widen the scope of section 11 beyond 'New Commonwealth' groups and so that it covered capital expenditure, running costs and training in addition to staffing, also, to provide the opportunity for black and ethnic minority organisations to make bids direct to the Home Office with the support of their Local Authority. It was also suggested that the Home Office should develop effective coordination of Government-led racial equality initiatives and ensure proper consultation and coordination between departments.

In March 1987, the Race Equality Policy group of the London Strategic Policy Unit (LSPU) set up a working party to prepare an 'alternative' to Section 11 (Seager, 1987). The purpose of the Working Party was to review and report on the main criticism of Section 11 and to clarify its current use; to review the need for specific Local Government finance to promote anti-racist and race equality work taking into account the duties set out in the Race Relations Act 1976, particularly Section 71; to prepare an alternative to Section 11.

It was the working party's view that changes to administration would

not rectify the faults of Section 11 and that new legislation was needed to take account of a more relevant perspective and recognition of recent developments in race equality. (Seager, 1987). The working party agreed that in considering any alternative to Section 11 certain criteria should apply. Firstly, it should cover all types of anti-racist equality initiatives; secondly, it should be available for capital and other revenue costs and grant aid to black and ethnic minority organisations as well as staffing costs; thirdly, there should be consistent take up by all Local Authorities; fourthly, it should be applied in a consistent manner on the basis of open criteria; fifthly, it should be cash limited; and finally, it should be founded on a specific duty to Local Authorities and supported by targeted funds.

A number of options including the following were considered as possible alternatives to Section 11: fuller utilisation of existing powers; an additional clause to be added to Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act; an enhanced and strengthened Section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976.

The Section 11 Working Party ultimately produced a report (Seager, 1987) which recommended that Section 11 should be abolished and replaced with an enhanced Section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976, so that Local Authorities would have to comply with its aims. It also recommended that the government should provide adequate financial sources to Local Authorities in order to meet their responsibilities under the enhanced Section 71 and that the Government should set up an independent body to monitor Local Authority race equality initiatives.

One year after the publication of the Section 11 Working Party Report and as a follow up to the 1987 report, the Race Equality Policy Group

(REPG) of the London Strategic Policy Unit (LSPU) commissioned a survey into the Local Authority use of Section 11 since the introduction of the new guidelines in October 1986 (LSPU, 1988). A questionnaire was sent to every Local Authority in England and Wales in August/September 1987. The survey sought to gain information about the number of applications under the new guidelines; the use of new provision; the designation of Section 11 posts under Section 5 of the Race Relations Act 1976; joint local authority applications; consultation procedures; the use of Section 11 within an overall race strategy; and detached worker posts. The survey also sought general views about Section 11 and its administration by the Home Office.

Based on the replies from 117 Local Authorities (including the City and the ILEA) the report found that many Local Authorities were not using Section 11 any differently to the way in which they had in the past. Some Authorities (the ILEA and seven London Boroughs) had not even submitted applications under the new guidelines, at that point. However, Local Authorities submitted applications for a broader range of posts than previously, although still mainly in the area of education. The Survey revealed that only one joint application had been made by Local Authorities. Few local Authorities had elected to designate Section 11 posts under Section 5 of the Race Relations Act 1976. Results showed that consultation still remained inadequate and did not meet Home Office requirements. Apparently, there continued to be little made of detached duty posts and due to the complexity involved (LSPU, 1988).

The LSPU report found that overall, the new Circular had "done nothing to remedy the basic criticisms of Section 11 as set out in the

previous year's report (Seager, 1987). Section 11 was still voluntary, only intended for the special needs of Commonwealth 'immigrants' and still encouraged the marginalisation of race equality initiatives. In conclusion, the report on the survey emphasised the necessity to abolish Section 11 and replace it with an effective alternative, stating: "The survey results lend support for this and demonstrate the need for this long overdue change" (LSPU, 1988, p.26). An alternative to Section 11 was supported by many Race Officers, one of whom wrote;

> *The spirit of the grant should be compatible with the objectives of the Race Relations Act 1976, i.e. to promote equal opportunities and eliminate racial discrimination. The change in emphasis would allow the use of the resources to challenge indirect discrimination and institutional racism to achieve ideals of pluralism in a multi-racial, multi-cultural democracy. In this context it is imperative to state whether any future arrangement would allow the use of resources for much more strategic posts, such as Adviser, Policy Coordinator, Trainers and those involved in monitoring policies and practice.*
> (Bakhsh, 1986, p.4).

The Scrutiny of Section 11

The Lane Report (1988) had recommended "a thorough review of Section 11" with the purpose of amending legislation and introducing fresh administrative arrangements (Lane, 1988). Lane recommended that the review should include: the range of Local Authority services; the types of expenditure that might qualify for grant-aid; the 75/25 split of financial responsibility between Central and Local Government; the wording of the statute and the guidelines, criteria etc; monitoring the Home Office team and administrative procedures.' A 'Scrutiny' of Section 11 was therefore set up in 1987 and a team of two representatives

from the Home Office and one representative from the DES was appointed.

Visits were made to 12 areas benefiting from Section 11 support between 15th August and 19th December 1987. Evidence was collected through interviews, written responses to a letter circulated by the Home Office, national discussion with organisations and particular individuals with a view on Section 11, as well as the collection of other relevant information by the Home Office team:

> *Our scrutiny concentrated on the practical issues surrounding Section 11. Complex philosophical discussion can be had about the nature of racial disadvantage, ... but we have concentrated on how Section 11 works in practice, whether it is effective and how to secure improved results* (Home Office, 1989, p.1).

The Scrutiny did examine some alternatives to specific grant including distribution of resources through the block grant system; transferring responsibilities to the relevant service department; and amalgamation with the Urban Programme. Curiously, the alternative put forward by the LSPU and equally supported by CRE, that was, to strengthen Section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976 and provide adequate funding, was not considered. An internal CRE briefing note (CRE, Field Division, 1989) suggested that the Home Office claimed that "ethnic minority organisations argued against such a change." However, the Scrutiny Report (Home Office, 1989) pointed out that the grant under Section 11 should be seen in the context of the Race Relations Act, 1976, and overall expenditure.

Section 11 cannot be the whole answer to racial disadvantage. For example,the Race Relations Act 76 sets the framework for tackling racial discrimination, with the Commission for Racial Equality having an important role in relation to continuing discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity policy in relation to Section 11 needs to take account of this wider context (Home Office, 1989, p15).

The Scrutiny of Section 11 grant found that only in two out of the twelve areas were the communities satisfied by the consultation undertaken by Local Authority officers. Communities argued that they felt no obvious benefit from the grant and criticised the authorities for failing despite Home Office advice, to adopt a strategic approach. Communities were keen to use Section 11 funding to support the teaching of community languages and to see more Community based Section 11 workers.

The main recommendations of the Home Office Scrutiny Report (1989) were that: the grant should be directed to opening up mainstream services and opportunities to the ethnic minorities; the overall aim should form the basis for a policy on the use of the grant in each service area; policy should be amended as objective evidence of successful approaches is obtained from the performance assessment system; primary responsibility for managing posts must rest with local authorities; Local Authorities should be accountable for the result achieved and to submit reports to the Home Office every three years. Authorities would be obliged to consult the ethnic minority communities about their reports, and provide the Home Office with the results. It was also recommended that the Home Office team should break from its current reactive role to become a mechanism for spreading

good practice in the use of the grant.

The Scrutiny suggested that the Government should re-launch the grant to persuade the ethnic minority communities and the Local Authorities that the Government is committed to tackling racial disadvantage; Very importantly, it was recommended also that the legislation should be amended to remove the concept of 'Commonwealth immigrant'

Perhaps one further point to note here is that the scrutiny generated much concern and apprehension amongst black communities, Local Authorities and Section 11 employees alike over future funding. The Scrutiny Report noted:

> *Despite the statement in the terms of reference that the Government wishes to retain special arrangements for directing resources to meeting racial disadvantage several argued that the current Home Office attitude to Section 11 showed its days were numbered and that the scrutiny was a mechanism for justifying abolition* (Home Office, 1989, p.4).

Local Authorities such as Waltham Forest called on the Home Office to issue a statement that any existing commitments would be honoured (Bakhsh, 1989). (In view of the situation in 1993, this was not an unreasonable demand). The Scrutiny Report responded to these anxieties with the following statement:

> *Abolishing or dismantling Section 11 would be seen by ethnic minority communities as a downgrading of the Government's commitment to tackling racial disadvantage. Our conclusion is that a specific grant centrally administered by the Home Office should be*

retained (Home Office, 1989, p.iv).

As noted earlier by the writer, there has been doubt historically as to the Home Office's ability to manage the administration of Section 11. The Home Office took the opportunity of the Scrutiny to respond to some of their critics. For instance, in reply to the accusation that they were extremely slow to respond and were overburdened with the administrative requirements of the 1986 review it was pointed out that:

> *This was not how the Home Office team saw their task,*
> *but caseworkers conceded that, given their workload, they*
> *tended to refuse when there were grounds for doing so*
> *rather than pursuing queries* (Home Office, 1989, p.6).

The Scrutiny admitted that there was insufficient specific expertise of other Departments in the team and there were no effective mechanisms for working in partnership with other relevant Government Departments.

> *The team are all too aware that they lack expertise in*
> *education, social services and housing where many of the*
> *applications fall. Yet there is no systematic arrangement*
> *for consultation with other Government departments....*
> *caseworkers said that consultation with the DES could*
> *involve significant delay, but was rarely decisive in terms*
> *of whether or not a post was approved* (Home Office,
> 1989).

Following the Scrutiny, the size of the Home Office team dealing with Section 11 was in fact increased. A recommendation that a part of the Home Office team should be relocated out of London to establish better links with Local Authorities in the Midlands and the North was not

taken up.

Section 11, 1990-1994

The new arrangements for Section 11 grant, having taken account of the recommendations of the Scrutiny, were published in October 1990 in two documents, one of which concerned Policy Criteria and the other, Guidelines and Administration. A number of important administrative changes were introduced which were to be significant. Section 11 provision would be in the form of projects rather than individual posts. Projects were to fall within the stated policy criteria accompanying circular 78/1990. Applications had to be submitted in line with a regular, annual timetable, and had to be regularly monitored against agreed performance targets. Local Authorities were required to identify within their bids, a proportion of provision for the voluntary sector. The overall Section 11 budget would be cash limited and grant would be paid quarterly in arrears.

The report set out the overall objective for Section 11 grant as it related to the Government's Race Relations Policy: "to enable everyone, irrespective of their origin, to participate fully and freely in the life of the nation while having the freedom to maintain their own cultural identity" (Home Office. 78/1990). The stated aim for Section 11 funding in Education was that : "It should be used to remove barriers to true equality of educational opportunity for ethnic minority groups" (Home Office 1990). Broadly, the types of provision in schools, eligible for Section 11 funding within the policy criteria for education are:

- English Language Support.
- Raising achievement of ethnic minorities.

- Strengthening ties between schools and parents of ethnic minority pupils.
- Pastoral care, careers guidance and other special support to ethnic minority pupils in school.

The Scrutiny Report (Home Office, 1989) relied on evidence from the 1981 Home Affairs Committee report on racial disadvantage. It further, made reference to evidence in the Policy Studies Institute Survey "Black and White Britain" (Brown, 1984) which identified the consequences of racial discrimination in the areas of education, housing and employment. However, whilst the Scrutiny Report confirmed that: "The evidence we collected during the Scrutiny confirmed these findings" (Home Office, 1989), there was no mention of the Government's general race relations policy, within which the new administrative arrangements for Section 11 were placed. And, there is:

> *No specific reference to the existence or need to combat disadvantage arising from racism and racial discrimination. The statement refers generically to the 'removal of other barriers to equality of opportunity* (Bagley, 1992, p.8).

Bagley argues that although Section 11 is viewed by the Government as a mechanism for tackling racial disadvantage, the impact of racism and racial discrimination on educational achievement played little part in the formulation of the new guidelines and policy criteria. Rather, he sees that the approach was based on the need to develop linguistic skills and tackle disadvantage arising from cultural and linguistic shortcomings. Bagley's contention is that the new guidelines and policy criteria are a step "back to the future" in that they continue to be based on an

assimilationist perspective.

Local Authorities spent a great deal of time writing bids and consulting the communities as required. Despite the acknowledged shortcomings of Section 11, the writer noted a growing awareness of the potential effectiveness of Section 11 if used as a well managed resource (NASSE/UMCESE, 1993). Subsequently Local Authorities produced and submitted well planned, coherent bids for Section 11 projects. The deadline for submission was changed by the Home office at least twice. The final date for submission was March 1991.

Ultimately in December 1991 Local Authorities received notification of the success or otherwise of their Section 11 bids. Local Authorities had been required to prioritise bids in consultation with the communities, but in some cases, those bids placed in higher priority failed to gain funding, whilst others with lower priority were approved (LARRIE, 1992).

Any sense of success where education projects were approved was short lived. Education Departments learned in a letter of 18th December 1991, that all successful Education Projects were to be subjected to an immediate scaling down of 15 per cent. Many Authorities had submitted project bids based as closely as possible to the actual needs of Section 11 qualifying communities and within budget constraints, whereas others had overestimated need as a deliberate strategy to increase external funding. Thus, projects most affected by the scaling down exercise and which had no connection with proven need, were in Local Authorities where economics had prevented any expansion of Section 11 projects. According to the Home Office estimates, the 1992/1993 allocation was

expected to fund 800 projects in total with 10,600 posts. Yet, the Home Office indicated that the scaling down of the Education bids had been as a result of over (1992) bidding. Although there was an overall increase in posts, the LARRIE survey suggested that this may have been due to an overall drop in the number of more senior posts.

Despite continuing criticism from some quarters, many community groups welcomed the more stringent approach to the awarding of Section 11 grant and the tightening up of administrative arrangements. It is interesting to note here that the term 'immigrant' was dropped entirely from the 1990 Guidelines, the policy criteria and also from subsequent Home Office Circulars.

The new arrangements put a great deal of pressure on Local Authorities who were required to provide detailed evidence of the specific needs of New Commonwealth Communities after close consultation with these communities. A growing confidence in the sincerity and extent of consultation was evident. Hopes and expectations were raised amongst the long suffering black communities (NASSE/UMCESE, 1993).

The projects included detailed job descriptions and task analyses. The levels of professional expertise required by the job descriptions in these projects was often very high. Career structures were built into projects to reflect the expertise of Section 11 staff. After years of being marginalised, there was recognition and acknowledgement of commitment and professional skills of section 11 staff, which hitherto had often gone unnoticed or been denied. During the planning of section 11 projects, in consultation with schools and mainstream colleagues, close cooperation developed between mainstream and section 11 colleagues as well as with

Local Authority Officers and Home Office staff. The all round commitment to more detailed and rigorous monitoring and reviewing of the work, set against clearly established targets and objectives, helped create a much clearer understanding and appreciation of Section 11 work than ever before.

According to a LARRIE survey (1992), 32 per cent of youth projects were approved whilst 81 per cent of projects to support ESL in schools and 52 per cent of education projects to support children and young people of African Caribbean heritage succeeded. The London Boroughs (the ILEA now having disappeared) received the largest overall proportion of grant. According to the LARRIE survey (1992) 41 per cent of the overall Section 11 budget was awarded to 31 London Boroughs.

Projects approved in December 1991 started up in April 1992. Morale was high as Section 11 workers and Local Authorities looked forward to the promised three years and in many cases, 5 years of funding. This was seen as a time for Section 11 teaching staff to make unprecedented progress in developing language skills, enabling greater access to the Curriculum and tackling underachievement and racial disadvantage. Many Local Authorities, confident, of funding, appointed new Section 11 staff on permanent contracts, many of whom were recruited from the black and ethnic minority communities (NUT, July, 1993).

Section 11 and Voluntary Groups

As mentioned earlier there appears to have been, in the past, a reluctance on the part of Local Authorities to apply for funding of posts located in and operating from voluntary organisations in the communities. However, the Home Office took steps to increase the number of

'detached duty posts' in Local Authorities. The Policy Criteria stated:

> *The Government takes the view that community based*
> *voluntary organisations will in a number of cases*
> *provide the ideal situation for Section 11 projects (or parts*
> *of such projects) on a detached duty basis* (Home Office,
> 1990, p.36).

This supported the view, long argued by the communities themselves, that "specific needs are often most effectively met through black and ethnic minority organisations rather than through the Local Authority" (NCVO, 1991, p.4).

Additionally, paragraph 30 of the Home Office (1990a) circular accompanying the new Policy Criteria stated:

> *The Government considers that the voluntary sector has*
> *an important contribution to make to the effective*
> *delivery of Section 11 provision. As part of this approach,*
> *the Government expects local authorities to include*
> *applications for projects placed in, and operating from,*
> *voluntary organisations. Such projects would remain*
> *under the overall control of the local authority who*
> *would continue to claim grant for them, but day to day*
> *responsibility for individual projects would rest with the*
> *organisation in which they were based.*

Then, quite unexpectedly, in a letter of 26th November 1992, the Home Office communicated to Local Authorities, a Government decision to cut Section 11 funding.

> *The level of financial support which the Government is*
> *able to provide by means of Section 11 grant crucially*
> *depends upon the economic circumstances of the*

country. The general economic situation has changed markedly since Local Authorities were invited, in October 1990, to apply afresh for all Section 11 funding with effect from 1st April 1992, and since decisions were announced on the outcome of the subsequent applications round conducted during 1991. As you know, it has been necessary for the Government to review the whole of its public expenditure programme very closely in the changed economic situation in order to contain public expenditure within limits which the country can afford and to ensure adequate investment in line with the Government's strategy for sustainable growth in the economy (Home Office, November, 1992).

The Home Office indicated that based "on current best estimates" the rate of grant was likely to be as follows: until March 1994 at 75 per cent (no change); from April 1994 to March 1995 at 57 per cent, April 1995 to March 1996 at 50 per cent. The Home Office contribution would therefore reduce by one third. There was no indication in the letter of the future of 5 year projects for the final two year period.

As a result of these unexpected cuts to Section 11 projects which had barely started up, "thousands of teachers and community workers jobs will be lost over the next three years" (Education, 1992) and the Government will massively reduce its contribution, leaving Local Authorities to try to make up the difference at a time of severe economic constraint. In view of the Government decision to alter the formula for determining the Standard Spending Assessment which has resulted in massive loss of revenue for many cities with large ethnic minority populations, the timing has been particularly difficult. At a time when access to the National Curriculum, the raising of standards and league tables have become so important in education, Section 11 support to

ethnic minority pupils who are failing or whose first language is not English, is being slowly but strategically eroded by Central Government. The proposals to reduce Section 11 have been seen not just as a threat to existing provision, but to the educational performance and the future of young members of the communities concerned.

Local Authorities committed scarce funding to provide appropriate services for Section 11 qualifying communities. The outcome of the cuts will certainly have an adverse effect on staffing, recruitment and morale (NUT, July 1993). In particular, this massive staffing reduction will seriously affect the teaching careers of many black and ethnic minority staff employed under Section 11. Provision for black and ethnic minority communities will be adversely affected, since it is unlikely that many Local Authorities, already under massive pressure to cut mainstream budgets even where essential services are concerned, will be in a position to make up the shortfall.

These cuts will undoubtedly have a significant impact not only on educational provision for ethnic minorities, but also on the Government's own long term 'aim' to provide equality of opportunity to all its citizens as promised. (Home Office, November 1992). The cuts have been seen by all concerned as the Government reneging on a commitment not only to fund projects for an agreed time period, but also a failure to deliver equality of opportunity to Britain's ethnic minorities. Whilst there was great emphasis placed on the need for consultation before the start of the projects, this has been of low priority in respect of the cuts and their certain impact on black communities. As one member of the black community put it:

Importance was placed on consulting black communities

until funding was decreased. The notion of partnership and participation has been devalued, insulted. How valid was that process in the first place? (NASSE/UMCESE, 1993, p.9).

The NUT (1993) survey of LEA responses to cuts in Section 11 provision indicated that twenty three of the LEAs which responded had already held consultation meetings with black and ethnic minority communities since the announcement of the cuts. These authorities reported that: "The views expressed ranged from concern, disquiet, dismay, disbelief, disappointment, sense of betrayal through to opposition, anger and outrage" (NUT, 1993, p.3).

Under the new Section 11 arrangements the Government, only months before, had created hundreds of new projects and thousands of new posts. The initial and wholly unrealistic expectation of the Government (given the current financial climate) was that Local Government should increase their share of the grant, in order to maintain existing levels of Section 11 services.

In the financial year 1993-1994, the projected Section 11 expenditure is £130.8 million (LARRIE , 1993), with Local Authorities contributing £43.6 million, in total a sum of £174.4 million. With the cuts, grant will fall from £130.8 million to £110.7 million in 1994-1995 and to £97 million in 1995-1996. In order to maintain the same level of Section 11 staffing, Local authorities would need to increase their contribution by 72 per cent. This is unlikely to happen as found by the LARRIE Survey (1993). Indeed, the Home Office have since agreed (Home Office, September 1993) an overall cash limit for projects allowing Local Authorities more flexibility in managing the cuts. In practice, this will mean that Local

Authorities will probably prioritise projects, losing some altogether and scaling down others. The NUT survey (June 1993) suggests that between 2,000 and 4,000 jobs will be lost. This supports the findings of the LARRIE Section 11 Survey Report (May, 1993). Some of the smaller Authorities with comparatively large Section 11 budgets reported that they would be particularly hard hit by the cuts and would find it harder to make up the shortfall. The LARRIE Survey Report also found that certain types of projects such as under 5's and those concerning African Caribbean Communities would be most vulnerable since the priority was likely to be to protect Section 11 in statutory service areas.

The LARRIE Survey Report (May, 1993) found that there was a great deal of anxiety in Local Authorities over redundancies, and since black and ethnic minority staff are disproportionately employed under Section 11, (some Section 11 services are staffed almost entirely by black or Asian staff), the cuts will deal a double blow to black communities. As one commentator put it:

> *This decision has undermined the build up of trust with Central and Local Government and has made it difficult to believe in the Government when it states that it wants minorities, to participate fully and freely in the economic, social and public life of the nation* (Yaseen, 1993, p.30).

The 1993 NUT Survey reported that there was strong support for Section 11 Services from headteachers, governors and, particularly ethnic minority governors. Teachers expressed concern about the effect on "educational standards, employment opportunities, and possible loss of jobs." Nearly all LEA's who responded to the NUT survey had protested to the Home Office concerning the cuts. Concern was such, that three

major conferences were held, one in Kirklees, one in Manchester and a national one in London to debate the impact of the cuts on educational achievement and opportunities for black and ethnic minority pupils. A lobby of Parliament to defend Section 11 was held on 21st October 1993 and attended by almost 2,000 Section 11 staff, parents, school governors and community members. Thousands of schools joined a letter and postcard campaign. The following are extracts from letters sent to the Home Office by schools in Manchester. These letters indicate the extent of the damaging impact of the cuts envisaged by the schools themselves:

> *Educationalists, parents and members of the varied racial and cultural communities have fought hard for a quality support service to schools and particularly in a tentative economic situation, principles cannot afford to be sacrificed if tolerance and acceptance of diversity are to prevail through the educational system.*
>
> *A reduction of funding would put the whole scheme, both locally and nationally, in jeopardy, relinquishing the very goals the present Government is attempting to promote to improve academic performance for all pupils. The existing support role could become peripheral to whole school development, possibly with less contact time for staff and children in one school and more schools to visit or advise on an infrequent basis.*
>
> *We feel we have initiated a model based on research and consultation which affirms educational excellence for all children and gives in-depth support to schools to help achieve educational targets according to national guidelines. We oppose any measures that would reduce the delivery of this forward-thinking programme which continues to acknowledge the influence of all racial and cultural backgrounds in a curricular context and aspires to prepare citizens for productive participation in an integrated society.*
>
> Infant School

This High School has a high proportion- approximately 60 percent of Qualifying Pupils, about 90 per cent of whom have Section 11 needs. The Section team are committed to making the National Curriculum accessible to all pupils, thereby raising achievements and improving the prospects of Qualifying Pupils and to raising overall standards, such as is reflected in the Government-imposed League Tables.

Section 11 support has become an integral and vital part of school life at both academic and pastoral levels, involving the production of appropriate additional materials for lessons, tests etc., developing links with parents and the community and INSETs for staff development. A reduction in Section 11 funding would adversely affect the level and quality of support currently being provided, inevitably hampering the educational progress of the target group the Service has intended to help. In the context of the social climate that currently exists the consequences would be doubly disastrous.

High School

The presence of a Section 11 Postholder in a school ensures that the special language and learning needs of such pupils are directly addressed. Pupils qualifying for help under Section 11 funding can therefore be enabled to achieve their full potential in the school curriculum.

If a proportion of the grant is withdrawn, however, substantial numbers of pupils requiring support will be deprived of it. The consequence of this will be a comparatively lower level of attainment among ethnic minorities than among the population as a whole, an outcome which is surely to be avoided at all costs.

Primary School

High levels of support for the maintenance of current levels of

provision, has indicated a different view of Section 11 to that expressed in the 1970's and 1980's. The three Section 11 conferences all produced motions calling on the Government to change its mind and prevent the massive damage the cuts would bring about. The NUT response to the Home Office argued;

> *Access to the National Curriculum is intended to be an entitlement for all pupils. For pupils where the home language is not English, support is required to enable access to the curriculum. In the early years, bilingual assistants can help children from ethnic minority families settle into schools and can assist their learning. The teaching of English as a second language is a vital skill and requires training and expertise. It would be a tragedy if much valued and experienced colleagues were to be lost to the education service through cuts to funding, while the need for support demonstrably still exists. For example, evaluation of Key Stage 1 SATs results shows ethnic minority and bilingual pupils performing at a significantly lower level than their peers. Second generation ethnic minority families often do not speak English at home, so that pupils still need English language tuition. There are also new arrivals from abroad in primary and secondary schools requiring help.*
>
> *Rather than a reduction in the level of grant, the Union believes it should be extended and expanded to cover all those children requiring support because of the differences of language and culture, including the large numbers of refugee and non-Commonwealth children now in schools in some areas, currently not eligible for Section 11 grant* (NUT, Letter of March, 1993).

Howard (1993) has argued that whilst Section 11 might be flawed, it is nevertheless helping provide crucial provision for ethnic minority pupils and

Given the market system of education which the ERA
introduced, schools could refuse entry to children from
the ethnic minority communities because they fear their
presence without support will adversely affect their
school's performance in the league tables of SAT and
examination achievement   (Howard, 1993, p.27).

The NUT report concluded with a view from one head of a Section 11
Service:

There have historically been many criticisms (rightly) of
Section 11 funding, e.g., lack of monitoring, lack of career
structure, etc. The new guidelines and projects gave LEA's
the opportunity to address these issues. It is more than
ironic that Section 11 has come under threat at the very
moment it was seen to be effective, delivering what it
was designed for (NUT, June, 1993, p6).

The Gerrard Bill

Even more ironically, at the time of writing and against the backdrop of
the threat of cuts to Section 11, the 'Gerrard Bill' introduced by Neil
Gerrard, Member of Parliament for Walthamstow, proposed the
extension of Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966, to all ethnic
minorities "whose language or customs differ from those of the rest of
the community". Now known as the Local Government (Amendment)
Act 1993, the bill passed through its various stages unopposed on the
understanding that no additional funding would be allocated in order to
meet any additional need. Whilst the removal of the term 'immigrant'
as well as the lifting of the restriction to 'New Commonwealth
immigrants' in the statute has been widely welcomed. It has resulted in
further pressure on already stretched Section 11 funding.

Whilst the amendment enables Local Authorities to extend provision to communities groups such as the Vietnamese, Somalis and Bosnians (subject to full consultation with communities), competition for this scarce resource could result in inter-community rivalry. The immediate needs of some of the refugee communities have long been recognised as being qualitatively greater than those of the New Commonwealth communities, yet, the restrictive wording of Section 11 previously prevented support for them. Whilst the changes proposed in the amendment are welcome, the need to extend provision means that cuts will bite even deeper and provision will be spread more thinly. The need to prioritise will be so vital that the educational progress of many children will be sacrificed. Who will make these decisions and how? These are some of the issues which must be faced.

The Home Office intention is to provide guidance on priorities for Section 11 which the discretionary nature of Section 11 funding permits (CRE communication, 24 November, 1994). Until then, it might be argued that the amendment act will open the 'floodgates' to all ethnic minorities, for instance, the Irish, the Polish and the Japanese. The shift in target population also throws into some confusion, the use of the legislation as a measure for tackling racial disadvantage. An analysis of the wording of the Local Government (Amendmen) Act 1993 reveals that some of the old criticisms still remain. The offer of payment to Local Authorities ".... in consequence of the presence within their areas of persons belonging to ethnic minorities" still gives the impression that it is a compensatory measure, because, as Dorn and Hibbert (1987, p.63) put it, "The Blacks are here".

The Single Regeneration Budget

Whilst still attempting to manage the effects of the proposed cuts, Local Authorities received notification on 4th November 1993 of the Government's decision to move Section 11 funding for urban areas from the Home Office to the Department of the Environment. Intended as part of a package to encourage regeneration and economic development, Section 11 will form part of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) with effect from 1st April 1994.

> *The Secretary of State for the Environment will be formally accountable for the budget but guidelines will be set, and performance will be monitored, by a new cabinet committee involving all ministers with an interest including the Home Secretary* (Home Office letter, 4 November, 1993).

The Home Office letter indicated that the arrangements concerning the SRB would apply to authorities in urban priority areas in the first instance, the other authorities to join the new 'system' at a later date. The implications of this shift of funding from the Home Office to the Department of the Environment (DoE) are significant. Whilst the entire Single Regeneration Budget is expected to be in the region of £1.4 billion for 1994-95 (Press release, Department of the Environment, 4 November 1993) and pulls together twenty different programmes including Section 11 in Urban priority areas, there are no specifically earmarked funds for Section 11 type activities.

The government announced that their intention in bringing these grants together is part of a drive "to shift power from Whitehall to Local Communities and make Government more responsive to local priorities to bring services closer to the people they serve, simplify the

130

Government machine and improve value for money" (DoE Press Release, 4th November 1993).

John Gummer, Minister of State for the Environment issued a 'challenge' to three cities - London, Birmingham and Manchester. The press release stated that the intention of the Regionally administered scheme known as 'City Pride', was to provide the investment stimulus for economic growth. Referring in the same statement to the Single Regeneration Budget, the minister stated,

> *The budget will help mobilise private sector money, and*
> *complement the provision of business support services.*
> *It will support measures to improve education and*
> *training, to tackle crime, to meet ethnic minority needs*
> *and to improve rundown housing. These measures will*
> *be combined in a comprehensive way to meet local needs*
> (DoE Press Release, 4th November, 1993).

Correspondence from Peter Lloyd, Minister of State for Home Affairs to Herman Ousley, Chair of CRE, claimed:

> *The new arrangements should better meet the needs of*
> *ethnic minority communities as well as other sections of*
> *the communities. We will also be ensuring that they*
> *benefit along with other sections of the community from*
> *programmes of wider application. We can be confident*
> *of our ability to do this since the Home Secretary will be a*
> *member of the new cabinet committee being established*
> *to oversee the new arrangements and the key objectives*
> *of the Single Regeneration Budget already encourages*
> *assistance to ethnic minorities. I hope you will join me*
> *in looking forward to the benefits the new arrangements*
> *will bring* (Correspondence, Home Office, 4 November
> 1993).

The following day, on 5th November 1993, a CRE press release endorsed the new arrangements for Section 11 funding in that it appears to be more coherent. However, it warned that the new arrangements should not be an excuse for lowering the level of targeted grant for ethnic minorities.

The researcher wholeheartedly agrees with the sentiments expressed in a CRE press release (5 November, 1993) that any reduction in the level of grant for ethnic minorities will result in

> *A deterioration in the social fabric of hard pressed inner city areas and greater alienation for poor ethnic minority and white residents. This situation would be a disaster for all those working to improve race relations.* (CRE Press Release, 5th November, 1993).

CHAPTER 4

The Present Research

Rationale, Design and Conduct

The purpose of the research was to examine Section 11 provision and evaluate the role and effectiveness of Section 11 staff in enabling children from black and ethnic minority communities to improve their English language skills and increase their achievements in the whole school curriculum. Data was collected from Section 11 staff as well as headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools.

This Chapter sets out the rationale behind the research as well as its design and conduct. The methodology both at a theoretical and practical level are explored in relation to the design and conduct of the research in order to prepare for the following Chapter which looks at the data analysis.

A number of factors were taken into consideration in determining the specific area of research. Firstly being employed through Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act the writer has a personal interest. Secondly the whole area of Section 11 work has come under considerable scrutiny over the last decade, yet,

> *There have been few studies of Section 11 in the academic and policy-related literature despite its role as 'the only Government finance earmarked directly and exclusively for combating racial disadvantage* (Cross, Johnson and Cox, 1988 p.20).

Thirdly, the writer has access through her work, to Section 11 data and Section 11 staff. This has been significant in the selection of the area of research and in carrying out the research into Section 11 provision in schools. Moreover, the everyday remit of the writer requires a thorough understanding of the workings of this piece of legislation and its application in education.

It was decided for pragmatic reasons, to focus on Section 11 provision in schools in one Local Education Authority in this research. A survey by use of a questionnaire, was undertaken of all Section 11 staff in the schools sector in order to gather some general data from a relatively large number of participants and, after having drawn on the statistical information from the survey, some general characteristics and trends were determined. Further to the survey and survey analysis, a semi-structured interview technique was used for exploring in greater depth at an individual level, particular issues which had emerged from the survey results. Further data was gathered from interviews with headteachers.

A brief introduction to the development of research

The processes by which we make sense of the world and the phenomena around us, have long interested scientists, philosophers, psychologists and other authorities. According to Cohen and Manion (1989) the ways in which we deal with knowledge can be broken down into three categories; experience; reasoning; and research. Whereas our experiences in life tend to occur haphazardly, research is the controlled systematic and critical investigation of the phenomena around us, or as Mouly defined it,

Research is best conceived as the process of arriving at dependable solutions to problems through the planned and systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. It is a most important tool for advancing knowledge, for promoting progress, and for enabling man to relate more effectively to his environment , to accomplish his purposes, and to resolve conflicts (Mouly cited in Cohen and Manion, 1978, p.42).

There is no single, universally accepted approach to research, on the contrary, there has been considerable debate and conflict concerning not only the nature of research, but also the methods and methodologies which have emerged over the course of time.

The deductive method, attributed to Aristotle, was an early approach to reasoning based on syllogism, a series of steps which move from the general through to the specific. Although deductivism made an important contribution to the development of modern research, it was in itself, very limited. Nevertheless, it still plays a part in the research process and help us solve problems in everyday life.

As scientists became aware of the shortcomings of classic deductivism, they sought new ways of acquiring knowledge. In the 16th century, Francis Bacon brought about a major change by advocating the direct observation of phenomena. Known as inductivisim, the study of a number of cases permit the scientist/researcher to draw a hypothesis, leading to a generalisation. Thus, simply put, Bacon's main contribution to the development of research was to focus attention on empirical

evidence.

A further major development came about when scientists recognised that on its own, inductivisim was insufficient to solve certain problems and therefore integrated the deductive and inductive approaches. Darwin for instance, applied an inductive-deductive approach in developing his theory of evolution. This synthesis of approaches has been described as the 'modern method' of research sometimes known as the 'Scientific method', although according to Verma and Beard (1981), the scientific method can have several meanings.

According to Cohen and Manion (1989) the scientific method can be distinguished by two distinctive characteristics, firstly its empirical nature and secondly the set of procedures which demonstrate the process which might be duplicated by other scientists. Although the scientific method has been successful, particularly in the field of the natural sciences (Cohen and Manion, 1989), a similar approach, positivism has met with less success in the social sciences due to its mechanistic view of nature.

Positivism was first coined by French philosopher Auguste Comte, to describe the new science of society. Put simply, his stance was, that social phenomena should be examined in the light of physiological laws and theories and subjected to empirical investigation. This led to the supposition that methodological procedures applicable in the natural sciences were directly transferable to the social sciences. The quantitative paradigm has often been associated with scientific and positivistic paradigms. Focusing on the experimental isolation of causal variables, it is concerned very much with measurement and statistical analysis.

A leading critic of positivism and the scientific method was William Blake who perceived the universe as a living organism rather than a mechanism and formed the view that many aspects of life were not measurable or quantifiable. Another critic, Kirkegaard, the founder of what has become known as 'existentialism', sought to free thinking from the illusion of 'objectivity', which he saw as the domination of rules over thought and behaviour. He argued that a conscious capacity for ' subjectivity' was necessary and went so far as to state that "anyone who is committed to Science, or to rule-governed morality, is benighted, and needs to be rescued from his state of darkness" (cited in Cohen and Manion, 1989, p.25).

A different paradigm variously labelled as qualitative, interpretive, ethnographic, phenomenological, humanistic and naturalistic emerged from what anti-positivists saw as the shortcomings of the scientific approach (Robson, 1993). Ions (1977) for instance saw the act of quantification, particularly when it becomes an end in itself, as having a dehumanising effect. A commonly held viewpoint of the anti-positivist social scientist is encapsulated as follows-

The purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their views shape the action which they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies behind social reality, they must work with man's definition of reality and with the rules he devises for coping with it (Beck, 1979, p.72).

A major difference with a qualitative or interpretive approach is that it is 'hypothesis generating' rather than 'hypothesis testing', that is theories and concepts emerge from the enquiry itself. It also attempts to present a

holistic picture, taking context into account. Shimahara (1988) for example, believes that human behaviour is shaped in context and that events cannot be fully understood if stripped of that context. Qualitative research, sometimes known as naturalistic enquiry focuses on events in their natural settings "qualitative researchers want those who are studied to speak for themselves" (Sherman and Webb, 1988, p.5), and to study experiences holistically. Qualitative approaches to research have particularly found favour within the different areas of social science, where there is a focus on the study of human behaviour.

Although qualitative research has been criticised for being unscientific and 'soft', Robson (1993) argues that it is infact very complex and demanding, particularly in terms of analysis. Because there is no clearly accepted set of conventions, (Miles 1979, p.590) has described qualitative data as an "attractive nuisance" and according to Robson (1993), the unprepared researcher can meet with a range of unexpected problems although there is now a useful range of typologies and computer packages which will assist with the more systematic analysis of qualitative data. Tesch (1990) for instance has produced a typology of qualitative analyses which can assist the qualitative researcher.

A key issue in research design is the relative merits of quantitative and qualitative approaches. Whilst there are those who are firm exponents of one or the other of these approaches, (Robson 1993, p.6) holds the view that " many of these differences are more apparent than real and that there is in practice a considerable underlying unity of purpose" Merton and Kendall point out that:

> *Social scientists have come to abandon the spurious*
> *choice between qualitative and quantitative data: they are*

concerned rather with that combination of both which makes use of the most valuable features of each. The problem becomes one of determining at which point they should adopt the one, and at which the other approach (Merton and Kendall, 1946, p.545).

In fact, the research methodology and the formulation of research strategy will vary depending on the individual investigator and the nature of the research following viewpoint, that

The principal concern is with an understanding of the way in which the individual creates, modifies and interprets the world in which he or she finds himself or herself (Cohen and Manion, 1989, p.8).

The Present Research

Robson, (1993) advocates an eclectic or multi-method approach involving the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, for solving research problems. For the purposes of this research it would have been possible to rely entirely on qualitative data from interviews or entirely on quantitative data from the questionnaire, but the combining of both approaches seemed to present the best opportunity for a holistic view of the case study which was the study of educational provision under Section 11 in one Local Authority.

Summarising the three main traditional research strategies as experiment, survey and case study, Robson suggests that a 'hybrid' or 'combined' strategy should be considered, by the researcher, the choice of which will be influenced by the research question and the purpose of the enquiry. In combining strategies, the researcher may choose for example to link a survey with an experiment, or incorporate a survey into a case

study - whatever seems best to suit need. Robson (1993) has argued that in essence "each enquiry is a case study. It takes place at particular times, in particular places with particular people". The case study has been described by him as:

> *A strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary problem within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence* (Robson, 199, p.5).

Thus, the writer has chosen a combined strategy for the present research, this could, based on the terms outlined above be described as a case study of Section 11 provision in one local authority incorporating a survey.

The 'contemporary phenomena' or 'case' might concern a service, a programme, an event, a decision, an individual or group of individuals. There are different types of case study, Yin (1989) has differentiated between 'holistic case studies' which concern an individual or single unit such as a service or institution and 'multiple case studies'. Although the case study can be prestructured or emergent, many case studies fall somewhere between the two extremes. As pointed out by Bromley (1986), the case study has been used for a long time in many areas such as education, business studies, clinical medicine, social work and sociology. A major advantage of the case study approach is that it is flexible and responsive if need be. It may be exploratory or confirmatory, or even both.

According to Robson (1993), an important benefit of the use a multi-method approach is the "reduction of inappropriate certainty". Robson

also asserts that "Using a logic equivalent to that of classical test theory, the error due to methods is regarded as averaging out when multiple methods are used" (p.290). A multi-method approach also permits triangulation whereby a 'fix' on something is determined from two or more places, sources, methods, investigators or theories (Denzin, 1988). This provides a way of cross checking one source of information against another. If the two sources are in accordance, then to some extent they cross-validate each other and any discrepancy will need to be investigated and explained. 'Triangulation' was used in the present research since the survey (questionnaire) and the interview were both used to obtain similar information using two different sources, Section 11 staff and headteachers.

The case study approach is not without its critics. The case study has been viewed as 'soft' research, for instance by Campbell and Stanley (1963) who argued that case studies are the mere collection of tedious detail and stated that "It seems well-nigh unethical at present to allow, as theses or dissertations in education, case studies of this nature" (p.177). Bromley (1986), an advocate of the case study approach, has found that "case studies are sometimes carried out in a sloppy, perfunctory, and incompetent manner" (p.xiii). Nevertheless, Robson, has denied that the case study is a 'soft option', although he does explain that it can be 'soft',

> *in the sense that there are no 'hard and fast' routinized procedures where all you have to do is follow the formulae. This makes life harder rather than easier - though also more interesting* (Robson, 1993, p.162).

According to Robson, whilst there is a particular view that 'true research' depends on numerical skills and the ability to use statistical analysis, and the case study requires more literary, artistic skills, they are not mutually exclusive and indeed the case study approach can gain by a combination of these different skills. And, where multi-method approaches are used which generate both qualitative and quantitative data, the qualitative data does not have to play a minor or less valuable role than the quantitative data, particularly if there is a systematic rigorous approach to the collection and analysis of the qualitative data.

While the concepts of 'internal validity'. 'external validity', 'reality', and 'objectivity' have been developed as criteria for establishing the trustworthiness of quantitative data, Lincoln and Guba (1985) have proposed four parallels more appropriate to qualitative case study data. These are 'credibility', 'transferability', 'dependability' and 'confirmability', which they argue, will establish trustworthiness.

Credibility can be demonstrated by the use of several techniques including prolonged involvement, persistent observation and triangulation, which are all applicable in the present research. The researcher has been involved in Section 11 over a long period of time and has had long and ample opportunity to observe its workings.

In so far as transferability is concerned Lincoln and Guba (1985) have argued that the onus is on the person wishing to generalise or transfer to make that decision. The responsibility of the researcher is to provide an accurate data base so that judgements concerning transferability might be made. As for dependability, Robson (1993) suggests that triangulation together with reliability provide a means of assessment, and

confirmability might be determined by a number of techniques, for instance through the 'audit trail'.

Much research is now consumer driven. Although evaluation is not a new form of research, it has become popular in the process of accountability in a whole range of public services and private multi-national companies. Evaluation is a type of applied research rather than pure or basic research. It is usually carried out in the 'field' or real world setting rather than in the laboratory.

According to Robson (1993), "the purpose of an evaluation is to assess the effects and effectiveness of something, for instance some innovation or intervention, policy, practice or service" (p.170). Since Section 11 is a government intervention to improve local government services for black and ethnic minorities, the present research fits this definition, to the extent that it was an internal audit of Section 11 provision in one local authority. Evaluation can be difficult and even contentious, since it might be like 'opening Pandora's box'. Whilst evaluation can be very useful and usable, there are issues, such as the 'how' and the 'why', which need to be answered. One advantage of evaluation is that it can be functional, serving not only to evaluate but also to bring about change in the real world. The focus is on improvement.

There are various types of evaluation research. 'Formative' evaluation is meant to assist in the development of a service, programme or whatever is the focus. 'Summative' evaluation is concerned with assessing the effects or effectiveness of the service, programme or other research focus. Similar, to formative and summative evaluation are 'outcome' and 'process' evaluation. Process evaluation is concerned with

the process or the 'how' through systematic observation, whereas outcome evaluation focuses on the result, for instance, to what extent has a service or programme met its stated objectives? To some extent therefore, the present research shows elements of both summative and formative evaluation in that the writer has a professional interest in assessing the effects and effectiveness of Section 11 provision in schools and intends to use the findings to further develop the service and improve provision.

Within the context of the internal audit of Section 11 provision, a survey by questionnaire produced quantitative data and semi-structured interviews produced qualitative data, both of which were equally important to the study. Robson (1993, p.4) has described the survey as "a tradition of empirical work outside the laboratory which aspires to quantitative rigour comparable to that of experimentation". Although questionnaires or interviews can be used to carry out a survey, this particular study made use of a questionnaire. The survey was used by the enquirer to gather some quantitative data which would shed some light on the area of study by putting carefully standardised questions to a specific population, the Section 11 staff based in schools of the local authority in question. A variety of techniques can be used for selecting a representative sample so that some generalisations can be drawn from a particular population. Getting the sample right can create difficulties. However, in this instance, sampling was not a necessary procedure since all the Section 11 staff in one service (bar absentees) were asked to complete the questionnaire. Usually, a relatively small amount of data is collected at the individual level. The real focus is on profiles and general statistics (trends, patterns, comparisons) from the whole sample or specific population, which therefore tends to be large.

Although the survey can be a convenient method for collecting data from a large number of people, the low demand on participants has been called into question. Robson (1993) for instance, has debated the extent to which we can rely on information gained from a 'chance encounter', or a tick on a piece of paper. However, in this particular enquiry these criticisms were not entirely applicable since the participants were not chance encounters, and had an ongoing involvement and professional interest in the area of research.

Being flexible and interactive, the case study approach to this research permitted a degree of preplanning with further opportunities to capitalise on unexpected eventualities. Hence, analysis of data gathered from the questionnaire at the first stage allowed the enquirer to better plan the semi-structured interviews which followed. She was then able through the interviews, to confirm or pursue issues or patterns which had been highlighted by the survey.

> *The actual interview is focused on the subjective experiences of the persons who have been exposed to the situation. Their responses enable the researcher; (a) to test the validity of his hypothesis; and (b) to ascertain any unanticipated responses to the situation, thus giving rise to further hypotheses* (Cohen and Manion, 1989, p.326).

The interview is a commonly used technique in research which can be a flexible, responsive way of finding out things. The face to face interaction between the interviewer and interviewee can provide opportunities for example of observation, of verbal cues, clarification and modification. Cannel and Kahn (1968. Cited in Cohen and Manion, 1989, p.307) have described the interview as "initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research relevant information and

focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation".

Robson (1993, p.228) has described the interview as "a conversation with a purpose". On the surface, this may give the impression that it is very easy. On the contrary, there are very specific skills which the interviewer must develop and employ if she or he is to exploit the potential for rich, illuminating data. There are many pitfalls to be avoided and the interviewer needs also to be aware of potential bias in the questions. It is often the very flexibility, which can be so appealing, that can produce unreliable data because of lack of standardisation.

'Action research' implies that the researcher will be involved in a process which will lead to a solution to the problem being studied (Verma and Beard, 1981). Certainly some issues relevant to action research have emerged during the course of this study. In particular, the writer is conscious of the issues surrounding what might be perceived as 'self-evaluation', which could be highly contentious. Opinion seems to be very much divided on this. At one end of the spectrum there are those who believe that the insider cannot carry out credible, objective research in the area in which she or he is centrally involved. At the other end of the spectrum, there is a view that outsider research is ineffective, particularly where change or development might be a purpose of the research, for instance Carr and Kemmis (1986).

The practitioner - researcher is someone who conducts systematic research at the same time as carrying out her/his professional duties. For instance a teacher might carry out some research into the effects of the introduction of SATs at Key Stage 3, or a social worker might undertake a

study of a group of clients following the implementation of a 'care in the community' policy. The research is usually carried out in addition to normal duties but might take place in time specifically allocated by the employers. The focus of such study is to carry out professionally related research.

There are a number of criticisms or limitations which the 'insider' or parctitioner-researcher may have to face, none of which are insurmountable. Perhaps the main disadvantage of the practitioner - researcher role is the limited time available. Attempting to carry out systematic enquiry which is not fragmented by other professional demands can be exceedingly difficult. Time management is therefore extremely important. Also, the practitioner - researcher may not have the experience or confidence to undertake the business of designing, implementing and analysing the research, although this will vary enormously from one researcher to another. Here, the practitioner can benefit from a taught course on research methodology. The insider might also have preconceived ideas about particular issues or solutions. The practitioner - researcher must therefore rigorously apply methods which are based on justifiable principles. One useful technique for instance is triangulation which has been employed in this study. Another disadvantage might be the position of the researcher in the hierarchy of an organisation. This may for instance have an unwanted influence in an interactive interview situation where there are power differentials. The researcher will therefore need to look carefully at ways of avoiding this and achieving credibility and validity in the study. Nevertheless, these disadvantages can be outweighed by a number of advantages which according to Sommer and Wicker (1991) can produce "unrivalled" expertise. Firstly, the insider will have opportunities not

available to the outsider, for instance pre-existing knowledge and experience of the situation and the people within it. Secondly, implementation of the research is likely to be less problematic since the practitioner - researcher will know and understand the organisation and its systems. Thirdly, although it might be argued, that there is potential for role conflict, Allen-Meares and Lane (1990) have found that there is potential synergy between research and practice and that the role and insight of the practitioner can be helpful in producing a useful and appropriate design and analysis. Certainly, the forging of links between research and practice is increasingly seen as advantageous, and, finding sympathy with this viewpoint, the researcher has proceeded with this study!

It is appropriate here to briefly discuss the writer's own role as a white researcher. She is conscious of the common criticism of white researchers focusing on black issues. Troyna and Carrington (1993) raise three main concerns relating to this dynamic. Firstly, that power and status differentials are so significant that they prevent the production of meaningful responses from black participants. Secondly, that the experiences of black people may be negatively and stereotypically perceived and interpreted by the white researcher. Thirdly, that the role of the white researcher as self-appointed arbitrator, is of ethical concern.

Whilst the researcher has worked in various capacities in the field of race for the last twenty years she would not attempt to justify her role on the spurious grounds of experience or empathy. Whilst the subject of the research is policy related, the purpose, as already stated, is to comment on Section 11 and the educational provision and the role of the Section 11 teacher (who may be black). And, although such status and power

differentials may have existed in this research, particularly in the interview situation, the writer feels that the trust she has built up over a number of years with the black and ethnic minority staff concerned, went some way to offsetting these factors.

Whilst the writer recognises that black people should rightly reject white researchers regarding them as objects of study, the exclusion of white participation in race research seems to be naive and simplistic. Can no one but a Jew write of and research the holocaust? Can white researchers not analyse and write about slavery? Can only white people research British history? It might also be argued that one cannot understand British history without an understanding of slavery or black history. Can we understand the social, cultural and demographic history of urban areas without knowledge and understanding of the black presence?

More specifically in relation to this research which concerns Section 11, black groups have long argued that Section 11 funding and the issue of race have been marginalised. Since the writer is part of that system which is marginalised and which marginalises, it seems to her to be legitimate to reflect upon, analyse and discuss issues of concern and make an assessment of the situation based on the evidence.

Research Strategy

The principal intention of this research was to assess the value of Section 11 in one Local Authority as a resource in schools to helping black and ethnic minority children overcome barriers, and access the school curriculum. As already discussed in Chapter 3, Section 11 funding was misused and misdirected for more than two decades. The writer was interested to see if Section 11 funding was now being more effectively

used in schools and by local authorities following the 1990 Home Office guidelines which led to project based provision and a centrally managed Section 11 service.

In particular, the study has addressed a number of important issues. These are:

1. The quality of Section 11 staff and the appropriateness of their qualifications and skills.

2. The experience of Section 11 staff and the barriers they encounter in carrying out their work.

3. The knowledge and/or understanding of Section 11 of headteachers, mainstream staff, governors, parents and pupils.

4. The extent to which headteachers and mainstream staff value Section 11 provision.

5. The effectiveness of Section 11 support in schools since the introduction of the 1990 Home Office Guidelines and the centrally managed service.

6. The importance of Section 11 provision and the impact of cuts on black and ethnic minority pupils and their schools.

Since the participants came from a range of racial and cultural backgrounds with very different experiences, it was the phenomenological aspect which was of most interest. The ethnicity factor has been a very important one and has been a key consideration in the planning, carrying out and analysis of the research.

As already discussed two main types of data were gathered for the purpose of the research. Firstly, quantitative data from the questionnaire and secondly qualitative data from the interviews with Section 11 staff

and headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools. Additionally, some documentary evidence in the form of service data has been used in certain instances where it has been useful in supporting or illustrating evidence from the two main sources.

It is recognised that the findings of this research may not be reproduced exactly in other LEA's, nevertheless, since the LEA concerned is a sizeable one with one of the largest Section 11 Services in the north west of England, certain trends and findings are likely to be reflected in other Section 11 Services. The City which has a population of 420,000 is truly multi-racial with significant numbers of Citizens of New Commonwealth heritage from Africa, Bangladesh, Hong Kong, the Caribbean, India and Pakistan. There are also relatively large groups of refugees including Somalis, Vietnamese, Kurds and Bosnians.

In the course of her work, the writer carries out biannual data collections of Section 11 qualifying pupils in the Local Authority. These take place at the beginning and end of each academic year. The following table gives languages spoken by Section 11 qualifying pupils and their Stages of English Language Acquisition (SELA) in September 1993.

TABLE 4.1. Languages Spoken by S.11 Qualifying Pupils and their Stages of English Language Acquisition, September 1993.

QUALIFYING PUPIL SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (QPSOL)				
Language spoken	No.	SELA	No.	%QP
African Languages	246	A	1007) -	21
Arabic	462	B	1975)	
Bengali/Sylheti	766	C	3140) -	40
Cantonese/Hakka	291	D	2518)	
Cantonese (Viet)	85	E	1904	13
Creoles/Patwa	1,044			
Farsi	109			
Gujerati	182			
Punjabi/Gurmukhi	352	TOTAL	10,544	75
Punjabi/Urdu	194			
Somali/Brawa	5,824			
Vietnamese	348			
Other Languages	94			
	588			
TOTAL	10,585			

It should be noted that due to the Local Government (Amendment) Act 1993, ethnic minorities who are not of New Commonwealth or Pakistan heritage have recently become eligible for Section 11 funding. The three groups which are most likely to benefit from changes to Section 11 legislation in the Local Authority concerned, are the Somalis, the Vietnamese and children from various Middle Eastern Countries. Qualifying pupils, represent 20 per cent of all pupils on roll, that is, 14,669 ethnic minority pupils out of a total of 71,577 in 234 educational establishments.

Background and Context

Like many other Local Authorities, this particular authority has benefited from Section 11 funding for some considerable time. Education department records examined by the researcher show that Home Office funding was available to the LEA from at least the mid 1970's. The records indicate that until 1982 when the Home Office required Local Authorities to name Section 11 staff, these staff were not easily identifiable. As pointed out in Chapter 3, this was by no means unusual at that time. From 1982 onwards, in response to Home Office Circulars, the records show that the LEA attempted progressively to ensure that Section 11 staff were identifiable. By 1986 records indicate that all Section 11 staff were identifiable and appeared to have job descriptions.

From 1986 until 1991, a small Section 11 team, had limited responsibility for monitoring Section 11 posts. However, this was difficult since the team never had access to necessary information such as the names of Section 11 staff, their location and their job descriptions. This was

largely due to the fact that Section 11 staff were appointed by schools and there was no central service or mechanism for ensuring the 'tracking' of Section 11 staff. It was mainly left to headteachers to get on with the appointment of Section 11 staff and subsequently to inform the authority of any new appointment. This did not always happen. It is debatable whether or not staff appointed to Section 11 during this period were always recruited and selected with the appropriate skills and knowledge in mind, particularly since it was difficult to attract staff with the right qualifications, skills and experience.

Since 1992, Section 11 support to schools has been centralised following a successful bid to the Home Office for funding. In line with the Home Office criteria, the provision is project based. Funding was agreed initially at 75 per cent of staff salaries for a five year period. As indicated in Chapter 3, the level of Section 11 grant is for the first time since its application in 1967, to be lowered to 57 per cent from April 1994 and 50 per cent from April 1995 due to the 'economic climate' of the country.

A structure has been built into the project so that Section 11 staff have for the first time, access to career opportunities and career development. Apart from the small management team and administrative team, there are 123 full time equivalent staff based in schools, working in partnership with mainstream staff to support Section 11 qualifying pupils in the following ways:
- providing language and learning support in order to raise levels of performance and attainment in all areas of the curriculum;
- developing appropriate assessment, monitoring and reviewing procedures;
- supporting and advising schools on language and learning needs;

- developing, adapting and reviewing resources;

- helping schools consult with parents and encouraging their participation in their children's learning;

- assisting in the provision of pastoral and career guidance more relevant to the needs of qualifying pupils;

- providing school and centre-based In Service training;

- developing links between schools receiving language and learning support.

The 123 posts (148 actuals) are allocated to 76 schools (65 primary, 10 secondary, and 1 special school). Staffing allocations are based on agreed criteria, that is, the number of Section 11 qualifying pupils and the 'Qualifying Pupil Weighted Total' (QPWT). This is a weighted formula based on an assessment of pupil need. This includes Stage of English Language Acquisition (SELA) and curriculum support requirement. The assessments are carried out biannually by Section 11 staff who take part in standardisation exercises at the beginning of the academic year. It is likely, in the future, following a reduction in staffing due to the government cuts, that the criteria for allocating Section 11 staff will include a poverty weighting, so that scarce funding might be targeted at those Section 11 qualifying pupils most in need.

In line with Home Office requirements, all Section 11 staff have a job description. The types of posts fall broadly into the following categories: Support teachers (100); Home School Liaison teachers (7); Bilingual Instructors (8); Nursery Nurses (8). There are other bilingual and ethnic minority teachers in addition to the eight bilingual instructors. Question 2 of the survey asked staff to indicate ethnic background and Question 3 asked for mother tongue in order to ascertain more information about

black and ethnic minority staff in the service.

Qualified teachers have one of two types of job description, either 'Language and Learning' or 'Learning and Achievement'. The latter emerged from a growing recognition that job descriptions based on a teaching model which suited the needs of children of Asian heritage (Language and Learning) had inappropriately been used as a model for working with children of African-Caribbean heritage. Based on an analysis of the learning and pastoral needs of African-Caribbean pupils, the 'Learning and Achievement' job description was developed.

Staff in the service receive 4.5 days per year training, specifically relating to their work in schools. This training is accredited by the local university. Most recently appointed staff (14 out of 19) are of African-Caribbean or Asian heritage. Whilst they may be younger and have fewer years experience than many other staff, their specific skills and other racially and culturally relevant experiences are welcomed.

The total cost of the project in its first year was estimated at £2.5 million when fully staffed. The project had a 1.4 per cent vacancy rate during its first year of operation. Since notification by the Home Office in November 1992, of the proposed cuts to Section 11 funding in April 1994, all new appointments have been temporary. The use of temporary contracts is now very common since Local Authorities fear further cuts to Section 11. Although the use of temporary contracts is not desirable, it has been viewed as a prudent step taken by the authority to present a truthful picture of the future to new employees, whilst at the same time safeguarding the employment of Section 11 staff with permanent contracts. It should be noted that there is a policy of no redundancy in the local authority in this research. The writer draws attention to the

employment situation since it inevitably affects the planned provision, staff morale, perceptions of Section 11 staff and the future educational achievement of Section 11 qualifying pupils.

Conduct of the Questionnaire

The researcher devised a questionnaire (see appendix 3) to be completed by Section 11 staff which was intended to obtain data that would be pertinent to the issues under investigation. The questionnaire was pretested on 18 Section 11 staff in four schools, (two secondary schools and two primary schools). The respondents in the pilot came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. The particular schools were carefully chosen so that participants were broadly representative of the population from which the writer planned to draw the research subjects. The Section 11 coordinator in each school subsequently made comments on the completion of the questionnaire, indicating which questions seemed ambiguous or problematic. In the light of this trialling, two amendments were made to the questionnaire, one concerned the layout of the questionnaire which needed to be clearer, the second concerned the insertion of TESOL in question 16 which although not a specific curriculum area better described the type of support given by some participants. A brief analysis of the pretest results suggested that the planned questionnaire would work satisfactorily. The revised questionnaire was then produced.

The researcher decided to administer the questionnaire at each of three training sessions for Section 11 staff held over a three day period in July 1993, since this would give an opportunity for the researcher to interface with respondents and provide a full explanation of the purpose of the questionnaire before distribution. The first session was for staff working

with Nursery and Key Stages 1-2, the second session was for staff working in Key Stages 2-3 and the third session was for staff working with Key Stages 3-4. The three training sessions were attended by 142 of the 148 staff (6 absentees). Questionnaires were distributed fifteen minutes before the end of each session. Although completion of the questionnaire was voluntary, the value of a good response was pointed out and in the event, the response was very high with 138 Section 11 staff completing questionnaires.

The Questionnaire

Details of the thinking behind the questionnaire are set out below. The questions were designed to produce a broad picture of the Section 11 staff, the provision and the value and importance Section 11 staff felt was placed on their contribution in schools. Participants were asked to tick boxes in response to 20 questions of the fixed choice type.

Questions 1-3 sought data regarding gender, ethnic origin and mother tongue. This provided important background information about participants particularly in relation to attitudinal variations. It also permitted the researcher to see if the ethnic origin and mother tongue of staff in any way reflected the makeup of the schools' populations.

Questions 4-6 asked for data concerning professional and academic qualifications. The researcher was interested to ascertain the level of academic and professionally appropriate qualifications. For instance a diploma in TESOL or multi-cultural education.

Question 7 asked for an indication of the phase in which the participant works; nursery, primary, secondary, sixth form and Question 16 asked for

information relating to the area in which participants most gave Section 11 support for instance, English or Maths, Science or general TESOL support. The data from these two questions provided the researcher with important information concerning the focus of support.

Questions 8-15 were designed to produce data which gave an indication of the importance and value placed on Section 11 provision by the school including the headteacher, and mainstream colleagues. It also sought to provide some idea of the extent to which headteachers and mainstream colleagues understood Section 11 work and issues. Also of interest to the researcher was the extent to which governors, parents and Section 11 qualifying pupils knew something about Section 11 and the fact that there were Section 11 funded staff in their school.

Questions 17-20 related to Section 11 staff, their future plans, self-esteem, morale and skills and experience. The researcher was interested in the view of participants as to the impact of reductions in Section 11 provision and the achievement of black and ethnic minority pupils. She was also concerned to discover if the morale and stability of the Section 11 workforce had suffered as a result of the announcement of Government cutbacks in Section 11 funding. The data here was also intended to provide some insight into whether or not participants felt that the staff development programme had equipped them with the skills and knowledge which would help them better provide for the educational needs of Section 11 qualifying pupils.

The Interviews

The purpose of the interviews at the second stage of the research was

mainly to obtain qualitative data from Section 11 staff and also from headteachers with Section 11 staff in their schools. (Interview schedules are attached as appendices 4 and 5).

This could be used for several purposes. Firstly, it permitted triangulation. The qualitative data obtained from the interviews could be used to cross-validate the quantitative data from the questionnaires and vice versa. Also, data was obtained from two different sources at interview stage, Section 11 staff and headteachers with Section 11 staff, enabling further cross checking of data. Secondly the interviews provided face to face opportunities with participants to explore issues and discrepancies which had been highlighted by the analysis of questionnaire data. Thirdly, the use of the interview as an approach as well as the questionnaire, was intended to improve the overall quality of research data.

It was decided to interview approximately 15 per cent of all Section 11 staff in the Service and 15 per cent of all headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools. The sample of headteachers was selected through proportionate stratification so that the researcher could obtain the views of a cross section of headteachers in the primary and secondary sectors. Another factor taken into consideration was the ethnic composition of the children in the particular schools. Hence the headteachers who were invited to participate in the research managed schools which were representative of three broad categories of schools with Section 11 qualifying pupils. First those schools with children mainly of African-Caribbean heritage, secondly those with children mainly of Asian heritage and thirdly schools with similar numbers of children from both of these heritage groups. Consequently, 10 headteachers were interviewed, eight primary headteachers and two

secondary headteachers.

Twenty Section 11 staff, were interviewed. The sample was selected by disproportionate stratification so that black and Asian staff might be more meaningfully represented. Position in the career structure was also a consideration in selecting participants. It was decided to ensure that staff at different levels were included. The table beneath gives an analysis of participants by gender, ethnic group and position in the career structure (type of post).

TABLE 4.2. Analysis of participants by gender, ethnic group and type of post (September, 1993).

Participant	Gender	Race	Type of Post
1	M	W	'D'
2	F	W	'B'
3	F	W	SS
4	F	W	SS/HSL
5	F	B	SS
6	F	As	BI
7	F	W	SS
8	F	B	'A'
9	M	As	'C'
10	F	As	NN
11	M	B	'A'
12	F	As	'A'
13	M	W	'B'
14	F	W	SS
15	F	As	'A'
16	F	W	'B'
17	F	B	SS/HSL
18	F	W	SS
19	F	B	SS
20	F	As	BI

Key
Gender
M - Male
F - Female

Race
W - White
B - Black
As - Asian

Type of Post
'D' - Teacher, 'D' allowance
'C' - Teacher, 'C' allowance
'B' - Teacher, 'B' allowance
'A' - Teacher, 'A' allowance
SS/HSL Home-School Liaison teacher, standard scale
SS - Teacher, standard scale
BI - Unqualified teacher, Bilingual Instructor
NN - Nursery Nurse

A cross-section of participants was achieved by careful analysis of the workforce. Random sampling was likely to have jeopardised the chances of obtaining a well balanced set of participants. Similarly, headteacher participants were not randomly chosen for the same reason. Of the primary school headteachers, two managed schools serving predominantly African-Caribbean communities, four served predominantly Asian communities. The other two schools served racially mixed local populations with similar numbers of black, white and Asian pupils. The two secondary headteachers managed very different schools, one a single sex (girls) school, the other co-educational. The girls' school had significant numbers of Asian and African-Caribbean pupils. The co-educational school served a school population with large numbers of pupils of Asian heritage.

The Conduct of the Interview

The interviewer spent several minutes on the telephone before each interview took place, agreeing appointments and ensuring that participants were clear about the purpose of the interview. The interviews each took between 30 minutes and 1 hour. The researcher decided to record responses by taking notes during the interviews. Immediately after each interview the interviewer spent 20-30 minutes writing up the interview. The first three interviews were recorded and played back after writing up in the manner described. This exercise was intended as a mechanism for checking the accuracy of the interviewers' notes of the interviews. Once the interviewer was confident that the interview notes were sufficiently accurate, the tape recording of interviews was discontinued.

As already described, the interviews conducted were not formally structured although there was an overall strategy and an interview outline had been prepared. Some questions were not pursued at length but were included to provide opportunities for participants to talk and develop a rapport between themselves and the interviewer. The strategy was to obtain some biographical detail of the participants, in the case of Section 11 staff, then focus on the views and experiences of the participants who were also asked to speculate on the future particularly regarding Section 11 qualifying pupils and their schools.

The interview data was integrated with data gathered from the questionnaire and analysed thematically in line with the original research questions.

CHAPTER 5

Research Findings and Discussion

This Chapter sets out the findings from the analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires completed by Section 11 staff and the interviews with Section 11 staff and headteachers. The purpose is to provide information which gives an overview of Section 11 staff and Section 11 provision as well as explore and comment in more detail, on trends and issues which have emerged, particularly in relation to the achievement of black and ethnic minority pupils. The first part of the Chapter concerns Section 11 staff, their qualifications, skills, and experiences and the second part of the Chapter explores Section 11 provision; the past, the present, its management, its importance and its future.

The research focuses on school based Section 11 staff (teachers and bilingual instructors) and provision in one Local Authority. 138 Section 11 teachers and bilingual instructors completed questionnaires. Of these, 36 were based in Secondary schools, 98 in the Primary Sector (including Infant and Junior schools) and 3 in Nursery Schools. The data gathered from the questionnaires was intended to provide a broad picture of Section 11 staff and the context of Section 11 work. Of the 138 Section 11 staff who completed questionnaires, 20 also took part in the interviews. Ten headteachers with Section 11 staff based in their schools were also interviewed. The interview schedule sought to pursue issues arising from the research in a more flexible, responsive way than the questionnaires, yet which was, complementary to them. This combination of approaches, the questionnaire and the interview, attempted to strike a balance between the general in that it sought to present prevalent attitudes and experiences, and the particular in that it

sought to focus on individual view points.

The quantitative data gathered from the questionnaires is integrated with the qualitative data obtained from the interviews. Likewise the interview data from Section 11 staff and headteachers is presented in an integrated form. Trends and issues are therefore dealt with thematically.

SECTION 11 STAFF - THE PROVIDERS

Profile of Section 11 Staff - Race, Gender, Mother Tongue

An important starting point in looking at educational support under Section 11 is the people who actually provide that support. The questionnaire sought to establish important background information concerning those staff who provide educationally for black and ethnic minority pupils through their Section 11 work.

Table 5.1 Section 11 Staff by Ethnic group and Gender (as a number of each group and a percentage of the 'Black', 'Asian', 'White' categories) July, 1993.

	Black				Asian						White				Mid East	Sub Total %	
	Afro-Carib.	Black Brit.	Other Black	Sub Total %	Bangla	Chinese	E.African Asian	Indian	Pak	Sub Total %	Irish	White Brit	Other White	Sub Total %	Mid East	Sub Total %	Grand Total %
Male	0	1	1	1.4	1	0	0	1	4	4.3	0	12	0	8.7	0	00	14.5
Female	5	2	2	6.5	3	2	2	4	14	18.1	1	75	6	59.4	2	1.4	85.5
				8.0						22.5				68.1		1.4	10.0

Note: All Percentages in tables to 1 decimal point

As can be seen from Table 5.1, the majority of Section 11 participants were female of whom just over seven out of ten were white. It should be noted that although statistics have been given by ethnic group, since the numbers were so small, the three broader categories given above, that is, 'Black', 'Asian' and 'White', generally showed more significant trends for the purpose of discussion. The two Middle Eastern

participants were not included in the Black, White or Asian categories, but were retained in the total sample. The categories used for determining ethnic origin were those adopted by the Local Authority.

In all, approximately two thirds of the total group classified themselves as belonging to the 'White' group which included Irish, White British and Other White. Just less than a quarter of participants, classified themselves as belonging to 'Asian' groups. The 'Asian' group included Bangladeshi, Chinese, East African Asian, Indian and Pakistani. The smallest group, less than one tenth of the participants belonged to the 'Black' groups which consisted of those identifying as Afro-Caribbean, Black British and Other Black.

Service data indicated that 18 out of 23 new staff over the previous twelve months were black or Asian. However, the figures in table 5.1 showed that despite an increase in black and ethnic minority Section 11 staff since the start of the new project, there was still a disproportionate percentage of white staff and an under representation of black and ethnic minority staff in the Section 11 Service. According to data from the interviews, Section 11 staff were sometimes the only black or ethnic minority staff in a school. This was an indicator of a very low number of black role models in schools. The reliance on Section 11 funding to provide black and ethnic minority teachers appeared to be a common feature in schools. In one school with no black or Asian mainstream staff and an allocation of 3 Section 11 staff, the headteacher told the writer that the Section 11 service should provide the school with "one black teacher, one Asian teacher and one white teacher". Nevertheless, the data revealed that even within the context of Section 11, black and ethnic minority teachers were a scarce resource.

Table 5.2. Mother Tongue of Section 11 Staff
July, 1993

	Number	Percentage of all Staff
Bengali/Sylheti	5	3.6
Cantonese/Hakka	2	1.4
Creoles/Patwa	6	4.3
Gujerati	1	0.7
Punjabi	20	14.4
Arabic	1	0.7
English	99	71.7
Other	3	2.2

Since Section 11 provision is aimed at communities whose first language might not be English, the researcher was interested in the languages spoken by Section 11 staff, particularly since language can be a major barrier for some ethnic minority pupils in accessing the school curriculum. Data relating to mother tongue in Table 5.2, revealed, as perhaps expected, that the first language of almost three quarters of participants was English. Apart from English, the second most common mother tongue amongst Section 11 staff (14.4 per cent) was Punjabi. Since Pakistanis were the largest ethnic minority community in the city this reflected to some extent the ethnic make-up of the community as a whole. Since 6,370 children in schools were Punjabi speakers (Service information, September 1993), the ratio of Punjabi speaking Section 11 staff to Punjabi speaking children was 1:318.

The second largest community were the African-Caribbeans. Over half of the 11 'Black' staff indicated that they were speakers of Creoles/Patwa, whilst 1,044 of the school children (Service information, September 1993 were speakers of Creoles/Patwa on Section 11 data. This gave a ratio of 1:174 Creoles/Patwa speaking S11 staff to pupils.

The third largest ethnic minority group were the Bengalis. 3.6. per cent of staff were Bengali/Sylheti speakers. Since there were 766 Bengali/Sylheti speaking children in Local Authority schools (Service Information, September 1993) this gave a ratio of 1:152 Bengali/Sylheti speaking Section 11 staff to Bengali/Sylheti speaking children.

The picture produced by data was one in which there continues to be insufficient Section 11 staff who can use bilingual skills to aid transition from mother tongue to English. An interesting statistic to note was, that amongst the Asian group, nine out of ten worked in the primary sector, mainly in the early years where one might expect there to be the greatest need for transitional bilingualism. The black group was more evenly divided with just under half working in the secondary sector and just over half in the primary sector.

The most recently appointed staff, that is from January 1993, were on temporary contracts in anticipation of staffing reductions due to Government cutbacks. Service data revealed that 18 out of 23 temporary staff were black. The loss of these staff would therefore have a serious impact on the Service. Firstly, the ethnic make-up of the service would be even more unbalanced and secondly there would be fewer bilingual staff and black role models for pupils. This would affect both the quality of Section 11 provision and pupil achievement.

How did Participants find out about/become Section 11?
A major issue historically concerning Section 11 funding has been its 'inexplicitness' resulting from the Home Office's failure until 1990, to ensure proper monitoring and use of Section 11 grant at Local Authority level. It was therefore of interest to the writer to discover

from participants how they first learned of Section 11 funding. This tended to vary depending on the length of time the participants had been 'involved' with Section 11 in whatever capacity. One Infant school Headteacher said,

> *I can't remember how I found out about Section 11. It must have been in the late 1970's. In those early days it was not considered very important. Only gradually did we appreciate the importance of Section 11.*

This growing awareness of the existence and use of Section 11 funding was a common feature in those interviews with long serving Section 11 staff. Several of them, including two bilingual staff, spoke of "a gradual realisation" of its existence and the implications for changing classroom practice. Certainly it appeared that any clarity concerning Section 11 emerged over a number of years and that Section 11 staff were often left without sufficient guidance or information about their role.

A number of established Section 11 staff first discovered the existence of Section 11 when they were suddenly and unexpectedly 'identified' as Section 11 funded teachers. This included three participants who are now primary school headteachers. One of these, a headteacher, recounted:

> *I found out about it (Section 11) a long time ago when schools had to identify Section 11 staff. They were planning to identify me - but I moved.*

Another headteacher had had a similar experience of being named as Section 11 without any involvement or negotiation.

> *Staff were suddenly identified as Section 11. I discovered I'd been put down as Section 11 but I was a class teacher. I*

didn't change my responsibilities at all.

Although a number of participants said that they had been very unhappy when they were suddenly named as Section 11, they were apparently reassured by headteachers that their duties would not change, even though did not have job descriptions. This exercise, which caused much anxiety, followed a letter to schools from the Local Authority, which in response to a Home Office requirement in 1982, required them to identify Section 11 staff for the first time.

However, not everyone was unhappy to be Section 11, a Senior Section 11 teacher with a management responsibility in the service candidly stated:

> *I got promotion and as one of the top twenty highest paid*
> *staff . I found my name on a list. It didn't bother us. We*
> *carried on doing the same work. The list didn't stay the*
> *same. It changed about every term. The way it was put*
> *to us was that it was 'creative accountancy'.*

The length of time participants had worked as Section 11 varied. A number of staff had been Section 11 for between twelve and sixteen years whilst other staff were relatively recently appointed some of these being on temporary contracts. One of the longest serving Section 11 teachers said:

> *I was first appointed in 1979 and was appointed as Section*
> *11. When I was appointed the Head showed me a Home*
> *Office letter. I was not allowed to do cover. I just worked*
> *with language groups in a separate base. The Head*
> *rigidly made us stick to guidelines and never asked us to*
> *do anything other than Section 11.*

This was a surprising revelation. At a time when there was widespread abuse or misuse of Section 11, it appeared that headteachers had in fact received full information and guidance from the Home Office via the Local Authority and that at least one headteacher had taken that guidance very seriously. Since at that time, responsibility for Section 11 staff was delegated to headteachers by the Local Authority, correct deployment of Section 11 staffing was left very much to the discretion of the headteachers concerned without any monitoring system in place. As the same participant put it:

> *The only person I think who ever read the letter from the Home Office was my headteacher. No one else had the remotest idea what we should do.*

And when they were identified as Section 11, several staff complained that they had been asked to work with pupils in corridors, storecupboards and even in toilets although they insisted that this no longer happened.

The more recently appointed to Section 11 a participant was, the more likely it was that they had made a conscious decision to be 'Section 11' since they had applied for Section 11 posts with a Section 11 job description. Some of the following comments from more recently appointed staff, illustrated this trend.

> *I wanted to be Section 11. I knew what it was and I wanted to do it. I don't want to leave it, I love it.*

- *I saw Section 11 advertised. I was on TP I wanted to help the local community. I was already involved in the community.*

- *It was a choice, increasing my experience, building up my skills. I didn't see it as career development at the time but it was.*

Most of the newer staff applied for Section 11 posts sometimes after completing a PGCE or diploma in TESOL, but not everyone applied because they wanted to do Section 11 work. The following remarks were typical of this smaller group. "I was desperate to get back to this part of the country, that was why I applied but I knew it was a Section 11 job. That was O.K". Whilst this may not have been the best of reasons for applying for a Section 11 post, at least a conscious decision was taken to do Section 11 work and the person concerned must have succeeded in meeting a person specification through the Local Authority's Equal Opportunity Recruitment and Selection process. This process attempts to objectively base a person specification on a job analysis to try to ensure that those appointed to posts have the right qualifications, skills and experience to enable them to carry out the job description effectively.

Qualifications, Training and Skills

In the 1980's, it was difficult to recruit and retain Section 11 staff who were well qualified. The researcher therefore looked at the qualifications of the participants to see if this was still the case.

Table 5.3 (5.3i, 5.3ii, 5.3iii) Qualifications By Ethnic Group (by number and percentage) July, 1993.

	Black		Asian		White		Mid East		All	
	Number	Percentage of group	Number	Percentage of group	Number	Percentage of group	Number	Percentage of group	Number	Percentage of group
5.3i. Highest Qualification										
Masters or higher	2	18.2	16	51.6	11	11.7	1	50.0	30	21.7
Bachelor or higher	8	72.7	25	80.6	62	66.0	2	100	97	70.3
5.3ii. DES Recognised										
DES Recognised	9	81.8	22	71.0	88	93.6	1	50.0	120	87.0
Unqualified	0	0	7	22.6	1	1.1	1	50.0	9	6.5
5.3iii. Specialist Qualifications										
All Specialist Qualifications	3	27.3	15	48.4	34	36.2	1	50.0	53	38.4
• Multicultural	1	9.1	5	16.1	6	6.4	0	0	12	8.7
• TESOL	0	0	6	19.4	23	24.5	0	0	29	21.0
• Other	2	18.2	4	12.9	5	5.3	1	50.0	12	8.7

In terms of the qualifications held by Section 11 staff, table 5.3i shows that more than two thirds of all Section 11 staff had a bachelor's degree or higher. Two thirds of the white group, and almost three quarters of the black group, held at least a bachelor's degree, whilst over three quarters of the Asian Group had the same level of qualifications.

Just under one fifth of the black group and just over one tenth of the white group had a master's degree or above as their highest qualification, whilst over half of the Asian group held a masters degree or higher. The black and Asian staff therefore tended to be better qualified than the white staff, although the Asian Staff tended to be best qualified of all three groups. This bears out research, such as that produced by CRE (1988) which has shown that it is not an uncommon pattern for black and ethnic minority staff to be better qualified than is the norm for white staff.

An interesting result from the questionnaire was that more than 8 out of 10 participants who had a teaching certificate as their highest qualification were 'White British'. This might be accounted for in the different Education Systems in England and the Asian Sub continent. Whereas in Britain a Teaching Certificate or PGCE are common currency as teaching qualifications, a master's degree is a more commonly accepted teaching qualification on the Asian Sub-continent and indeed, a master's degree from Pakistan, Bangladesh or India was accepted by the former DES as a teaching qualification until 1982.

As shown in table 5.2ii, the Asian group tended to have fewer DES (now DFE) qualified staff than the other two groups although two thirds of this group had DES recognition. More than 90 percent of the white group were DES recognised and just over 80 per cent of black staff were DES recognised, whilst just under three quarters of the Asian staff were DES recognised.

Of the 9 unqualified teachers 7 were Asian. None of the black staff were unqualified teachers and one white member of staff was unqualified. However, 8 out of the 9 unqualified teachers had a bachelors degree or higher. Since there were 8 posts in the Service designated as 'Bilingual Instructor', bilingualism would have been an essential criteria for appointment and not DES recognition to this type of post. Since white staff were unlikely to have applied for posts which required them to be bilingual in a community language, the route into the Section 11 Service for them would more likely have been the possession of a recognised teaching qualification, plus either experience of working in multi-racial schools or some specialist qualification such as a 'TESOL' diploma, a

multi-cultural diploma or masters degree in multicultural education or similar.

As indicated in Table 5.3iii, almost four out of ten participants had a 'relevant specialist qualification', such as a diploma in TESOL or multi-cultural education. Of these, approximately a quarter of the black group had a 'specialist' qualification', approximately one third of the white group and almost half of the Asian group had specialist qualifications.

The Asian group contained the highest percentage of those participants with a 'multicultural' qualification (16.1 per cent) followed by the black group of whom 9.1 per cent had a 'multicultural' qualification. The white group had the lowest percentage (6.4 per cent) of those with a multi-cultural qualification.

Contrastingly, a quarter of the white group had a TESOL qualification compared to the Asian Group of whom one fifth had a TESOL qualification and the black group amongst whom no one had a TESOL qualification.

The likely explanation for these patterns is that historically, the majority of Section 11 support given was TESOL, irrespective of the racial background or educational need of pupils. However, there has been a growing recognition of the very different needs of children of African-Caribbean heritage and third generation children of Asian heritage requiring a different educational response. This response includes greater emphasis on pastoral care and raising achievement across the curriculum. The presence of Asian and African-Caribbean staff as positive role models in building racial identity and self-esteem is a

crucial dynamic in developing an appropriate educational response. Since the existing support given to African-Caribbean children tends to be across the curriculum and pastoral rather than TESOL, the black staff would usually, but not necessarily, be less likely to use or need TESOL skills in their Section 11 work. Moreover, membership of a black or ethnic minority group would be an important qualification for Section 11 work since a good understanding of the cultural needs and racial identity as well as language or dialect, which these staff will have gained first hand, can positively help children's learning and development. (Verma, 1990)

Overall, a picture emerged of well qualified Section 11 staff, particularly the Asian Group, who possessed the highest level of qualifications and specialist qualifications. Whilst differences did emerge between the three groups, these differences appeared to be related to some extent to different educational experiences and systems and also to the particular needs of pupils from their own ethnic groups.

As discussed in Chapter 3, section 11 staff frequently used to complain of becoming 'deskilled'. The writer wished to see if this situation had altered in the 1990's and if the training programme had been effective.

5.4. S.11 Training programme has raised professional skills and and knowledge. View of S.11 Staff, July, 1993.

| | Black | | | | Asian | | | | | | White | | | | | All |
	Afro-Carib.	Black Brit	Other Black	Sub Total	Bangla	Chinese	E.Afri Asian	Indian	Pak	Sub Total	Irish	White Brit	Other	Sub Total	Mid East	Total
A great deal	60	66.7	33.3	54.5	50	50		40	50	45.2	100	35.6	33.3	36.2	100	40.6
Quite a lot	20	33.3	66.7	36.4	50	50	100	60	44.4	51.6		51.7	50	51.1		49.3
Very little	20			9.1					5.6	3.2		10.3	16.7	10.6		8.7
Not at all												2.3		2.1		1.4

As shown in Table 5.4, nine out of ten participants indicated that the Section 11 training programme had raised their skills and knowledge. Although all three groups black, Asian and white gave a high level of positive responses, the highest percentage of positive responses, (96.8 per cent), was recorded by the Asian group. The general trend showed that Section 11 staff saw themselves as increasingly more skilled with regard to their work rather than being deskilled. The training clearly accounted for an increase in skills. It is also likely that over a period of time, given the greater stability within the Section 11 workforce, participants will have benefited from a wide range of courses within the training programme. Since the training programme is validated by the Local University, this may have given more status to the training programme and provided Section 11 staff with an opportunity to upgrade their qualifications. The modular nature of the training programme has also allowed scope for choice, permitting staff to select those courses which best suited their needs.

What skills and training are needed by Section 11 staff to carry out the work effectively? Job descriptions of Section 11 Staff included 4.5 days per year for Section 11 training in addition to the 5 staff development days which all teachers have in their contract. Section 11 staff in the service were therefore provided with a training programme based on an analysis of need. The training programme provided opportunities for Section 11 staff to come together either for specific training events or for 'networking meetings'.

Those participants who were interviewed felt that the Section 11 training programme had been very useful and that training was an important element of the Central Section 11 Service's remit. One

176

headteacher felt that,

> *Inset is needed to increase skills and needs coordination,*
> *otherwise we become very insular. The central service*
> *keeps us up to date and involves us in sharing ideas and*
> *developments.*

All those interviewed said that the training programme which was designed to increase their skills as Section 11 staff had been helpful, at least in part. Newer Section 11 postholders seemed to have found it more valuable than those who had been Section 11 for a long time. One member of staff who had worked in Section 11 for eighteen months said:

> *The training gave me purpose, direction. Gave me*
> *confidence. I felt I was on the right track. I found I was*
> *amongst like minded people. People you would discuss*
> *ways of doing things with constructively. You can feel*
> *isolated in school. You can learn from other colleagues in*
> *other schools.*

The sense of isolation which could be experienced by Section 11 staff was highlighted by a number of participants, particularly those in schools with no other Section 11 colleagues. All Section 11 participants said that opportunities to meet other Section 11 colleagues, to discuss and share strategies and resources, were very helpful and confidence building as well as a means of overcoming isolation.

The Asian staff in particular found that the training programme was very useful and practical. They explained that this was because they were used to quite a different education system and therefore support for their professional development through training helped them to adapt to the British Education System and become more effective within it.

The type of training this group said they most appreciated was on "methodology" or "school systems".

The more established Section 11 staff said that they found only parts of the training helpful and felt that they already possessed a lot of the necessary skills and knowledge to carry out their Section 11 work effectively. Although this signalled the need for differentiated training, resources for training in the service were so scarce that this had not been viable.

The skills required to work effectively as a Section 11 teacher proved to be an interesting topic during discussions. Participants frequently referred to the wide ranging demands of Section 11 work, often listing a multitude of skills which were required of a Section 11 teacher. Terms such as "a magician" and "a juggler with many balls in the air" were used to describe the job of a Section 11 teacher. One headteacher listed some of the many skills which she felt were needed to carry out Section 11 work effectively.

> *A good Section 11 teacher has to have wonderful skills. Counselling, for example. Sharing, listening, clarifying, practical ideas, resources. Knowledge and understanding of language, language development, cultural implications and the children's backgrounds. Not everyone can do all that.*

Several headteachers emphasised the need for good time management, assessment skills, knowledge of the National Curriculum and the ability to prioritise work and set targets. Other important skills mentioned by many Section 11 staff included the following, summarised by one participant: "Patience, tact, diplomacy, good communication skills, at the

same time as being assertive, confident".

Many Section 11 staff felt that they had acquired many or most of these skills through experience and training. Interestingly, several participants referred to themselves as having to be "chameleon-like". In explaining this term they pointed out that in order to survive and operate effectively, there is a need to be adaptable, flexible and willing to use different approaches. One Section 11 teacher felt that she had had to develop the "skin of a rhinoceros". Another talked of having learned to take things with "a pinch of salt". Some Section 11 staff explained that they needed at times to be "manipulative". Such terminology suggested that whilst there were certain barriers which Section 11 staff needed to overcome in carrying out their work, they seem to have acquired the necessary skills and strategies to recognise and deal effectively with them.

Morale and Future Plans

As demonstrated in Chapter 3 there was in the past, widespread low morale amongst Section 11 staff. Not only did they feel deskilled and marginalised, they often felt that they had been forced into undertaking the work. One participant who had worked in Section 11 from the outset spoke of her feelings and morale on discovering she was Section 11.

> *Finding out suddenly made me feel I didn't count for much. I had no choice. I was just identified. The part-timers got picked on to do Section 11. It was all very political. It was hidden. Heads must have known. They were using it just to suit themselves.*

This was not an untypical experience and similar feelings were echoed by several other participants who were identified as Section 11 funded,

without their consent in the early 1980's. The writer was therefore interested to find out how Section 11 staff felt about themselves and their work since the new Section 11 project began in 1992 and also if the level of morale had increased, or stayed the same.

Table 5.5. Morale of Section 11 Staff July, 1993, as compared with 1 year ago (by percentage) July, 1993.

	Black				Asian						White					All
	Afro-Carib.	Black Brit	Other Black	Sub Total	Bangla	Chinese	E.Afri Asian	Indian	Pak	Sub Total	Irish	White Brit	Other	Sub Total	Mid East	Total
The same	60		33.3	36.44	25			60	33.3	32.3		40.2	50	40.4		37.7
Higher	20	66.7	66.7	45.4	25		50	40	50	41.9		26.4	16.7	25.5	50.0	31.2
Lower	20	33.3		18.2	50	100	50		16.7	25.8	100	33.3	33.3	34.0	50.0	31.2

In response to a question concerning their current level of morale, table 5.5. shows that seven out of ten Section 11 staff felt that their morale was the same or higher than it had been one year previously. Of these, three out of ten indicated that their morale had actually increased. This was a surprising trend in view of the impending reductions to Section 11 funding. Whilst data indicated that over 40 per cent of the black and Asian groups indicated an increase in morale, in the white group only 25 per cent indicated that their morale had increased. The data indicated that whilst one third of the whites showed a decrease in morale, one fifth of the black group and one quarter of the Asian group indicated that their morale was lower. Again, this is an interesting attitudinal difference.

The greater increase in morale amongst black and Asian groups might be accounted for by their having previously experienced a comparatively lower morale and a greater sense of marginalisation prior to the

establishment of the new project. It is likely that race and racism would have been important factors in the relative morale and sense of marginalisation of different ethnic groups.

The establishment of the central Section 11 Service may have contributed to the general increase in morale. Historically, many Section 11 staff did not feel they 'belonged' to the school, nor did they belong to a central city-wide service. Where individuals were the only Section 11 staff in a school, or part of a small team of Section 11 staff, the existence of a centrally managed service seems to have given a sense of identity and being supported as well as providing advice and guidance, which in turn may have influenced morale.

Three out of ten participants indicated that their morale had actually decreased, since the previous year. This might in part have been due to the news that Section 11 funding is to be reduced from April 1994. As already noted, the percentage of white staff whose morale was lower, was double that of the Asian staff. This decrease in morale might also partly be accounted for, by a preference of some white staff, not to belong to a central Section 11 Service. Whilst the central service might be seen as a support mechanism by some staff, particularly black and Asian staff who are more easily identified as 'Section 11', there may be a preference or tendency amongst some white staff to 'belong' to the school or 'merge' with mainstream staff rather than be identifiable as 'Section 11'. The new guidelines and the existence of a centrally managed service would in such instances, be more likely to cause discomfort rather than create a sense of identity and solidarity.

However, whilst responses from the questionnaires showed a high level

of morale amongst Section 11 staff, six months later this appeared to be no longer the case. During interviews, the following comments were typical of the lower morale experienced by Section 11 staff. One person felt "Disheartened", another said that the current situation "makes me feel insecure." Feelings of insecurity were expressed by permanent staff as well as those with temporary contracts, even though only those with temporary contracts were likely to be directly affected by reductions in provision. However, those participants who felt less confident and secure, did state the cause as the proposed government reductions in Section 11 as the cause. Several people emphasised that it was because of the very fact that Section 11 provision was so important and valuable to schools that they felt so disappointed that it was to be cut.

The despondency which was expressed at interview stage could have destabilised the staffing situation and the provision. This might in turn have an effect on pupil achievement. The researcher was therefore interested to find out if the stability of the Section 11 teaching force might be affected. Would it be more difficult to retain good Section 11 staff and would it be possible for Section 11 staff to find alternative employment if they so wished?

Table 5.6. Future Plans of S.11 Staff
(by number and percentage), July, 1993.

	Number	Percentage
Remain S.11	100	72.5
Move to mainstream	21	15.2
Seek work outside Education	10	7.2
Leave/retire	7	5.1

As indicated in table 5.6, in response to a question concerning their future plans, almost three quarters of all Section 11 staff, indicated that their immediate plans were to remain in Section 11 work. One out of twenty indicated a wish to leave or retire. Approximately one in five said that they planned to move out of Section 11 work either into mainstream education or work outside of Education. This was an interesting trend since it appeared that the majority of Section 11 staff were 'settled', whereas previously as described in Chapter 3, headteachers had difficulty in retaining Section 11 staff. The current economic climate and employment market, in which it is more difficult to change jobs, will have also helped increase the stability of the Section 11 workforce. Nevertheless, there generally appears to be a greater sense of satisfaction with Section 11 work. Moreover, whilst many Section 11 staff in the 1980's did not choose to be Section 11, growing number of Section 11 staff have chosen to work in Section 11 and are therefore more likely to wish to stay in their chosen area of teaching.

The data from the interviews provided further interesting material for discussion concerning future employment possibilities for Section 11 staff. The responses to the questionnaires had revealed that the majority of staff intended to remain in Section 11 work. This position was unchanged at the time of the interviews and even temporary Section 11 staff expressed hopes that they might be able to remain in Section 11 work because they enjoyed it. Nevertheless, some concerns were expressed by Section 11 staff as to whether it would be difficult to move to mainstream jobs if they wished to do so (although Service information revealed that this was not the case). Headteachers were asked for their opinions. The view of a secondary headteacher was that: "Promotion might be difficult, but a sideways move would be easier."

Another secondary headteacher said:

*They (Section 11 staff) have increased skills if anything.
They are more multi-skilled, They have to know at least
two curriculum areas, but they get pigeon-holed as
Section 11. It might be difficult to move into mainstream
in some but not every school. It would be possible in this
school.*

Two primary headteachers who had both formerly been Section 11
suggested that, "They shouldn't stay in Section 11 too long". Both of
these headteachers felt that Section 11 work was excellent preparation for
management and that they themselves had acquired important skills
and experiences which had helped them to gain management positions.
Indeed it was significant that several primary headteachers who were
interviewed had themselves formerly been Section 11 staff. This
appeared to be a common trend amongst primary school headteachers
and deputy headteachers, of inner city schools in the Local Authority
studied. Section 11 work can therefore be an important step in career
development and in this sense Section 11 staff who are interested in
promotion to managerial positions should not stay overlong in Section
11 work although this would be true of any work. Finally, and most
encouraging, one headteacher who had been Section 11 herself stated,

*Section 11 is very positive, a wonderful experience. Not
everyone can. I've just appointed my Section 11 teacher
to a mainstream post.*

The data from the questionnaire and the interviews was supported by
service data. In the two terms which followed the survey, 11 members of
staff left. One took up employment outside of education, one returned

to India, four people took early retirement and five left the service for mainstream posts in their base school.

Section 11 Provision - Changes, Management, Value and Effectiveness

Project based Provision and the Centrally Managed Service

The 1990 Home Office Scrutiny Report was undertaken in order to establish criteria and guidance which would ensure an improved Section 11 Service to black and ethnic minority communities. The researcher was interested in whether or not the new guidelines had brought about any improvement in Section 11 provision. She therefore tried to establish from interviewees, what changes had taken place since the establishment of the new project based provision.

In Personnel Management terms, job descriptions are considered to be an important basis for a clear understanding of the work. In discussions with participants concerning the new Section 11 job descriptions required by the Home Office, it became evident that there had previously been little clarity or even existence of job descriptions despite this having been a Home Office requirement since 1986. The misuse of Section 11 staff in the absence of job descriptions, or any monitoring was evident.

> *In the old days you had to cover, take classes, fill in , be*
> *the odd job person. We're now recognised as doing a*
> *specific job, an important job. There was a lot of*
> *resistance before.*

Clearly although the situation appeared to have changed more recently, the scope for exploitation of Section 11 funding in the 1970's and 1980's had been extensive. In the absence of guidance or monitoring from the

185

Home Office, Local Authorities seem to have seen this not as exploitation but as maximisation of external funding. This 'exploitation' or 'maximisation' of Section 11 appears nevertheless to have helped stimulate important multicultural and anti-racist initiatives in schools which were of benefit to qualifying communities.

> *Those of us who started to look in more depth, more seriously at multicultural issues used it to spark off a lot of multicultural and anti-racist work. We did racism awareness under Section 11 and became involved in the development of Multicultural and Anti-racist Policy development. We even did some work mainly in white schools.*

As discussed in Chapter 3, Race Officers did not see such developments as abuse of Section 11 and indeed the curtailing of anti-racist work under Section 11 funding has been seen as a loss and even a shortcoming of Section 11 as a mechanism for achieving race equality.

The prevailing view amongst participants who were Section 11 staff was that the setting up of a centrally managed service had been very beneficial to themselves and to Section 11 work. The general feeling was that the structures, monitoring mechanisms and support systems allowed Section 11 staff to carry out their Section 11 duties unhindered. Only two people hinted at possible misuse. One Asian teacher felt that in order to get what she wanted "It's swings and roundabouts", suggesting that there were 'trade offs'. Another experienced teacher, who was fairly new to Section 11 work admitted:

> *I'm now aware of the work, what it is. I'm sometimes asked to do special needs work but now I'm able to resist being sidelined. It's a struggle.*

Several other participants also highlighted the fact that some schools tried to use Section 11 instead of Special Needs staff. In some cases participants had required clarification and support from the Central Section 11 service to deal effectively with this issue. The overriding view from headteachers and Section 11 participants alike was that having a centrally managed service kept them 'on track'. Nevertheless, two headteachers said that they would like to have budgetary control of Section 11 staff, one so that he could "move people in and out of the role", so that they could experience Section 11 work and develop important skills. This he suggested was a good way of raising awareness of Section 11 and Section 11 work across the school. He did point out however that having a central service can be very supportive for staff, particularly when there were difficulties. This view was shared by most participants. One person commented,

Now we feel we belong somewhere. If there's a problem we can go to the service. Before it was so disorganised we didn't know who to go to, who to approach, who to ask.

Only one person, a member of staff who had worked in Section 11 for many years, felt that it had not been a positive change.

I don't feel tremendously part of the Service. I predate the service and it hasn't changed what I do or how I do it. It has divorced me from the school. I was on the governing body but had to come off it.

For those Section 11 staff who felt that they 'belonged' to the school the changes brought about by the 1990 guidelines created a number of such dilemmas, for instance they could no longer cover for absent colleagues

'by consent', or act as 'an extra pair of hands'.

In the past, allocation of Section 11 posts did not appear to depend on any set criteria. Since the start of the new project, posts had been allocated to schools according to agreed and open criteria. One secondary headteacher commenting on the benefits of a central service thought that,

> *It's better to know where the responsibility lies. The old system seemed to be run on patronage. It's much more open now. Initially there was a fear that the centrally managed service would become too powerful but it hasn't happened. Very useful. Definitely.*

One of the aspects of the marginalisation experienced by Section 11 staff in the 1980's emanated from a lack of career structure or career path. The career structure within the new service was seen unanimously as a positive benefit. A number of the staff interviewed had gained allowances for responsibility within the career structure of the new Section 11 service. This seemed to provide a great deal of encouragement and sense of belonging to a Section 11 Service with an important brief to fulfil.

> *I'd been working in Section 11 for over six years. Now I have a 'B' allowance. I didn't think I'd ever get anywhere. It gives us more status in schools.*

Several primary headteachers felt that the central service was useful coordinating the work and preventing fragmentation. All of the headteachers recognised the importance of monitoring the work on a city-wide basis. Monitoring systems are now a priority in Section 11

provision since annual reports on the meeting of agreed objectives and targets are required by the Home Office on an annual basis. The need to focus and monitor Section 11 work was welcomed by a number of Section 11 participants. For instance one Section 11 teacher who also coordinated a large team of Section 11 staff in a secondary school said that:

It's more formalised, collecting data, keeping records and so on. It helps focus, review and set targets. There's less flexibility - which can be good.

Another Section 11 participant in a management role who also felt that monitoring provision was supportive as well as useful said: "Now we have a sense of purpose, very clear guidelines on how we monitor and support staff".

The requirement on schools to produce evidence of the performance of Section 11 was seen as advantageous by Section 11 staff who felt that it would serve as proof of the value of their work. The provision of data on SATs, GCSEs, SELAs by ethnic origin is now required by OFSTED. This was welcomed by Section 11 staff who felt that this would clearly show that Section 11 provision was important and effective.

A number of Section 11 teachers commented that monitoring by the central service and the existence of the service had also resulted in a sharp decline in 'malpractice'. One participant who had worked in Section 11 for eight years commented "Schools are more accountable. They're more careful now about how you are used".

Overall, the evidence from the interviews suggested that the 1990 Home

Office guidelines and the setting up of a centrally managed Section 11 Service have been instrumental in bringing about some important changes which have helped to deter abuse and improve provision.

Management of Section 11 Work

In the past it was difficult in schools to identify who was managerially and structurally responsible for Section 11 work and Section 11 staff. This often lead to frustration and a sense of powerlessness for Section 11 staff. Participants were therefore asked in the questionnaire who their managers were, in other words, who took responsibility within the school system for the effective management of Section 11.

At the start of the project in 1992, Senior Managers from the Section 11 Service together with school inspectors provided individual briefing sessions on the new guidelines and the new project, for all headteachers and their Section 11 staff. Headteachers were also asked to clarify the lines of management for Section 11 staff and work within the school structure. They were also required to include Section 11 in the school development plan as a matter of policy. Additionally, schools were also required to agree Section 11 targets for the following academic year which would be reviewed.

Nine out of ten participants who took part in the questionnaire indicated that they were directly managed by their headteachers, with only a small number, less than one in ten, indicating that they were managed by a head of faculty or head of department. This demonstrated that Section 11 work is largely being lead by school managers with sufficient power and seniority within the school structure to take responsibility for the effectiveness and monitoring of Section 11 work.

This might be interpreted as schools having given status value to Section 11. From the point of view of Section 11 postholders this has also ensured a direct line of communication with the decision makers in schools which was seen as very useful by several participants who were involved.

Whilst the literature referred to in Chapter 3 indicated that Section 11 staff previously felt that the work was not taken seriously by the school managers, the evidence in this study showed that much progress has been made since the implementation of the 1990 guidelines and the establishment of a centrally managed service in 1992.

Understanding of Section 11

A common complaint amongst Section 11 staff in the 1980's concerned the lack of interest and understanding of Section 11 and Section 11 issues by headteachers and mainstream colleagues. The researcher tried to ascertain if this situation persisted.

Table 5.7. Headteacher /Mainstream Colleagues understanding of S.11 work by number and percentage - view of S.11 Staff (by number and percentage) July, 1993.

	Headteacher		Mainstream Colleagues	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Very good understanding	46	33.3.	19	13.8
Good understanding	80	58.0	96	69.6
Little understanding	11	8.0	21	15.2
Very little understanding	1	0.7	2	1.4

As indicated in table 5.7, in response to a question concerning their headteacher's level of understanding of Section 11 work, 9 out of 10 Section 11 staff felt that their headteacher had a 'good' or 'very good'

understanding of Section 11, whereas only one participant felt that their headteacher had 'very little' understanding of the work.

In comparison, fewer Section 11 staff felt that their mainstream colleagues had a 'very good' understanding of Section 11 work as indicated in Table 5.7 15.2 per cent of participants felt that more mainstream colleagues than headteachers had 'little understanding' of Section 11 work, despite the fact that they worked alongside them on a daily basis. However, it is likely that this view applied to some mainstream colleagues and not to others since the question did not differentiate between various colleagues.   Nevertheless, it could be argued that the responses were an indication of the general level of understanding, or lack of understanding of Section 11 of colleagues, as perceived by participants. Overall, the majority of Section 11 staff perceived their headteachers and mainstream colleagues as having a good or very good understanding of Section 11.

The new Section 11 projects set up in 1992, based on the 1990 guidelines gave a good opportunity for a 'new start' to Section 11. The initial visits by senior managers from the central Section 11 Service, together with the School Inspector to provide a thorough briefing for the headteacher and Section 11 staff on the new guidelines seem to have been useful. One headteacher who was interviewed admitted that not only had the briefing session been useful, "It made me realise how much more use I could have made of Section 11", another said "It clarified things I'd never been sure about although I didn't want to admit it". This exercise appeared to have 'paid dividends' by providing information and clarification about the Section 11 project and the Home Office guidelines as well as opportunities for discussion.

Value placed on Section 11 Provision

As already discussed, there was formerly, a general sense of demoralisation amongst Section 11 staff who felt undervalued, and unappreciated. The researcher wanted to know if schools valued Section 11 provision any more than they did previously.

Table 5.8. The extent to which Headteacher/Mainstream colleagues value S.11 work (by percentage) - view of S.11 Participants (by percentage) July, 1993.

	Black				Asian						White					All
	Afro-Carib.	Black Brit	Other Black	Sub Total	Bangla	Chinese	E.African Asian	Indian	Pak	Sub Total	Irish	White Brit	Other	Sub Total	Mid East	Total
Table 5.8i. Headteachers																
Very much	20	100	100	63.6	75		50	60	50	51.6		51.7	83.3	53.2		52.9
Quite a lot	60			27.3	25		50	40	44.4	38.7		40.2	16.7	38.3	50.0	37.7
Not very much	20			9.1		100			5.6	9.7	100	6.9		7.4	50.0	8.7
Table 5.8ii. Colleagues																
Very much		33.3	33.3	18.2	25		50	40	44.4	38.7		36.8	83.3	39.4		37.7
Quite a lot	100	33.3	66.7	72.7	75	100	50	40	44.4	51.6	100	51.7	16.7	50.0	100	52.9
Not very much		33.3		9.1				20	11.2	9.7		11.5		10.6		10.1

Participants were asked in the questionnaire to indicate to what extent they felt their work was valued by headteachers. Table 5.8i showed that over half the staff felt their work was 'very much valued' by their headteachers. The majority of participants, over 9 out of 10 gave a positive answer, indicating that they felt Section 11 was either 'very much valued' or 'quite a lot valued' by their headteacher. This gave a very encouraging picture of the value placed on their work by headteachers. There were however, variations within ethnic minority groups. All the 'Black British' and 'Other Black' staff felt their work was

193

'very much valued' by their headteachers whilst the Chinese staff felt 'not very much valued'. The following groups all gave positive responses, feeling either 'quite a lot' or 'very much' valued by their headteachers'. Bangladeshi; East African; Asian; Indian; other White.

Participants were also asked whether they felt Section 11 work was valued by their mainstream colleagues. Table 5.8ii contrasts interestingly with table 5.8i in that fewer participants felt that their work was 'very much valued' by their mainstream colleagues compared to their headteachers. However, over half of participants felt that their input was valued 'quite a lot' by colleagues. Nevertheless, the majority of participants gave positive responses regarding their mainstream colleagues' valuing their work. A very similar number of participants gave positive responses regarding their headteachers' valuing their work. Although, the Chinese group was very small it was interesting that although neither felt their work was 'very much valued' by their headteacher both felt 'quite a lot valued' by colleagues. All of the the Indian group, felt that their headteachers valued their work and most of the Pakistani group felt valued by their headteachers and colleagues alike.

The overall picture presented by the questionnaire data was one in which Section 11 staff did feel that Section 11 work was valued by mainstream colleagues with only minor variations between the feeling of it being positively valued by headteachers and positively valued by colleagues. This was very encouraging given the situation in the 1980's . Whereas Section 11 staff had previously felt marginalised, undervalued and powerless, the evidence revealed quite a different situation in the 1990's with Section 11 staff showing high levels of feeling that their

work was valued by headteachers and mainstream colleagues alike.

Given the introduction of The Local Management of Schools (LMS) and the pressure generally on the financial resources of schools, an additional member of staff paid through external funding, was seen as a very valuable asset by schools.

Interview data confirmed the findings from the questionnaire. Asked if Section 11 provision was valued by schools and parents, one headteacher said: "We could do with double. That would really make such a massive difference to pupil achievement. It already makes a difference". Other headteachers spoke of the "significant difference" Section 11 provision made to ethnic minority pupils in enabling them overcome barriers and gain access to the National Curriculum and the whole school curriculum.

Whilst all of the headteachers expressed unequivocal appreciation of Section 11 provision, two felt that Section 11 work was not sufficiently understood or appreciated by mainstream staff in their schools. As one put it: "I'm not convinced they (mainstream staff) fully appreciate the importance, the necessity of Section 11". This supported the data from the questionnaire which revealed that Section 11 staff felt less valued by mainstream colleagues than headteachers. Nevertheless, one secondary headteacher referred to the Section 11 provision being "highly valued" by all colleagues in that particular school. This view was supported by the Section 11 coordinator in the same school, who said he felt "essential". There were therefore schools in which Section 11 staff felt that the headteacher and mainstream colleagues appreciated Section 11 support. Three Primary headteachers felt that Section 11 staff were

valued members of staff in keeping with the school ethos. One headteacher felt that his Section 11 teacher was: "Very much valued. That is the context of the school. We value the contribution each other has to make".

The views of Section 11 staff varied on the issue of whether they felt valued by the headteacher and other staff. Whilst all those interviewed who were Section 11 felt appreciated by the headteacher, this was not always the case with other colleagues as already indicated in the questionnaire responses. One Asian teacher spoke of the discomfort she experienced when she first went to work in her base school:

> *It was like being under a microscope at first. I felt I had a lot of skills, knowledge to offer but it was not always sought or used. Perhaps it was personalities, possibly racism.*

Although only a few participants raised the issue of racism, this was undoubtedly a dynamic in some of the difficult situations experienced by black and Asian staff. Mainstream colleagues varied very much in the way they treated Section 11 staff and placed value or otherwise on Section 11 work. Another Asian Section 11 teacher said,

> *Some treat you as another pair of hands. Some will feedback, value your work and involve you. Then you can really do something worthwhile for the children.*

Data did reveal that a salient feature of Section 11 work was, the difficulty for Section 11 teachers in functioning effectively until she/he has become well established in a school. Since there is no defined curriculum area or class of children to focus on, the effectiveness of the

Section 11 teacher depends very much on support from the school management and the development of good working relationships with mainstream staff. Indeed many participants referred to the necessity for good interpersonal skills in Section 11 work. The process of establishing Section 11 practice across the curriculum in a way which is effective and at the same time acceptable to mainstream colleagues is a slow and difficult process. One bilingual instructor felt,

> *It was very difficult at first, I was the first Asian member of staff. At first I felt lost, alienated. It has been slow but now, yes, they're OK. I can get on with the work and I know it's valued.*

Section 11 work is very complex, although this was not always apparent to colleagues with little understanding of Section 11 provision. A number of headteachers referred to the misperceptions of mainstream colleagues about Section 11 work. One primary headteacher said,

> *They think it's an easy number. It's much harder if you are doing it properly. With your own class you can have quiet times. Section 11 staff have to perform each and every time. It's not easy. It's very hard work, very demanding.*

Despite this, the majority of section 11 staff said they felt indispensable in their schools. It was frequently mentioned by white, black and Asian staff alike, that mainstream staff "rely on Section 11".

The demands on Section 11 staff did seem very high. Section 11 participants and headteachers were conscious of the wide ranging skills and knowledge required of the Section 11 role, but this was not always recognised by mainstream colleagues. This was clearly due to

insufficient knowledge or understanding of Section 11. Many mainstream staff had not had the benefit of a 'Section 11 briefing' as had headteachers. This may have made a difference.

Governors, Parents, Pupils.

The 1988 Education Act placed greater emphasis on the involvement of parents and governors in school life and their participation in decision making in schools. Since Section 11 staff in the Local Authority studied were based in schools under the day to day management of the headteacher, it seemed very important to the researcher that all governors and parents should be aware of the presence and role of Section 11 staff in their school. Equally, it seemed important that pupils should realise that particular staff were employed within their school whom they could count on to give them additional support for instance with English, Maths, Counselling.

Table 5.9. **Governors/parents/pupils knowing what is the Role of S.11 staff (by percentage) view of S.11 Staff, July, 1993**

	Governors	Parents	Pupils
All	25.4	1.4	3.6
Most	31.9	18.8	29.7
Some	23.9	68.1	52.2
None	0.7	1.4	5.1
Don't know	18.1	10.1	9.4

Table 5.9 showed that although many school governors appeared to be aware of the role of Section 11 staff, only one quarter of the participants indicated that all of their school governors knew what their Section 11 role was. Half of the participants indicated that most or some governors

in their schools knew the role of Section 11 staff. Less than one per cent of the participants thought that none of their governors knew what their role was.

With regard to governors, the results of this question might have been better, since as part of the monitoring of Section 11 work, all schools were required to include in their annual report to governing bodies, information concerning the progress of Section 11 work with particular reference to the work programmes of Section 11 staff and the achievement of targets agreed between the central service and the school at the start of each academic year. Schools were also required to produce an annual report from the governing body to keep parents informed of Section 11 provision, progress and results. It may be of course that although such reports were produced by schools, the Section 11 teacher did not receive any feedback or any indication of interest in their work on the part of governors or parents. Alternatively the Section 11 teacher/participant may have been aware of low levels of participation amongst some governors or governing bodies.

In contrast, very few parents or pupils were aware of the role of Section 11 staff in the opinion of participants. This was a very worrying trend which supported claims for instance by CRE (See Chapter 3) that insufficient information is provided to Section 11 qualifying communities preventing them from fully participating in the decision making processes.

The data concerning parents and pupils may reveal that there is still a fear of marginalisation, by Section 11 staff who wish to be seen in exactly the same way as other staff, therefore becoming 'invisible'. This is of

course a management issue, in that it is a school responsibility to ensure that all parents and pupils are fully appraised of provision within the school and understand how to access that provision. The writer speculates that there may be some avoidance of providing parents and pupils with information since schools might be wary of raising racial tensions. Nevertheless, there are ways in which the central Section 11 Service might and should support schools which feel less confident in dealing with communicating information concerning Section 11 and surrounding issues to all parents and pupils, not just those who are Section 11 qualifying. The writer sought to pursue the issue concerning the awareness of pupils and parents of Section 11 during the interviews.

Although the data from the the questionnaires revealed that few pupils or children seemed to know about Section 11 staff in school, six months later, at interview stage the data indicated that this situation seemed to have altered.

Several Section 11 staff said that they had held workshops for parents to explain what Section 11 was and that these sessions had been well attended and well received. In many cases participants informed the interviewer that through enlisting parental support in fighting the proposed Section 11 cuts, many more parents were now aware of Section 11. Many parents had signed petitions, participated in a postcard campaign and written letters to the Home Office to protest about the cuts. Several Section 11 staff said that most parents now knew of their existence and their purpose but did not appreciate that they were Home Office funded. One person felt that "To parents, that's an insignificant detail".

One headteacher had ensured that all parents knew about the Section 11 staff. She indicated that this knowledge had had an unexpected effect. It had; "Alleviated worries of White parents that their children might be pulled down". Here was evidence that Section 11 was still perceived as a mechanism for alleviating racial tensions and placating the white group (See Chapter 3) When one Asian teacher explained to some parents in their mother tongue that there were plans to cut Section 11, one parent demonstrated a continuing level of ignorance of Section 11 by replying; "Good. I don't want my children learning Punjabi at school".

A number of participants, particularly the two Home-School liaison teachers felt that they had developed close working relationships with parents and often received very favourable comments about Section 11 provision and its usefulness. Both secondary headteachers who were interviewed talked of very good relationships between parents and Section 11 staff and felt that the Home-School liaison staff had built good links with parents which were valued by the school. Nevertheless, several headteachers and Section 11 staff felt that much more could be done to keep parents informed about Section 11 support for their children's education and felt that the interview would act as a prompt or stimulus for them to take action on this matter.

None of the participants based in primary schools felt that telling pupils what Section 11 was or that there were Section 11 funded staff in schools would serve any useful purpose. Although children had not been told about Section 11, some participants thought that children had "a good idea" what their job was. But, as one participant explained, "we don't explain the role of the maths coordinator to the kids, why should we explain the role of the S.11 coordinator".

The situation in secondary schools was somewhat different. One participant said, "the pupils don't know what we are, but they have been told what we do." Several headteachers mentioned that parent-governors had had reports of the progress of Section 11 work and had been fully appraised of Section 11 provision in school. One headteacher pointed out that all parents had received an annual school report in which there had been specific mention of Section 11 support, but he was not sure if all parents had read the report.

Whilst there appeared to have been some increase in awareness of Section 11 amongst parents, there was clearly scope for much improvement. Whilst it is debatable whether or not pupils needs to know about Section 11, the real issue seems to be what and when.

The vast majority of Section 11 support in education has traditionally been TESOL (Teaching English to speakers of other languages). A criticism of Section 11 support has been that it has failed to meet the needs of those Section 11 qualifying pupils who are not speakers of other languages. This has often resulted in African-Caribbean pupils receiving inappropriate or no Section 11 support. For instance in Liverpool Section 11 supported only bilingual learners until recently. The writer therefore sought to discover if this situation persisted.

When asked which curriculum area they most supported, more than half of the participants who completed a questionnaire, indicated that they gave support in all curriculum areas. Just over one quarter of staff indicated that they mainly supported English or gave TESOL Support One in ten participants said that they gave most support in Maths and

Science. This showed some shift away from the traditional TESOL type Support. This might in part have been due to increased awareness amongst Section 11 staff and schools of the learning needs of black and ethnic minority pupils which concern pastoral and curriculum support rather than TESOL. There are growing numbers of third generation black and ethnic minority pupils who are Section 11 qualifying and the barriers to learning and achievement faced by these pupils go far beyond just language skills. The specific needs of African-Caribbean pupils are no longer ignored by Section 11 staff, nor are they provided with language support be more appropriate to children of Asian heritage. The Home Office's (1990) policy criteria are also likely to have been influential. Pastoral support and support to raise achievement were identified as specific and legitimate areas for section 11 funding under the new criteria for any ethnic group although the African-Caribbean pupils were specified. The Home Office's legitimisation of non TESOL support and the lead they took have been important stimuli for important developments in Section 11 work.

The language and learning needs of Section 11 qualifying pupils were an issue of major concern during interviews. A number of participants emphasised the high level of need amongst Section 11 qualifying pupils. One bilingual teacher expressed her great concern over the level of need and the inability of the 'system' to meet that need. "The needs are so massive, it's difficult to see how to overcome these barriers". Another bilingual Section 11 teacher spoke in a similar vein about pupil need and her anxieties for the future of children whom she taught. "Language and other needs are immense, mind boggling. I can't begin to explain".

Although Section 11 funding is directed at ethnic minorities and not at

social and economic deprivation as for instance Urban Aid funding the disadvantages experienced by ethnic minorities, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, are often interlinked with socio-economic factors. One Section 11 teacher who works in a primary school in a catchment with children mainly of African-Caribbean heritage felt that,

> *Some needs are the same as for white children needing*
> *extra support because of high social and emotional needs.*
> *Many have language needs. They need extra support*
> *because of the racism they face.*

Several other participants spoke of the social and economic deprivation experienced by black and ethnic minority pupils with whom they worked as the major disadvantage, whilst others focused on the racism experienced as the most significant barrier for black and Asian children in achieving their educational potential. Still others, particularly those in schools with large numbers of children of Asian heritage felt that English language was the most urgent need and that until pupils had acquired sufficient English language skills, it was difficult if not impossible to access the school curriculum. For instance one primary school headteacher had a new intake of 34 children in reception none of whom had English as a first language. Another primary school headteacher also felt that the most pressing need of the Section 11 qualifying pupil in his school was English language development.

> *There is an increasing number of new arrivals with no or*
> *little English. It takes them a long time to settle and*
> *acquire the language needed for school. There are other*
> *issues such as adjustment to the culture, the climate,*
> *formal education.*

Clearly, pupil need does vary depending on the individual child and the

particular needs of his or her heritage group. For instance whilst newly arrived Pakistani or Bangladeshi children may need TESOL support, this will be inappropriate for African-Caribbean pupils who are British born and are more likely to need curriculum or pastoral support. The headteacher of a school with approximately equal numbers of White, African-Caribbean and Asian pupils explained,

Need is varied. Some need confidence, self-esteem, help
with reading and writing. Others need language support.
But whatever the support needed, it is very high.

Many black and ethnic minority children are confronted on first entering school with an unfamiliar language and environment. The transition from home to school can be traumatic for any young child but for a child whose mother tongue is not English, the difficulties are exacerbated. Service data indicated that the TESOL and bilingual support given to pupils had resulted in improvement in English Language Skills. Table 5.10 indicates the numbers of pupils at each of the stages of English Language Acquisition (SELA) in September 1992 and June 1993 in the 76 schools in which there were Section 11 staff. The assessment of pupils' Stages of English Language Acquisition were carried out by Section 11 staff after attending a cross service standardisation exercise.

Table 5.10   Numbers of pupils at each stage of English
Language Acquisition,Sept 1992 and June 1993

SELA	Sep-92	Jun-93	Inc/dec
A	697	278	-419
B	1719	1154	-565
C	2415	2320	-95
D	1853	1996	143
E	1754	2385	631
Total	8438	8133	-305

Source - Service data
NB. SELA descriptors given in Appendix 6.

The totals in the increase/decrease column indicated that 419 pupils at
Stage A who were given Section 11 support moved on at least one stage,
565 pupils at Stage B moved moved on at least one stage and 95 pupils at
Stage C moved on at least one stage. The proportionately larger decrease
in numbers at Stages A and B indicated that at the end of the academic
year, fewer pupils had a high need of language support. The increase in
numbers at Stages D and E indicated that pupils had progressed to the
higher Stages of English Language Acquisition. In some cases pupils
might have moved up two stages or even down, for instance in the case
of pupils who had spent part of the academic year out of the country.
The overall total showed a decrease of 305 pupils. These pupils had
either changed schools or moved out of the city.

The importance of bilingual support for children whose first language is
not English was emphasised by one Infant headteacher who felt that it
was vital provision in the early years of a child's schooling if there was to
be any chance of equality of opportunity.

It is crucial that bilingual children are taught by a
bilingual teacher. This is an equality issue. It's to do with
self-image, confidence. It counters racist attitudes.

And this is not only true for children who are bilingual, it is applicable to children from other racial groups. Yet, often the only black or bilingual staff in a school were Section 11 staff. Only three of the ten headteachers interviewed said they had black and ethnic minority staff in their schools who were not Section 11 funded. Many schools were therefore relying on a marginal resource to provide an essential service in terms of equality. A primary headteacher with over 90 per cent qualifying pupils in his school added:

Bilingual skills are not just an immense aid to the
younger child and can help us communicate with
parents who can't or don't feel confident.

A number of Section 11 teachers talked extensively about the TESOL support for children of Asian heritage. Although they explained that they prioritised children at stage A (little or no English). They also targeted children at stages B, C and D on a scale A-E (level E being fluent, requiring no support) to help them access the whole school curriculum.

The headteacher of a secondary school particularly valued Section 11 support with regard to communication with parents.

Parents need to feel comfortable with someone on the
staff of a school. My parents always ask to see the Section
11 coordinator. They feel able to approach him, trust
him, talk to him.

A bilingual Section 11 teacher in a primary school emphasised the work that needed to be done with parents if they were to be expected to support their childrens' education.

> *Needs begin pre-school. In this school there are no aspirations, the families are very poor. There are socio-economic problems. The parents don't value education, don't understand the system. We need to do as much work with parents and children, but we're already overstretched.*

It is interesting to note that the whole family was seen as needing Section 11 support and not just the child. Although working with parents was an important element of section 11 work, particularly for Home-School Liaison teachers, there were nevertheless very limited Section 11 resources and the priority was generally focused on children. Nevertheless, there are Section 11 staff in the Adult Service of the same Local Authority with whom Section 11 staff in schools might forge a useful working relationship.

The necessity for developing trusting relationships with Section 11 qualifying pupils was another recurring theme, particularly amongst black and Asian staff. One Section 11 teacher felt that "Smaller groups give more opportunities to build up closer relationships, develop trust and confidence".

Many headteachers spoke of the enormous benefits of small group work and, intensive work with individual children undertaken by Section 11 staff. Almost all headteachers and Section 11 staff alike referred to giving pupils "quality time". By targeting and prioritising Section 11 qualifying pupils, there were opportunities for Section 11 staff to cater for

individual learning needs. Many Section 11 staff emphasised the importance of targeting particular children in consultation with class teachers. This exercise depended very much on the professional trust which developed between Section 11 and mainstream colleagues who worked in partnership or collaboratively.

A number of headteachers and Section 11 staff pointed to the importance of black role models in schools. Black and Asian staff in particular emphasised the significance of their presence in relation to the pastoral care of black and ethnic minority children. One Asian teacher said she wanted to: "Make pupils feel good about themselves and advise other staff on how they can help the children". Black and ethnic minority Section 11 staff felt they had a better awareness of some of the difficulties experienced by pupils from their own communities or racial background. This view was also shared by several headteachers and white participants. One black teacher, made the important point that there were shared experiences which helped them to understand the difficulties encountered by black children. She clearly saw her role as a mediator and a provider of pastoral support. "It is very difficult for kids living in two cultures. There can be a conflict and I can help. I know what it's like and so do my own children".

The black and ethnic minority Section 11 staff felt a sense of commitment and responsibility to their own communities. They stressed the value of the additional skills and expertise they brought to Section 11 work. Several black and ethnic minority staff interviewed also worked in a capacity at weekends or in the evening in community run supplementary schools. One Asian teacher who was also the head of a voluntary Supplementary School in his community said: "I have community links, expertise. I bring a different angle because I am

Section 11 and belong to the local community".

The interview data clearly revealed that there continues to be substantial and urgent need for Section 11 support and that Section 11 provision is seen as crucial by headteachers and Section 11 staff in helping schools to deliver the curriculum and in enabling black and ethnic minority pupils access that curriculum. Section 11 work can be enhanced by the experiences and skills which black and ethnic minority staff bring.

The effect of a reduction in Section 11 provision on the achievement of black and ethnic minority pupils.

How important or even essential was Section 11 provision to schools and their black and ethnic minority pupils? Given that schools were facing a real reduction in Section 11 provision, the consequences were not too difficult for participants to envisage. All Section 11 staff had been informed several months earlier that despite the project having been agreed by the Home Office for a five year period at a rate of 75 per cent grant, this grant was to be reduced by the government to 57 per cent due to the 'economic climate' of the country. (In the event, grant was reduced to approximately 53 per cent).

Table 5.11 Impact of Section 11 reductions on Pupil achievement - view of S.11 staff (by number and percentage) July, 1993

	Number	Percentage
Big difference	125	90.6
Some difference	13	9.4
Little difference	0	0
No difference	0	0

As shown in table 5.11, the questionnaire data revealed that more than nine out of ten Section 11 staff felt that a reduction in Section 11 provision would make a 'big difference' to the achievement of Section 11 qualifying pupils. Less than one in ten felt that a reduction would make 'some difference'. None of the participants felt that reducing the level of Section 11 support would make 'little' or 'no difference'. This indicated overwhelmingly that Section 11 staff saw themselves as making an important contribution to, and playing a key role in the educational achievement of ethnic minority pupils.

A stated intention of the Government, in relation to Section 11, is to ensure, that eventually all schools adapt their mainstream provision to suit the needs of black and ethnic minority pupils. Yet, these results showed that Section 11 practice has not been mainstreamed. It is an indication that schools are either not adequately resourced or adapted to fully meet the needs of Section 11 qualifying pupils without additional provision or that they have come to rely on Section 11 provision so that it is no longer 'marginal' but essential. The data from this question also indicated that the barriers encountered by black and ethnic minority pupils have not disappeared in the course of time as anticipated by successive governments.

The issue of cuts to Section 11 provision was obviously an issue at the forefront of everyone's minds during interviews. With an estimated loss in the Section 11 service of 20 out of 130 Section 11 posts, the likely effects were worrying for school managers and Section 11 staff alike.

The expected effects of the cuts on pupils were frequently described by participants as "devastating" and sometimes as "dramatic". All of the

headteachers and Section 11 staff interviewed had made efforts to organise the school and the parents in fighting the cuts. Several participants felt that the impact of any cuts would be so great, it was "difficult to describe". Many participants felt strongly that cuts would severely affect pupils' language development and access to the curriculum as well as the quality and appropriateness of pastoral care. An Infant headteacher felt that children would "Lose their entitlement of equal access to the National Curriculum." Several participants commented that there would be a lowering of standards and that the SATs results of ethnic minority children would reveal this.

There was widespread depression amongst all participants when discussing the effects of Section 11 cuts. One primary headteacher said that "If the children miss the boat early on, they'll never catch up". One Secondary head was very pessimistic.

Whilst comments often focused on the immediate and short term impact of the reduction in Section 11 provision, many participants were similarly fearful of the long term social and economic implications for ethnic minority communities. As one Section 11 teacher said; "This will affect both black and white children. Black children directly and white children indirectly." One teacher, himself a member of the black community expressed grave concern for children if Section 11 provision were to be reduced. "I have fears for their survival. Confidence will diminish, disaffection will grow. I really don't think they'll survive."

There was a general sense of dismay at the proposal to make cuts. Most participants felt "let down" by the government whom they felt had broken a promise to support Section 11 work at 75 percent of salary costs. Incredulity was expressed by a black Section 11 teacher who said,

> *This is unbelievable. We need more Section 11 staff not*
> *less. It's an indication that the Government has no idea,*
> *no understanding of the needs of children or the black*
> *community. Black communities are already suffering.*

Several participants anticipated racial tensions, increasing unemployment amongst black and Asian communities and even civil unrest resulting indirectly from the cuts which they saw as very short-sighted.

The overall picture then appears to be extremely worrying and should be of concern to all those working towards the development of a more just and equal society. Whilst headteachers and Section 11 staff all seemed very much aware of the short and long term impact of a reduction in provision on pupils and schools, there appeared to be some complacency amongst mainstream colleagues according to headteachers and Section 11 staff. One participant reflected, the view that need would remain even when Section 11 staffing was reduced or disappeared prevailed amongst all of those interviewed.

> *They just don't realise what it's going to mean . If they*
> *think they are under pressure now, this will create far*
> *more work for them.*

However, there were some schools where the headteacher and mainstream staff were very conscious of the importance of Section 11 which they clearly valued. The head of one Secondary school felt that concern about cuts was very high amongst mainstream colleagues.

> *We are gritting our teeth, hoping we can survive. We*
> *had a staff meeting in ' 85. The staff said they couldn't*

cope without more Section 11. There would be a repetition. If we lost Section 11 there'd be a demand to replace from mainstream.

The headteacher of another Secondary school with a team of several Section 11 staff described the great needs of the pupils in the school, and the need for Section 11 provision. She concluded that, "It (Section 11) should be a basic entitlement. Not discretionary". This was a view expressed by all the headteachers concerned. They also felt that Section 11 provision should not be reduced as one put it "on a whim, for convenience, because it's an easy target". Certainly, there was much concern expressed that Section 11 provision related more to economic vagaries rather than to actual need.

As a result of the cuts some schools will lose their Section 11 support altogether, whilst others face a reduction in provision. Irrespective of the presence of Section 11 staff in schools it is incumbent on schools to ensure, under the 1988 Education Reform Act that every pupil has access to the National Curriculum. Headteachers were therefore asked to comment on how they might meet the learning and achievement needs of ethnic minority pupils without Section 11 provision.

Most headteachers felt that need simply could not be met without additional resources. For example, one primary headteacher told the interviewer: "We couldn't. I don't honestly think we could without Section 11 funding. We couldn't even scratch the surface, "and another headteacher said: "We'd do our best to fill in the gaps but I can't honestly say we'd manage." Although the 1988 Education Reform Act requires schools to ensure that all pupils have access to the National Curriculum, the harsh realities of LMS (Local Management of Schools) often means

that schools do not have the financial resources to ensure that all pupils including black and ethnic minority pupils receive specialist support. A secondary headteacher exclaimed, "How? I already have a budget deficit of £150,000!" Most headteachers explained that it was difficult to balance budgets and meet the salary expenses of mainstream class teachers providing even the minimum statutory curriculum.

Several primary headteachers and one of the secondary headteachers suggested that whole school change would be needed if their schools were to begin to meet the needs of black and ethnic minority pupils in the absence of Section 11. One secondary headteacher said:

> *We'd have to reorganise the school in terms of how we set. We could offer intensive language classes but the integration would go. It would be against the ethos and philosophy of the school!*

A primary headteacher felt that if Section 11 provision did not exist there were far reaching implications for school policies and staff training. She commented,

> *It would have to be a whole school issue and from that, the focus would have to be on an appropriately adapted programme. There would be implications for time, resources etc. Very complicated. Yes, it would need different additional resources.*

This debate was an important one since all schools should rightly ensure that the curriculum and school practices are adapted to meet the needs of all pupils, yet in reality, Section 11 provision appeared to be the mainstay of support for black and ethnic minority pupils. Should support which is considered so important to schools be resourced

through Section 11 funding which is subject to the prevarications of central government. And, have school depended on Section 11 without taking full responsibility for black and ethnic minority pupils?

Although Section 11 is in principle additional or marginal funding, this research has revealed that in practice it is essential funding which underpins the mainstream curriculum for black and ethnic minority pupils. Clearly the additional funding is crucial to schools and should therefore be made more secure. Schools and ethnic minority communities should be able to depend on Section 11 or similar funding to address unequal access to the whole school curriculum.

In so far as responsibility for black and ethnic minority pupils is concerned, there has been a clear message from the Section 11 Service that they remain the responsibility of the schools academically and pastorally. Section 11 staff are present to help support mainstream staff and mainstream provision, not replace them. It goes without saying that any specialist provision which cost £2.5 million were to be taken away from schools, the difference would be felt and pupils would suffer. Whilst schools might struggle to meet the need, the extent of need could not be met.

Section 11 funding specifically helps those schools with most black and ethnic minority pupils. It is the only race related provision in education targeted at helping black and ethnic minority pupils to overcome barriers and access mainstream provision. Adequate resourcing is required to tackle the barriers which prevent black and ethnic minority communities from fully participating in and enjoying the full social, educational and economic benefits available to the rest of society require.

The evidence from the research indicated that in the context of education, those barriers have not disappeared, and that Section 11 support is of major importance in responding to the educational needs of black and ethnic minority pupils.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions, Recommendations and Reflections

The previous chapter presented and discussed the research data and findings concerning Section 11 provision in education for black and ethnic minority pupils in one Local Authority. The present chapter seeks to draw conclusions from the discussion of data in Chapter 5, to make recommendations and to reflect upon the present study.

Chapter 1 introduced and presented the rationale for the study. Chapters 2 and 3 set out the background, summarising the political responses to immigration from the New Commonwealth and focusing in more detail on the introduction and development of Section 11 as legislative political intervention. Chapter 4 set out the parameters of the research, the rationale, methodology and strategy. A multi-method approach was used involving the collection of qualitative and quantitative data principally through the use of a questionnaire and interviews together with limited use of service data. The advantages and disadvantages of the chosen methodological approach were discussed. Chapter 5 presented and considered research data and findings thematically so that the qualitative and quantitative data collected from different sources could be integrated.

The aims of the present chapter are: to pull together the various strands in order to address the original research issues which were identified in Chapter 4; to make recommendations intended to improve Section 11 provision in the local authority concerned; to make suggestion for further research and to reflect upon various aspects of the study from a personal viewpoint. However, before doing so, it seems appropriate to

draw attention to the limitations of this study.

Section 11 is specific provision to help black and ethnic minority communities access local government services. The perspective of parents belonging to local black and ethnic minority communities might therefore be considered as crucial in examining Section 11 educational provision. However, with limited time and limited human and financial resources, the researcher was faced with a serious dilemma. Since Section 11 staff in the service were distributed amongst 76 different schools working with approximately 12,500 Section 11 qualifying pupils, the logistics of obtaining a representative sample of parents presented a major problem. Accessing those parents or a sample of parents through 76 different institutions seemed an impossible undertaking for a small scale study. The writer could instead have asked personal contacts in the communities, black parents and volunteers in supplementary schools, to participate in the research, but in the final analysis she considered that their views would not be representative of the vast majority of black and ethnic minority parents. The writer therefore leaves the task of seeking parental views on Section 11 provision in education to a more intrepid, better resourced researcher. Nevertheless, the evaluation of Section 11 as educational provision from an inside perspective is not without value and can be instrumental in changing institutional practice to improve the quality of service delivery.

Summary of Conclusions

Chapter 4 set out six important issues concerning Section 11 which were to be addressed by the research. The evidence in relation to these issues is summarised as follows:

1. Section 11 Staff, their qualifications and skills

The data revealed that the Section 11 staff were mainly female and approximately two thirds of staff were white and one third black or Asian. Whilst service data revealed that the proportion of black and Asian staff had increased since the start of the new project based provision in 1992, the workforce was still not sufficiently representative of the Section 11 clientele group which was entirely black or ethnic minority.

Similarly, there was an under representation of local community languages reflected in the Section 11 workforce. Since many young children begin school with limited or no English and many parents have limited or no English or are not confident in English, the ability to use the appropriate community language can be an advantage for any teacher in a school. Teachers with bilingual skills or from the relevant community group can help young black and ethnic minority children to make the transition from home to school and help the school develop better links with parents. Although the research revealed that most bilingual staff worked in the primary sector the benefits of having staff from black and ethnic minority communities are not just confined to working with younger children. The presence of Section 11 teachers from the appropriate community group can support black and ethnic minority pupils pastorally and across the curriculum due to a better understanding of pupils' linguistic and cultural needs as well as racial identity. Pupils who appear to be coping with English and the curriculum, may be facing difficulties which may not be apparent to white, monolingual staff. This is not to negate the very positive input and support that white Section 11 staff can and do provide for black and ethnic pupils. The importance and value of all Section 11 provision,

irrespective of the racial background of staff was clearly evident. Nevertheless, there are additional skills and experiences that black and ethnic minority staff can bring to Section 11 work.

Difficulty in attracting well qualified Section 11 staff, according to the evidence in this research, seems to have become a thing of the past. Section 11 staff were well qualified, many holding a higher degree. In addition to academic and professional qualifications, many staff, particularly the Asian group held 'specialist' qualifications such as a TESOL or multi-cultural diploma. The type and level of qualification may well have related to the respective education systems experienced by different groups. On the whole, black and Asian staff tended to be better qualified than white staff, a trend which, according to CRE (1988) is not confined to Section 11 work.

Section 11 staff considered by and large, that the modular Section 11 training programme which had been given status due to validation from the local University, had helped raise their professional skills. The programme was particularly appreciated by black and ethnic minority staff, partly because it was practical and helped them understand the system better, but also because a number of new staff were black or Asian and benefitted from an induction course which prepared them for Section 11 work and how to deal with the barriers they might encounter.

The qualitative data revealed that the opportunities provided by training events to meet other Section 11 colleagues were particularly appreciated. Networking with Section 11 colleagues in other schools with similar concerns and interests were seen as illuminating and supportive and helped fight any sense of isolation particularly for those who were the

only Section 11 staff in a school.

In terms of skills, headteachers and Section 11 staff shared the view that Section 11 work was very demanding and a wide range of skills were required of Section 11 staff. Not only did they require a broad knowledge and understanding of the National Curriculum, they needed to understand language development. They also had to be adaptable, flexible and have an awareness of different teaching and learning styles. They also needed to be good communicators and negotiators, in order to plan and deliver an appropriate curriculum for black and ethnic minority children in the context of a partnership with the class or subject teacher.

Interestingly, a number of the primary headteachers who were interviewed for this study had previously been Section 11 funded themselves. It was acknowledged by these heads that there were particular aspects of Section 11 work and requisite skills which helped them to gain promotion as school managers. For instance communication skills, negotiation skills, targeting, prioritisation, understanding of whole school issues, a broad based knowledge of the National Curriculum, managing change and so on. Section 11 staff therefore develop a wide range of useful and transferable skills in the course of their Section 11 work, contrary to the long held view that they become deskilled.

Although longstanding Section 11 staff had become Section 11 in rather dubious ways, newer Section 11 staff had applied for their posts through recruitment and selection. They had to meet a person specification which took on board the necessary qualifications, skills and abilities to

carry out Section 11 work. This meant that an increasing number of Section 11 staff had chosen to work in Section 11 and possessed the right skills and qualifications for the work.

The evidence from this research provided a picture of Section 11 staff which contrasted markedly with that of the 1980's, when it was difficult to attract and retain quality staff. Here, was a well qualified, highly skilled workforce with skills which transfer well into senior management roles. The question then was not how to attract the right staff, but how to retain them. The current employment situation in education is likely to mean that limited opportunities will occur to recruit new staff to vacancies, but if opportunities do occur then it would be desirable to increase the proportion of black and ethnic minority staff.

2. The experience of Section 11 staff and the barriers encountered in carrying out their work.

Evidence from the research supported claims that in the 1980's Section 11 staff had on the whole been misused, marginalised and demoralised. Participants who had been Section 11 funded since the late 70's or early 80's had suddenly been 'named' as Section 11 without any consultation. Often they were used for cover, made to teach in corridors and store cupboards and expected to be a 'Jack of all trades'. Nevertheless, it was discovered that Home Office guidelines had filtered through to schools and at least one participant had worked strictly to Home Office guidelines at the same time as other Section 11 were being misused by schools. The fact that the management of Section 11 posts had been wholly delegated to schools without any monitoring or management taking place at Local Authority level, did nothing to raise the status of Section 11 or to ensure that Section 11 work was being carried out

effectively.

Section 11 staff still encountered difficulties in the course of their work, often feeling that they needed to be 'jugglers' trying to balance the various demands. Although there were still some difficulties or barriers, they felt better equipped to deal with these through the use of skills they had acquired.

There were still some misperceptions about Section 11 work on the part of mainstream staff, some of whom had insufficient understanding or knowledge of the skills and demands of Section 11 work. Some mainstream staff had formed the impression that Section 11 work was easy, whilst others seemed to confuse it with 'special needs' work. In those schools where the white staff had had a briefing session on Section 11 and an opportunity for discussion, there seemed to be a better understanding and appreciation of Section 11 work.

3. **Headteachers, mainstream staff, governors, parents and pupils. Knowledge and/or understanding of Section 11**

Levels of knowledge and/or understanding of Section 11 varied enormously between the different groups depending on their relationship to Section 11. It was found that headteachers or senior managers usually took responsibility for line management of Section 11. Headteachers had all benefited directly from the Section 11 briefings at the start of the project. Although mainstream staff seemed not to have such a good understanding of Section 11 work as headteachers, many had not been given a briefing or the opportunity for discussion which would have been informative and provided some insight into the different but equally heavy demands placed on their Section 11 colleagues.

In the view of Section 11 staff, many but not all governors knew about Section 11. Although all governors of schools with Section 11 staff would have received an annual report on the progress of Section 11 work and the achievement of targets agreed with the service, it was not clear whether or not they had read this or shown any interest. Certainly the involvement of many governing bodies in fighting the cuts increased their knowledge and understanding of Section 11. For instance a high level of appreciation and commitment to Section 11 was recently demonstrated by a small group of governors who voluntarily joined a lobby of Parliament to defend Section 11 provision. Other governing bodies wrote letters to the Home Office and DFE and signed petitions protesting at the cuts.

Awareness of Section 11 on the part of parents appeared to be extremely and unacceptably low. Although there was a view that parents were more interested in the support for their children rather than the detail of where that support came from, little effort seemed to have been made to raise their awareness. Even so, when parental support was required to help defend Section 11 provision, parents in many schools showed willingness to give that support by signing petitions, joining in a post-card campaign and attending meetings. Although the proposed cuts to Section 11 may have presented an opportunity to inform parents about Section 11, other strategies need to be considered, a fact which was acknowledged during interviews by headteachers and Section 11 staff.

The evidence from the research demonstrated that Section 11 staff held different opinions on whether or not pupils should be informed of the role of Section 11 and Section 11 staff. Some participants felt that Section 11 should be treated in the same way as other curriculum areas where pupils were given little or no detail of Section 11 particularly in primary

schools. Other participants had given limited information to pupils. The issue seems to be then, what do pupils need to know, how and when, rather than that they should not know at all. This matter needs further consideration since information about Section 11, ableit possibly inaccurate, is available to pupils through second or third hand sources.

4. The extent to which headteachers and mainstream staff value Section 11 provision.

The view was that all Section 11 provision was valued on the whole by mainstream staff and particularly by headteachers. Black and Asian staff felt that their work was very much valued by their headteachers who confirmed that bilingual skills and the ability of black and Asian staff to relate well to pupils and parents were very valuable.

However, there were concerns raised by headteachers and Section 11 staff that mainstream colleagues did not always value the provision quite as much as they ought, probably due to insufficient understanding of the pressures and complexities of the work.

The evidence from this research signalled significant changes since the 1980's when Section 11 provision and Section 11 workers were generally marginalised. The high profile given to Section 11 in many schools through the leadership of the headteacher or senior management, had helped raise the status and apparent value of Section 11 work. The inclusion of a 'Section 11 perspective' and the involvement of Section 11 staff in the drawing up of school development plans was an indication of the importance often placed on Section 11 input and value given to the perspective of the Section 11 staff.

The current economic climate in schools was also likely to have

contributed to the value placed on Section 11 provision. At a time when pressures are on teaching staff and scarce resources, additional staff are welcome in spite of the demands of monitoring and accountability to external bodies.

The fact that Section 11 staff had a clearly identifiable brief with targets agreed between the Section 11 service and the school meant that progress was monitored and was seen to have been achieved. The value of Section 11 work was therefore more easily identifiable in quantitative as well as qualitative terms. Moreover, the quality of Section 11 staff will have contributed to the value of the work being undertaken.

The marginalisation of Section 11 staff and Section 11 work which was a phenomena in the 1980's was no longer a common feature. On the contrary, the centrally managed service together with headteachers, supported by clearer guidance from the Home Office, appeared to have brought about important changes so that Section 11 staff and Section 11 provision had become valuable to schools and valued by them.

5. The effectiveness of Section 11 support in schools since the introduction of the 1990 Home Office Guidelines and the centrally managed service.

The 1990 Home Office Guidelines which took effect from April 1992 resulted in the Local Education Authority being studied, establishing a unified, centrally managed Section 11 service. The Section 11 schools based bid to the Home Office was successful in achieving a Home Office grant of almost £1 3/4 million. The project was agreed on the basis of stated aims objectives and quantifiable targets which were subject to rigorous monitoring. Whilst headteachers were given the day to day management responsibility for Section 11 staff, the central service had

the responsibility for management oversight of all Section 11 posts, including allocation of posts, joint monitoring of posts together with schools, support, advice and training. As already described, headteachers were provided with a Section 11 briefing at the start of the 5 year project, the aim of which was to ensure that they were fully informed of the basis on which the Section 11 grant had been agreed. Each school was to agree the internal structures and the management for Section 11 as well as some school based targets for the following academic year. What improvements if any had these changes brought about for Section 11 staff, Section 11 work and the schools themselves?

On the whole the opportunity presented by the Home Office's 'shake up' gave Section 11 a 'fresh start' and had brought about some positive changes. Headteachers and Section 11 staff were clearer and more confident about the parameters and requirements of Section 11 work. The greater accountability was welcomed and seen in very positive terms. The central Section 11 service was seen as giving unity and direction to Section 11 staff and Section 11 work in schools. It was also seen as being responsible for taking initiatives and developing school practice. For instance the shift away from a traditional TESOL approach as a solution for all black and ethnic minority pupils was seen as a development from the centre which led to a change in Section 11 practice more appropriate to the educational needs of different groups of qualifying pupils.

The existence of the unified Section 11 service, gave Section 11 staff an identity, a purpose and a sense of being supported in trying to achieve that purpose. They were also provided with training opportunities to develop skills which would help them to achieve their purpose.

The central service was seen as supportive not just by Section 11 staff but also by headteachers who had discovered that it could be helpful, useful and provide a degree of impartiality and evenhandedness in terms of allocation of provision.

The new Home Office Guidelines and the Central Section 11 service was seen as having helped create a new 'openness' and a climate in which Section 11 practice was legitimate and legitimised rather than ad hoc and conspiratorial. Far from being resented, the changes were seen almost unanimously as beneficial despite fears from some quarters at the start of the project that the central management of the Section 11 Service might 'interfere' in the business of schools.

6. The importance of Section 11 provision in education and the impact of cutbacks on black and ethnic minority pupils and their schools.

Despite the view of successive governments in the 1960's and 1970's that Section 11 would be a temporary measure to meet a temporary need, headteachers and Section 11 staff agreed that there was a high and continuing need amongst black and ethnic minority pupils for Section 11 support. Section 11 staff provided a vital range of support for pupils such as language support, curriculum support, pastoral support and support to help increase achievement. They also helped schools to communicate better with parents and carers and build better relationships between home and school. Considerable fears were expressed by the headteachers and Section 11 staff for the future of black and ethnic minority pupils, whom they felt faced social, economic and linguistic disadvantage as well as the damaging effects of racism if this support were to be reduced or lost.

Although the morale of Section 11 staff was high at the time of the questionnaire, morale was lower six months later at the interview stage. Participants felt that the work they were doing was extremely important and they were very concerned about the effects of impending cuts to Section 11 on themselves and on the the pupils they taught. The majority of staff wished to stay in Section 11 work which they enjoyed and wanted to do. This seemed to be borne out by service data which confirmed that there was only a small staff turnover in a twelve month period. Most of those who left had either taken early retirement or been appointed to mainstream jobs in their base schools with a post of responsibility, demonstrating that not only did Section 11 staff have skills which transferred to mainstream practice but that their schools were happy to employ them in mainstream posts.

Section 11 provision was not just considered to be important from the point of view of black and ethnic minority communities, it was also seen as an indirect support to the whole school community including white children. If Section 11 qualifying pupils were to be directly affected by cuts in provision then it was suggested that white pupils would be indirectly affected since there would be an increase in pressure on mainstream staff and provision.

There had been Section 11 provision in schools in the local authority concerned for almost 20 years. For much of that time Section 11 was taken for granted as it was nationally. However, with greater accountability and impending reductions in Section 11 provision, the climate had changed. Whilst Section 11 was perceived as a marginal resource, this study revealed quite clearly that it is now seen as essential provision in schools without which black and ethnic minority pupils

could not access the basic school curriculum. Indeed, Section 11 provision was viewed as part of the basic educational entitlement for Section 11 qualifying pupils. Some headteachers and Section 11 staff felt that schools would not be able to cope without Section 11 staff and that tensions would increase if support were reduced or removed. It was generally the view that current levels of provision were a minimum and that there should be an increase rather than a decrease in Section 11 support.

There was also criticism of central government for its race related policies in that the actual needs of black and ethnic minority communities seemed of little consequence. The view was that it seemed anathema to cut Section 11 provision at a time when black and ethnic minority communities were suffering poverty and unemployment and Section 11 provision was to be extended to Non-Commonwealth Communities including white groups. Historically, education has been an important vehicle for disadvantaged groups to improve their social and economic conditions. The cuts to Section 11 in education have therefore been seen as an attack not just on provision but on the black and ethnic minority communities. And, since many of the newer staff to Section 11 on temporary contracts were from black and ethnic minority communities, the impending cuts were more likely to affect the employment situation of the same groups. This would serve as a double blow to the communities concerned by reducing Section 11 provision and at the same time leaving black and ethnic minority teachers without employment.

How would schools cope in the absence of Section 11 provision? The evidence showed that most headteachers and Section 11 staff felt that

reductions to Section 11 funding would have a negative impact on black and ethnic minority pupils. Yet it was difficult to see, given the current economic constraints, how mainstream funding and staffing could adequately meet the needs of all pupils, including black and ethnic minority pupils. There was a view that schools would need to make institutional changes to try to cope, although some headteachers felt that they simply could not cope with need without additional funding.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings from this research, the writer makes the following recommendations.

1. Efforts should be made to retain black and ethnic minority staff at present on temporary contracts so as to maintain a better racial balance within the service and keep the special skills and experiences those staff bring to Section 11 work in schools.

2. Strategies should be used where appropriate to increase the number of Section 11 staff from communities which reflect the racial and cultural backgrounds of the client group, including the use of Section 5 of the 1976 Race Relations Act and through including in the person specification, certain skills such as bilingualism (English and a relevant community language).

3. The training programme should include specific opportunities for Section 11 staff to network, share resources and experiences and give each other support. The training programme should also include, for those staff who are interested in career progress, courses designed to help Section 11 staff move into management.

4. Management of Section 11 should rest with headteachers and senior managers. Line management of Section 11 should not be undertaken by heads of special needs or be subsumed under any

form of Special Needs support so that Section 11 is not confused with special needs support.

5. A programme of Section 11 briefings similar to those given to headteachers, should be offered to school, for mainstream staff. The aim would be to provide information about Section 11 and opportunities for discussion so that any misconceptions about the work might be addressed. This would act not just as clarification for mainstream staff but as a support for Section 11 staff.

6. A number of strategies should be employed in order to better inform governors about Section 11 work, including written information in English and community languages from the Service, briefings on Section 11 matters provided by the Section 11 coordinator in the school or by the group coordinator from the central services. There should also be city-wide meetings for governors which provide opportunities for information giving and the exchange of views.

7. Much more information should be provided for parents about Section 11, preferably on a regular basis. Leaflets in English and community languages about Section 11 work should be given out to all parents in all schools where there are Section 11 staff. This should include the names of Section 11 staff in the particular school so that parents know who to contact. A short video should be produced which explains Section 11 work to parents showing examples of Section 11 staff working with parents and pupils. There should be versions of the video in community languages as well as English. Copies of the videos should be placed in local libraries, information centres and the Section 11 Service's Resource base for loan to schools and parents or parents groups. Section 11 staff should hold workshops for parents keeping them informed about

their work and helping them support their childrens education. Links should be made with parent-educators in the adult education service so that they might help inform parents of the availability of Section 11 support in their children's school.

8. A full and open discussion should take place within the service in the first instance, concerning whether pupils should be supplied with information about the existence of Section 11 staff in their schools and if so, what information and how should this be communicated to them.

9. Section 11 funding or an alternative, needs to be made more secure so that schools can properly plan specific provision for black and ethnic minority pupils and communities feel confident that provision is available to help them access local services. Measures should include the earmarking of specific Section 11 funds within the SRB.

Recommendations for further Research

Attention has been drawn to a number of issues relating to the present research. The writer suggests two areas of interest for future research.

Firstly, as already discussed the parental perspective on Section 11 provision is important but has not been tackled as part of this research, such research will require sufficient resources as well as a good knowledge of local communities. Bilingual skills would be very useful to the researcher or the employment of experienced interviewers with the appropriate bilingual skills

Secondly, the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) will be introduced from April 1994. This will have far reaching effects for Section 11 provision

and Section 11 qualifying communities and is an important area for future research.

Reflections - Beyond Section 11

It has been an inescapable fact during this research that concerns over the impending cuts to Section 11 have been pervasive. The 1992 census revealed that black and ethnic minorities are still suffering disproportionately socially economically and educationally. The decision to cut what is seen as vital Section 11 provision in education can only serve to further disadvantage those communities.

Section 11 funding was initially seen as a temporary measure to assist those Local Authorities who were 'bearing the brunt' of immigration. The assumption was that as time passed, immigrants and their descendants would be assimilated into British Society without that society having to make any adjustment itself. With hindsight, the supposition that black and ethnic minority communities would be willing to give up their language, culture and racial identity was at best, naive and unrealistic. Nevertheless, it is apparent that central government still sees Section 11 as a marginal resource which can be decreased irrespective of actual need.

Whilst black and ethnic minorities are the supposed beneficiaries of Section 11 funding, it should be remembered that Section 11 was first allocated to Local Authorities, not the black and ethnic minority communities, as compensation for the presence of immigrants, and the notion of the communities as beneficiaries emerged only later. The decision to reduce crucial educational provision for black and ethnic minority pupils is another reminder that Section 11 is still a political

'sop' rather than needs driven provision.

The Local Government (Amendment Act) 1993 has been welcomed by CRE, the Runnymede Trust and others. Thousands of pupils from communities other than New Commonwealth countries can now legitimately benefit from Section 11 provision. However, to extend a reducing provision to thousands more pupils is not only putting further stress on that provision but is anomalous and derisory. Many schools are already struggling to cope on 'a shoestring', with the National Curriculum, yet legal responsibility is placed on them - with or without additional funding - to ensure that every pupil has equal access to the National Curriculum. And, the CRE has advised, that there might be unlawful direct racial discrimination if children needing TESOL Support to access the curriculum do not receive it. There may also be unlawful direct racial discrimination if TESOL support is provided by unqualified or inappropriately qualified staff. Moreover, the CRE has suggested that unlawful indirect racial discrimination may occur if secondary schools indicate to parents or feeder primary schools that they are unable to provide TESOL support since this could be construed as applying a discriminatory admissions test on the basis of fluency in English so that certain racial groups are disproportionately affected.

The Single Regeneration Budget has been welcomed by some organisations as an attempt to adopt an integrated, holistic approach to urban regeneration. The possible benefits of this single funding mechanism include sensitivity to local needs and priorities and a partnership between Local Authorities, TECs and local black communities. However, whilst the SRB may well be a potentially effective strategy for allocating and monitoring a range of funding

programmes, it is difficult to see where the educational objectives of Section 11 fit into the vision of economic urban regeneration. The demands of the SRB may result in Section 11 provision in education being biased towards training and employment, rather than educational imperatives. This would be detrimental to educational objectives particularly in the early years of education. Moreover, education bids may well be vulnerable in the overall context of competing bids and might not attract strong interest from partners. The success or otherwise of bids which depend on commercial or economic potential will further exacerbate the current situation where Section 11 provision is not needs based. This will result in an uneven, unequal pattern of support to black and ethnic minority communities, and, unless specific funds within the SRB are earmarked for Section 11, further erosion of educational provision is likely.

In addition to earmarked Section 11 funds, a statement of commitment to equality of opportunity within the SRB, together with performance indicators and monitoring of race equality targets, some in relation to education, need to be introduced if the educational needs of black and ethnic minorities are to be addressed in the future. Failure to take such steps is likely to result in the recent progress which has been achieved through Section 11, being permanently lost.

As described in Chapter 3, there have been attempts and suggestions in the past to make funding for the provision of services for black and ethnic minority communities more secure, for instance through the strengthening of Section 71 of the 1976 Race Relations Act. In so far as educational provision for black and ethnic minority pupils is concerned, some consideration might be given to the inclusion in future education

legislation, to a mechanism which places a responsibility on Local Authorities to provide for the additional educational needs of black and ethnic minority pupils, in much the same way that provision for travellers is a statutory requirement placed on Local Authorities.

Finally, perhaps it is fitting to close with remarks from the published report of an OFSTED Inspection which took place in January 1994 in one of the schools in the local authority which was studied in this research. Not only does it support the findings of the research, it bears testimony to the excellent Section 11 practice in schools and the dedication of Section 11 staff.

> *The (Section 11) staff are well deployed, each having a curriculum area to support and pastoral links. With 15 languages spoken by pupils and with 586 pupils eligible for Section 11 support,the instructors (sic) are sorely stretched. Their role is crucial, not only to standards of learning and achievement to those pupils for whom they have been provided, but also for the other pupils in the classes. By helping pupils to achieve, they play an essential part in reinforcing the racial harmony that exists in the school.*
> (OFSTED, January, 1994).

Epilogue

Shortly after the completion of this thesis in June 1994, the office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), published a report on "Educational Support for Minority Ethnic Communities" (1994). The report focuses on a survey of educational provision funded under Section 11 which was undertaken by Her Majesty's Inspectors.

The inspection of 76 Section 11 projects across the country found that the more rigorous arrangements for Section 11 funded work which were established in 1992, have "promoted better targeting of the resources and an improvement in the standards achieved by minority ethnic pupils" (OFSTED, 1994, p.2). This concurred with the findings of this research. In further support of the findings of the present study OFSTED reported that "Well-trained and experienced Section 11 staff provided good support and contributed effectively to the progress and achievement of minority ethnic pupils" (p.3).

Also in keeping with the findings of the present research, the practice of appointing Section 11 staff from the same ethnic backgrounds as pupils was found to contribute to the effectiveness of Section 11 work. The report also indicated, as did the present study, that these staff were valued by headteachers, particularly with regard to their role as mediators between home and school, and for their insight into the additional cultural and linguistic needs of ethnic minority pupils.

Evidence from the OFSTED inspection of Section 11 services also supported the findings of this research regarding the usefulness of centralised management of Section 11 services. In relation to this, particular mention was made of the effective deployment of staff, dissemination of good practice, regular monitoring of pupil achievement and efficient organisational and administrative procedures.

The impact of the new arrangements for Section 11 funding within the context of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) was highlighted in the OFSTED report. Indeed at the time of writing, local authorities have just submitted their first bids for Section 11 type provision under SRB criteria. Based on the writer's knowledge gained from contacts in a number of local authorities, and from her own personal experience, bidding has been undertaken amidst confusing and conflicting advice from the Government Offices for the Regions, of the Department of the Environment. There is a great sense of insecurity in local authorities concerning the potential success or otherwise of bids and a growing demand from CRE, NUT, the Runnymede Trust and a variety of other organisations, either to take Section 11 out of the SRB or to ring fence it within the SRB. Should Section 11 remain untargeted within the SRB, the widespread fear is that the recent advances made by Section 11 services under new Home Office arrangements will be lost, and that the ultimate victims will be the black and ethnic minority communities.

References

ALLEN-MEARES, P. and LANE, B. (1990). 'Social Work Practice: integrating qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques' in Social Work, 35

ANNETTE, D. (1990) 'Section 11' Advisory Centre for Education Bulletin, No.36 July/August.

ASSOCIATION OF LONDON AUTHORITIES (1993) Section 11 Survey. London, ALA.

BAGLEY, C.A. (1992) Back to the Future. S.11 of the Local Government Act 1966, LEA's and Anti-racist Education, Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research.

BAKSH, Q. (1986). Review of Section 11, London, Waltham Forest.

BAKSH, Q. (1989). The Scrutiny Report, London, Waltham Forest.

BAKSH, Q and WALKER, N. (1980). Unrealised Potential: A Case for Additional Resources Under Section 11 Gravesend, District Community Relations Council.

BALL, W. and TROYNA, B. (1989) 'The Dawn of a New Era? The Education Reform Act. 'Race' and LEA's', in Education Management and Administration.17

BECK, R.N. (1979). Handbook in Social Philosophy, New York, Macmillan.

BEDFORD COUNCIL FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1987). Memo of 15th June.

BEN-TOVIM AND GABRIEL (1987). 'The Politics of Race in Britain, 1962-79: a review of the major trends', in Husband, C. (ed) Race in Britain: Continuity and Change. London, Hutchinson.

BEVAN, J. (1986). The Development of British Immigration Law, London, Croom and Helm.

BOLTON, E.J. (1979). 'Education in a Multi-racial Society',inTrends in Education (Winter) 1979.

BORG, W.R. and GALL, M.D. (1983). Educational Research. An Introduction, New York, Longman.

BOURNE, J. (1987). 'Making Use of Section 11', in Issues, No. 50 Spring 1987.

BOURNE, J. (1989). Moving into the Mainstream: LEA provision for Bilingual Learners, Windsor, NFER/Nelson.

BRENT, (1986)   Internal memo

BRIDE, R (1988). 'Uses, Abuses, Special Needs', in National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education Journal, May.

BROMLEY, D.B. (1986). The Case Study Method in Psychology and Related Disciplines, Chichester, Wiley.

BROWN, C. (1984) Black and White Britain, London, Heinemann.

BROWN, C. and GAY, P. (1985). Racial Discrimination: 17 Years After the Act, London, Policy Studies Institute.

BURGESS, R.C. (1989). Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods, London, The Falmer Press

CAMPBELL, D.T. and STANLEY, J.C. (1963). 'Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching', in Gage,N.L. (ed), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago, Rand McNally.

CARR, W. and KEMMIS (1986). Becoming Critical, London, Falmer.

CARTER, B., HARRIS, C. and JOSHI, S. (1987). The 1951-55 Conservative Government and the Racialisation of Black Immigration, Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

COHEN, B. (1971). 'The Race Relations Board', in Abbott, S. (ed) The Prevention of Racial Discrimination in Britain. London, Oxford University Press.

COHEN, L. and MANION, C. (1989) Research Methods in Education. London, Routledge.

COLLETT, R. (1985). 'Consultation: Participation and Control' in Multicultural Teaching, Spring III.2

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1985). Ethnic Minorities in Britain: statistical information on the pattern of settlement, London, CRE.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY, Southampton (1986). S.11 of the 1966 Local Government Act. A General Code of Practice for Local Authorities, Southampton, CRE.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1987) Internal memo

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1988). Comments from the CRE on the Home Office's Scrutiny of Section 11 of the Local

Government Act, London, CRE.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1988). Ethnic Minority School Teachers, London, CRE.
COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1989). Internal briefing note. Field Division

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1994). Communication of 24th November, 1994

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY (1994). Press Release, 5th November 1993

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION. (1976) Funding multi-racial Education: A National Strategy, London, Community Relations Commission.

CRISPIN A and HIBBERT, P. (1986). Education Funding for Ethnic Minorities: a case study of Section 11, London, ESRC.

CROSS, M., JOHNSON, M. and COX, B. (1988). Black Welfare and Local Government: Section 11 and Social Services Departments. Policy Papers in Ethnic Relations No. 12, University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

DEAKIN, N. (1968). 'The Politics of the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill', in Political Quarterly, 39.1

DEAKIN, N. (1970). Colour, Citizenship and British Society, London, Panther.

DENZIN, N.K. (1988) The Research Act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1965). Spreading the Children , London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1965). The Education of Immigrants. Circular No. 71/65. London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. (1971) The Education of Immigrants Survey 13, London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1972). The Continuing Needs of Immigrants, Survey 14. London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1981). West Indian Children in Our Schools (The Rampton Report Cmnd 8273), London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1982). The Education Reform Act 1988, London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1985). Education for All: The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. (The Swann Report) London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1987). Report on Brent Education, London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1988). Report on Brent Education: Report by HMI on the Development Programme for Race Equality in the London Borough of Brent, London, HMSO.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (1993) Press Release, 4 November 1993

DORN, A. and SEAGER, R. (1990). Maximising the use of Section 11 in Tower Hamlets, Tower Hamlets.

DORN, A. and HIBBERT, P. (1987). 'A Comedy of Errors: Section 11 Funding and Education', in Troyna, B (Ed.) Racial Inequality in Education. London, Tavistock

DORN, A. and TROYNA, B (1982). 'Multiracial Education and the Politics of Decision-Making', in Oxford Review of Education. 8,2.

DUMMETT, M. and DUMMETT, A. (1987). 'The role of government in Britain's racial crisis', in Husband, C. (ed) 'Race' in Britain: continuity and change, London, Hutchinson.

DUNCAN, C. (1988). Pastoral Care: An Anti-racist/Multicultural Perspective, Oxford, Blackwell.

EDUCATION (1992). Clarke Sounds the Death Knoll for Section 11 4 December, Harlow, Longman Group

EDWARDS, J. (1987). Positive Discrimination, Social Justice and Social Policy, London, Tavistock.

EDWARDS, J. and BATLEY, R. (1978). The Politics of Positive Discrimination, London, Tavistock.

EVANS, J.M. (1983). Immigration Law, London, Sweet and Maxwell.

FIGUEROA, P. (1991). Education and the Social Construction of 'Race', London, Routledge.

FITZGERALD, M. (1986). 'Immigration and race relations: political aspects', in New Community, Vol. X111, No.2 Autumn 1986, London, Commission for Racial Equality.

FOOT, P. (1965). Immigration and Race in British Politics, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

GIBSON, D (1987). 'Hearing and Listening, a Case Study of the Consultation Process undertaken by a Local Education Department and Black Groups', in Troyna, B. (ed) Racial Inequality in Education, London, Tavistock.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1905). The Aliens Order, 1905 London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1914). The Aliens Restrictions Act 1914 London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1931). The British Nationality Act 1948 London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1962). Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962 ,London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1965). Race Relations Act 1965, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1966). Local Government Act 1966, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1968). Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1968). Race Relations Act, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1969). Immigration Appeals Act, 1969, London, HMSO

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1971). Immigration Act 1971, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1976). Race Relations Act 1976, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1981). British Nationality Act 1981, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1988). Education Reform Act 1988, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1988). Immigration Act 1988, London, HMSO.

GREAT BRITAIN STATUTES (1993). Local Government (amendment) Act 1993, London, HMSO.

GURNAH, A. (1987). 'Gatekkeepers and Caretakers: Swann, Scarman and the social policy of containment', in Troyna, B. (ed) Racial Inequality in Education, London, Tavistock.

GUY, W. and MENTER, I. (1992). 'Local Management of Resources. Who Benefits?' in Gill, D., Mayor, B., and Blair, M. (Eds) Racism and Education: Structures and Strategies. London, Sage.

HALL, S. (1978) 'Racism to Reaction' in Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain, London, CRE.

HAMMERSELEY, M. and ATKINSON, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in Practices. London, Tavistock.

HANSARD (1966a). Local Government Bill, Second Reading Debate, 14th June 1966. Col 1307-1380

HANSARD (1966b). Local Government Bill, Standing committee F.7 July 1966. Col 214-225

HANSARD (1978). Inner Urban Areas Bill. Standing Committee A. 16th March 1978. Col 1393-6

HANSARD (1979). Local Government Grants (Ethnic Groups) Bill. Second Reading Debate. 12 March 1979. Col 55-174

HIBBERT, P. (1982). 'Funding inexplicitness: A look at Section 11 and the proposed guidelines', Multi-racial Education Vol. 11,(1).

HIBBERT, P. (1983). 'Section 11 Posts: Review or Reform?' Multi-racial Education, Vol.12,1

HILL, C. (1970). Immigration and Integration, London, Pergamon.

HIRO, D. (First edition 1971, this edition 1991). Black British White British, London, Paladin.

HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. RACE RELATIONS AND IMMIGRATION SUB COMMITTEE (1981). Racial Disadvantage: Report of the Home Affairs Committee, Race Relations and Immigration Sub Committee, London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE (1965). Immigration from the Commonwealth, London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1967). Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966 (Circular No. 15/1967), London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE (1975). White Paper: Racial Discrimination, London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1978). Proposals for Replacing Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966, (Consultative Document), London, HMSO

HOME OFFICE. (1981). 5th Report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, (80-81), London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE (1981). The Brixton Disorders (Scarman Report) London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1982). Government Reply to the Fifth Report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee: Racial Disadvantage. London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1982). Section 11 of the Local Government Act, (Circular No. 97/1982), London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1982). White Paper: Racial Disadvantage, London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1983). Section 11 of the Local Government Act, (Circular No. 94/1983), London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1986). Section 11 of the Local Government Act, (Circular No. 72/1986), London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1989). A Scrutiny of Grants under Section 11 of the Local Government Act. Final Report December 1988, London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1990a). Section 11 Ethnic Minority Grants. Grant Administration; Policy and Guidelines, London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1990b). Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966. (Circular No. 78/1990), London, Home Office.

HOME OFFICE. (1991). Letter to Local Authorities, 18th December, 1991.

HOME OFFICE (1991). Opportunities for Achievement. Report of the Advisory Panel on Brent's Development Programme for Educational Attainment and Racial Equality, London, HMSO.

HOME OFFICE. (1992). Letter to Local Authorities, 26th November, 1992.

HOME OFFICE. (1993). <u>Correspondence with CRE, 4th November 1993.</u>

HOME OFFICE. (1993). <u>Letter to Local Authorities, 21st September, 1993.</u>
HOME OFFICE. (1993). <u>Letter to Local Authorities, 4th November, 1993.</u>

HOUSE OF COMMONS (1981). <u>5th Report of the Home Affairs Committee on Racial Disadvantage, July.</u>

HOWARD, M. (1993). 'Section 11 funding: flawed, but should it be phased out?' in <u>Teaching Today,</u> London, NAS/UWT.

INDIAN WORKERS ASSOCIATION (1987). <u>The Regeneration of Racism. Black Inner City Uprisings,</u> Southall, Indian Workers Association.

IONS, E. (1977). <u>Against Behaviouralism: A Critique of Behavioural Science,</u> Oxford, Blackwell.

ISSUES (IN RACE AND EDUCATION) (1987). 'Section 11. Who needs Special Funding', in <u>Issues, Spring No. 50, 1987.</u>

JACKSON, J.A. (1963). <u>The Irish in Britain,</u> London, Routledge and Kegan.

JOHNSON, M., COX, B. and CROSS, M. (1989). 'Paying for Change? Section 11 and Local Authority Social Services', in <u>New Community April 1989,</u> London, Commission for Racial Equality.

JOLLIFFE, J. and Jhingan. P. (1994). 'Careers Education and Guidance: Pastoral Care and Career Needs', in Verma, G.K. and Pumphrey, P.D. (Eds) <u>Cultural Diversity and the Curriculum Vol. 3,</u> London, The Falmer Press.

JONES, T. (1993). <u>Britain's Ethnic Minorities,</u> London; Policy Studies Institute.

KIRP, D. (1979). <u>Doing Good by Doing Little: Race and Schooling in Britain,</u> University of California Press.

KUSHNIK, L. (1971). 'British Anti-discrimination legislation' in Abbott, S. (ed) <u>The Prevention of Racial Discrimination in Britain,</u> London, Oxford University Press.

LANE, D. (1988). <u>Brent's Development Programme for Racial Equality in Schools,</u> London, Home Office.

LAYTON-HENRY, Z. (1984). <u>The Politics of Race in Britain,</u> London, George Allen and Unwin.

LINCOLN, Y.S. and GUBA, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry, London, Sage.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES RACE RELATIONS INFORMATION EXCHANGE (1991). Guide to Section 11 Funding (June), London: LARRIE.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES RACE RELATIONS INFORMATION EXCHANGE (1992). Guide to Section 11 Funding: The 1992-93 S.11 Allocation Research Report No. 3, London, LARRIE.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES RACE RELATIONS INFORMATION EXCHANGE (1993). Section 11 Survey Report, Part One (May), London, LARRIE.

LONDON STRATEGIC POLICY UNIT. RACE EQUALITY POLICY GROUP. (1988). An Alternative to Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966. Section 11: One Year On, London, Policy Studies Institute.

MACDONALD, I.A. (1983). Immigration Law and Practice in the U.K., London, Butterworth.

MALLICK, K. (1992). 'Careers Education and Guidance', in Verma, G.K. and Pumphrey, P.D. (Eds) Cultural Diversity and the Curriculum Vol.2, London, The Falmer Press.

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL (1986). Section 11 Conference Report, Race Unit, Manchester City Council.

MARTINS, L. and WILLIAMS, A. (1991). Section 11 Handbook, London, Voluntary Service Council for the African-Caribbean Community Development Unit.

MATTHEWS, A. (1982). Advisory Approaches to Multi-cultural Education, London, Runnymede.

MERTON, R.K. and KENDALL, P.L. (1946). 'The Focused Interview'. American Journal of Sociology, 51

MILES, M.B. (1979). 'Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance: the problem of analysis', Administrative Science Quarterly, 24

MILES, R. and PHIZACKLEA, A. (1984). White Man's Country, London: Pluto Press.

MILES, R and SOLOMOS, J. (1987). 'Migration and the State in Britain', in Husband, C. (ed) Race in Britain: Continuity and Change, London, Hutchinson.

MOULY, G.J. (1978). Educational Research: The Art and Science of investigation, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCILS AND GREATER LONDON ACTION FOR RACE EQUALITY (1987). Statement. 15th May, 1987.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS (1992). Section 11 - Funding for Black and Ethnic Minorities?, London, NCVO and NAREC.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS. (1978). Section 11 - An NUT Report, London, National Union of Teachers.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS. (1979). Replacing Section 11 - an NUT Commentary, London, National Union of Teachers

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS (1993). Response to Home Office on Section 11 cuts, London, NUT.

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS. (1993). Section 11 Survey of LEAs, London, NUT.

NORTHERN ASSOCIATION OF SECTION 11 SERVICES IN EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER CENTRE FOR ETHNIC STUDIES. (1993). Report of Section 11 Conference, Manchester, NASSE.

OFTED (1994). Educational Support for Minority Ethnic Communities.

OWEN, D. (1992). Ethnic Minorities in Great Britain: Settlement Patterns. 1991 Census Statistical Paper No. 1, University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

OWEN, D. (1993). Ethnic Minorities in Great Britain: Economic Characteristics 1991 Census Statistical Paper No. 3, University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

PATTERSON, S. (1969). Immigration and Race Relations in Britain, London, Oxford University Press.

PATTERSON, S. (1971). 'Immigrants and Minority Groups in British society', in Abbott. S.(ed) The Prevention of Racial Discrimination in Britain, London, Oxford University Press.

POWELL, E. (1968) Speech of 20th April, 1968, in Race, Vol. 10 No. 1

RAMDIN, R. (1987). The Making of the Black Working Class in Britain, Aldershot, Wilwood House.

RICHARDSON, R. (1992). 'Race Policies and Programmes Under Attack: Two Case Studies from the 1990's', in Gill, D., Mayer, B., and Blair, M. (Eds) Racism and Education: Structures and Strategies,

London, Sage.

ROBSON, C. (1993). Real World Research, Oxford, Blackwell.
ROSE, E.J.B., ET AL (1969). Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations, London, Oxford University Press.

RUNNYMEDE and RADICAL STATISTICS GROUP (1980). Britain's Black Population, London, Heinemann.

SCOTT, M. and LAYMAN, S.P. (1989). 'Accounts' in American Sociology Review. Vol.33' New York.

SEAGER, R. (1987). An Alternative to Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966, London, Policy Studies Institute.

SHERMAN, R. and WEBB, R.B. (1988). 'Qualitative Research in Education: A Focus', in Sherman, R and Webb, R.B. Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods, London, Falmer.

SHIMAHARA, N. (1988). 'Anthroethnography: A methodological consideration', in Sherman, R. and Webb, R.B. (eds) Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods, London, Falmer.

SIVANANDAN, A. (1982). 'Race, class and the state', in A Different Hunger, London: Pluto Press.

SMITH, H.W. (1975). Strategies of Social Research - Methodological Imagination, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

SMITH, O.J. (1977). Racial Disadvantage in Britain, London, Penguin.

SOMMER, R. and WICKER, A.W. (1991) in 'Gas Station Psychology'; The Case for Specialisation in ecological Psychology', in Environment and Behaviour 23.

STENHOUSE, L. (1975). An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development, London, Heinemann.

TESCH, R. (1990). Qualitative Research: Analysis, types and software tools, London, Falmer.

TIERNEY, J. (1982). 'Race, Colonialism and Migration' in Tierney, J. (ed) Race, Migration and Schools, London, Holt.

TOWNSEND, H.E.R. (1971). Immigrant Pupils in England: the LEA Response, Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research.

TROYNA, B. (1992). 'Multi-cultural and Anti-Racist Education Policies', in Gill. D., Major, B., Blair, M. (Eds) Racism and Education: Structures and Strategies, London, Sage.

TROYNA, B and CARRINGTON, B. (1993). 'Whose Side are We On?' Ethical Dilemmas in Research on 'Race' and Education' in Troyna B. (ed) Racism and Education, Southampton, Open University Press.

TROYNA, B. and WILLIAMS, J. (1986). Racism, Education and the State, London, Croom Helm.

VERMA, G.K. (1990). 'Identity, Education and Black Learners: Are things improving?', in Multicultural Teaching, London:, Trentham.

VERMA, G.K. and ASHWORTH, B. (1986). Ethnicity and Educational Achievement in British Schools, London, MacMillan.

VERMA, G.K. and BEARD, R. (1981). What is Educational Research? Farnborough, England, Gower.

WARNOCK, M. (1970) Existentialism, London, Oxford University Press.

YASEEN, M. (1993). 'Tears and Fears for Section 11' in Education, 9th July Harlow, Longman group.

YIN, R.K. (1989). Case Study Research: design and methods, London, Sage.

Appendix 1

Section 11 Qualifying Communities

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Botswana, Brunei, Republic of Cyprus, Dominica, The Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica ,Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Nauru, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, St Kitts and St Neves, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tanzania, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, Vanuatu, Western Samoa, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Appendix 2

HISTORY OF SECTION 11 FUNDING AND RELATED EVENTS

1965   Race Relations Act.
White Paper "Immigration from the Commonwealth".

1966   Local Government Act
Section 11 of the Local Government Act provides that:
"Subject to the provisions of this section the Secretary of State may pay, to local authorities who in his opinion are required to make special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence within their areas of substantial numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language or customs differ from those of the community, grants of such amounts as he may with the consent of the Treasurer determine on account of expenditure of such descriptions (being expenditure in respect of the employment of staff) as he may so determine".

1967   Home Office Circular 15/1967

      1.   Government funding for LAs with 2% or over Commonwealth immigrants.

      2.   50% of salaries for posts representing this "special provision" under Section 11.

      3.   No explicit requirements - grant allocated on basis of numbers.

      4.   46 Local Authorities eligible.

1968   Commonwealth Immigration Act.
Race Relations Act.
Urban programme announced.

1969   S.11 grant increased to 75% of salaries.

1972   Local Authority must apply for the grant stating need warranting "special provision". No details required of usage or postholders.

1973   DES Form 7i discontinued.

1976   Race Relations Act.

1979   Ethnic Minority Grants Bill fails.

1979/80   Statistics, details of postholders and usage requested.

1981   Home Office Affairs Committee Report on Racial Disadvantage. Insists on identification of postholders.

1981   Brixton 'riots'
Scarman Report
Rampton Report

1982   New Home Office Circular 97/1982 guidelines for Section 11 funding established.

1. 3 yearly review of posts.

2. Post must meet needs that are different in kind from or are the same as but proportionally greater than those of the rest of the population.

3. Local Authorities advised to consult CRC about needs.

4. Local Authorities asked in general to monitor effectiveness of posts.

5. Home Office would make occasional checks.

6. Posts must be identifiable.

1983   Home Office Circular 94/1983.

1985   Brixton and Handsworth 'riots'.

Freeze on new applications

1986   Press attack on Brent's DPRE.

Further new guidelines Home Office Circular 72/1986.

For the purposes of this circular. "Commonwealth Immigrant" include all those born in another country of the Commonwealth (or Pakistan before it left the Commonwealth in 1972) however long they have been resident in the U.K. and their immediate descendants.

Other main points in Guidelines for Local Authorities:

1. Identify postholders - location of post.
2. Not less than 20% of time on Section 11 work.
3. Postholders must meet needs of 100% of time for which grant is claimed.
4. Needs must be stated and show how identified.
5. Objectives must be set for first 2 years of post.
6. objectives set to be evaluated (output measures).
7. Consultation with a cross section of the community.
8. Value for money.
9. Postholders must have job description which explicitly links activities of post to the needs.
10. Local Authorities should have a general strategy to meet needs of communities and their duties under section 71 of the 1976 Race Relations Act, plus an analysis of needs and a policy.
11. Implications that some objectives may be achieved over a shorter time than others.
12. Home Office to monitor "the contribution the post can make to overall Local Authority Policy".
13. A rolling programme of inspection of Local Authorities' Section 11 provision.

1988   Lane report on Brent.

1988   'Scrutiny Review' of Section 11 provision in a number of Authorities by the Home Office "having regard to efficiency and effectiveness to report on and make recommendations about.... 'preferred system' and 'clear objectives' for monitoring efficiency and effectiveness.

1989   Report with minister. Suggestions of cash limits and also rejection of

new posts mentioning 'withdrawal'. Section 11 a 'mandatory exception' under L.M.S. funding - retained centrally by L.E.A. and staff distributed according to need.

1990/91   Home Office Circular 78/1990 New guidelines published for Local Authorities' applications for further Section 11 funding. All existing posts discontinued from 31st March 1992. New bids to be made by May 1991 in line with the new criteria outlined in the guidelines.

1.   A project approach - all posts must fit into projects which will be time limited - usually 3 years. For language projects approval may be granted in the first instance for 5 years.

2.   Projects must be needs-led. It must be established that there is a specific need amongst the target group which is different from or the same as but greater than the rest of the population. This necessitates the collection of statistics to prove need.

3.   The monitoring of the effectiveness of the project is even more stringent. Targets have to be set which are "achievable and measurable" and evidence has to be provided to show this. Local Authorities will also be required to monitor the performance of ethnic minority pupils in the schools against National Curriculum attainment targets, SATs etc.

1992   April. New 3-5 Year S.11 projects start.

Nov. L.As notified of proposed reduction....the level of financial support which the Government is able to provide by means of Section 11 grant crucially depends upon the economic circumstances of the country. The general economic situation has changed markedly since Local Authorities were invited, in October 1990, to apply afresh for all Section 11 funding with effect from 1st April 1992.....the Government, with much regret, can no longer afford to provide, throughout the whole of the 3 year period, the level of financial help to local authorities......which the Home Secretary had earlier planned to provide by means of the Section 11 grant.

The Home Office indicates that based "on current best estimates" the rate of grant was likely to be as follows:

Present to March 1994   75% (no change)
April 1994 to March 1995   57%
April 1995 to March 1996   50%

1993   (Sept) Neil Gerard's private member's bill passed.
Introduction of the 1993 Local Government Amendment Act.
(Dec) Announcement of introduction of SRB.

1994   (April) Reduction of grants to between 49% - 54%.
(April) Introduction of SRB for Urban areas.

Sources: 1.   NASSE, UMCESE (1993)
           2.   Hiro, D. (1991)
           3.   Cross, Johnson and Cox (1988)

256

Appendix 3

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each question by ticking one box.

1. **Male** ☐

    Female ☐

2 Ethnic Origin

African ☐

Afro-caribbean ☐

Bangladeshi ☐

Black British ☐

Chinese ☐

East African Asian ☐

Indian ☐

Pakistani ☐

Middle East ☐

Vietnamese ☐

Other Black ☐

(Please specify) _____

Irish ☐

White British ☐

Other White ☐

(Please specify) _____

WHAT IS ETHNIC ORIGIN?

Ethnic origin refers to members of an ethnic group who share the same cultural background and identity.
This does not mean country of birth or nationality.

---

3. What Is Your Mother Tongue?

African Language(S) ☐

Bengali/Sylheti ☐

Cantonese/Hakka ☐

Creoles/Patwa ☐

Gujerati ☐

Punjabi/Gurmukhi ☐

Punjabi/Hindi ☐

Punjabi/Urdu ☐

Arabic ☐

Farsi ☐

Somali ☐

Vietnamese ☐

English ☐

Other ☐

(Please Specify) _____

4. **What is your highest qualification?**

Qualification	
Doctorate	☐
Masters	☐
Bachelor	☐
Teaching Certificate	☐
Qualified Youth Worker	☐
Nursery Nurse	☐
Other	☐

(Please specify) _____

5. **Are you:**

DES Recognised Teacher	☐
Unqualified Teacher (Instructor)	☐
Qualified Nursery Nurse	☐
Qualified Youth Worker	☐
Other	☐

(Please specify) _____

6. **Do you have a specialist qualification/Diploma relevant to your S.II Work?**

Multi Cultural Education	☐
TESOL	☐
Other	☐
None	☐

7. **Is your School/Establishment:**

Sixth Form	☐
Secondary	☐
Primary	☐
Junior	☐
Infant	☐
Nursery	☐

8. Who is your Line Manager ?(not the S.H Co-ordinator)

The Head

The Deputy

The Head of Faculty

The Head of Department

Other
(Please specify) _____

9. Do you feel your Headteacher values your work?

Very much

Quite a lot

Not very much

Not at all

10. Do you feel your work is valued by Mainstream Colleagues?

Very Much

Quite a lot

Not very much

Not at all

11. In your opinion, does your Head have:

A very good understanding of Section II work

A good understanding of Section II work

Little understanding of Section II work

Very little understanding of Section II work

12. Do Mainstream Staff in your school have:

A very good understanding of Section II work

A good understanding of Section II work

Little understanding of Section II work

Very little understanding of Section II work

13. What proportion of parents know what your specific role is in school?

All

Most

Some

None

Don't know

14. What proportion of Governors know what your specific role is in school?

All

Most

Some

None

Don't know

15. What proportion of pupils know what your role is in school?

Most

Some

None

Don't know

16. In which Curriculum area do you mainly give support?

TESOL

English

Maths

Science

All

Other
   (Please specify) _____

17. How would you describe your morale at present, compared with 1 year ago?

The same

Higher

Lower

18. Are your immediate plans to:

Remain Section II as long as possible

Move into Mainstream as soon as possible

Seek employment outside of Education

Leave/Retire

19. If Section II funding is reduced, what impact do you think this will have on the achievement of qualifying pupils in your school?

Will make a big difference

Will make some difference

Will make little difference

Will make no difference at all

20. To what degree has the Section II training programme raised your professional skills and knowledge?

A great deal

Quite a lot

Very little

Not at all

PLEASE CHECK YOU HAVE NOT LEFT ANY QUESTIONS UNANSWERED
AND HAVE GIVEN ONE TICK FOR EACH.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS SURVEY.
YOUR CONTRIBUTION IS APPRECIATED

Appendix 4
Interview Schedule. (Headteacher)

Headteacher: Date:

Name of School:

Type of School   No. on roll:
                                No of Q.P's

Other Information:

How many S.11 Staff do you have?

What kind of work do they do which mainstream staff cannot provide:

Do staff/parents/governors value S.11 work?
How do you know?

How did you first find out about S.11?

If you were once S.11 yourself what skills did you acquire which helped you become Deputy/Head?

What specific skills do you think S.11 staff have acquired due to the types of work?

Has s/he missed out/not developed important skills/knowledge not being in mainstream?

Would this affect her/his career, particularly if s/he wants to move back into mainstream?

Was the briefing AGC/Insp) at start of project helpful?
Why?

What do you see as role of central S.11 Service. Has it been useful/valuable or not?
1. To your school?
2. To S.11 staff?

Do the other staff value the S.11 work/staff?

Do governors/parents know of the work?
Value the work?
How did they find out?

What impact do you think the cuts will have on the children?

How will it affect the staff?

How would you meet the needs of S.11 Qualifying Pupils W/O S.11 staff?

Section 11 Staff   No: _____   Date: _____

Name: School:

How long have you been S.11?

What did you do before?

How did you become S.11/Story?

Did you know what S.11 was when appointed?/How did you find out?

Was S.11 what you wanted. your career move?

What did you do as a S.11 teacher/instructor/which makes your work 'special'/what are the children's specific needs?

Has the work/approach to work changed since the new project began? (If appropriate).

Is the job description clearer/clear?

Do you ever get asked to do things you feel you shouldn't do as S.11 teacher?

What for example? (eg. cover)

Do you feel accepted by the Head/staff?

Do the Head/staff value your work?

How do you know?

Do you feel you belong to a valued service? Do you feel supported by the Service?

Do the children/parents know you are S.11 funded/your purpose?

Do the Head/staff/parents know about the cuts?

What have they done?

What impact do you think the cuts will have on you/the school/staff/children?

What skills/qualities do you think an effective S.11 teacher needs.

Have you built up these skills since becoming S.11 funded?

Has the training helped?

How?

Do you think these skills might enable you to gain promotion in mainstream?

Appendix 6 a

Stages of English Language Acquisition Descriptors

STAGES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (SELA) CRITERIA : KEY STAGE 1 (N-Y2)

Stage	Definitions	Descriptors
A	New to English	• May speak and, depending on age, read and write in first language /dialects and other languages. • May use first language /dialect with multilingual peers and adults. • Drawings, paintings and models similar to children of own age. • Uses non-verbal gestures with peers and adults. • Watches, imitates, listens and shows evidence of understanding English. • Echoes / repeats English words and phrases of peers and adults
B	Early Stages of Acquiring English	• May use a mixture of first language / dialect and English. • Depending on age may write in first language/dialect. • Responds to simple direction in English. • Names objects and puts together simple phrases in English. • Evidence that the child understands more English than she/he speaks. • Uses English in conversation with peers and adults. • Often communicates meaning without the correct grammatical structures. • Uses English through stories, rhymes, songs and games by joining in with peers.
C	Becoming Familiar with English	• Demonstrates that she/he is acquiring and using particular English language structures for specific purposes eg free / structured play, story-telling, reporting, drama and games. • Evidence that the child is becoming aware of English print in the environment. • Demonstrates that she/he is developing an interest in fiction and non-fiction books in English. • Evidence available that the child is developing emergent writing in English. • Strong evidence that she/he requires continued support in developing Standard English for use in the classroom.
D	Becoming Competent as a User of English	• Evidence that the child is reading simple stories in English with peers and independently. • Depending on age may produce spontaneous writing in first language. • Depending on age may produce spontaneous writing in English. • Shows in speaking and writing that she/he understands and uses an increasing range of English vocabulary eg nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs. • Participates in, and contributes to, a wide variety of curriculum activities. • Evidence that continued support is necessary in developing Standard English.
E	Becoming a Fluent User of English in Most Social and Learning Contexts	• May show that she/he can move easily between English and first language / dialect. • Evidence that the child is using complex sentence structures and a widening vocabulary in all curriculum areas and in the playground. • Depending on age reads with meaning from a variety of sources eg story, information, poems. • Depending on age she/he writes stories and accounts of activities. • Fluent user of English in a variety of situations and for a variety of purposes. • Strong evidence that the child has a command of the English Language equal to that of his/her peers.

NOTES
1. *Stage assessments should be made in relation to fully fluent English speaking peers.*
2. *Divisions between stages are not hard and fast. The information is for the purpose of identifying need, NOT to label a child. If you are unsure about which of two stages to use for a child use the lower stage.*
3. *The descriptors for SELA are subject to review as the need arises.*

Appendix 6 b

Stages of English Language Acquisition Descriptors

STAGES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (SELA) CRITERIA : KEY STAGES 2, 3 & 4 (Y3-11)

Stage	Definitions	Oracy	Literacy
A	New to English	• The earliest stage of acquiring English. May communicate freely in first language. • Listens to English and may understand from context and respond physically. • May participate non-verbally, may echo words and short phrases and may communicate using non-verbal signals such as gesture. • May begin to produce single words or formula phrases, eg - 'Miss', 'finish', 'playtime', 'dunno'.	• May be able to copy, draw, colour in, etc. May have orientation towards writing, eg - pattern making, scribbling. May have fine motor skills, eg - manipulates pencil, paints, etc. • May be beginning to recognise some words, eg - name, pictures and symbols.
B	Early Stages of Acquiring English	• Uses single word utterances showing some basic vocabulary, usually content words such as nouns, verbs, etc. • May generate telegraphic sentences joining words together without grammatical modification, eg - 'Girl go shop buy sweet.' • Shows understanding of everyday classroom and topic language, instructions and simple stories. • Uses language to communicate basic needs and give basic information. • Uses English through stories, songs, reading and games by joining in with peers.	• May be able to follow simple picture stories told by teacher. • May have literary skills in first language.<hr>• Emergent/beginning reader. • Shows recognition of more words. • May be able to follow print of simple stories. • Writing ability developing. • Further develops above skills.
C	Becoming Familiar with English	• Produces longer utterances and begins to connect sentences together. • Begins to use grammatical modification, different verb tenses and modifiers such as '+s' for plural, eg - 'Girl going to shop. She buying some sweets.' 'Yesterday I see film on television and it was ...' • Possible evidence of interlingual features (using rules of first language to help in the second), eg - using 'one boy' for 'a boy'. • Vocabulary expanding and becoming less context bound. • Shows greater understanding of spoken instructions, language for learning and what is said generally in the classroom. • Can follow stories, teacher presentations and join in appropriately. • Participates orally in group activities over a wider range of functions of language such as reasoning, predicting.	• Is able to read appropriate simple stories and other texts with understanding. • Is able to read simple instructions for tasks. • Is able to sequence simple stories and texts. • Is able to produce written outcomes within a structured framework. • May be able to produce some free writing which may exhibit interlingual features.
D	Becoming Competent as a User of English	• Uses English for learning and most functions necessary to operate in the classroom. • Produces longer, more complex utterances, using phrases, eg - 'After the film ...' and clauses, eg - 'because ... if ... when ...' • Wide range of verb forms - present, future past, eg - 'He has broken it.' • Grammar use more accurate and consistent. • Vocabulary extensive, covering a wide range of abstract and specialist topic words though there may still be some gaps. • Produces connected discourse, eg - re-telling stories, descriptions explanations, using appropriate tenses and some sequence words, eg - 'first', 'then', 'however'. • Is becoming more aware of appropriate forms and styles of language for different purposes.	• Is able to read longer stories and texts with understanding. • Is able to follow more complex written instructions. • Is able to write more freely in both expressive and factual modes with greater structural accuracy and complexity. • Is able to read for information and produce written or other outcomes. • Is able to participate in most tasks.
E	Becoming a Fluent User of English in Most Social and Learning Contexts	• This is a broad stage. At first, there may remain a few inaccuracies and some inconsistent of usage, but over a period, consistency and competence will continue to increase. • Produces fluent utterances and coherent, properly connected discourse in most circumstances. • Uses the full range of grammatical patterns competently and accurately, including the more complex, eg - conditionals, passives, etc. • Employs the full range of language functions including more abstract and complex usages, eg - hypothesizing, presenting an argument. • Has ability to comprehend a wide range of language activities necessary for classroom and curriculum purposes and participates appropriately. • Is able to vary style appropriately including intonation and stress.	• Is able to read fluently with understanding. • Is able to produce written work for a wide variety of purposes with appropriate level of structural accuracy. • Is able to research for information from a wide variety of sources and produce appropriate written or other outcomes.

NOTES
1. *Stage assessments should be made in relation to fully fluent English speaking peers.*
2. *Divisions between stages are not hard and fast. The information is for the purpose of identifying need, NOT to label a child. If you are unsure about which of two stages to use for a child use the lower stage.*
3. *The descriptors for SELA are subject to review as the need arises.*