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Executive Summary

Introduction

In March 2003, a team from the University of Bristol working in association with Birmingham Local Education Authority (LEA) was commissioned by the DfES (Department for Education and Skills) to conduct research into the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils with specific reference to the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils. Qualitative research was carried out in fourteen schools in six LEAs (primary schools with more than 10% of mixed heritage pupils and secondary schools with more than 5% of mixed heritage pupils). Quantitative data from the DfES National Pupil Database are also reported.

Key findings

- The attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils is below average, the attainment of White/Black African pupils is similar to average in primary schools and slightly below average in secondary schools and the attainment of White/Asian pupils is above average.
- The key barriers to achievement facing pupils of White/Black Caribbean origin are in many cases similar to those faced by pupils of Black Caribbean origin. They are more likely to come from socially disadvantaged backgrounds; are more likely to experience forms of institutionalised racism in the form of low teacher expectations; and, are more likely to be excluded from school.
- White/Black Caribbean pupils also face specific barriers to achievement. Low expectations of pupils by teachers often seem based on a stereotypical view of the fragmented home backgrounds and ‘confused’ identities of White/Black Caribbean pupils. These pupils often experience racism from teachers and from their White and Black peers targeted at their mixed heritage. This can lead to the adoption of what are perceived to be rebellious and challenging forms of behaviour.
- The barriers to achievement experienced by White/Black Caribbean pupils operate in a context where mixed heritage identities (including those of White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African and White/Asian pupils) are not recognised in the curriculum or in policies of schools and of LEAs. In the case of White/Black Caribbean pupils, their invisibility from policy makes it difficult for their underachievement to be challenged.
- In those schools where White/Black Caribbean pupils achieve relatively highly they often benefit from inclusion in policies targeted at Black Caribbean learners, with whom they share similar barriers to achievement and with whom they often identify.
- Even in these schools, however, the specific barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean learners are rarely explicitly addressed.

Background and Aims

Despite anecdotal evidence that some categories of mixed heritage pupils are
underachieving in the educational system and are over-represented in school exclusions, to date there has been limited research to investigate the educational needs of this group. For the purposes of this research, the ‘needs’ of mixed heritage pupils were assumed to comprise of two inter-related elements. The first of these is the issue of achievement. In this respect, White/Black Caribbean pupils are both the largest group of mixed heritage pupils and the group most at risk of underachieving and so provided a focus for the study. The second of these is the need for all pupils, including mixed heritage pupils, to have their identities recognised and understood in schools in a broader societal context where mixed identities are increasingly common.

The aim of the research was to investigate the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils through a specific focus on the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean learners. In particular the research addressed, largely through qualitative case study work in primary and secondary schools, the following areas:

- The relative achievement of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils;
- The barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils;
- How schools have overcome these barriers through successful practice which promotes achievement.

**Methodology**

The research made use of both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Data from the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) and the National Pupil Database were used to provide background demographic and achievement data for different groups of mixed heritage pupils disaggregated by gender and free school meals (FSM) which was used as a proxy indicator of socio-economic background. Qualitative research in the form of semi-structured interviews was then undertaken in fourteen schools across six Local Education Authorities in England to provide data relating to the perceptions of teachers, pupils, parents and local Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) advisors about the barriers to achievement faced by mixed heritage pupils and strategies to overcome these barriers.

In the sample schools, mixed heritage pupils accounted for 10% or more of all pupils in primary schools and 5% or more in secondary schools. Ten schools were chosen at random across the LEAs and four were chosen because they were ‘high achieving’ schools, i.e. mixed heritage pupils were performing as well or better than the average for all pupils at the school and the school was performing as well or better than similar schools within the LEA.

**Results**

- Demographic data reveal that mixed heritage pupils are the largest growing minority ethnic group across England as a whole. The 168,901 mixed
heritage pupils make up 2.5% of the national school age population with large regional variations. 22,327 or 7.3% of Inner London school children are classified as mixed heritage. The largest group nationally are those of White/Black Caribbean background who number 60,635 and make up 0.9% of the school age population.

- The analysis of performance data for mixed heritage pupils shows that the attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils is below average, the attainment of White/Black African pupils is similar to average in primary schools and slightly below average in secondary schools, and the attainment of White/Asian pupils is above average.

- Part of the reason for these differences appears to be associated with differences in relative levels of deprivation, as measured by the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals. The proportion of White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils eligible for free school meals is around twice the national average. For White/Asian pupils, the proportion is closer to the national average.

- However, this is not the full picture. When differences in free school meal eligibility are controlled for by comparing the performance of pupils not eligible for free school meals, White/Asian pupils still perform above average as do White/Black African girls. In contrast, White/Black Caribbean pupils and White/Black African boys in secondary schools underachieve.

- The case study research suggested that like their Black Caribbean peers, White/Black Caribbean pupils’ achievement in school is negatively affected by low socio-economic status, low teacher expectations and behavioural issues related to peer group pressure. However, these take on a specific form for White/Black Caribbean pupils.

- In the case of this group, low teacher expectations are linked to stereotypical views of the negative effects of fragmented homes and identity confusion on account of their mixed heritage. These can interact with low academic aspirations on the part of some White/Black Caribbean pupils linked to peer group pressure in a mutually reinforcing downward cycle. Peer group pressures are exacerbated by name-calling and forms of exclusion by both White and Black peers related once again to their mixed heritage. These two barriers can lead to the adoption of extreme, rebellious behaviour by White/Black Caribbean pupils.

- There are factors operating in schools and LEAs that affect the broader educational needs of all mixed heritage pupils (White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African and White/Asian) i.e. needs relating to having their identities recognised and understood in the curriculum as part of the overall diversity of society and to be protected from racist abuse.

- These factors include the ‘invisibility’ at the level of LEA and school policy of mixed heritage pupils including the lack of a common terminology to describe them and their absence from policies relating to race equality; the failure to monitor and set targets for mixed heritage pupils; and, the absence of mixed heritage identities from the curriculum and in the role models present in schools. Whereas these factors may not serve as a barrier to achievement for all mixed heritage pupils, they form part of a climate in which schools are unable to effectively respond to the barriers to achievement facing White/Black Caribbean pupils noted above.
Where White/Black Caribbean pupils were performing well in the so-called ‘high achieving’ schools, they were often targeted by strategies aimed primarily at raising Black Caribbean achievement. There are clear benefits associated with targeting White/Black Caribbean pupils with strategies aimed at Black Caribbean pupils. White/Black Caribbean pupils often relate strongly to Black culture and with their Black Caribbean peers. There is a need, however, to modify existing strategies and the model of effective practice that underlies them to take account of the specific needs faced by White/Black Caribbean learners.

Based on effective practice outlined in the DfES consultation document Aiming High, the research team identified the following elements of effective practice for raising the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils:

a. The style of leadership adopted by the ‘high achieving’ schools was supportive yet challenging of staff with respect to raising achievement of minority ethnic learners including White/Black Caribbean learners.

b. In addition, there was a focus on effective teaching and learning for all pupils and the senior management were innovative in developing strategies targeted at minority ethnic groups. Some schools provided supplementary education or targeted support for learners in key areas of the curriculum that benefited White/Black Caribbean pupils as part of a larger group of Black learners.

c. The high achieving schools reflected diversity in the school curriculum and amongst the staff. The research team reports of more limited examples from the research of how schools can reflect mixed heritage experiences and identities in the curriculum and include effective role models for White/Black Caribbean pupils.

d. There were high expectations of all pupils including White/Black Caribbean and other minority ethnic pupils supported by effective data monitoring (although even at the high achieving schools there was a lack of information about the backgrounds and experiences of White/Black Caribbean pupils that could have helped to raise teacher expectations further).

e. The schools worked hard to develop a positive culture for all pupils and staff based around the idea of a common community and underpinned by the respect for diversity. The research team reports examples where schools have actively challenged the use of derogatory terminology for mixed heritage pupils.

f. Schools across the sample exemplified instances of good practice with respect to parental involvement to raise the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils.

In addition to these areas of effective practice the research team suggests an additional element that is of particular relevance for mixed heritage pupils and goes to the heart of a whole school approach, namely that of a ‘learning school’. By this it is meant that unlike some other schools in the sample, the high achieving schools were able to predict the implications and embrace the challenges posed by changes to their pupil intakes and shifts in government policy and were proactive in piloting new initiatives. They also sought to learn about the educational needs of different groups and to challenge stereotypes and were therefore, more open to the possibility of seeing the world in mixed as well as ‘mono-heritage’ terms.
Summary of key recommendations

- That the DfES in consultation with other key national bodies develop clear and consistent guidelines for schools on the use of terminology for describing White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage learners and work with appropriate partners to ensure that mixed heritage experiences and identities are reflected in the national curriculum and in learning materials.
- That LEAs work with schools to tackle the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean learners including effective data monitoring and target setting, provision of resources and training of managers and teachers.
- That schools work with LEAs to develop strategies that target White/Black Caribbean learners in the context of all Black learners but in a way that also takes account of their specific needs as well. Strategies include staff training, representing mixed heritage identities in the curriculum, provision of appropriate role models, supplementary learning opportunities and working with parents and the community.
Chapter One

Introduction: The Invisibility of Mixed Heritage Pupils

*I think we tend to not see them as a group in itself 'cause we sort of assume that it's not an issue ....To be honest if it wasn’t for you bringing it up I would probably not have given it another thought.*

[Teacher, School E]

**Background and rationale**

i) The policy context

Tackling the under-achievement of minority ethnic groups at risk of underachieving is a government priority for meeting the educational needs of these groups and those of a diverse society. This priority has been reflected in a range of government initiatives in recent years including the introduction of the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) in 1998, the Home Secretary’s action plan in response to the McPherson Commission of Enquiry into the fatal stabbing of Stephen Lawrence (Home Office, 1999), the introduction of categories relating to ethnicity into government’s Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) and more recently, the *Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils* initiative. Included in the broad category of African-Caribbean pupils, which is one focus of this strategy, are Black African and Black Caribbean, as well as mixed heritage pupils of White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African descent. This reflects a growing concern within the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) with the performance of this group of pupils reflected in the PLASC data. This data is reviewed in Chapter two. The concerns of the Department coincided with a similar concern at school and LEA level, which provided some of the impetus for the current research. Data collected by Birmingham LEA, which is an associate partner in the research, indicates that White/Black Caribbean pupils who make up the majority of those classified under the mixed/dual heritage category have below average achievement levels and are over-represented in school exclusions. In these respects they are similar to Black Caribbean pupils. Yet despite this growing awareness of achievement issues, to date there has been little attention given to the attainment and educational needs of mixed heritage pupils.

ii) The legal context

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 which was introduced in response to the McPherson Enquiry (1999) gives public authorities a statutory duty to promote race equality. The aim of the duty is to make promoting race equality central to the way public authorities work. This has important implications for the work of central
government, local government, schools and other educational institutions. The
general duty says that the body must have “due regard” to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people of
different racial groups.

In addition, there are specific duties on schools to help them meet the general
duty. They are a means to an end which should result in an improved educational
experience for all children and not become a bureaucratic exercise. These specific
duties are to:

- Prepare a written statement of the school’s policy for promoting race
equality, and to act upon it.
- Assess the impact of school policies on pupils, staff and parents of different
racial groups, including, in particular, the impact on attainment levels of
these pupils.
- Monitor the operation of all the school’s policies, including, in particular, their
impact on the attainment levels of pupils from different racial groups.
- Take reasonable steps to make available the results of its monitoring.

iii) The needs of mixed heritage pupils according to the literature

The ‘invisibility’ of mixed heritage children in relation to existing policy has been
reflected in the broader educational research relating to minority ethnic
achievement and needs. Some of this research is quantitative in orientation and
has been important for identifying general trends in the achievement of specific
minority ethnic groups and in relation to other factors such as gender and socio-
economic class (see for example Modood et al, 1997; Gillborn and Mirza, 2000,
Tikly, Osler and Hill, 2002). None of this work, however, has provided a
quantitative mapping of the relative achievement of mixed heritage pupils. There
has also been a strong qualitative education research tradition into the
achievement of minority ethnic pupils. Some of this has been important in
identifying the barriers to achievement faced by minority ethnic learners including
institutionalised racism, pupil resistance, peer group pressure and low teacher
expectations (Wright, 1986; Mac an Ghaill, 1988; Gillborn, 1990; Mirza, 1992;
Connolly, 1998). More recent qualitative research (Gillborn and Gipps, 1996; Blair,
1998a; Runnymede Trust, 1998; OFSTED, 2002a,b) has shifted the focus towards
identifying examples of effective practice towards raising achievement. Here the
focus has been on whole school strategies. Although this more recent research
has not focused on mixed heritage pupils, it has been influential in shaping the
approach of the current study. However, although we are broadly supportive of the
emerging model of effective practice arising from this literature, we argue in
chapter five for modifications to this model if it is to address the specific needs of mixed heritage pupils.

Despite the lack of research carried out within the educational system, a significant body of research on the question of mixed heritage identity has been forming in the UK (Wilson, 1987; Tizard and Phoenix, 1993; Ifekwunigwe, 1998; Parker and Song, 2001; Olumide, 2002, Ali, 2003). This ‘new wave’ of research challenges the traditional view of the ‘marginal’ or ‘pathological’ nature of mixed heritage identities associated with the psychoanalytical tradition and instead emphasises the important influence of social variables on mixed heritage identity development. We aim to deepen and extend this understanding of mixed heritage identities. In chapter four, for example, we draw on the perceptions of mixed heritage pupils themselves as well as those of their parents and teachers to suggest that many mixed heritage pupils in fact have a strong and positive sense of their own identity. Insofar as there is an identity ‘problem’, this resides in the lack of recognition afforded to mixed heritage pupils and their needs in school policies and processes and in the perceptions of other, so-called ‘mono heritage’ members of the school community.

The ‘new wave’ of literature has also been influential in pointing out the dangers of treating the experiences of different categories of mixed heritage people as if they were the same. For example, although there is evidence (supported by the present study) that White/Black Caribbean pupils may be underachieving as a group, there is more limited evidence that White/Asian pupils may be outperforming other groups at ‘A’ level (Ballard, 1999; Modood, 2003). Whilst this may be related to the tendency for this group to be of a higher socio-economic status, it may also be due to a different perception and reaction to the nature of its mixed background, in the sense that this mixed background is unnoticed and/or viewed as insignificant. Perceptions and reactions to the mixed background may also involve a significant gender dimension. This has been evident in relation to the achievement and exclusion of ‘mono heritage’ groups (Gillborn and Mirza, 2000; Osler et al, 2002). Indeed recent research suggests that perceptions of and reactions to women of mixed ‘White/Black Caribbean backgrounds are more likely to incorporate an awareness of their mixed background than are those regarding men of similar backgrounds, who are more readily viewed as being ‘mono heritage’ (Caballero, 2004). In the present research then, care will be taken to look at the educational needs of different categories of mixed heritage pupils (see below) and to consider the significance of related factors such as gender and socio-economic class.

From the discussion of the existing literature on mixed heritage pupils it can be seen that the ‘needs’ of this group can be usefully seen to comprise of two interrelated elements that require further investigation. The first of these is the issue of achievement which has been central to how educational needs have been understood within the educational debate. In this respect, and as the evidence in chapter two confirms, White/Black Caribbean pupils are both the largest group of mixed heritage pupil and the group most at risk of underachieving. The study will, therefore focus on the achievement of this group of pupils. The literature also draws attention, however, to another aspect, namely the need of mixed heritage pupils to have their identities recognised and understood in the school context. In other terms, this is to acknowledge the role of schools not just in raising the
achievement of different groups of learners but in producing rounded citizens with a confidence and belief in their own identity and who can operate effectively in an ethnically diverse society where mixed as well as ‘mono heritage’ identities are increasingly the norm. This last aspect has implications not just for mixed heritage but for ‘mono heritage’ pupils as well. Indeed, it is at this point that the two aspects of the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils from the literature become linked. We argue in chapters four and five, for example, that part of developing a whole school approach to raising achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils involves developing an understanding and respect for mixed heritage identities amongst pupils and teachers.

iv) The demographic context of mixed heritage research

Interest in the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils is also related to recent demographic trends. There is evidence from the 2001 census (ONS, 2001) and in the literature (Owen, 2001) that as a whole, the mixed heritage group is growing in both size and recognition. 1.2% of the total UK population, or 15% of the total minority ethnic population described themselves as ‘Mixed’ and over half of these (55%) are under the age of 16. This last figure suggests that the mixed heritage category is the fastest growing of any ethnic group. The largest proportions of people of mixed heritage origin are in London, with the exception of Nottingham where two per cent of people are White/Black Caribbean. Demographic data relating to the numbers of different categories of mixed heritage pupils by region and educational level are provided in Appendix One and will be discussed in more detail in relation to sample choice in chapter three. The reported demographic data in this study has been gathered as part of the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) process. Following the example of the 2001 census, the DfES introduced mixed heritage categories in 2002 which became compulsory codes in 2003. This has allowed more detailed demographic information to emerge and has also made it possible to ascertain the relative performance of different categories of mixed heritage pupils (see chapter two). The PLASC data uses four main categories of mixed heritage, namely, White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African, White/Asian and any other mixed background.

It can be seen from table one in the Appendix that as a whole, mixed heritage pupils make up about 2.5% of the school age population with large regional variations. Whereas only 0.7% of pupils in the North East are of mixed heritage, 7.3% of London school children are classified as mixed heritage, (almost 1 in ten of the school-going population). Other regions, including Outer London, the West Midlands, the East of England, the South East and the East Midlands all have 2% or more mixed heritage pupils. The proportions of mixed heritage pupils in primary school are greater than those in secondary school underlining the point made above about the overall expansion of the mixed heritage category (see tables 2 and 3).

There are, however, significant differences in numbers between the different categories of mixed heritage pupils. The largest group are those of White/Black Caribbean background who make up 0.9% of the school age population. This fact, along with a consideration of the performance data discussed in chapter two, has
provided a rationale for focusing more on this mixed heritage group than the others in the context of the present study. The second largest group of mixed heritage pupils are those who have been identified during the PLASC process (see below) as belonging to ‘any other mixed background’. More information is needed about the various groups that have been identified under this heading but it is likely to include, for example, pupils whose parents are both White but from different countries of origin as well as others who have chosen this category because they do not fit comfortably into any other. Pupils of White/Asian origin are the next largest category, making up 0.5% of the school age population with White/Black African pupils making up 0.2%.

**Aims and Objectives**

Following on from the above then, the aim of the research is to investigate the educational needs of different categories of mixed heritage pupils through a specific focus on the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils. In particular the research will seek to address through qualitative case study work in primary and secondary schools the following objectives:

- Explore the barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils;
- Explore how schools have overcome these barriers and identify successful practice which promotes achievement

**Overview of Methodology**

This research is the product of an interdisciplinary collaboration with researchers from educational and sociological backgrounds. The strengths of this interdisciplinary collaboration were that the team were able to provide a comprehensive account of the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils by combining sociological insight from the field of race/ethnicity and culture with expertise in the field of education. Consequently, the study was an outcome of the raised awareness and concern regarding the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils expressed at academic and LEA level.

A detailed account of the sample used is provided in chapter three. The findings reported here are based on a study that was conducted between March 2003 and April 2004. The study made use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data relating to mixed heritage pupils was provided by the DfES and provides a background for the present study. Some of this data relates to the demographic profile of mixed heritage pupils and is reported in this chapter and in chapter three. The DfES also supplied performance data for different categories of mixed heritage pupils and this is discussed in more detail in the next chapter. This data provides both a context and a rationale for considering the educational needs of specific mixed heritage groups.

Although the quantitative data is a key component of the ‘big picture’ in relation to understanding the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils and as a means of
identifying general trends, it is less helpful for identifying processes and perceptions at the level of the individual and the school that shape the experiences of mixed heritage pupils and of White/Black Caribbean pupils in particular. For the most part the study draws on the results of qualitative case study work that was carried out in 14 primary and secondary schools across six LEAs. Ten of the schools were initially chosen in order to investigate barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils whereas the remainder were purposefully identified because the performance of White/Black Caribbean pupils in these schools was relatively good and in some cases much better than in the other schools. These schools were originally dubbed ‘effective practice schools’ although the reality was that we found little evidence to suggest that any schools had measures in place to raise the performance of White/Black Caribbean pupils as a specific group. So instead these schools are described in the report simply as ‘high achieving’ schools. Rather, what we did find was that effective practice where it did exist was ‘scattered’ across the entire sample.

The results of the case studies are reported in chapter four. A thumbnail sketch of each of the participating schools along with the research instruments used are also included as appendices. Interviews were conducted with five mixed heritage pupils in each school with the exception of the ‘high achieving’ schools where ten mixed heritage pupils were interviewed. The majority of these were White/Black Caribbean pupils although other categories of mixed heritage pupils were also interviewed to provide a point of comparison. Interviews were also conducted with the Head teacher and two additional members of staff, including, where possible, staff with specific responsibility for minority ethnic achievement issues in the school. Focus groups with parents of mixed heritage pupils were also organised. All interviews and focus groups were transcribed and subsequently analysed with the assistance of Nvivo qualitative software, which is a useful tool for the management and interpretation of large quantities of interview material. We identified key themes and issues arising from the interview material from each group of participants which we analysed according to the objectives of the research.

In some of the ‘high achieving’ schools, curriculum materials in the core areas of maths, English and science were also analysed as were OFSTED reports and school documents and policy statements which were considered to have a bearing on mixed heritage pupils. These included, for example, anti-bullying and equal opportunities policies along with the vision and mission statement of the school.

A note on terminology

As has been highlighted in recent research on mixed heritage identities, there is little consensus on the use of terminology to describe mixed heritage people. As other research has pointed out, none of the current terminology adequately captures the potential diversity of mixed heritages (Aspinall, 2003, p275; also Ifkewunigwe, 1998). Depending on personal preference and cultural context, people of mixed heritage backgrounds refer to themselves, and are referred to by others, using many different terms. This is also true at an ‘official’ level, as demonstrated by the debates regarding the phrasing over the new ‘Mixed’ category
in the 2001 UK Census (Caballero, 2004). Consequently, as illustrated by the wide range of terms used by interviewees in our study, there is no ‘standard’ terminology with which to refer to people of mixed heritages.

For the purposes of this report, we use the term ‘mixed heritage’ rather than the more commonly used term ‘mixed race’ to refer to those pupils and people who identify themselves, or are identified, as having a distinct sense of a dual or mixed, rather than ‘mono heritage’. Where possible, we refer to the specific heritages of the interviewees as defined within the PLASC (Pupil Level Annual School Census) categories: White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African, White/Asian and Any Other Mixed Background. The decision to use ‘mixed heritage’ instead of ‘mixed race’ was adopted in order to ensure consistency of terminology in DfES literature. However, it was apparent in interviews that the majority of pupil and parent respondents used ‘mixed race’, whilst some were content to use ‘half caste’. For most pupils and parents, ‘mixed heritage’ was not a term that they were familiar with and were less comfortable with its initial use in the interview. The researchers were alert to this and the use of appropriate or acceptable language formed part of the initial interview discussion. The use of terminology for mixed heritage people is discussed in more detail in chapter four.

There is often conflation between the use of terms referring to ‘Black’ heritages, such as African Caribbean and Black Caribbean. In this report, we follow the guidelines of the DfES where Black Caribbean refers to those of Caribbean heritage and Black African refers to those of African heritage. Occasionally, we use the term ‘Black’ in its more politicised sense to refer to peoples of both Black Caribbean and Black African heritages. We also adopt DfES guidelines and use ‘Asian’ to refer to people of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic heritage. Finally, we make reference in the report to the term ‘mono heritage’ as a means to distinguish, where appropriate, between those who identify, or who are identified, as having a distinct mixed heritage identity and those who do or are not. We are aware that this is a problematic term as few people can claim to be truly ‘mono heritage’ in this sense, and we use inverted commas around the term ‘mono heritage’ to reflect this fact.

Political context of mixed heritage research

Research into issues related to race and ethnicity do not operate in a political vacuum. Researchers need to be aware of the broader context of mixed heritage issues. For example, there is a perception amongst many of those involved in the field of race equality in education both within the Black and Asian communities and beyond, that it has taken a great deal of effort over many years to draw attention to the barriers to achievement facing minority ethnic learners and for the government to respond to demands to have their needs met. Even today, and notwithstanding existing government initiatives, there remains a widespread feeling that the needs of minority ethnic children continue not to be met (see, for example, the influential Commission for Multiracial Britain report, 2000). If handled insensitively, the risk is that drawing attention to the specific barriers and needs pertaining to mixed heritage pupils will be perceived by some sections of the Black and Asian communities as an attempt to fragment whatever consensus has already been
achieved around issues of race equality in education. Many mixed heritage pupils, including many White/Black Caribbean pupils, identify themselves as ‘Black’ as well as mixed heritage and face similar problems of institutionalised racism as those experienced by other Black groups. Attempts to treat mixed heritage people as anything other than members of the broader Black community are also likely to meet with resistance from these groups themselves.

On the other hand, there is also a growing recognition of the diversity of barriers to achievement and educational needs that exist within the Black and Asian communities broadly conceived and this is reflected, for example in the different strategies targeted at different Black and Asian groups at risk of underachieving. For instance, whereas strategies aimed at providing mentors and supplementary educational opportunities are often effective at raising the achievement of Black Caribbean pupils, providing targeted language support is important for raising the achievement of many pupils of South Asian origin. In other words and in relation to White/Black Caribbean learners, it is necessary to simultaneously recognise the barriers that these pupils face in common with other Black pupils and the specific needs that these groups have on account of their mixed backgrounds. As a representative in LEA 2 commented:

So on the one hand, we don’t want to be part of the process of fractioning children [from different Black backgrounds]. However, at the same time we do realise that there are particular achievement patterns that are specific to pupils of Caribbean heritage [and of] dual heritage and so we’re doing specific work with those groups.

The implication of this discussion for our research is that we have endeavoured to understand the experiences of White/Black Caribbean learners both as Black learners and as a sub-group of Black learners with specific needs. We draw out the implications of this understanding in later chapters.

**Ethical issues**

Research that is concerned with racial and ethnic origins, health, gender and sexuality, religious or political beliefs/opinions, and criminal convictions are considered to be more sensitive topics than others. Bearing this point in mind, the names of all individuals and participating institutions have been kept anonymous. This helped to preserve the integrity of the research process and also made it easier for individuals to respond without fear of reprisal. The issue of anonymity for participants within social research in order to protect their identity has taken on a heightened level of importance due to the Data Protection Act (1998), which came into effect in March 2000 (Grinyer, 2002). Previously it had been a matter of research ethics (see for example, Homan, 1991) as to whether to disclose the identities of those who participated in social research, but it now has more salient legal implications. Care therefore, has been taken at all stages of this research process to not only ensure that participants’ identities and institutional names remain anonymous, but that data has been kept securely, and individual digital recordings have been deleted or destroyed upon transcription.
The permission of schools and parents was also sought before individual parents and pupils were interviewed. Although parental/care giver permission was not strictly required given that schools do act in *loco parentis*, given the sensitivity of the research it was considered important to provide parents/carers and the individual pupils the opportunity to decide for themselves as to whether they wished to participate or not. Pupils were also given an opportunity at the beginning of their interviews to decline from participating, once a member of the research team explained the nature of the research again.
Chapter Two
Attainment and Progress of Mixed Heritage Pupils

Introduction
This Chapter looks at the attainment and progress of mixed heritage pupils at the end of each Key Stage of compulsory education. It includes an analysis of results by gender and pupils’ free school meal eligibility (as a proxy indicator of relative deprivation). Poverty and gender are known to be associated with attainment and progress and need to be taken into account when exploring the reasons for differences in performance between groups. The proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals is much higher than average for mixed heritage pupils, particularly White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils. In 2003, the proportion of White/Black Caribbean pupils eligible for free school meals was 33%, for White/Black African 28% and for White/Asian 19%. This compares to the national average for all pupils of 16%.

This chapter also examines the latest school exclusion statistics for mixed heritage pupils since previous research has shown that mixed heritage pupils are over represented in the exclusion statistics (Osler and Hill, 1999).

The attainment of mixed heritage pupils
Tables 4 to 7 in Appendix One and figures 1 to 6 below compare the attainment of the three largest mixed heritage groups at the end of each Key Stage of compulsory education in 2003. For Key Stages 1, 2 and 3, the end of Key Stage test results, averaged across English and mathematics, have been used as the performance indicators. For Key Stage 4, the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more A*-C grades in the GCSE/GNVQ examinations has been used.

1 Unless otherwise stated, the source of the data is the DfES.
3 Free school meal (FSM) eligibility is a proxy indicator of deprivation. Pupil level FSM requires cautious interpretation. The limitation of pupil level FSM is that it does not take into account the varying degrees of poverty. The categorisation of pupils as either FSM or non-FSM does not distinguish between the levels of deprivation found within and between these groups. For example, non-FSM pupils in high FSM percentage schools or high poverty areas may tend to be less affluent than those in low percentage FSM schools or low poverty areas.
Fig. 1 Percentage of pupils achieving Level 2 and above in the 2003 end of Key Stage 1 tasks/tests (averaged across reading, writing and maths) by ethnic group and gender.
Fig. 2 Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4 and above in the 2003 end of Key Stage 2 tests (averaged across English and maths) by ethnic group and gender.
Fig. 3 Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 and above in the 2003 end of Key Stage 3 tests (averaged across English and maths) by ethnic group and gender.
Fig. 4 Percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more A*-C grades and percentage of pupils achieving no passes in the 2003 GCSE/GNVQ examinations by ethnic group and gender

- 5+A*-C
- No passes

All pupil average 5+A*-C
Fig. 5 Mixed heritage boys attainment at each Key Stage compared to the average for all boys.

- White/Asian Boys
- White/Black African
- White/Black Caribbean

Difference from all pupil average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stage</th>
<th>White/Asian Boys</th>
<th>White/Black African</th>
<th>White/Black Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1 (%L2+ Eng. &amp; Maths)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (%L4+ Eng. &amp; Maths)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 (%L5+ Eng. &amp; Maths)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4 (%5+ A*-C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6 Mixed heritage girls attainment at each Key Stage compared to the average for all girls

- White/Asian
- Average for all
- White/Black African
- White/Black Caribbean

Key Stages:
- KS1 (%L2+ Eng. & Maths)
- KS2 (%L4+ Eng. & Maths)
- KS3 (%L5+ Eng. & Maths)
- KS4 (%5+ A*-C)
The attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils is just below the national average at the end of Key Stage 1 and below average at the other Key Stages. The gap is widest at the end of Key Stage 4.

The attainment of White/Black African pupils is just above the national average in primary school (KS1 and KS2) and just below the national average in secondary school (KS3 and KS4).

The attainment of White/Asian pupils is above the national average at each Key Stage. The gap is widest at the end of Key Stage 4.

As is the case for other ethnic groups, mixed heritage girls’ attainment is higher than mixed heritage boys’ attainment at each Key Stage.

The differences between mixed heritage pupils’ attainment at each Key Stage and the national average is not as great for girls as it is for boys. For example, at the end of Key Stage 4 the difference between the percentage of White/Black Caribbean girls achieving 5 or more A*-C grades and the national average for girls was –9% compared to a difference of –13% for White/Black Caribbean boys and the national average for boys. The equivalent differences for White/Black African pupils were –1% for girls and –6% for boys and for White/Asian pupils 15% for boys and 13% for girls (Figures 5 and 6).

Nationally, there is a strong correlation between levels of deprivation and educational attainment. For example, in 2003 the proportion of pupils achieving national expectations in English at the end of Key Stage 2 (Level 4+) was 75%. However for pupils eligible for free school meals this fell to 55%. In the GCSE/GNVQ examinations in 2003, 51% of Year 11 pupils in maintained schools achieved 5 or more A*-C grades. For pupils eligible free school meals this fell to 24%.

Table 8 in Appendix One compares the attainment of mixed heritage pupils with national averages broken down by gender and free school meal eligibility. This shows that:

- The attainment of White/Black Caribbean boys eligible for free school meals is above average in primary schools and similar to average in
secondary schools when compared to the results of all boys eligible for free school meals.  

- The attainment of White/Black Caribbean girls eligible for free school meals is above average in primary schools and slightly above average in secondary schools when compared to the results of all girls eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of White/Black African boys eligible for free school meals is above average in primary schools and slightly above average in secondary schools when compared to the results of all boys eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of White/Black African girls eligible for free school meals is above average in primary schools and above average in secondary schools when compared to the results of all girls eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of both White/Asian boys and White/Asian girls eligible for free school meals is above average in primary schools and above average in secondary schools when compared to the results of all pupils eligible for free school meals.

In summary, the overall attainment of mixed heritage pupils eligible for free school meals is, on average, above that of all pupils eligible for free school meals.

Comparing the results for pupils not eligible for free school meals shows that:

- The attainment of White/Black Caribbean boys and White/Black Caribbean girls is similar to average in primary schools but below average in secondary when compared to the results of all pupils not eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of White/Black African boys is above average in primary schools, similar to average at Key Stage 3 but below average at Key Stage 4 when compared to the results of all boys not eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of White/Black African girls is similar to average in both primary and secondary schools when compared to the average for all girls not eligible for free school meals.

- The attainment of both White/Asian boys and White/Asian girls is above average in primary schools and above average in secondary schools when compared to the results of all boys not eligible for free school meals.

---

4 The national average results for pupils eligible for free school meals is affected by White British pupils who numerically contribute most to the national average and have the lowest level of performance in the GCSE/GNVQ examinations. On a group basis, White/Black Caribbean pupils’ performance is above that of White and Black Caribbean pupils eligible for free school meals, but below that of other ethnic groups.
schools when compared to the results of all pupils not eligible for free school meals.

This analysis suggests that differences in attainment between groups are at least partly 'explained' by differences in relative levels of deprivation. However, this does not fully account for the above average attainment of White/Asian pupils, whether or not they are eligible for free school meals, or the below average attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils and to a lesser extent White/Black African boys in secondary schools\textsuperscript{5}.

**The progress made by mixed heritage pupils**

Tables 9 to 11 in Appendix One compare the progress made by mixed heritage pupils between Key Stages 1 to 2, Key Stages 2 to 3 and Key Stages 3 to 4.

The indicator used for Key Stage 1 to 2 progress is the proportion of pupils achieving Level 2C at the end of KS1 (averaged across reading, writing and maths) who went on to achieve Level 4 or above at the end of KS2 (averaged across English and maths); for Key Stage 2 to 3 progress it is the proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 at the end of KS2 (averaged across English and maths) who went on to achieve Level 5 or above at the end of KS3 (averaged across English and maths); and for Key Stage 3 to 4 progress it is the proportion of pupils achieving Level 5 at the end of KS3 (averaged across English and maths) who went on to achieve 5 or more A*-C grades in the GCSE/GNVQ examinations.

- As is the case for overall attainment, there is a correlation between progress and relative deprivation. On average, around 10% fewer pupils eligible for fee school meals progress to the next level\textsuperscript{6} compared to pupils not eligible for free school meals. The 'progress gap' is widest in secondary schools.

- On average girls' from each ethnic group made slightly less progress than boys during Key Stage 2 and more progress than boys during Key Stages 3 and 4.

- When differences in free school meal eligibility are controlled for, Key Stage 2 progress was similar to average for White/Black Caribbean pupils and above average for White/Black African and White/Asian pupils.

\textsuperscript{5} It may be that a high proportion of White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils not eligible for free school meals are from families that are close to the eligibility threshold and materially are no better off than those eligible for free school meals.

\textsuperscript{6} Based on two National Curriculum levels between Key Stages 1 and 2. For Key Stage 4, it is Key Stage 3 Level 5 to 5A*-C.
At Key Stage 3, progress was below average for White/Black Caribbean pupils, similar to average for White/Black African pupils and above average for White/Asian pupils when differences in free school meal eligibility are controlled for.

At Key Stage 4, White/Black Caribbean girls eligible for free school meals made above average progress compared to all girls eligible for free school meals and White/Caribbean boys made similar progress compared to all boys eligible for free school meals. However, the progress made by White/Black Caribbean pupils not eligible for free school meals was below average, particularly boys’ progress.

White/Black African and White/Asian pupils’ progress was above average at Key Stage 4 when differences in free school meal eligibility are controlled for.

School exclusions

School exclusions not only disrupt pupils education during the period of exclusion but also effect pupils’ chances of continuing in mainstream education as schools are reluctant to accept pupils excluded from another school (Atkinson, 2004).

The latest statistics on permanent exclusions show that White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils are over-represented when compared to their numbers in the school population. In 2002/03 the permanent exclusion rate for White/Black Caribbean pupils was 2.9 per 1000 pupils, for White/Black African pupils 2.6 and for White/Asian pupils 1.1. This compares to 1.2 for White pupils and an average of 1.3 for all pupils (Fig. 7). Most permanently excluded pupils are boys (82%) from secondary schools (83%).

Although there are no national statistics on fixed term exclusions by ethnic group, there is evidence to suggest that White/Black Caribbean pupils are also over-represented in those pupils excluded on a temporary basis (Osler and Hill, 1999).

Most research on the over-representation of some ethnic groups in the exclusion statistics has focused on Black Caribbean pupils. However, the similarity between the exclusion rates for Black Caribbean, White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African suggests common experiences.
Conclusions and implications for the research

In conclusion, this analysis shows that the attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils is below average, the attainment of White/Black African pupils is similar to average in primary schools and slightly below average in secondary schools, and the attainment of White/Asian pupils is above average.

Relative rates of progress were below average for White/Black Caribbean pupils at Key Stages 3 and 4, particularly for boys at Key Stage 4.

Part of the reason for these differences appears to be associated with differences in relative levels of deprivation, as measured by the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals. On average pupils eligible for free school meals have lower attainment and make less progress than pupils not eligible for free school meals. The proportion of White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils eligible for a free school meal is around twice the
national average. For White/Asian pupils, the proportion is closer to the national average.\textsuperscript{7}

However, this is not the full picture. When differences in free school meals are controlled for, White/Asian pupils' performance remains above average across all Key Stages. White/Black Caribbean pupils’ performance is above average in primary school and similar to average in secondary school when compared to all pupils eligible for free school meals. However, compared to pupils not eligible for free school meals, White/Black Caribbean pupils’ performance is below average in secondary schools, particularly boys’ performance at Key Stage 4.

White/Black African pupils’ performance is above average when compared to the performance of all pupils eligible for free school meal. For White/Black African pupils not eligible for free school meals their performance is similar to or above average across Key Stages 1 to 3, although boys performance at Key Stage 4 drops below average.

Although numbers are relatively small, the latest statistics on permanent exclusions show that White/Black Caribbean and White/Black African pupils are over-represented.

The case studies described in the next section examine the experiences of mixed heritage pupils in a cross-section of schools and the factors, both within and outside school, affecting their performance. On the basis of the statistical evidence, particular attention has been given to an examination of the factors affecting the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils in secondary schools.

\textsuperscript{7} The Statistics of Education, Schools in England 2003 edition (DfES, 2003) show that the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals across all ethnic groups is 16% but for White/Black Caribbean pupils the proportion is 33%. The proportions for White/Black African and White/Asian are 28% and 19% respectively.
Chapter Three

The Research Sample and Context of the Research

In this chapter we provide a more detailed background to the context of the research, which will include an overview of the sample of LEAs, schools, pupils, teachers, and parents that participated in this research.

- It provides a further elaboration of aspects of the research design including an explanation of the selection of LEAs, schools and pupils.
- It highlights the salient features of the local context in which participating schools are situated including the demographic details of school ‘catchment area’ and/or local population; evidence of ethnic and racial tension; and the level of social deprivation.
- It shows where possible the ethnicity and socio-economic background of pupils and parents who were interviewed.

This chapter makes use of available PLASC data, OFSTED reports, DfES resources and school data, as well as interviews and focus groups with pupils, parents, teachers and LEA representatives/consultants.

The local and national context for the research

Local Education Authorities

The qualitative research was conducted within six LEAs, all of which had the largest populations of mixed heritage pupils regionally and represent the West Midlands, Inner London, East of England, North West and East Midlands regions (see Chapter 1). The inclusion of LEA 3 in the spread of LEAs was an opportunity to gather information about both the experiences of mixed heritage pupils in a county environment and the experiences of different categories of mixed heritage pupils, whilst maintaining focus on the White/Black Caribbean pupils originally identified as the mixed heritage category most at risk of underachieving. Access issues with one of the LEA’s schools resulted in the need to identify alternative LEAs with high percentages of White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils. This resulted in the inclusion of both LEA 2 and 6. All of the included LEAs are establishing systems for collecting and analysing data related to mixed heritage pupils.

As well as being based on overall mixed heritage pupil populations, the selection of these six LEAs represents a north-south geographical spread and London coverage, which itself has the highest proportion of people from minority ethnic groups (ONS). Tables 3.1 and 3.2 below show the overall numbers of mixed heritage pupils in each of the participating LEAs at both
primary and secondary school respectively. Table 3.3 provides the total numbers of both primary and secondary pupils from all ethnic categories in each LEA alongside the population of mixed heritage pupils in the LEA. These tables should be read in conjunction with those in chapters 1 and 2, which list total numbers and percentages of mixed heritage pupils for each region in England.

Table 3.1: Mixed Heritage pupils at primary school at compulsory school age and above by selected local education authority as at January 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Total Mixed Number</th>
<th>White/Black Caribbean Number</th>
<th>White/Black African Number</th>
<th>White/Asian Number</th>
<th>Mixed Other Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5208</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2712</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.2: Mixed Heritage pupils at secondary school by selected local education authority as at January 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>White/Black Caribbean Number</th>
<th>White/Black African Number</th>
<th>White/Asian Number</th>
<th>Mixed Other Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.3: Total number of pupils by local education authority as at January 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Total mixed heritage Number</th>
<th>All pupils Number</th>
<th>Total primary pupils Number</th>
<th>Total secondary pupils Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8764</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>152 667</td>
<td>82 054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21 549</td>
<td>13 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4738</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>152 905</td>
<td>74 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3004</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28 950</td>
<td>17 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3386</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>55 488</td>
<td>31 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>33 412</td>
<td>19 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA 1

LEA 1 is a large authority with approximately 43 per cent of the school pupil population from minority ethnic groups, which also constitute 30 per cent of the total population (OFSTED, 2003). The mixed heritage pupil population at maintained schools in LEA 1 is the largest (numerically) for all of England with a combined total of 8764 mixed heritage pupils which is 5.7 per cent of the maintained school population of 152 667 pupils. The city is socially and economically diverse, and has an average unemployment rate of 7.7 per cent, which is twice the regional rate for West Midlands and more than three times the national rate. The percentage of secondary school pupils in LEA 1 achieving 5 or more good GCSEs is up from 36 per cent in 1998 to 48.6 per cent in 2003 (DfES). Since the mid-1990s, the LEA’s overall rate of improvement has been significantly higher than the national pattern.

The LEA is considered a national leader in the field of race equality. The educational needs of mixed heritage pupils within the LEA have been identified, based on both performance and exclusion data, and it is emerging as one of the principal focus areas that needs to be developed. There are two achievement plans currently operating within the LEA, one that focuses on the achievement of Black Caribbean and Black African pupils and the other on Asian achievement. Both of which have been adopted as part of the council’s policy. Additionally, there is a White Achievement group in the process of being set up to focus on the various levels of White underachievement for both boys and girls specifically from lower socio-economic backgrounds. There is no concomitant mixed heritage group.

LEA 2

LEA 2 is a borough characterised by ethnic and cultural diversity with 80 per cent of its school population from minority ethnic groups (OFSTED). It is also one of the most deprived areas in England with high levels of socio-economic disadvantage. On almost every indicator of deprivation and disadvantage (e.g. unemployment; overcrowded homes; health; crime; income support; car ownership) the LEA is at the extreme end of the spectrum of need, according to the Index of Local Deprivation (1998). The mixed heritage pupil population at maintained schools in the LEA is 1620, which is 7.5 per cent of the maintained school population of 21 549 pupils. However, there is a perception amongst representatives of the LEA that there is a level of uncertainty attached to these mixed heritage figures as it is thought that the ethnic categories have not been used correctly in schools. The percentage of secondary school pupils in the LEA achieving 5 or more good GCSEs is up from 27 per cent in 1998 to 36.8 per cent in 2003 (DfES).

According to the LEA representative in our study, White/Black Caribbean pupils are disproportionately represented amongst those who experience
permanent and fixed term exclusion, and also disproportionately represented amongst those in local authority public care in the LEA. There is an awareness of these and other issues pertaining to ‘identity’ for mixed heritage pupils of White/Black Caribbean backgrounds in particular relative to socio-economic background and gender. A programme of support is currently under review within the LEA which aims to target the specific needs of mixed heritage pupils identified in individual schools. There has been some work already carried out as part of Race Awareness with Head teachers, teachers, and classroom assistants, and it has also been a theme in biographies during Black History Month in October in some of the schools in the LEA.

**LEA 3**

LEA 3 serves a large county with a population in excess of one million, the vast majority of whom live in small to medium-size towns or in one of the large number of villages. Its southern boundary is only 13 miles from the centre of London. Four per cent of the LEA’s population is of minority ethnic heritage. Overall the county is advantaged although there are a small number of communities which present a significant challenge. The unemployment rate is well below the national average; the proportion of adults with higher education qualifications is higher than is found nationally. The proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals is smaller than the national average and 7.5 per cent of the school population is of minority ethnic heritage. The percentage of secondary school pupils in the LEA achieving 5 or more good GCSEs is up from 54 per cent in 1998 to 58 per cent in 2003 (DfES).

The mixed heritage pupil population at maintained schools in the LEA is 4738 which is 3.1 per cent of the maintained school population of 152,905 pupils. There are four EMAG centres located in the LEA providing support for pupils and communities including travellers and refugees in the northern area of the LEA. Teachers are funded under EMAG to give extra help to pupils with English as an additional language and for ethnic minority children who are under achieving, including pupils of mixed heritage, and work in conjunction with the schools. The African Caribbean Achievement Project supports mixed heritage pupils in schools along side Black Caribbean and Black African pupils. However it seems that there are distinct differences in the way mixed heritage pupils are treated in different parts of the LEA. The LEA is still at the stage of getting schools to acknowledge the presence of this category of pupils and believes that the educational needs of White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils are similar to those of Black Caribbean pupils. According to the LEA representative in this study, although the LEA is not so data rich in relation to mixed heritage results and achievement, statistically mixed heritage pupils are doing better than their Black peers in the LEA. However, this is not highly reliable, as schools are not skilled enough in supporting families in identifying pupil ethnicities and as a result many mixed heritage pupils are not being recognised. In addition, any data regarding the variation between the different categories of mixed heritage pupils was not indicated.
LEA 4

LEA 4 is a large inner city London borough. It is very diverse both ethnically and culturally but is predominantly disadvantaged. One third of the overall population and 50 percent of pupils in local schools are from minority ethnic groups. Just under 35 per cent of its primary pupils and 40 per cent of its secondary school pupils are entitled to free school meals, there is a high proportion of lone-parent families, youth unemployment is high and there is a high level of crime involving young people (OFSTED). Over 134 different language communities are also represented in the borough. The local unemployment rate has continued to decline in recent years and was 10.2 per cent in 2002. The national average currently stands at 5.2 per cent. There are low levels of adult literacy and numeracy in the LEA, and the number of young people achieving five or more GCSEs at grade C or above was 38.4 per cent in 2003 (DfES). Evidence from OFSTED reports show that the attainment on entry to education is well below that found nationally.

The mixed heritage pupil population at maintained schools in the LEA is 3004, which is 10.4 per cent of the maintained school population of 28 950 pupils in the LEA. This represents the LEA with the largest percentage of mixed heritage pupils that participated in this study. The LEA sees the raising of educational standards throughout the community, not just in schools, as central to its ambition for the borough. In order to achieve this, the LEA has established effective links and partnerships with other community organisations and initiatives. There is a specific programme within the LEA that is focusing on raising the attainment of underachieving pupils from minority ethnic groups, specifically Turkish and Black Caribbean and Black African pupils. Pupils from these groups have been identified as most at risk of achieving below the LEA average at KS3 and 4. At present there are no LEA wide initiatives targeted specifically at mixed heritage pupils.

LEA 5

LEA 5 serves one of the largest cities in Britain, and is characterised by very significant areas of deprivation, with over three quarters of its 33 wards falling into the 10 per cent of most deprived wards in England and Wales. There are also high levels of population mobility within the city, particularly within the most deprived areas. There are significantly more pupils entitled to free school meals than the national figure, and 30 per cent of pupils are from minority ethnic groups (OFSTED). The percentage of secondary school pupils in the LEA achieving 5 or more good GCSEs is up from 29 per cent in 1998 to 38.6 per cent in 2003 (DfES).

The LEA began recording performance data for all mixed heritage pupils across all key stages in 2001 as a single category initially but this now reflects
White/Black Caribbean, White/Asian, White/Black African and Mixed Other categories too. According to a senior representative of the EMAS team, the most significant aspect of this new data was the fact that “from nowhere, from being a hidden population it became our second biggest minority ethnic community”. White/Black Caribbean pupils were identified as the largest group within the mixed heritage category, and broadly speaking, have the same attainment levels as Black Caribbean pupils with slight fluctuations across different key stages and minor differences for gender groups. As a group, Black Caribbean pupils are underachieving particularly in secondary schools but not necessarily in primary schools and in fact they are doing quite well in KS1. White/Black African mixed heritage pupils have also got low levels of attainment. The biggest drop for both groups is between KS3 and KS4. However, the White/Asian mixed heritage pupils are performing well.

Despite having lower attainment levels the White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils are making very good progress, as are Black Caribbean pupils. The three years of data that have been collected show this for both groups. At KS4 in 2003, coincidentally they are exactly the same – 33.3 per cent of Black Caribbean pupils and also 33.3 per cent of the mixed heritage (White/Black Caribbean) pupils got 5 good A-C grades. This is less than the city average, which is currently 39 per cent, but is an improvement from what they were getting several years ago. However, the city average is below the national average. Incidents of racial harassment involving mixed heritage pupils are at levels that are becoming a concern for the EMAS team, more so than for other minority ethnic groups such as Black Caribbean and Asian pupils. To this end, there are two schools within the LEA that are specifically targeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils.

LEA 6

LEA 6 serves a city in the north east of England with significant levels of deprivation and where more than half of its wards are amongst the most deprived areas in England. There is also a higher percentage of adults and children from minority ethnic groups. Unemployment for the city is higher than the national average. The percentage of secondary school pupils in the LEA achieving 5 or more good GCSEs is up from 26 per cent in 1998 to 34.3 per cent in 2003 (DfES).

According to a senior EMAG consultant in the LEA, White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils were the highest achieving group at KS1 and the lowest achieving group at KS4 in 2003. In comparison with other groups at KS4, Pakistani and Black Other groups of pupils have been able to improve their performance although are still below the national average, whilst other groups such as Black Caribbean and White British pupils’ performance continues to fall. In terms of school exclusions, whilst Black Caribbean and Black African pupils constitute 10 per cent of the population in 2000-01, they also constituted 22 per cent of all pupils excluded. The LEA analysis of performance data for minority ethnic groups has identified the two key areas
of focus as being Pakistani children with little English (especially in primary schools) and Black Caribbean pupils’ performance.

The LEA began monitoring for mixed heritage pupils only recently, and are currently tackling any specific issues for mixed heritage pupils, particularly those pupils of White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage origins, within the same programmes that target Black Caribbean pupils, such as Engage\(^1\). Like LEAs 1, 2 and 5, there is a growing awareness of the specific issues facing White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils in terms of invisibility, over-representation in exclusions and underachievement, and a recognition that more work needs to be developed to address their educational needs and experiences at school.

**Overview of participating schools**

National level performance data showed that the White/Black Caribbean group of mixed heritage pupils are underachieving compared with other groups of mixed heritage pupils (see Chapter two). The case studies focused primarily on the White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage group whilst incorporating the experiences of a smaller number of White/Black African and White/Asian mixed heritage pupils. Each of the schools that participated in the study is given a ‘thumbnail sketch’ in Appendix Two.

**Barriers to achievement and ‘high achieving’ schools**

Ten schools, each with 10 per cent or more of mixed heritage pupils (primary) and 5 per cent or more mixed heritage children (secondary) were selected. All schools involved in the study were mixed comprehensives. Two of the case study schools – Schools J (primary) and L (secondary) – were used to pilot research instruments. Four schools (Schools A, D, E and N) that had been relatively successful in raising the achievement of mixed heritage pupils deemed to be at risk of underachieving were selected on the basis of achievement data to be ‘high achieving’ schools. The criteria for selection was that mixed heritage pupils as a group must be doing as well

\(^1\) This is one of ten other LEAs, with large numbers of minority ethnic pupils, involved in EiC/EMAG Pilot Projects, launched by the DfES in February 2002. Seven secondary schools are involved in this LEA. There are 3 strands to the pilot project: 1) is a PSHE/Citizenship programme developed by Dr Tony Sewell of Leeds University entitled ‘Learning to Succeed’, which comprises a ten-week module, and its main objective is to provide a context in which pupils can discuss issues that concern them in school; 2) is concerned with developing curriculum content and resources and to enable schools to select a minimum of two subject areas where they carry out a curriculum audit and purchase resources that take account of Black perspectives and in particular reflect the lives and aspirations of African-Caribbean and mixed heritage young people; and finally; 3) relates to tackling parents and their attitudes to schools, and tries to draw more Black parents into school life.
as all groups within the school and that the school ought to be performing above average for similar schools within the LEA.

In some cases, the participating schools had already been alert to their school’s mixed heritage population and the need to address their specific educational needs and were thus very interested in taking part in this study. Many other schools that met the above criteria were approached about the research but were not able or willing to take part in the study for legitimate reasons. The final selection of schools was the outcome of the criteria stipulated above, as well as willingness to take part and to accommodate the research. Some also saw it as an opportunity to learn more about this ‘invisible’ population in their schools and to tackle some of the emerging, and in some cases, disturbing issues, such as overrepresentation in school exclusions, low achievement and behavioural issues.

**School location and type**

The sample of primary and secondary schools were spread through the north and south of England, including London, and had populations of mixed heritage pupils both in schools where the majority of pupils were from minority ethnic groups (Schools A, D, E, F, G, I, J, M, N) or where minority ethnic groups actually were the minority population in schools (Schools B, C, H, K, L). Where overall numbers of minority ethnic pupils were equal to or outnumbered their White counterparts, these schools were spread throughout the LEAs and were not just situated in London. Some of the sample schools were located in areas with large concentrations of minority ethnic groups (Schools A, E, F, G, I, J, M, N), and the rest were located in formerly traditional ‘White working class’ areas where the demographics were shifting (Schools B, C, D, H, K, L). The level of deprivation in surrounding areas was significantly greater for some schools (Schools A, C, F, G, I, J, K, L, N).

Three of the schools visited were faith schools- School I, a Roman Catholic primary and Schools F and M, both Church of England secondary schools. In the case of the Catholic primary school, there was a cultural shift taking place within the school’s approach to ethnic diversity, whereby once all children were viewed as ‘the same’ from a religious point of view, the school had now to begin monitoring pupils’ achievement and behaviour according to their ethnic background in order to address specific educational needs. Thus, by law, they now were required to see ‘difference’. Both secondary faith schools had a notable focus on the individual as opposed to ethnic group in terms of achievement.

In some of the more deprived areas of school location there was evidence to show that the school was central to the regeneration of the area (School M) or was a central aspect of providing young pupils with security and stability (School H), and in one instance (School A), there was an acknowledgement that in order to tackle pupil underachievement and behavioural issues,
schools had to begin providing wider resources for the local community. The teaching staff at School A, were very keen to establish a Community Centre on school premises, which would house staff with both teaching and learning backgrounds as well as social services provision and public care to co-ordinate with parents/carers and pupils.

The broad classification of schools in terms of performance for all mixed heritage pupils are those schools where the mixed heritage population are either under-achieving (Schools B, C, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M) or doing better than or as well as all other pupils in the school (Schools A, D, E, N). These last four schools are also schools that are doing as well or better than similar schools within the LEA.

The co-ordination of EMAG within the schools varied considerably. Some schools had EMAG or related staff that were not only helpful to this study; they also had a deeper awareness of issues relating to race and ethnicity within the wider society. Some schools were more able to implement policies and practices that targeted minority ethnic groups within schools because there was a senior management team that supported the EMAG staff and their agenda. Additionally, the more successful EMAG co-ordination occurred in schools where it was central to whole school improvement rather than viewed as a marginal issue. There were many schools where the EMAG team and their work in the school was marginalised and unsupported by senior management. These schools often had quite complex behavioural and performance related issues occurring throughout the entire school.

Profile of participating pupils, teachers and parents

Teachers

At each of the case study schools, semi-structured interviews were conducted with Head teachers and/or deputy/assistant head-teachers, a member of the EMAG team wherever possible, and one other teacher either involved in curriculum development or monitoring of performance/achievement. The majority of head-teachers were White with one exception. There were equal numbers of male and female head-teachers at the schools; Schools A, B, C, F, H, M and N had male Head teachers and Schools D, E, G, I, J, K, L had female heads or in one case, there was an acting female Head teacher temporarily in place.

The overall number of teachers that participated in this study was 44. The number of non-White teachers spoken to was 8 and in most cases, these teachers were connected to EMAG or were the equalities officer responsible for ‘race’ and ethnicity issues within the school. The male to female ratio of teachers participating in the study was 4:7.
Pupils

An overall total of 84 pupils participated in this study. All pupils that participated in this study were mixed heritage pupils in either years 6 or 5 at primary schools, and in years 11 or 10 at secondary schools. The pupils were selected at random from these specific years in each school starting with the older pupils first. Equal numbers of boys and girls, and high and low achievers were represented in the school sample where possible. The categories of mixed heritage pupils represented in the research were drawn mostly from the school populations of White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils, as this was the main focus of the research in terms of being identified as the category of mixed heritage pupils most at risk of underachieving. In some schools where there were significant populations of other categories of mixed heritage pupils (Schools E, H and I), namely White/Asian and White/Black African, interviews/focus groups also included pupils from these groups. Table 3.4 shows the overall numbers of White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African and White/Asian pupils, disaggregated by gender and school level.

Table 3.4: Numbers of all categories of mixed heritage pupils interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White/Black Caribbean</th>
<th>White/Black African</th>
<th>White/Asian</th>
<th>Mixed Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (Primary)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Primary)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Secondary)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Secondary)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Secondary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the secondary school pupils were interviewed individually, whereas all of the primary school pupils were interviewed in groups of 5 or in some cases 6 pupils were present. The differentiation in interview method for the two age groups was due to the sensitive nature of aspects of the research, and the perception that such issues relating to school experiences and identity would be more acute for pupils in their teenage years. In some cases, the number of pupils interviewed at schools was lower due to pupil absence on the day.

Whilst there were some salient details provided about the social background of each pupil that may be used as class indicators, it is beyond the scope of this research to assert with absolute confidence the social class of each participating pupil or parent. However, as pupils were asked some indicative questions about household structure and place of residence, we can assert that the majority of pupils spoken to were in fact from lower working class backgrounds and lived in areas of deprivation. A large number of pupils
spoken to were also from single parent homes but certainly not all, and as will be shown in the next chapter, this may be a contributing factor to low teacher expectations.

Parents

Letters were sent to a random sample of parents or carers of mixed heritage pupils from across the entire school population inviting them to a focus group held at each participating school. In some cases the level of participation was very low but this is not only consistent with other studies conducted in schools; it also often reflects the schools' links with parents and their current difficulty to involve parents and carers in school activities. There was a clear numerical distinction between participation in focus groups at secondary schools to those at primary schools, which reflects the normal trend for parents/carers of younger pupils to be more involved. Secondary schools recognise continued parental or carer involvement to be a key issue for overall improvement of pupils performance and behaviour. In a recent OFSTED, one of the schools that participated in this study (School A) had the lowest national attendance figure for parents'/carer's evening, which was duly reflected in non-attendance at our focus group.

The parents were mostly parents of White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils with occasional parents of White/Asian and White/Black African pupils. It should be noted that the parents that did attend the focus groups were not necessarily the parents of the pupils also interviewed in the study. The majority of participants in these focus groups were female and totalled 30, and the total number of males was 5. This either reflected a case of 'traditional' household structure where males were the 'breadwinners' whilst females were the caregivers, and hence, men may not have been available at the time of the focus group. Or, it reflected the number of pupils from single parent households where the principle caregiver was female. Finally, often in more traditional households females take on board the responsibility of dealing with school matters and are often the ones that attend functions or meetings at schools, although this kind of pattern is shifting.

Nineteen of the mothers that participated in the focus groups were White British, although there were also 7 White/Black Caribbean and 4 Black Caribbean mothers that participated. There were 2 Black Caribbean, 1 Black African and 1 White British father that participated. This issue is discussed in more detail in the next chapter alongside data analysis of pupil achievement and experiences at school.
Chapter Four
Mixed Heritage Pupils: Barriers to Achievement and Educational Needs

The aim of this chapter is to investigate the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils through a focus on the barriers to achievement faced by pupils from White/Black Caribbean backgrounds. It will be recalled from chapter one that the decision to focus on this category of mixed heritage pupils is based on the fact that they make up the largest category of mixed heritage pupils and because they are the group most at risk of underachieving. They are also over-represented in school exclusions. The main findings presented in this chapter are based on qualitative analysis of interviews with pupils, parents, teachers and LEA representatives. The barriers to achievement identified for pupils derive from: socio-economic disadvantage; low teacher expectation linked to misunderstandings of mixed heritage identities and backgrounds; and the behavioural issues and attitudes towards achievement linked to peer group pressures.

The chapter also identifies a further set of factors that result in schools not being able to meet the broader educational needs of White/Black Caribbean and indeed all mixed heritage pupils. It will be recalled from chapter one that this broader set of needs relate to the role of schools in helping to develop a recognition and understanding of mixed heritage identities as part of the broader ethnic diversity in society. There is also a need to protect all mixed heritage pupils from racist bullying where this occurs. This further set of factors derive from: the invisibility of mixed heritage pupils at policy levels; the absence of guidelines concerning the appropriate use of terminology to refer to mixed heritage pupils; ineffective monitoring of mixed heritage achievement; a failure to reflect mixed heritage experiences and identities in the curriculum and in the school.

These factors may not necessarily be considered as barriers to achievement in the case of average and high achieving mixed heritage pupils. However, they are a contributing factor to the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils because taken together, they create a climate in which the other barriers mentioned above facing this group of pupils are not addressed by schools. We will develop this argument below. It is also arguably the case that if this further set of factors was recognised by LEAs and schools, then average and high achieving groups of mixed heritage pupils might achieve even better than they are at present.

1 Whilst there is anecdotal evidence from our research that some of these barriers may also affect White/Black African pupils who are also underachieving at secondary school, further research focused on this group of learners is required to investigate this possibility. See chapter six for further research needs in this area.
Barriers to Achievement

The three key barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils are similar to those which have been identified for Black Caribbean pupils: socio-economic disadvantage; low teacher expectations; and behavioural issues and attitudes resulting from peer group pressures (Sewell, 1997; Gillborn and Mirza, 2000; Bhattacharyya et al. 2003). However, and importantly, the findings of our research indicate that, for White/Black Caribbean pupils, these barriers to achievement have distinct and unique attributes including teacher perceptions of White/Black Caribbean pupils as having 'identity issues' and problematic household structures as well as peer group pressure relating to their mixed heritage.

Socio-economic disadvantage

Research has shown that socio-economic background has a key role to play in determining the outcomes of attainment (DfES, 2003a; 2003b). Whilst it is important to note that all ethnic groups experience a wide range of achievement within each group, on average, the higher the social class, the greater the attainment level (Gillborn and Mirza, 2000). The correlation between socio-economic background and attainment is supported by the findings of this research as demonstrated in chapter two, with the lowest achieving mixed heritage pupil group – White/Black Caribbean – experiencing around twice the national average in terms of eligibility for free school meals.

In addition to their high levels of eligibility for free school meals, White/Black Caribbean pupils are also over-represented in the care system, as indeed are mixed heritage children in general. Socio-economic factors have been identified as contributing to low attainment amongst all children in care, whose levels of achievement are significantly worse than among their peers. (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003). According to the EMAS representative in LEA 2, it is believed that the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils in this LEA might be linked to the over-representation of these pupils in the care system. However, it should be noted that this did not arise as an issue in other LEAs. Nor did we interview any pupils who we knew to be in the care system and nor was this issue raised by any of the teachers we interviewed. Nonetheless, in light of the national statistics, it may be the case that over-representation in the care system may be a contributing factor to the low attainment of White/Black Caribbean pupils.

Whilst further research is needed to examine the link between the over-representation of White/Black Caribbean (and other mixed heritage pupils) in the care system and their levels of attainment, it is clear from the quantitative

2 http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/VOL/v000454/index.shtml
3 In 2001-02, just 8 per cent of young people in Year 11 who had spent at least one year in care gained 5 or more GCSEs graded A*-C, compared with 50% of all young people. Almost 50 per cent had no qualifications at GCSE level. Of Year 11 pupils who had been in care for one year or more, 42 per cent did not sit GCSEs or GNVQs, compared to just 4 per cent of all children. (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003).
data in this research that the level of socio-economic disadvantage is a strong factor in influencing levels of achievement for some groups of mixed heritage pupils, particularly those of White/Black Caribbean backgrounds. The majority of schools which participated in the study were situated in areas of social deprivation and had White/Black Caribbean pupil populations who were underachieving and/or over-represented in school exclusions. Indeed, many teachers felt that socio-economic background was a key determinant in the lower achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils:

*I’d say the highest number of young people that we work with have actually got some form of barriers to learning as a result of socioeconomic status.* [Teacher, School B]

*We would say that such a class issue actually is probably a bigger issue here, than race.* [Teacher, School M]

*I think it’s in that order in terms of potential for disengagement from school. It’s not Black boys, it’s poverty, boys and Afro Caribbean boys.* [Head teacher, School A]

Whilst this common perception by teachers supports our own findings concerning the significance of relative levels of social deprivation reported in chapter 2, the focus of many teachers on socio-economic disadvantage as the sole explanation for underachievement obscures the more complex picture of how socio-economic background, ethnicity and gender interact, in this case to determine educational outcomes. Only a minority of teachers demonstrated an appreciation of this more complex picture:

*I think it’s a mixture of things. I don’t think it’s one issue that you can…you know, ‘everyone is in that box and that’s the end of it’. You know we’re not all in one box and the best it’s a 2 dimensional matrix or at the simplest it’s a 2 dimensional matrix, but we know that there are far more dimensions than you can draw.* [Teacher, School M]

The findings of this study point to the fact that underachievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils needs to be understood not simply in terms of socio-economic disadvantage but rather in the way that this factor may work in conjunction with gender and ethnicity to produce barriers to achievement. It will be recalled from chapter two that with regard to gender, for instance, mixed heritage girls perform better than mixed heritage boys, regardless of the specific mixed heritage category. The pattern of minority ethnic girls performing better than minority ethnic boys has also been identified in other studies (Gillborn and Mirza, 2000). However, even when socio-economic background and gender are controlled for, there remain differences in overall achievement between the different groups that can only be explained in relation to their ethnicity. This finding has also been highlighted in studies of achievement of ‘mono heritage’ groups (Gillborn and Mirza, 2000). In brief, when differences in free school meal eligibility are controlled for White/Asian pupils still perform above average whilst White/Black Caribbean pupils underachieve. We will focus on these further barriers to achievement facing
White/Black Caribbean pupils related to their ethnicity in the remainder of the chapter.

**Perceptions and Expectations: Teacher, Pupils and Parents**

This section will explain how teacher perceptions and low expectations of White/Black Caribbean pupils can act as a barrier to achievement. These perceptions are similar to those linked to Black Caribbean pupils in relation to low academic expectations and behavioural issues as well as racial stereotyping. However, our research found that there are also important distinctions amongst teacher perceptions regarding the mixed heritage identities of White/Black Caribbean pupils. These are based on misunderstandings of the barriers to achievement faced by this group including assumptions regarding ‘identity issues’ faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils, the inability of white mothers to deal with these issues and the household structures of White/Black Caribbean pupils. The views of teachers are counterposed to those of pupils and parents concerning these key assumptions. The chapter will illustrate how teacher perceptions and low expectations can have a negative impact on how the pupils themselves perceive their inclusion within the school and their attitudes to achievement.

Teachers often expressed contradictory views related to their expectations of White/Black Caribbean pupils. A pervasive view existed in the case study schools that high expectations and equal opportunities were extended to all pupils in the school without the need to target specific groups. Where specific groups within the school were singled out by teachers as being at risk of underachieving, teachers often correctly singled out Black Caribbean and White working class boys. On the one hand, many exemplified a ‘there is no problem here’ attitude in relation to the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils and the view, not necessarily reflected in the performance data that White/Black Caribbean pupils were doing relatively well in achievement terms compared to all other ethnic groups.

On further probing, however, it became clear that some of the teacher respondents did have low expectations of White/Black Caribbean pupils linked to stereotypes and perceptions of the causes of their underachievement. We discuss these further below. Many pupils and parents interviewed perceived pupils to be over-represented in exclusions from school, a perception that is supported in the national data (see chapter two). Moreover, many pupils and parents cited instances of feeling that some teachers ‘picked on’ or disliked them or their children because of their perceived mixed or Black heritages.

*Well there’s only me and another boy who are like mixed race in that class. And she does sort of pick on him as well but I get it a lot...And I don’t know if that’s because of race or because of who I am, because I don’t, you know, backchat or anything...So maybe it is because of my race.*

[Female Pupil, School A]
We [teacher and pupil] was like arguing at the classroom, and she wants to start cussing me, so I cussed her back, and she said at least she’s fully Black or something like that [...] And the teachers didn’t believe me [...] but then they found out it was true because she had to tell them the truth eventually.

[Female Pupil, School F]

[My son] said his RE teacher once said to him, they were in RE lessons, and she said “oh I don’t believe in the two races mixing”. And he said, mum, it was two of us of mixed race in the class and he said we were both astounded by what she said and they both looked at each other. [Parent, School F]

Many pupil respondents, as well as some teachers, were unconvinced that issues concerning race were or would be dealt with fairly within the school as their experiences led them to believe that no action would be taken:

Pupil: One of my English teachers, she’s always helping the others
Interviewer: She never helps you?
Pupil: Yeah.
Interviewer: And why is that do you think?
Pupil: I think it’s cause of the colour of my skin cause my friends are like the same colour as me and they don’t get help either
[...]
Interviewer: Have you told anybody about that?
Pupil: My friend did.
Interviewer: She told the teacher?
Pupil: Yeah.
Interviewer: What did the teacher do?
Pupil: She says that there’s nothing he can do.
[Female pupil, School D]

As a result, those pupils indicated that they would not opt or had not opted to report what they saw as racial prejudices by teachers to other members of staff. Some pupils, particularly female pupils, tried to develop strategies themselves to cope with these situations:

I don’t like this sort of ... this sounds a bit selfish ... but I don’t like the ones that are horrible to me, I don’t see them as role models. I learn from their mistakes. Like when this teacher’s teaching me, I notice and I think ’I’m not going to be like that when I’m older.’ [...] Cause I learn from what she’s doing. And I don’t think she can see, you know, I think she’s a bit ignorant. Because I think, Why’s she being like that towards me? I haven’t done anything. It’s not my fault if I had an accident, if I miss the lesson, I’ll catch up. [Female Pupil, School A]

However, other pupils, particularly male pupils, tended to disengage from the situation altogether:
Pupil: I don’t even bother going into the lessons.
Interviewer: So it’s all because of this one teacher?
Pupil: Yeah. […]
Interviewer: And have you said anything to [the head teacher]? What’s been her response?
Pupil: Nothing…nothing good anyway. So I thought, don’t come in
Interviewer: How do you feel about all this?
Pupil: I thought it was good ‘cause I get a bit of a lie-in in the morning. [Male Pupil, School, F]

The lack of confidence in some teaching staff regarding unfair treatment in class had an impact on the manner in which pupils addressed wider issues of racial bullying in the school. For example, a number of pupils, particularly male pupils, said that if they were racially bullied, they would take matters into their own hands rather than trusting teachers to deal with the situation effectively:

Interviewer: What would you do if you did start getting bullied?
Pupil: Probably beat them up
[Male Pupil, School D]

[I would] get some cousins […] they would go to school…[and] box them
[Female Pupil, School N]

As a consequence, many pupils and parents expressed the view that they would prefer to see more members of staff from White/Black Caribbean and other minority ethnic backgrounds to reflect the diversity in the school. Also, pupils in particular believed it would be easier to talk to teachers from these backgrounds about their experiences at school.

Interviewer: If you had a problem with pupils or teachers, who would you turn to?
Pupil: Probably Mr…[an African Caribbean teacher]…Cause he’ll understand where I’m coming from and how I feel.
Interviewer: Because he’s black?
Pupil: Yeah. And he would do something about it, I know he would.
[Male Pupil, School B]

However, some pupils and parents expressed the view that the ethnic background of teaching staff did not matter, as long as there was equal treatment. The pupils and parents interviewed frequently indicated that they believed that some teachers had lower expectations for White/Black Caribbean pupils as they often did for Black Caribbean pupils:

You know it’s quite a White dominated school, specially in the higher ranks and where they’re coming from doesn’t mean to say that they’re racist but just I know their outlook perhaps is very different and there’s
been times where he’s come up against sort of things where I’ve sort of thought (..) there’s a little bit of institutional racism in there
[Parent, School G]

I think...they’ll think of anything just to put ... any little thing that a Black person does bad, I think they’ll put it round [...] I don’t think that’s right. We should be treated the same as White people.
[Male pupil, School B]

Even some teachers, whilst keen to stress that all pupils were treated fairly, indicated that some of their colleagues held stereotypical notions relating to the achievement of White/Black Caribbean and Black Caribbean pupils:

Some I know [...] I can say some are definitely racist [...] a lot of it is, well it’s not as blatant I suppose. Times have gone where you know, yes, it would be a blatant comment. But you see by when you work with another teacher, another team teacher, you can see that... oh do you realise that you’re constantly... not picking on that child, but, you know, addressing that child and the way your tone changes when you actually address that child, whether ‘it’s oh bring me your book’ or, you know, ‘come and show me your work’. The tone... or whose name you mention mostly.
[Teacher, school J]

I mean I would be lying if I said that didn’t think that some of the staff don’t have a little underlying racism.
[Teacher, school C]

Whilst low teacher expectations and stereotypes are a barrier to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils as well as Black Caribbean pupils, we found a distinct and important element experienced by White/Black Caribbean pupils, specifically the perception that behavioural issues of some White/Black Caribbean pupils were mainly due to ‘identity’ problems.

Generally the ones that you’ve seen today [are] the ones who haven’t got problems. But a lot of the mixed heritage do have...it’s just to do with identity.
[Teacher at school F]

My suspicions are that there are some pupils in the school who have confused feelings about their identity.
[Teacher, School B]

In general respondents who commented on identity as a barrier to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils did not expand further as there appeared to be an assumption that the ‘mixed’ identity of the pupils was explanation enough. It will be recalled from chapter one that there is a common perception of mixed heritage identities reported in the literature that ‘mixed heritage identity equals a “mixed up” and “confused” identity. This view was not always explicitly expressed by the respondents, although it did
appear implicit in many of their responses, for example in the view that mixed heritage pupils are ‘confused’ by their identity.

Despite these teacher perceptions of the ‘identity issues’ experienced by White/Black Caribbean pupils, all of the pupils interviewed, even those that teachers had confidentially signalled as having ‘identity issues’, demonstrated overwhelmingly distinct and positive senses of their own mixed heritage identities:

*Interviewer:* How do you describe your identity?
*Pupil:* Mixed blessings…it’s just something that me and my brother come up with. ‘Cos you know we think that we’re the best from the black and from the white, so therefore we’re mixed blessings.

[Female Pupil, School A]

*I like being mixed race. There’s nothing wrong with any of us.*

[Male Pupil, School C]

The pupils’ views thus contradicted the teachers’ views regarding their identities. As supported by the findings of some other studies (Wilson, 1987; Phoenix, 1993), any ‘issues’ that the pupils displayed regarding their mixed heritage identities were not as a result of their own negative and confused feelings, but rather an awareness of and frustration with how their mixed background was sometimes perceived.

Additionally, teachers explained the behavioural and achievement issues related to some White/Black Caribbean pupils as stemming from their family environment. Whilst there is little quantitative research on the ethnic backgrounds of the parents of mixed heritage pupils, research into interracial unions and children in the care system in the UK suggest that the majority of mothers of mixed heritage children are of White ethnic backgrounds (Modood et al. 1997; Barn, 1999). This pattern was also identified in our study, where the majority of pupils interviewed indicated that their mothers were White British, whilst their fathers were of African Caribbean heritage. This fits the general picture of mixed heritage parental backgrounds as far as it can currently be discerned (Modood et al. 1997; Census 2001).

The majority of the mothers of White/Black Caribbean pupils in this study were White British. Research suggests that it is a common perception that White/Black Caribbean pupils tend to reside in single parent households where the primary carer, usually the mother, is White although once again, there has been little quantitative work that could qualify this. Indeed, from the information volunteered by the pupils we interviewed, we found evidence that although some pupils, particularly at secondary level, were living in single parent households, this was by no means a majority. However, of the
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4 It should be noted that whilst White/Asian and White/Black African pupil populations are both quite significant, as was made clear in the Introduction, due to the focus on achievement in this project, we decided to concentrate mainly on pupils from White/Black Caribbean backgrounds.

teachers who were asked if they knew what the typical household structure of the White/Black Caribbean pupils in the school was, the majority said that they had the impression that most of the pupils resided solely with their White mother. Several teachers indicated that they thought this household structure caused problems for White/Black Caribbean pupils due to both the greater difficulties that they thought White mothers had in terms of providing the support necessary to counter racism and to raise the racial self-esteem of their children:

*I think it often depends on whether the mother or the father is Black or White because I think the mother often has a significant role in how the children are brought up and I think if the mother is Black I think the children are more likely, not necessarily but I think often they are more likely to be brought up knowing about their Black heritage.*

[Teacher, School J]

Similarly, teachers expressed concerns that in households where the Black father was ‘off site’, White/Black Caribbean pupils – particularly boys – lacked positive male role models. Household structure was perceived by many teachers to contribute to the behavioural issues and achievement attitudes of many White/Black Caribbean pupils.

*when I think here of the behaviour, when I think of the children, you know, behavioural problems [...] if I think of the children in my class [...] the ones where I have problems with, it’s the parents, it’s the mixed race where it is a white mother umm and often where dad’s not around*

[Teacher, School J]

*Some of our mixed heritage pupils will have identity issues. If you ask me to quantify it, I’d say it’s a minority of the mixed heritage pupils within the school. But I am aware that it is an issue for some, and for some families. I’d say that where those issues exist I would describe them more as family issues rather than the issues for the individual child. Because it seems to be that a particular family will have those issues and other families just won’t.*

[Head teacher, School H]

However, the teachers that held the perception that many of the pupils came from White single parent households were unable to provide statistical data or other evidence to support this. Parents and pupils who took part in the study were sensitive to these teacher perceptions:

*She [the headteacher] came up to my mum and my mum didn’t know who she was or anything, she don’t know she was the new head teacher or anything and she went ‘I know what it is like to be a single parent’, before she was introduced to her, and my mum looked at her and she said ‘oh my mum was a single parent too’ and my mum was like ‘how do you know I’m a single parent’, you know just ‘cause my mum was on her own and we are black and why she is saying that,*
'cause mum didn’t even know who she was, she just came up to her and said ’I know what it is like to be a single parent’ [...] I think that is a very prejudiced assumption to make’

[Female Pupil, School D]

But I just think I’m Black and ... I can’t explain because I have my Black culture ... I do have my Black culture more because of my mum ... my mum’s White but she’s been with Black people more, so she’s been brought up with them. So she cooks the same things as them [...] so I don’t see what’s different

[Female pupil, School A]

There was evidence to suggest that all parents involved in the study did have high expectations of their children. However, some teachers indicated that they thought there were actually low expectations amongst the parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils due to household structure, socio-economic background, the parental level of education and general low aspirations. Some teachers also indicated that they thought cultural background influenced parental attitudes towards education and future aspirations for their children, particularly what they often saw as the lower aspirations or lesser involvement of the parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils:

I’m talking about this without having actually looked at the statistics, but my perception is that it tends to be White mothers and Black fathers [who] don’t tend to get involved in the school. [Teacher, School I]

Clearly, these conflicting views have repercussions for schools and parents leading to the situation where parents feel more alienated from the school, which only serves to make it harder for schools to maintain constructive relationships with parents. In chapter five we suggest strategies for more actively involving parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils in their education.

The majority of the parents who attended the interviews were White British mothers of White/Black Caribbean pupils and most of them were aware of the negative perceptions of some teachers and society at large towards mothers of White/Black Caribbean pupils. Whilst a few of the White British mothers who took part in the research seemed to lack awareness of the issues that White/Black Caribbean pupils in the schools indicated they faced – including teacher stereotyping and low expectations, peer group pressures – the vast majority demonstrated high levels of awareness as did most, but not all, of the Black Caribbean parents who attended.

Just as the teachers who participated in this study expressed a wide range of often contradictory views on the barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils, so did the participating parents. This related directly to the individual level of awareness and understanding of ‘race’ related issues and how these might operate within school, particularly with regards to how their children’s mixed heritage identities are perceived. In comparison with the pupils, the parents who participated were less likely to appreciate fully the
nuances of the perceptions experienced by their children at school regarding their mixed heritage identities. Some parents were concerned with the way in which the mixed heritage identities of their children were perceived in the school:

*I think as long as their own self-esteem is good, because you know they can’t learn and progress unless they’ve got high self-esteem. In some situations, there might be mixed race children that are confused about their background, and that might bother them. And if they’re upset about something then that might stop them from learning.*

[Parent, School I]

*[my son’s] really got a sense of his own identity and he is his own person, so I’m just worried that that isn’t being recognised*

[Parent, School G]

Other parents were aware that often their children, particularly boys, were subject to the same teacher expectations and perceptions as Black Caribbean pupils but were not aware of any extra dimensions pertaining to their mixed heritage identities. Some parents did not believe the mixed heritage identity of their children to be salient and were less likely to feel that teachers held stereotyped views and low expectations of their children.

*It doesn’t matter whether they are mixed race or whatever, does it?*

[Parent, School D]

*I’ve brought my children up the same. That they’re mixed race and they should be proud of it. So I’ve never come across any ... problem. On a positive note, generally speaking I don’t see it as a problem. I deal with it as and when it arises. I think it doesn’t matter what colour they are, it’s not an issue [...] You know they have black friends, they have white friends, they have mixed race friends. It’s not ... you know it’s not something that I think they’re probably conscious of.*

[Parent, School K]

Research into mixed heritage identities has shown that many assumptions are made about whether White or Black parents, especially mothers, are better qualified to support the positive identity formation of their children (Twine, 1999). Whilst Black parents are often more able to readily identify with the constant lived experience of race and racism, this is not to say that White mothers are ignorant of this as they themselves tend to become aware of race and racism, due to their having had an ‘interracial’ relationship and mixed heritage children. Moreover, with mixed heritage children often reporting that they have experienced racism or hostility from both of their heritage groups – as was the case for some of the White/Black Caribbean pupils in this study – although Black parents from a ‘mono heritage’ background may be able to give more general support, they may not always be able to identify with this particular type of discrimination.

The above discussion portrays a complex picture of the assumptions of teachers and parents in contrast to the experiences of the White/Black
Caribbean pupils in this study. It highlights how, despite any tangible evidence, some teachers perceive the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils to stem partly from the 'identity issues' that White/Black Caribbean pupils are assumed to have due to their mixed heritage. This is further compounded by the accompanying perceptions of the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils as being causally linked to their coming from fragmented households consisting of a present White mother and an absent Black father. Together, these can foster low teacher expectations of the abilities and potential of White/Black Caribbean pupils. In combination with the peer group pressures experienced by many White/Black Caribbean pupils, especially at secondary school, these teacher perceptions and low expectations can result in challenging school experiences for many White/Black Caribbean pupils. In the next section, we will discuss the peer group pressures mentioned above.

Peer Group Pressures

Research has demonstrated that the influence of peer pressure and youth subcultures can play an important part in shaping Black Caribbean (and potentially, in some cases, Black African) pupil behaviour and attitudes towards achievement (Sewell, 1997, 2000, 2001). It is clear from this study that peer pressure and youth sub-cultures may constitute further barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils. As Sewell has pointed out, Black Caribbean pupils, particularly boys, may experience considerable pressure by their peers to adopt the norms of an ‘urban’ or ‘street’ subculture in which academic interest and success are seen as undesirable and useless (Sewell 1997). We found this to be equally true for White/Black Caribbean heritage pupils in this study, particularly at secondary school and particularly for boys, as they were frequently perceived as ‘Black’ by teachers, peers and the community at large.

There’s a lot of pressure there for them [mixed heritage pupils] to be... having the street credibility. So learning becomes ... what do you call ... it doesn’t become cool to learn, it becomes you know that it’s not ... I don’t want to learn because if I learn then I’m seen as a geek and all the rest of it.
[Teacher, School B]

However, our study suggests that there is an extra dimension to the way in which this peer pressure operates on White/Black Caribbean pupils, particularly boys. It must be understood that peer pressure and youth subcultures are the result of wider social processes and must be considered in this light, not as isolated factors. As chapter one discusses, White/Black Caribbean people experience contradictory pressures with regards to their identity. On the one hand, they are viewed as being ‘caught between two worlds’ in the sense of being ‘neither Black nor White’. On the other, there is a tendency for them to be viewed as Black Caribbean and rarely as White.
Whilst all the pupils interviewed in this study expressed distinct and positive attitudes towards their mixed heritage identities, as illustrated earlier, some pupils also reported negative incidents involving both White and Black pupils regarding their mixed heritage backgrounds. This often took the form of name-calling or taunting about being ‘mixed’:

_They’ll call like - if you’re like having an argument or something – like, ‘you mixed, you…’ or ‘half-breed’. _

[Female Pupil, School D]

_I’ve had names called at me though…like half-breed, stuff like that._

[Male Pupil, School F]

_It’s mostly white people that cuss me and stuff. That makes me annoyed and stuff. They don’t need to know what you are really. It’s not what you look like. Some people could be like black but they could be really pale. Their mum, their dad could be black but like really pale. They could be like that. You could say you are mixed race and white people will cuss you and black people will cuss you._

[Male Pupil, School E]

_Like one time this argument I was having and he was trying to talk to me and I didn’t want to talk to him. And he went to go and touch me and I said “don’t touch me”. And he said, “oh you mixed race girls are all bitches, ra,ra,ra” and stupidness [...] because they say that white girls let off easy, so that’s why,’ cause we’re half white. That’s why. They don’t say it about black girls but they say it about mixed race girls._

[Female Pupil, School F]

These wider pressures have significant implications for the behavioural and achievement attitudes of White/Black Caribbean pupils. As the dominant peer group sub-culture in many schools was perceived as a ‘Black street culture’, pupils of all ethnic groups were subject to its influence, to varying degrees. High achievement or efforts to succeed were viewed as contrary to the values of this dominant sub-culture and credence was given to unruly behaviour with teachers and antagonistic behaviour with other pupils. Often high achievement attitudes and co-operative behaviour were more associated with a particular class-based notion of ‘Whiteness’, which was understood as ‘posh’ and/or ‘geeky’.

Given the contradictory pressures outlined above, even though White/Black Caribbean pupils are often seen as Black, there are frequent challenges to prove this by their peers. Indeed, according to a consultant in LEA 2, there may be more pressure for mixed heritage pupils, particularly boys at secondary school, to adopt ‘extreme’ behaviour or stances in order to ‘prove’ their Blackness and be accepted by the peer group, which puts them in confrontational situations with teachers:
When they choose to show that they are Black and demonstrate sort of, you know, Black behaviours which are extreme, when that happens it puts them into conflict totally with the school and they have behavioural difficulties. I mean obviously there may be some children who have got sort of like learning difficulties, but.... in general, it’s all about, it’s all about super-expression of identity and behaviour and so on. What’s called....compensatory behaviour, [Head of EMAS, LEA 2]

There is evidence from this study that for some White/Black Caribbean pupils, particularly boys, a strong rejection of those norms that view academic participation as essential and beneficial in order to fit in with a peer group culture in which strong and even antagonistic displays of masculinity are valued and high academic aspirations are considered as weak and ‘feminine’.

I think there’s still a little bit of a legacy that says you can survive in [this school] if you’re Black. And you’re tough. Or you’re mixed race and tough. And I think there’s still a lot of that. And most of our kids of ethnic minorities or of mixed race, I would argue tend to be tougher characters than those who are weaker characters. Umm so to some extent, some of the White boys would not challenge some of the kids that, you know, who are Black or Asian and White. So I think there is a sense in which they wouldn’t sort of take them on in a sense. [Teacher, School L]

It should be noted that this form of peer group pressure on White/Black Caribbean pupils was only evident at secondary schools in this study. Given the transitional process taking place for pupils of secondary school age in terms of sexuality and adulthood, it is not surprising that these pressures were not present at primary school, as far as this research could confirm. It is at secondary school where pupil relationships become more complex both in terms of friendship and dating as well as expressions of identity relating to clothes, music, appearance, and leisure activities.

In relation to the particularly masculine form of dominant ‘street culture’ outlined earlier, White/Black Caribbean male pupils are at a greater disadvantage than White/Black Caribbean female pupils. This gender pattern has similarly been well documented for pupils from Black Caribbean backgrounds (Sewell, 1997). However, it should be noted that White/Black Caribbean female pupils are also susceptible to these dominant peer group pressures, although the overriding picture emerging from the testimony of teachers and pupils is that these pressures are more acute for boys, as reflected in the achievement and exclusion data. Whilst there was an indication, as touched upon in previous research (Youdell, 2003), that White/Black Caribbean female pupils experienced pressure from the dominant peer group in relation to ‘appearance’ and ‘sexuality’ – e.g. regarding hairstyles, skin tone, clothing styles, friendships and relationships – it is beyond the scope of this project to present any conclusive findings. Further
research needs to be conducted in this area in order to ensure that the experiences of White/Black Caribbean girls are not overlooked.

We have demonstrated in the above sections that the barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils derive from: socio-economic disadvantage; low teacher expectation linked to misunderstandings of mixed heritage identities and backgrounds; and the behavioural issues and attitudes towards achievement linked to peer group pressures. By highlighting the barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils, we are also able to identify a broader set of educational needs, which are also applicable to other mixed heritage, and ‘mono-heritage’, pupil groups. The next section addresses these needs.

Understanding the Educational Needs of Mixed Heritage Pupils.

This section will present factors associated with the extent to which schools address the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils based on interviews with LEA representatives, teachers, pupils and parents. These factors are in addition to the specific barriers to achievement outlined above. We should reiterate that we are not arguing that these factors necessarily operate as barriers to achievement for all groups of mixed heritage pupils although in the case of White/Black Caribbean pupils, they contribute to a situation in which the barriers identified in the first part of the chapter are not adequately addressed. We do argue, however, that they should be addressed for all pupils regardless of achievement performance as part of a broader educational entitlement.

Policy Visibility

In line with the small body of research focused on the educational needs of all categories of mixed heritage pupils in the USA (Wardle, 1999), we found that although there was an occasional awareness of the needs of this group amongst individual respondents, there was an almost total neglect of this category of pupils, both at the level of LEA and school policy. This was the case across the whole sample of LEAs and schools, including both the randomly selected schools and the high achieving schools. Despite the introduction of the PLASC categories in 2002, mixed heritage pupils remain largely invisible whether in terms of identification and monitoring or support and strategies to raise achievement. Rather, we found that White/Black Caribbean pupils were included in strategies targeted at Black Caribbean pupils. Where strategies for Black Caribbean pupils were successfully in place, White/Black Caribbean pupils were also included in mentoring schemes, forms of supplementary education and initiatives that sought to affirm Black histories and experiences in the curriculum. As many White/Black Caribbean pupils were strongly able to identify with their Black Caribbean
heritages, they also benefited from these strategies. However, as discussed in the previous sections, despite the strong similarities in the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean and Black Caribbean pupils there remain some barriers to achievement that are specific to White/Black Caribbean pupils. As a result, whilst the invisibility of mixed heritage pupils at policy level does not in itself constitute a barrier to achievement, as demonstrated by the high achievement levels of White/Asian pupils, without policy visibility, the distinct forms of the barriers to achievement for those groups of mixed heritage pupils who are underachieving, such as White/Black Caribbean, cannot be targeted. We will now highlight important aspects of the policy invisibility of mixed heritage pupils.

Language

Even within the official discourse employed by school and LEA personnel, there remains a good deal of ambiguity in describing pupils from mixed heritage backgrounds. As one teacher respondent put it:

Well it's interesting straight away that you call them ‘mixed heritage’, because that in itself is an issue … it varies from one place to another as to what's appropriate.
[Teacher at school J]

Many teacher and LEA respondents used the term ‘dual heritage’ or ‘mixed race’ rather than ‘mixed heritage’, whereas pupils and parents mostly used ‘mixed race’. Many pupils and parents had never heard of the term ‘mixed heritage’ before the interviews and didn’t consider it to be a term they would use, considering it an ‘official’ term rather than one that described their lived experiences:

It’s one of those long scientific words I don’t really understand.
[Male Pupil, School G]

Interestingly, ‘half-caste’ was used by quite a few of the pupils and parents as an acceptable identity term, although most respondents considered it to be inappropriate and derogatory:

My sister, she hates it when people say half-caste, she hates it so much […] She says…you’re half African Caribbean and you’re half English and caste means to be chucked out, so you’re being chucked out of Black and White. And that’s what she doesn’t like, so say mixed race….
[Female pupil, School B]

I don’t like half-caste ‘cos it’s classing it yeah? It’s like, oh, we’re second class, not best and all that.
[Male Pupil, School B]
On the one hand, this language ambiguity reflects some of the conceptual and ethical difficulties associated with naming mixed heritage people that were discussed in chapter one. It also indicates the difficulties that may arise from the fact that official categories, such as those used to gather pupil level data, are subject to sometimes rapid change or are contrary to those used by people in their everyday lives. More so than with other groups, however, the absence of a debate about appropriate terminology was noted by some teacher respondents who admitted feeling unsure and even uncomfortable in what terminology to use.

LEA policy

All the LEAs in our study were chosen because they contained relatively high proportions of mixed heritage pupils (see chapter 3). However, we found little evidence that across the LEAs there was any great awareness of the needs of mixed heritage pupils, as the following quote encapsulates:

*I think I have to be honest with you that at an LEA level, the level of awareness of mixed race children, their needs, their issues, problems... is very low.*

[Head of EMAS, LEA 1]

Although this was the case generally at LEA level, there was a growing awareness, amongst the heads of the ethnic minority achievement services interviewed in this study, of the growing significance of this group in numerical terms and of the achievement issues faced by some mixed heritage pupils. Even prior to PLASC, most of the LEAs we visited had been collecting data relating specifically to mixed heritage achievement, albeit under a range of headings such as Black Other. The EMAS officials we interviewed were also aware of the over-representation of mixed heritage pupils in permanent and fixed term exclusions and in behavioural referral units. There were also expressions of concern about the increasing anecdotal evidence from schools regarding the behavioural and other difficulties experienced particularly by White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils. Indeed, some of the LEA officials had a very detailed understanding of the specific issues facing some mixed heritage pupils, including the alarming numbers of mixed heritage pupils who are cared for and the role that gender and socio-economic background play in shaping their behaviour and responses to school and their peers. In relation to the former, this led to recognition of the importance of working with other service providers, such as social services, in tackling problems facing mixed heritage pupils who are also cared for. In relation to the latter, there was an awareness of the need to develop gender sensitive interventions.

There was, however, little evidence that these insights had been converted into concrete practice in the form of specific LEA strategies. Examples of
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6 This is exemplified, in the changing ways in people of Caribbean origin are described in official language as African Caribbean and Black Caribbean
some broad approaches to raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, based on recent research into the use of the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) are given in the next chapter as are some examples of isolated instances of good practice in raising the achievement of mixed heritage pupils specifically.

School policy

Across all the schools we visited, including the high achieving schools, awareness of the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils was limited amongst the teachers we spoke to and tended to be isolated amongst senior managers and specialist EMAS staff. Amongst these members of staff, there was awareness that White/Black Caribbean mixed heritage pupils were in danger of underachieving at a national level, although this awareness was not uniformly shared. Unsurprisingly, given the lack of awareness of their educational needs, policies and strategies specifically targeting underachieving mixed heritage pupils were also limited. Although there were isolated exceptions where mixed heritage issues were reflected in school policy (see chapter five), for the most part, references to mixed heritage pupils were absent from school improvement plans and school targets. This was despite the fact that other groups at risk of underachieving, including Black Caribbean pupils and pupils for whom English is an additional language, were sometimes specifically mentioned; although even here, references were often limited to the high achieving schools that tended to have effective data collection and target setting mechanisms in place.

Mention of mixed heritage pupils as a specific group was not made either in any of the schools’ race equality or equal opportunities policies, vision or mission statements. This observation needs some qualification for it was also the case that other individual minority ethnic groups were not mentioned either. Rather, the tendency in these documents was towards general statements affirming the commitment of the school to have high expectations and to treat all groups equally and to promote an ethos of respect for all cultures in the school. Taken as a whole, however, school policy documents were phrased in a way that committed the school to acknowledging the experiences and backgrounds of ‘mono heritage’ groups, but certainly not all. In other words, no recognition was made in these documents of the fact that many pupils within the schools we visited came from mixed heritage backgrounds and of the possibility that these groups may have specific needs that differed to those of ‘mono heritage’ minority ethnic pupils.

In the case of the two schools that are participating in Aiming High: Raising African Caribbean Achievement, no mention was made of mixed heritage pupils in the action plans that the participating schools were asked to prepare. The almost total silence in school policy in relation to mixed heritage pupils and their needs was explained in typical terms in the following quotes:
We don’t look at our mixed race children as being particularly an ethnic minority really. We’ve sort of been looking more at African-Caribbean pupils]
[Teacher, School G]

It doesn't come up in any sense as a kind of cause for concern if you like, other than...identity and so on, but in terms of ability and achievement it's not raised to my knowledge as an issue. Whereas you are reminded constantly about African Caribbean boys and...it's not often that we would be talking about mixed heritage as a concern
[Head teacher, School J]

Even where issues such as the achievement and identity of mixed heritage pupils were recognised in general terms, there was little awareness of how these might impact or be engaged with at the level of the individual school as was discussed previously.

Curriculum Representation

Acknowledging and representing the diversity in British society within the school environment is now well established as a means of countering institutional racism and helping to raise the achievement of minority ethnic pupils by giving them access to a more equal curriculum (Blair et al, 1998). However, in many schools, we found a distinct lack of formal and informal inclusion of minority ethnic people within the curriculum and general school environment. Moreover, even in schools where diversity was readily and creatively acknowledged, mixed heritage identities were not evident within the school curriculum or environment, even though the mixed heritage populations were often one of the largest minority ethnic pupil groups in the school.

Although many pupils had created a clear and distinct sense of their mixed heritage identities, they demonstrated an awareness of their mixed heritage invisibility within the school curriculum and culture.

But we don’t hear about people that are like us [...] Probably because people just don’t bother about those things
[Male pupil, School N]

Most of the schools acknowledged Black History Month⁷ as their contribution to addressing the lack of minority ethnic representation in the curriculum, by organising various African, Caribbean and Asian culinary, musical and theatrical activities as well as projects that involved looking at famous figures
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⁷ Black History Month is held every October in Britain in order to promote knowledge of black history and experience, to disseminate information on positive black contributions to British society and to heighten the confidence and awareness of black people in their cultural heritage <http://black-history-month.co.uk>
from non-White backgrounds. Whilst many pupils enjoyed the opportunity to explore parts of their heritage not often reflected in schools, such as their Caribbean or Asian background, they also said that they would like this to be more central to their schooling.

*When I was in Year 9 I said to my teacher, I said to my History teacher, at the end of the day I said, ‘Miss, how come we don’t do about Black history that much?’ Cos’ I’m interested in Black history and stuff like that, I like to read books about it and stuff. Yeah? And she says ‘I don’t know, cos’ it’s not in the curriculum.*

[Male Pupil, School B]

This view was supported by senior advisors from LEA 6, who believed that Black History Month was at best a small step in the right direction as it tended to marginalize the experiences and heritages of minority ethnic groups rather than reflecting their normality. Indeed, many of the pupils expressed a desire to have specific acknowledgement of their mixed heritage backgrounds alongside White and other ‘mono heritage’ backgrounds:

*It would be nice. You'd feel more settled, you'd feel like you're different. Well you are different from everyone else but you just feel more settled if you had ---I think you feel more aware that you're different if there aren’t any pictures of families that are mixed race in the books*

[Female pupil, school J]

All the pupils said that talking with the researcher was the first time they had had the chance to talk about their mixed heritage identities within the school environment. The majority indicated that they had enjoyed being able to do so and some said that they would like to be able to do so again. Some Yr 11 pupils thought that it would be beneficial for younger pupils to be able to talk about their identities, as a means of supporting their transition from primary to secondary school.

*I think for the younger children [it would help them] maybe like fitting in and stuff cause they might feel like out of place and stuff [...] I’m in year eleven and stuff. I haven’t really had no problems so that’s fine [...] But I can understand with them coming especially people in their first year or second year and making friends and stuff it would make them be more aware of like mixed race people and stuff and more opportunities*

[Female Pupil, School B]

Whilst there were also some pupils that said they would like to have more opportunity to talk about their mixed heritage backgrounds, they were keen that ‘a big deal’ should not be made out of it. More so than primary school pupils, secondary school pupils were much more likely to be aware of their invisibility within the school and expressed a desire for this situation to change. Although girls tended to be more articulate on the subject than boys, there was no significant difference in terms of gender between those who
expressed dissatisfaction with the invisibility of their mixed heritage identities and those who were aware of the invisibility but didn’t believe that anything should or would be done to address it.

A related issue to curriculum representation is the lack of available resources for schools that can address the invisibility of mixed heritage identities and experiences. Several teachers who demonstrated an awareness of this issue were frustrated by the limitations of the White European focus within the curriculum and believed this to be a significant barrier to learning for all pupils, regardless of ethnic background.

The barriers to achievement for White/Black Caribbean pupils and the factors highlighted in this section that contribute to these were spread throughout the entire sample of schools. These barriers and factors were also present in the achieving schools but, as the next chapter will demonstrate, existing strategies and processes in these schools, particularly those aimed at raising the achievement of Black Caribbean pupils, helped to mitigate their worst effects. Furthermore, these barriers to achievement pertain to both primary and secondary schools although, as has been highlighted throughout the chapter, some elements of these - especially those relating to particular forms of peer group interactions – are more acute at secondary schools. The prevalence of these barriers at secondary school is also indicated by the drop in attainment between KS2 and KS3 for White/Black Caribbean pupils.

This chapter has focused on the main barriers to achievement for mixed heritage pupils as identified from an analysis of the interview data with pupils, parents, teachers and LEA officials as well as an analysis of school and LEA document materials. The next chapter looks at ways in which these barriers to achievement for mixed heritage pupils can be tackled, drawing on examples from some of the schools where mixed heritage pupils of all categories were highly achieving.
Chapter Five

Making the Invisible Visible: Towards a Whole School Approach that Includes Mixed Heritage Pupils

We do talk about mixed-heritage and it is not something to be ignored. It’s a natural thing, it is there. Over the centuries, we are all mixed in a way.

[Head teacher School N]

Introduction

In the last chapter we explained how mixed heritage pupils are for the most part invisible from school and LEA policy and that as a consequence of this, their specific needs are not being fully met within the educational system. In the case of pupils of White/Black Caribbean origin, the absence of strategies to counter the specific barriers to achievement faced by this group can be understood as a contributing factor to their underachievement. As a prelude to this chapter, it is worth revisiting the main threads of the argument that we introduced in chapter four.

In chapter four we acknowledged that the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils are similar to those faced by Black Caribbean pupils. We also demonstrated that there were distinct aspects to these barriers for White/Black Caribbean pupils, such as teacher perceptions of White/Black Caribbean pupils as having ‘identity issues’ and problematic household structures, as well as peer group pressure relating to their mixed heritage. However, we suggest below that in schools where they did have successful strategies that targeted Black Caribbean pupils at risk of underachieving, often the White/Black Caribbean pupils would be included and would reap some benefit.

One starting point for our discussion in this chapter then is to suggest that the strategies that have been found to be effective in raising the achievement of Black Caribbean pupils need to be extended to all contexts where White/Black Caribbean pupils are present. However, both the strategies targeted at Black Caribbean pupils and the model of effective practice that underpins these strategies needs to be modified in order to be more sensitive to the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils. For example, a holistic approach to tackling the underachievement and meeting the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils also means providing opportunities for all pupils, parents and teachers to learn more about the histories and experiences of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage people, to have access to mixed heritage as well as other minority ethnic role models and to have ‘mixed’ identities affirmed in the curriculum, in wall displays and through other activities of the school.

Developing strategies to accurately and comprehensively reflect mixed
heritage identities would benefit White/Black Caribbean pupils through providing a learning context in which negative stereotypes of White/Black Caribbean people can fuel racism and prejudice and serve as an additional barrier to achievement for this group. It would also assist in meeting the educational needs of all mixed heritage pupils (including White/Black Caribbean, White/Black Africa and White/Asian) who might also experience forms of racism and prejudice based on misconceptions of their identities. Although we argued in chapter four that in many cases, the current lack of recognition of the mixed identities of these other groups may not prove a decisive barrier to their achievement, at the very least schools have an obligation in terms of the Race Relations Amendment Act to tackle all forms of discrimination based on race, including discrimination faced by this larger group of mixed heritage pupils.

In this respect, meeting the educational needs of mixed and ‘mono’ heritage learners involves more than tackling the potential barriers to achievement that these groups may or may not face (although this is the focus of the present study). It also involves producing rounded and confident citizens that are comfortable with their own identities and able to operate effectively within a diverse society. Mixed heritage pupils, like all pupils, would benefit from having their identities affirmed within the context of a wider diversity that still perceives ethnic identities largely in ‘mono-heritage’ terms. Thus although the focus of this chapter and indeed of the report as a whole is primarily on tackling the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils, this issue is itself linked and is an aspect of this wider issue.

As was mentioned in the introduction, examples of effective practice for raising the educational achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils and meeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils as a whole were limited even in the ‘high achieving’ schools\(^1\). Nonetheless, we did find examples of effective practice scattered across the entire sample of schools and LEAs and we report on some of these below in the form of vignettes.

**The existing model of effective practice**

Much of the evidence from the present study confirms what is already known about raising the achievement of minority ethnic groups at risk of underachieving and about the need for a whole school approach. The elements of such an approach have been recently outlined by the DfES and form the basis for the *Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils* project\(^2\). The elements of effective practice outlined in the project are:

---

\(^1\) It will be recalled from chapter one that the definition of a high achieving school for the purposes of the present research is one where mixed heritage pupils were doing at least as well as all pupils and the school itself was performing at least as well as similar schools in the LEA.

\(^2\) The *African-Caribbean Achievement* project which forms a major plank of the *Aiming High* agenda is, at the time of writing, being implemented in thirty secondary schools across England that contain 10% or more Black pupils, including White/Black Caribbean and Black African heritage. Two of the schools that we visited were involved in *Aiming High* (see chapter three).
• **Strong leadership:** The headteacher and senior teachers lead an effective strategy that is applied across the whole school

• **Effective teaching and learning:** Lessons are planned and delivered as effectively as possible, with support provided for bilingual pupils. And teachers are able to reflect the cultures and identities of the communities represented in the school in their lessons

• **High expectations:** Every pupil is expected and encouraged to achieve their potential by teachers and parents. These expectations are underpinned by the practical use of data and monitoring. Policies and exam results are monitored for their effect on particular groups of pupils to pinpoint and tackle underperformance

• **Ethos of respect with a clear approach to racism and bad behaviour:** There is a strong ethos and culture of mutual respect where pupils are able to have their voices heard. There are clear and consistent approaches to bad behaviour, bullying and tackling racism across the whole school with a focus on prevention

• **Parental involvement:** Parents and the wider community are positively encouraged to play a full part in the life and development of the school.

(DfES, 2003 a)

In the sections below and drawing on our research findings, we suggest that taking account of the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils requires a revision of some of these elements of effective practice. It also requires thinking in some instances beyond the status quo represented by this model. To begin with, it requires putting issues relating to mixed heritage pupils onto the educational agenda of the DfES, LEAs and schools. Moving beyond the existing model also means embracing a ‘sixth element’ namely that of a ‘learning school’. In some respects this element goes to the heart of a whole school approach and is based on the idea of continuous school improvement. Taking on board this element means being perceptive to the rapidly changing demographic realities of modern Britain, being prepared to embrace new strategies at school level for dealing with these realities and being able to implement both bottom up and top down approaches to change.

**Putting the Needs of Mixed Heritage Pupils on the Agenda**

It was suggested in the last chapter that a contributing factor to under-achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils is their general invisibility from policy at LEA and school level. Through making their needs explicit, policy makers at the national and local level can begin to draw the attention of
practitioners to the barriers to achievement faced by this group and appropriate strategies for overcoming these barriers. Policy makers need to be aware, however, of some of the political and other sensitivities surrounding issues related to mixed heritage pupils, as discussed in chapter one. The implication of these sensitivities for policy makers is that there is a need to target simultaneously White/Black Caribbean pupils both as Black pupils and as a sub-group of Black pupils with specific needs.

Policy makers also have to take into account the reality that many teachers are only just beginning to come to terms with existing policies targeted at ‘mono heritage’, minority ethnic groups. This is in a context too where there is a widespread feeling amongst some teachers as we reported in chapter four, that the major achievement issue in our education system relates to pupils from socially deprived backgrounds, particularly white working class boys. Some teaching staff feel that there is an over-emphasis on the achievement of minority groups whilst little is being done to address the needs of this larger group (see also DfES, 2003 b). The view of the DfES is that the needs of all pupils should be addressed, including majority and minority ‘mono-heritage’ pupils. We suggest that this view needs to be further extended to include mixed heritage pupils.

Nonetheless, policy makers need to be sensitive to the barriers to implementing change at school level including teacher resistance to change in a context where there are increasing demands being placed on schools. In this respect, as the literature on effective change reminds us (see, for example, Fullan, 2002), effective strategies and innovations in education require that those initiating change must clearly demonstrate to teachers the relevance, practicality and need for change. This can be achieved through presenting in as clear a form as possible the facts relating to the demographic size, the relative achievement and patterns of exclusion from school of different mixed heritage groups along with whatever information is available about the barriers to achievement faced by groups and effective strategies for overcoming these barriers. Policy makers also, however, need to be proactive in taking steps to build the capacity in schools to manage whatever changes are required including, for instance, appropriate training for managers and teachers and making available the resources required to support change. We develop some of these ideas below.

i) DfES Policy

The DfES has a key role to play in putting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils onto the agenda of LEAs and schools and in particular to create an awareness of the needs of those most at risk of underachieving, namely White/Black Caribbean pupils. To some extent the DfES has begun to address the barriers to achievement faced by this group, for example, through their inclusion in the Aiming High project and this research. We discuss and develop examples of how the DfES might further develop and extend its role in the sections below and we make specific recommendations based on our
discussion in chapter six. Briefly, the role of DfES can be summarised as follows:

- Provide clear guidance to schools about the barriers to achievement faced by, in particular, White/Black Caribbean pupils and appropriate strategies for overcoming these barriers within an overall emphasis on the barriers to achievement faced by Black and minority ethnic learners.
- Set targets for schools and LEAs to meet to raise the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils.
- Provide clear and unambiguous directives to schools about the use of language and terminology to refer to mixed heritage pupils and be consistent in the use of appropriate terminology in its own policy documents.
- Work in partnership with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) to ensure that both mixed and ‘mono’ heritage identities and experiences are reflected in the national curriculum.
- Work with educational publishers to ensure that mixed and ‘mono’ heritage identities and experiences are reflected in educational materials used by schools including pictures and text.

In developing its role in relation to the achievement of mixed heritage pupils, the DfES would benefit from processes of wider consultation with relevant stakeholders in the field of race equality including mixed heritage charities such as People in Harmony (PIH), the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the Runnymede Trust. This could take the form of discussions over the use of appropriate terminology to use in relation to mixed heritage pupils, issuing of advice and guidance to schools and developing appropriate curriculum and learning materials. PIH in particular brings an understanding of the history and issues facing mixed heritage people in the UK to public attention and has developed a range of resources to achieve this that the government, LEAs and schools could effectively draw on. Some of these are available on the PIH website:

http://www.pih.org.uk/

ii) LEA Policy

**The strategic role of the LEA.**

Some isolated examples of pilot projects were found in three of the LEAs we visited.

- LEA 5 was supporting the development of curriculum resources that presented positive role models of people of White/Black Caribbean origin such as Bob Marley as part of an LEA wide uptake of Black History Month.
- The same LEA had conducted in-service training sessions for teachers and governors focusing specifically on the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils.
LEA 2 was also supporting a pilot project that had yet to be launched in a school to provide a forum for White/Black Caribbean pupils to share and explore issues of identity.

LEA 6 is attempting to address the lack of resources in its schools by providing a sum of money specifically to purchase books and other materials reflecting both Black and White/Black Caribbean heritages.

Although it is too early to assess the effectiveness of these pilot projects in raising achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils, they do indicate a growing awareness of the needs of this group and are worthy of further study in the future.

Although we reported in chapter four that there is a lack of initiatives and strategies at LEA level to meet the needs of mixed heritage pupils, we also reported an increasing awareness amongst the heads of the ethnic minority achievement services of the growing numbers of White/Black Caribbean pupils in particular, of the achievement issues faced by this group and of their over-representation in school exclusions.

The examples of LEA initiatives cited above, although very much in a pilot stage, illustrate the important role that LEAs can potentially play in supporting school initiatives to tackle the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils. The role of the LEA can go further, however, than these isolated examples suggest. Recent research (Tikly, Osler & Hill, 2002) into the use of the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant by LEAs has demonstrated the role that effective LEAs can play in raising the attainment of groups at risk of underachieving. Key elements of this strategic role that could potentially be of relevance for White/Black Caribbean pupils are:

- Supporting schools to review their performance, set targets and monitor achievement for groups at risk of underachieving (including White/Black Caribbean pupils).
- Collating and disseminating effective practice for raising achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils across the LEA as part of a strategy to raise the achievement of other Black and minority ethnic pupils.
- Helping schools to improve the school management practices for supporting Black and minority ethnic pupils at risk of underachieving (including White/Black Caribbean pupils).
- Supporting supplementary educational opportunities (in this case opportunities that target White/Black Caribbean pupils as part of a wider group of Black learners);
- Helping schools to provide mentoring support for pupils, particularly at GCSE (including support for White/Black Caribbean pupils as part of a wider group of Black pupils);
- Supporting schools in devising strategies to work with White/Black Caribbean parents as a wider group of Black pupils.

In addition to the above, and based on our conversations with LEA EMAS advisors, there are further possible strategies that could potentially have a
specific impact on the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils. It was suggested in chapter four that there is a widespread perception that White/Black Caribbean pupils are more likely to come from fragmented home backgrounds. There was also a concern raised in LEA 2 regarding the over-representation of White/Black Caribbean pupils who are cared for by the local authority. More detailed information is required about this. If this were indeed found to be the case, however, then a possible strategy for LEAs would be to encourage a multi-agency approach to tackling the problems faced by those categories of mixed heritage pupils considered to be broadly ‘at risk’ of social exclusion including underachievement at school. LEAs could encourage schools to develop links with social service and housing departments, as well as the police and to share information about White/Black Caribbean pupils who are particularly at risk.

A concern raised by several respondents in schools and LEAs is the lack of information and resources relating to the experiences and needs of mixed heritage people. LEAs could liaise with national organisations of mixed heritage people such as People in Harmony and local organisations where these exist, to access resources and to develop appropriate strategies for meeting the needs of mixed heritage pupils.

iii) School policy

In chapter four we reported that whilst school policy statements expressed an often genuine commitment to tackle discrimination, racism and underachievement, these phenomena were expressed and understood in ‘mono heritage’ terms, i.e. in terms that did not acknowledge the existence of mixed heritage identities in the school or the specific barriers to learning faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils. The barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils can only begin to be effectively tackled once the needs of this group are reflected in school policy and practice. This needs to be part of a wider whole school approach to tackling the underachievement of Black and other minority ethnic groups but also needs to take account of the specific needs faced by White/Black Caribbean learners.

Besides the DfES and LEAs, schools themselves can take a lead in providing greater recognition of the barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils. For example, it will be suggested below that the terminology used to describe White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils is an important consideration when it comes to drafting school policies and that the process of drafting more inclusive policies may itself help to raise awareness of the issues facing these learners. Including different mixed heritage pupils as distinctive groups within the broader group of Black and minority ethnic learners and describing White/Black Caribbean pupils as examples of learners that may suffer discrimination and underachievement in race equality and equal opportunity statements, may help to demonstrate to White/Black Caribbean pupils and their parents that the school is aware of and cares about their needs.
Making the invisible visible. School K, had become aware of the underachievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils and had included a target in the school's development plan for this coming year to determine what the educational needs of this group of pupils are by carefully monitoring their performance across a range of subjects.

School ‘K’ above provided an isolated example of a school where the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils were beginning to be addressed. Including the needs of these pupils in the form of specific targets and/or strategic goals in school development and strategic planning can be one of the most effective ways for a school to express a genuine concern. We have already suggested that LEAs might have a significant role in supporting schools to develop appropriate targets and goals.

The Importance of Leadership and Leadership Styles

Perceptions of effective leadership for raising mixed heritage achievement: A teacher in School E provided a very nice summary of effective leadership from a teacher’s point of view in the following description of her head teacher:

I think that she’s always got a vision. And she has an idea of what she wants to happen. As for how we go about it she’s quite open to opinion. I think that she wants to get from A to B but how we go about it is kind of a school issue. And I think she’s happy to work around it as long as we get to that vision.

Likewise, we felt that the following quote from a White/Black Caribbean pupil in school K effectively puts across how effective leadership appeared to many of the pupils that we interviewed:

The head teacher and everything was like yeah you know, we want to give you the best opportunities. And the heads of years were like that as well. They help you, they want you to do your best. And cos you’re in Year 11 they’re pushing you more to get your coursework done and everything.

Although we have suggested that effective leadership is a responsibility at a number of levels, we agree with the thrust of much of the existing research (Blair et al, 1998; Runnymede Trust, 1998; OFSTED, 2002a,b; Bhattacharyyarah et al, 2003) that has consistently identified school leadership as having a critical role to play in raising awareness of minority ethnic achievement as an issue, identifying and implementing effective strategies to tackle underachievement, working with partners including parents and governors to implement policy and creating a school culture of respect for
Leadership and vision are crucial to raising standards and aspirations. Well-led schools provide the best educational experience and the highest standards for their pupils. Headteachers, governors and school management teams (as well as middle managers) must therefore understand the issues around minority ethnic achievement. (p. 15)

As noted in chapter four, with few exceptions, none of the head teachers in any of the schools we visited explicitly demonstrated an awareness of the educational needs of pupils of White/Black Caribbean origin or of mixed heritage pupils more generally. Nonetheless, many of the head teachers, particularly in the high achieving schools, did demonstrate an awareness of the issues relating to minority ethnic achievement in general and had incorporated these into their vision. Where White/Black Caribbean pupils were seen as part of a wider group of Black learners, they benefited from this raised awareness. From the accounts of fellow teachers, parents, pupils and LEA advisors, the following characteristics of leaders were considered effective in relation to raising minority ethnic achievement and including that of White/Black Caribbean pupils:

- The leaders in the high achieving schools had a clear vision that encompassed a whole school approach to raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils.
- Where White/Black Caribbean pupils were part of a broader vision to raise the achievement of Black Caribbean learners, they particularly benefited from this vision.
- Effective leaders were good at communicating their vision to governors, staff, parents and pupils and worked hard to develop ownership amongst these stakeholders of key values, goals and targets related to raising minority ethnic achievement.
- Each of them was also an effective listener and made time to listen to the views and opinions of teachers, parents and pupils and to be seen to respond to issues that were raised in relation to the needs of minority ethnic learners.
- They each had a good grasp of how to implement effective strategies to tackle underachievement and an ability to take whatever steps were necessary to see implementation through.
- The Heads shared high expectations for all learners with the rest of the staff. However, they were also keen to develop and encourage the leadership potential in others, particularly in relation to devising effective strategies to tackle underachievement and to manage behaviour.
- They were good at delegating and each had put in place an effective management structure to support minority ethnic achievement.
- They promoted an ethos within the schools where teachers, parents and pupils felt able to discuss and exchange ideas related to race, ethnicity and barriers to achievement in a climate of trust and respect.
Nonetheless, these Heads were also effective at putting in place and enforcing clear and transparent behaviour policies and were not afraid to deal with under-performance amongst staff.

They were each able to embrace new ideas and challenges and engaged positively with the issues and ideas thrown up in our research.

This last quality of the effective leaders is of special relevance for our study. Some of the Heads we spoke to expressed a desire for more to be done at government and LEA level to raise awareness of issues relating to mixed heritage pupils and particularly White/Black Caribbean pupils. It is suggested on the basis of our research that the DfES and the LEAs need to work with Head teachers to raise awareness of the specific barriers to achievement facing White/Black Caribbean pupils and of effective practice with respect to meeting the needs of all mixed heritage pupils. For example, information could be included in training for existing and aspiring head teachers including the programmes run by the National College of School Leadership (NCSL). LEA advisors could also work with Heads to promote awareness and understanding, for example, through including information about strategies to tackle White/Black Caribbean underachievement in circulars and newsletters to school, offering workshops on the subject to head teachers and senior managers and incorporating awareness of the relevant issues in governor training.

In the high achieving schools, effective leadership was to some extent dispersed at the level of the school beyond the Head teacher. Governors and middle managers had a key part to play in raising standards and ensuring high expectations for all pupils. Curriculum leaders in particular were found to have an important role to play in terms of implementing the curriculum and in monitoring the achievement of minority ethnic pupils including, potentially White/Black Caribbean pupils.

A pivotal leadership role was played, however, by the individual or individuals responsible for co-ordinating strategies to raise achievement of minority ethnic learners. As indicated in chapter three, practice varied quite widely across the whole sample of schools involved in our research with respect to who had responsibility for monitoring minority ethnic achievement and implementing appropriate strategies to tackle underachievement. Across the sample as a whole we noted a degree of role ambiguity amongst different people with responsibility for raising minority ethnic achievement. Although this was not a specific research focus, we did find that in schools where the Manager with responsibility for minority ethnic achievement had the full support of senior management, he/she was more effective and central to school strategies. More research is needed into effective leadership and management at this level. Knowledge of the educational needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage groups was least developed at this level and some respondents expressed the need for clearer guidance and training from the local authority EMAS service. Only one of the authorities we visited had implemented such a training programme.
Effective teaching and learning

Teaching and learning lie at the centre of the education process for all pupils including mixed heritage pupils. All of the high achieving schools that formed part of the research had a clear focus on teaching and learning. The approach is exemplified by one of the teachers in school A, a high achieving secondary school:

The strengths of the school are ... I mean how we’ve managed to improve the results is we’ve put a lot of time and effort into focussing on classroom practice and how to improve our own practice as teachers and the kids’ learning, you know how we could improve their learning process. I mean the staff here are exceptionally committed to the school. I mean I’ve never come across a group of staff who are prepared to try new things or who are committed to the kids as much as this staff...

It is clear that all pupils, including White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils benefit from such an approach. An effective approach to teaching and learning, however, also has implications for the way that the school is managed as the following vignette illustrates:

Raising achievement of mixed heritage pupils in a secondary school through a focus on teaching and learning

School K, although not a high achieving school for White/Black Caribbean pupils, according to the criteria used for our research (see chapter one), is nonetheless an improving school and this is reflected in annual improvement in the performance of White/Black Caribbean pupils at key stages 3 and 4. Central to their success has been the structure of the senior management team. Three of the four deputy heads take responsibility for improving all aspects of teaching and learning, including learning and assessment, learning technologies and learning and teaching. The fourth deputy is responsible for school improvement planning, performance management, and training, linking all the priorities that emerge from those areas and making sure that they’re embedded in the school planning as well as within the faculties. Responsibility for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including White/Black Caribbean pupils, is shared by the whole team and driven by the personal vision and commitment of the head teacher.

The drop in performance of White/Black Caribbean pupils between key stages 2 and 3 has recently been picked up as an issue in the school and the development plan now includes a target to find out the reasons for this under performance. The team has been assisted by the appointment of a teacher with special responsibility for interventions at Key Stage 3. The structure of the senior management of the school ensures that teaching and learning is the key focus of school leadership. The strategic vision of the leadership along with careful data collection and monitoring ensures that a concern for the
achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils now lies at the heart of teaching and learning.

It will be recalled from chapter four that the fact that White/Black Caribbean identities are not reflected in the curriculum is not in itself a barrier to achievement. Rather, as is the case with other minority ethnic groups at risk of under achieving, the significance of recognising White/Black Caribbean identities and experiences in the curriculum is related in part to the need to make the curriculum more accessible to White/Black Caribbean pupils but also to a wider strategy aimed at creating an ethos of respect for mixed heritage pupils within a whole school approach. This requires, however, that schools and LEAs take seriously the sensitivities associated with representing White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage experiences and identities (see below).

In chapter four we also pointed out that where pupils of White/Black Caribbean origin were doing relatively well, this was often as a consequence of them having been grouped together and targeted along with Black Caribbean pupils and, as a result of this, benefiting from programmes and strategies aimed at them. Thus, in these schools, mixed heritage pupils were included in mentoring schemes involving mentors of Black Caribbean origin and from initiatives such as Black History Month and other strategies aimed at positively affirming Black Caribbean identities in the curriculum and in the life of the school. Where supplementary educational activities such as after school clubs were used by the school, White/Black Caribbean pupils were sometimes targeted for these as well. There are many positive aspects of the inclusion of White/Black Caribbean pupils in activities targeted at Black Caribbean pupils. As we reported in chapter four, many White/Black Caribbean pupils identify with Black Caribbean cultures and with the ‘urban’ or ‘street’ sub-cultures operating in the school. These pupils spoke in positive terms about having aspects of their identities affirmed either through their association with Black role models or through their inclusion in activities associated with Black History Month. For instance, one White/Black Caribbean pupil in School B commented in the following positive terms about having one of the houses in the school named after Martin Luther King:

But I think to have Martin Luther King as one of the houses is a really good idea. ‘Cos he did like do a lot for like the Black community and stuff like that.....So I think that they’ve taken into account what other people think as well. ‘Cos like I’ve got a booklet at home about Martin Luther King and ..... I think it’s like quite important to me. Because like my granddad was alive when all that stuff was going on.

However, whilst including White/Black Caribbean pupils in strategies targeted primarily at Black Caribbean pupils goes some way towards addressing the barriers to achievement that the former group encounters, there are limitations. To begin with, there were limitations, perceived by some of our respondents, with the existing strategies targeted at Black Caribbean pupils. For example, although Black History Month was generally accepted as a positive intervention, it was also sometimes perceived as being an ‘add-on’ to
the curriculum. In at least two of the high achieving schools, there was an effort for a more comprehensive, integrated and all-year round approach to including Black cultures and histories in the curriculum. As the Head of one of these schools, school N, explained,

So, we’ve had of course the Black history initiative came about, but we don’t…make one week of it, it’s throughout the whole year. … we have said that to parents ‘if you were to come in on any day, you would see something going on in school that is attributed to a particular group or all children’

Secondly, however, as we reported in chapter four, even in these high achieving schools where there is a more systematic effort to integrate Black cultures and histories into the curriculum, White/Black Caribbean identities remained unacknowledged and un-affirmed within this wider recognition of Black identities. Despite their identification with Black culture and role models, many of the White/Black Caribbean pupils that we interviewed also felt that they would have liked to see more White/Black Caribbean role models reflected in the curriculum. The vignettes below illustrate an approach that seeks to redress this imbalance:

**Reflecting diversity and difference in the school and the curriculum:**

School J, a primary school had photographs of children including mixed heritage children in the foyer of the school. Mixed heritage faces were also evident in the pictures and self portraits painted by the children. In short the full spectrum of human complexions was represented for all to see and acknowledge.

A similar approach was adopted at School M, a secondary school. The approach was summarised by the deputy head:

And looking at teaching and learning, looking at the curriculum content, [...] does the school reflect its school population? And by no means is it perfect and I wouldn’t suggest it is, but it’s looking at even things like display work, looking at participation in events, even looking at who goes on school trips, you know, making sure that there’s a representation that there’s access for the students in all events. And if a school is consciously doing that ....then that to my mind is a healthy situation.

At the same school the students study the poem by John Agard called ‘Half Caste’. This affords the teacher, who is White/Black Caribbean himself, to present an historical understanding of the origins of the derogatory term ‘half caste’ though a critical reading of the poem and of some of the stereotypes that have arisen around it and which persist today. In this way the ‘common sense’ usage of the term by pupils, parents and even some teachers can be discussed.

We also reported a lack of resources available to schools to develop suitable materials to adequately reflect White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage identities and experiences. There is a need for important historical
figures including Malcolm X, Mary Seacole and Bob Marley as well as contemporary figures from the worlds of politics, arts and entertainment to be portrayed not only as leading figures within the ‘Black community’ but as people of mixed heritage as well. As noted in a previous section, LEA 6 is attempting to address the lack of resources in its schools by providing a sum of money specifically to purchase books and other materials reflecting both Black and White/Black Caribbean heritages.

As mentioned above, describing role models that have in the past been described simply as Black, as being Black and of mixed heritage, needs to be handled carefully by LEAs and schools. The danger is that the ‘Blackness’ of the role models is perceived by other Black learners and parents as being in some ways compromised by describing them as mixed heritage. The emphasis needs to be on the extent to which for these figures themselves, as was the case with many of our White/Black Caribbean respondents, their ‘Blackness’ often took precedence over their ‘mixedness’ in terms of understanding their experiences and sense of identity.

Given these sensitivities, however, we suggest that the DfES and LEAs work in partnership with appropriate mixed heritage and Black organisations as well as with organisations such as the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the Runnymede Trust, to develop appropriate resources for use at all levels of the education system. The DfES needs to work in partnership too with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) and with educational publishers to ensure that the identities and experiences of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage groups as well as those of ‘mono heritage’ groups are reflected in learning materials. Schools also need to be encouraged to develop their own resources and LEAs can play a supportive role in this respect, advising schools and disseminating effective practice.

Our respondents indicated that the strategy of having Black as well as White ‘mono-heritage’ role models in schools can be just as affirming for White/Black Caribbean and other categories of mixed heritage pupils as it is for pupils from ‘mono-heritage’ backgrounds. All of the high achieving schools had visible numbers of Black and minority ethnic members of staff compared to some of the other schools we visited and in some instances they were in positions of authority. There were also effective mentoring schemes involving Black mentors operating in these schools. Our research also indicates, however, that White/Black Caribbean and other categories of mixed heritage pupils would also benefit from having more mixed heritage members of staff. We suggest that schools ought to be sensitive to the need to employ mixed heritage and particularly White/Black Caribbean staff as part of a recruitment strategy targeted at raising the overall numbers of Black and minority ethnic staff. In this respect, we are suggesting that having more mixed heritage staff and mentors can help affirm mixed heritage identities and challenge the negative stereotypes of particularly White/Black Caribbean pupils by ‘mono heritage’ pupils and teachers from different ethnic backgrounds. However, given the difficulty with recruiting minority ethnic staff in general, schools should nevertheless ensure that all members of staff can act as positive role models for all pupils regardless of background. This can be done by adopting
a whole school approach previously outlined, which includes awareness and understanding of the needs of mixed heritage pupils.

Although our research focus was on schools which had relatively high numbers of mixed heritage pupils compared to all schools, we acknowledge the findings of other studies (see Cline et al, 2002, for example) which suggest that mixed heritage and other minority ethnic pupils in isolated communities are less likely to have their identities recognised and affirmed than pupils in schools where there are significant numbers of minority ethnic pupils. Schools and LEAs have a particular responsibility in these environments to ensure that mixed as well as ‘mono heritage’ minority ethnic identities are adequately reflected in the context of a balanced curriculum.

**High Expectations**

Schools across the entire sample involved in our research reported having ‘high expectations’ of all of their pupils. This is not surprising as this in itself is an expectation of all schools and is clearly reflected in government policy. As was reported in chapter four, however, the views of teachers with respect to White/Black Caribbean pupils were complex and contradictory. Contradictory views were sometimes held by teachers within the same school and sometimes even by the same teacher. Also, teacher statements on high expectations were also often contradicted by pupils and parents from the same school. Views were also often implicit rather than explicit, reflecting only a partial and tentative awareness of White/Black Caribbean pupils as a group with distinctive educational needs. There was often a recognition amongst teachers, however, that some White/Black Caribbean faced ‘identity problems’ linked to fragmented home environments. We argued in chapter four that more research needs to be undertaken into the home backgrounds of White/Black Caribbean pupils most at risk of underachieving and about the link if any between fragmented home backgrounds and achievement. Nonetheless, it was clear from speaking to the mixed heritage pupils in our sample and to their parents that a positive image of mixed identities was often reinforced in the home. This was not the case, however, in the school context, where their mixed identities were either not recognised at all by teachers or were seen in similar terms to Black Caribbean identities. Like their Black Caribbean peers, White/Black Caribbean pupils, particularly boys, were often perceived to have behavioural problems at school.

These low teacher expectations were sometimes reinforced by low academic expectations and future aspirations on the part of the mixed heritage pupils themselves and, occasionally, parents. In some instances, low academic expectations were linked to what is perceived as rebellious, non-academic, Black sub-cultures in and out of school. Some of the White/Black Caribbean pupil respondents reported suffering racism from White peers. Despite often being proud of their Black identities, some of the respondents also reported suffering name calling and forms of exclusion from their Black peers. According to one LEA advisor who had worked closely with mixed heritage pupils over a number of years, these factors together contributed to a
phenomenon where some White/Black Caribbean pupils tended to act out particularly extreme and rebellious Black identities. These patterns of behaviour then reinforce low teacher expectations in a negative feedback loop.

What this analysis suggests is that rather than the problems of identity being seen to reside with the individual White/Black Caribbean child or in his or her home environment, the emphasis needs to be placed on tackling negative stereotypes based on a general ignorance of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage identities amongst teachers and fellow peers. In one sense this is a positive message because it suggests that there are definite interventions that schools can adopt to break the vicious circle of low expectations and underachievement. For example, the analysis lends further support to the need for positive affirmation of White/Black Caribbean identities in the curriculum and for the greater use of accessible White/Black Caribbean role models in schools. It also suggests, however, the need to engage constructively with low teacher expectations. On the one hand, teachers need to be given greater information about the experiences and educational needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils both as part of initial and in-service training. On the other hand, teachers can be made more aware of existing strategies used to tackle underachievement. For example, we provide a vignette below of an approach to school discipline that has proved effective in many schools in dealing with what is perceived to be challenging and un-cooperative behaviour by Black Caribbean and White/Black Caribbean pupils.

Monitoring of achievement data by ethnicity and gender is important for supporting high expectations because it provides a mechanism for teachers to share information about the performance of individual pupils and to potentially challenge stereotypes. Schools can also use careful data monitoring to observe if these high expectations have been realised in practice. All of the high achieving schools that we researched had effective systems of data collection and monitoring in place and this was used to identify achievement issues for different minority ethnic groups. However, achievement issues relating specifically to White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils were rarely picked up during data monitoring. In chapter four we suggested that this situation reinforces the widely held perception that ‘there is no problem here’ even when respondents were unclear what the school data did in fact indicate.

The role of effective data monitoring in supporting high expectations of all pupils in a primary school.
School N is a high achieving primary school. One of the areas that impressed the research team in relation to their obvious success in raising the achievement of mixed heritage pupils, was their approach towards the use of achievement data to encourage high expectations for all pupils. Two aspects were particularly significant, namely, the way that the school constantly challenged the data in relation to relevant benchmark data and in a way that challenged their own prior assumptions; and, the way that the data was used subsequently, i.e. the communication of key findings and implications
amongst the entire staff and the conversion of these implications into clear targets with resources attached to the targets. The deputy head of the school summarises the approach as follows:

So you are looking at school data, but then you would look at it with a bit more...analysis, to look at gender differences,[and] ethnic group data just to see, is there a pattern? Is there a concern? You’ll have your overall view, but then you need to look a bit further just to see whether that is actually the case. So while you’ve got your own conceptions of what it might be in practice, when you look further you might find surprises. Very rarely do we find surprises, we generally are very much in tune. So our staff, both the maths, science, English post holders...we look at the regional results. I am assessment co-ordinator so I look at base-line data, we monitor throughout...share that with staff as well. So that if ...there is a particular concern, if there is a difference, you can then question why and be open to why that might be. It is not always one reason, there might be a combination of factors. But then you can look at that and study your own practice to see if there are any changes needed. Do we need to... look in more depth? And then make adjustments so that you can support the children. It is no good waiting for four years and then say - ‘oh dear, this group hasn’t performed, I wonder why?’ and then look back and find that there were issues in year three or four that we could have addressed and brought things back on line, but the opportunity was missed. So it is very much, you’ve got to monitor...but not to be totally assessment and data driven, because then, there are other things that are factors as well. You don’t want to be constantly looking at performance data to...monitor where you are going and what the school’s development plan is going to be or the initiatives that might take place. I think that keeping a balance is important. Challenging your data. Really studying and finding what the facts are, but most importantly, if you analyse and find an area where you feel the need is...you have to resource that need otherwise there is no point doing it. So all of that process is what we try to but in to practice...and with a lot of success. We don’t get everything right all the time. I think we would be hard pressed to do that, but certainly that is the intention.

By way of contrast, the vignettes above, although isolated instances in the context of the research, indicate that schools can use data effectively to pick up patterns of underachievement relating to mixed heritage pupils when they occur and can lead to a greater awareness at school level of the specific needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage learners. However, because numbers of mixed heritage pupils are often relatively small compared to other ethnic groups, care is required in interpreting statistics. Quantitative indicators need to be set alongside qualitative records of pupil progress in key subject areas at each key stage to form a rounded, individualised profile of pupil progress. This approach was recognised in one of the largest secondary schools that we researched and is encapsulated in a quote from the head teacher of the school:

... you know we don’t talk about the kids as a number .... we actually get down to the level of saying ‘this child in this set called this’... we’re actually talking about individuals. And I think that’s actually helped to drive the results up.
The existence of such an approach challenges the view that such careful data monitoring and profiling of students is impossible in large secondary schools.

The vignette taken from the primary school above indicates a further element of effective practice, namely the importance of paying attention to how the data process is managed. Once trends have been identified in the data, implications then need to be drawn and communicated to key staff. Implications need to be converted into targets and resources assigned to targets. It is only then that specific interventions aimed at White/Black Caribbean pupils can be implemented. These targets in turn then need to be carefully monitored. At the beginning of the last section we provided an example of how a senior management team can be structured to maximise the potential of data monitoring in the processes of teaching and learning (albeit in that instance in the case of a secondary school).

It was clear, however, that having effective data collection and monitoring systems in place is not enough to ensure that the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils are prioritised. Several respondents who were senior managers underlined the point that targets aimed at identifying and meeting the needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils would have to compete with concerns about other groups that may also be grounded in school data and may prove to be equally pressing. Here the school leadership, the LEA and the central government have a key role in providing strategic leadership to ensure that the growing national concern with the achievement of some mixed heritage groups is reflected in school targets by encouraging schools to prioritise interventions aimed at these groups. One mechanism for this is to incorporate targets for White/Black Caribbean pupils into LEA improvement plans, a process that would inevitably have a knock on effect to schools within the authority. Policy guidelines and frameworks emanating from the DfES and aimed at raising the attainment of groups at risk of underachieving need to also be more explicit in identifying White/Black Caribbean learners as being at risk of underachieving even where this is alongside a concern with Black Caribbean or other groups.

**Ethos of respect with a clear approach to racism and bad behaviour**

i) Language and school culture

_The power of language._ During our visit to primary school J, the Head teacher told us of an incident in which a White/Black Caribbean child had

---

6 For example, the current _Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils_ project includes in its broad definition of African Caribbean pupils, pupils of Black African and mixed heritage origin. It does not make the achievement needs of these two groups explicit, however, in the programme information which may perpetuate the view that the project is solely aimed at Black Caribbean pupils who are the main target group included under the heading ‘African Caribbean’.
described herself in a piece of work as ‘half caste’. The parents of the child were distressed that the school had apparently sanctioned the use of this negative type of language by the child and had not sought to engage with the issue or to challenge the use of this and similarly derogatory terms within the wider school community (the parents claimed that the child had learned this terminology and had internalised it from her experiences at school). The parents objected to the use of the term ‘half caste’ because it suggests that mixed heritage people are somehow incomplete in terms of their identities rather than ‘whole’ people. They brought their concerns to a parent governor. The incident led to a review instigated by the senior management team into the use of terminology in the school to describe mixed heritage pupils both in everyday language used by teachers and in official documents and forms. The aim was to find a form of description that mixed heritage pupils felt comfortable with and that had positive rather than negative connotations. The school opted for the less offensive term ‘dual heritage’ which was the term used by the LEA at that time to collect ethnic data. A further upshot of the incident was that the school as a whole became more aware of mixed heritage identities and these started to be positively reflected in wall displays around the school which we noticed during our visit.

In chapter four we reported on the absence of a common vocabulary to name mixed heritage pupils at the level of everyday discourse in schools and in communities with a wide range of sometimes derogatory names being used by teachers and pupils. The above vignette describes how one school tackled the problem. The vignette demonstrates the importance for schools of having a clear ‘message’ from the DfES and the LEA about the use of appropriate terminology. We suggest that the DfES and LEAs can do more to ensure that schools are clear about what types of language are appropriate for describing different categories of mixed heritage pupils. This would be consistent with the terms of the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000). DfES advice to schools could also reinforce the duty on schools to ensure that appropriate terminology is used and that the use of inappropriate language is challenged. The above vignette also demonstrates how schools can use the issue of language to instigate a constructive debate about tackling the use of racist language in schools.

ii) Characteristics of positive school cultures

For the most part, the high achieving schools demonstrated what can be described as a ‘positive school culture’. This culture was related by many of the respondents to the success of the schools in creating an environment in which all pupils, including mixed heritage and other minority ethnic pupils, could feel secure from racial harassment and bullying and feel valued. In this way the cultures of the high achieving schools helped to create an environment where all pupils could succeed academically. A distinguishing feature of these positive cultures was that similar elements were acknowledged by senior managers, teachers, pupils and parents as existing in the school and of being important. The characteristics of the cultures of the
highly achieving schools that contributed to this success in the eyes of our respondents were as follows:

- An emphasis on common values of respect and tolerance
- Senior teachers often talked about their school in terms of a family or a community
- High expectations of all pupils are perceived to be acted on in practice
- Senior management and staff place a great value on minority ethnic achievement
- Clear and consistent expectations with respect to behaviour shared by teachers, pupils and parents
- Effective systems in place for recording racist incidents and bullying and for responding to these
- As a consequence of the above pupils felt ‘safe’ and able to focus on their learning
- A collaborative culture amongst staff who felt able to share and develop innovative ideas to improve teaching and learning
- Staff feel supported but challenged by the senior management in relation to improving their practice
- High levels of communication and openness between the staff and the senior management in sharing information
- Visible presence of Black and minority ethnic staff, mentors and members of the local community in schools
- A culture of openness and trust between teachers and pupils based on teachers valuing and listening to pupils’ problems
- Teachers emphasising the positive aspects of pupils’ behaviour whilst being consistent and fair in applying sanctions
- Children’s work is clearly valued in well maintained wall displays
- Diversity is highly valued and reflected in the curriculum, in wall displays, in assemblies etc.

Notwithstanding the existence of the above cultures and on the basis of the evidence relating to the experiences of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils presented in the last chapter, we believe more needs to be done even in high achieving schools to extend the values of respect and tolerance through a greater appreciation and understanding of the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils.

iii) Effective behaviour management systems

The ‘backbone’ of the positive school cultures identified above were clear expectations of behaviour for all pupils coupled with effective ways of managing behaviour. The two key elements of effective behaviour management were recording and monitoring incidents of bullying including racist incidents and developing effective whole school approaches towards behaviour management. The approaches adopted by the high achieving schools varied and two examples are given below.
Effective behaviour management in a primary school

School N, a high achieving primary school has worked hard to develop a fair and consistent approach to behaviour management including tackling bullying and racist incidents and to develop ownership of the approach amongst staff, pupils and parents. The basis of the approach is summarised in the following quote from the Head Teacher at School N.

Yeah, we have a behaviour management policy…is very, very clear. You see, there are two major issues here … bullying and monitoring. The one way is you can have a piece of paper or a book record everything, right… that is one way of playing it, right? Then what’s the end product at the end of the day? We want the end product, not the procedural thing. For example, a child could make a comment, it’s a very innocent comment, but the other party might say it is a racist comment. The child that has made the comment could [have made it] in a very innocent way because he or she has heard some other people saying these things. So I think, what is even more important than this paperwork is the culture you try to create, you know. And you saw that in assembly…that the culture we try to create is that we are a community…and would we like someone else to say things to us which would hurt us…so why say that? You cannot eradicate in totality all the time, but you can definitely make children very much aware of what the expectations are, of what is right and what is wrong, ... I think our emphasis over the years has been on that, but yes there has been incidents where children have made comments. .... So we monitor it in a very serious way …

Effective behaviour management in a secondary school

The Head and Deputies acknowledged behaviour management as one of the most challenging issues at School A. In light of this, they adopted a positive approach to behaviour management that included both a ‘no blame’ culture of support for teachers and an opportunity to develop more effective teaching strategies to cope with specific behavioural issues. To this end, teachers never had to feel isolated and incompetent if they were faced with challenging student that they could not work with. Instead, the senior management saw it as part of the school strategy to develop and share effective practice amongst their own staff which ultimately benefited all pupils. An important aspect of this school strategy was to draw on the views of pupils themselves in order to find out their perceptions of how behaviour is managed in the classrooms. The school was also willing to utilise new techniques to assist with this by using video conferencing of pupils’ views and teaching practices.

We use video conferencing a lot here with regard to the kids. And we sit the kids down and we talk about the school, you know, we put them in a situation of managing the school – ’how would you do it? What’s good and what’s bad?’ Without mentioning any names at all. And they talk about how staff talk to the kids, you know, how they sometimes shout at them when there’s no need to. So staff are there sort of looking at and thinking ‘Mm, maybe’ and... using the children as ... letting staff see how children feel when staff either come in on a bad day or whatever or try and put something over maybe in the wrong way, and how the kids feel. And how we could
move forward as a school by sometimes listening to them, sometimes acting upon what they’re saying.
[Deputy Head, School A].

In fact the more experienced teachers are more adept at pupil relationships and never use the support room ... or hardly ever. Other people use it as a classroom strategy.... It’s not designed for that. It’s designed for staff, if a kid is losing it in a lesson they give the kid time out, so that they don’t stop the lesson, disrupt the lesson and lose it in the lesson. But we’re aware of that and rather than pillory staff over it and say ‘Why are you doing this?’ we try and through the CPD room here, professional development, to continually raise their expectations about classroom management, expertise, about pupils’ performance, and to be introspective about it. One of the things I’d like to do and I’ve only mentioned it to one department, is put cameras into classrooms. Not for me. The teacher would own what filming was done, what recording was done.... That’s arisen for a couple of reasons. One is that it’s an idea from an American guy [...] I met....But it’s also ... in doing classroom observations as we do, because we review departments on a regular basis, on a cycle of two years we review all the departments. So that would involve classroom observation. I was watching one of the best young teachers we’ve got. And I noticed that she made about 10 remarks to this young lad, a Year 7 boy, that were sort of chiding. Like ‘Pay attention’ ‘Put your pen down’ all that sort of stuff. Nothing nasty, because she’s a very, very enabling teacher. When I presented that to her, I said ‘You know how many times do you speak to so and so?’ ‘Yeah I think I spoke to him twice.’ I said ‘You actually ... 10 times you told him off, but not in a nasty way.’ She was horrified.
[Head Teacher, School A].

**Parental involvement**

Parental involvement is important for raising the achievement of all pupils, including White/Black Caribbean and other minority ethnic pupils at risk of underachieving, because of the role that parents can play in ensuring the attendance and good behaviour of their children and providing them with support with their school work. The two vignettes below describe how school can provide parents with information about their children’s learning:

**Maths evening to help parents come to grips with new teaching approaches**

That’s why that maths evening was amazing because, because of the change in the numeracy strategy. Everyone at home, parents you know, from any race is saying "well this is how I taught it you know tens and units in columns", and we’re moving away from that.... they didn’t understand....they’d say [to their children] "oh I can’t help you they don’t do it like we used to", which is a fair enough response if you don’t understand, [that is] until you’ve sat down with the parents and showed them how. Now we’ve got homework going on more than we used to because now they get it the way that you sort of add up in columns and partition and things like that. So that was a real breakthrough as well; we started talking the same language.
Parental involvement to raise the achievement of minority ethnic learners in year 11
Year 11 is a critical time for mixed heritage pupils at risk of underachieving as chapter two demonstrates. In school A the head of year had implemented a strategy to involve parents more in their children’s learning during this critical exam year by organising four review meetings where the Head of year would talk through the child’s progress with each parent including his or her recent performance in each subject, attendance and punctuality. Parents and staff reported that this initiative had been important in driving up results each year.

Creating stronger links between the home and the school can also reinforce the message to pupils that the school values their home cultures and that their parents value their achievements in school. For example, one high achieving primary school made a point of inviting parents to awards ceremonies where each of the children got certificates and converted one of their classrooms into a parent’s room for the day to make the parents feel welcomed. Involving minority ethnic parents in school activities can also provide other pupils with positive role models, whilst involving minority ethnic parents in governing boards can provide an opportunity for the school to learn more about the educational needs and cultural backgrounds of pupils and to have the voices of these parents reflected in school policy and priorities. One of the high achieving schools, school E, was particularly pro-active in involving minority ethnic parents as governors with positive results. Yet as was reported in chapter four, there are often problems associated with involving White/Black Caribbean and other minority ethnic parents and this is especially the case in communities characterised by social deprivation. The vignette below illustrates how schools can work with the local community to reinforce common expectations regarding behaviour.

Getting minority ethnic parents ‘on-side’ in the battle to raise achievement in a secondary school
The Head teacher of school F has been recently appointed. She describes how she prioritised effective parental and community links as a way of challenging anti-social behaviour amongst some pupils and getting parents ‘on-side’ in order to raise their children's’ achievement.

Because in a challenging school like this where you’ve got lots of issues outside and those issues are often brought in here you’ve got to work incredibly hard, you can’t coast in a school like this. So the ethos has changed and we’ve got better partnerships with the parents, we’ve got better partnerships with the community. Because I used to have lots of complaints from the local community when I first came here. And I remember in my first half term going to a residents meeting in one of the estates and it was just bit of a slanging match. But I go to residents meetings, I have half termly meetings now and the residents from that estate…..come over here and we talk about the behaviour of the students. Has it improved? We talk about litter, we talk about the environment, we talk about them coming in and working with the
students. They’re coming into the school council meetings, they’re going to start doing some adult learning here. So we’ve moved a long way and we’re developing more partnerships with the community than when I first came here. So we’ve changed a lot... but it’s got to focus on teaching and learning and raising achievement and I don’t just mean raising attend, I mean raising achievement.
[Head teacher, school F]

The high achieving schools in our study adopted a range of strategies for involving minority ethnic parents linked to the objectives outlined in the paragraph above. Examples of successful strategies included:

- The Head teacher and senior management team adopting and investing a lot of time in meeting with parents and getting to know the specific issues relating to each child’s learning and encouraging other teachers to do the same.
- Working with local community associations to identify and overcome specific problems and issues, for example, related to the behaviour of pupils
- Developing Black and mixed heritage parental support groups in year 7 and year 11 to discuss the issues relating to the achievement and educational needs of their pupils and to work directly with the school in overcoming these difficulties
- Initiatives to get more minority ethnic governors
- Initiatives to increase the number of progress review meetings with parents at during Key Stage four
- Meetings to explain new curriculum initiatives to parents so that they can provide more support for their children at home

As with other areas of school policy, White/Black Caribbean pupils and their parents have benefited from strategies such as those outlined above. Once again, however, there was little evidence of schools meeting with parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils to specifically address the issues confronting this group or indeed of senior managers and teachers having much awareness in their meetings with the parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils of these issues.

**Conclusion: Towards a learning school**

Considering the needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils draws attention to a ‘sixth’ dimension of the existing model that needs to be emphasised, that of the need to create ‘learning schools’. By this we mean schools that are outward looking, open to new ideas and able to constantly adapt to the changing ethnic composition and needs of the local community. In some senses this is a characteristic that cuts across and underpins the other aspects of a whole school approach. All of the high achieving schools showed several of the attributes of a ‘learning school’. Across the sample as a whole these attributes were:
The senior management team is alert to changes of policy either at government or LEA level and works to anticipate the challenges and implications of new policy for their schools.

Schools are eager to pilot new initiatives such as *Aiming High* or similar strategies to raise the achievement of minority ethnic groups.

There is careful monitoring of quantitative and qualitative internal data and relevant benchmarking data relating to ethnicity to identify changing demographic patterns, patterns of achievement and underachievement for different mixed and ‘mono heritage' groups across key stages as well as data relating to attendance and exclusion. This data is disseminated widely across the school and to parents. Where issues are identified these are translated into measurable performance targets with resources attached to these targets. The progress of targets is then monitored. Schools were prepared to challenge achievement data.

The senior management team and staff are prepared to challenge their own assumptions and stereotypes about the performance and educational needs of different groups based on careful data analysis and to access advice from the LEA or other sources.

The ‘learning schools’ were committed to continuous staff development as a means to understand and develop effective strategies to raise the achievement of mixed and ‘mono' heritage groups.

As well as embracing innovation and change initiated centrally or by the LEA, learning schools also actively encourage innovation by their own staff in a ‘blame-free' environment.

‘Learning schools’ are open to the ideas and views of parents and to provide learning opportunities for parents to assist in meeting the educational needs of their children.

In the next chapter, attention will turn to specific policy recommendations for meeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils and in particular those of White/Black Caribbean background.
Chapter Six: Recommendations

The aim of this final chapter is to provide some policy recommendations to the DfES, the CRE, LEAs and schools based on the research findings and to make some suggestions about further research work in relation to understanding the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils. The recommendations are drafted with due regard to some of the sensitivities identified in chapter one. Specifically, the recommendations are written in a language that, wherever possible, seeks to underline the fact that White/Black Caribbean learners identify with and face similar barriers to achievement as the larger group of Black learners of which they are a part. Within this broad understanding, however, the recommendations also seek to identify approaches and strategies targeted at the specific needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils. In making our recommendations we are also conscious of the absence in some instances of policy to address the needs of Black and minority ethnic groups in general, for example in the national curriculum and in the training offered to teachers and managers. Once again, our recommendations seek to reflect this awareness.

Policy Recommendations

Department for Education and Skills (DfES)

1. Undertake a review of its own documents and advice to schools based on this and similar research to ensure that these reflect the experiences and needs of White/Black Caribbean pupils including those that they share in common with other Black learners and those that are specific to them.

2. Consult with leading mixed heritage and Black organisations, the CRE and Runnymede Trust to agree on appropriate terminology for describing mixed heritage pupils and undertake a review of its own official documents to ensure that consistent and appropriate terminology is used when referring to people of mixed heritage.

3. Work with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority to ensure that mixed heritage experiences and identities are adequately reflected in the national curriculum and educational resources within an overall approach that reflects the ethnic diversity of Britain. The representation of people of White/Black Caribbean origin ought to be in such a way as to recognise that they identify with and are a part of the broader Black community in Britain.

4. Work with the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) and National College for School Leadership (NCSL) to ensure that key information relating to the educational needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils is included as a component of initial teacher training and in the training of senior managers. This information ought to include an awareness both of White/Black Caribbean pupils as belonging to a larger group of Black learners and of having specific
educational needs. This recommendation also needs to be implemented within an overall emphasis on meeting the needs of minority ethnic learners.

CRE

5. Include as part of its advice to schools on implementing the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000), advice on the use of appropriate official terminology for referring to mixed heritage pupils and their parents as part of similar advice relating to all Black and minority groups. The CRE should also include advice for LEAs and schools on how to ensure that strategies put in place to meet schools’ statutory responsibilities in terms of the Act take full account of the need to tackle discrimination and disadvantage as it affects White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage groups as well as other Black and minority ethnic groups.

LEAs

6. Effectively monitor the achievement of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils and disaggregate performance data by mixed heritage group, gender and free school meals at each key stage in order to determine patterns in attainment, progress and exclusions and set challenging targets for White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils in LEA improvement plans.

7. Allocate resources from the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) to target White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage underachievement where this is evident.

8. Work with schools to ensure that the performance of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils is effectively monitored and that challenging targets are set for these groups within school improvement plans.

9. Assist schools in setting appropriate and challenging targets for mixed White/Black Caribbean and other heritage pupils at risk of underachieving and incorporate these into school improvement plans.

10. Assist schools to develop appropriate strategies for meeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils and provide resources and training where necessary. Strategies need to target White/Black Caribbean pupils as part of the larger group of Black learners as well as targeting the specific barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils.

11. Collate and disseminate effective practice for raising achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils and meeting the needs of mixed heritage pupils across the LEA;
12. Put in place effective systems of data monitoring and target setting (see recommendations 10 and 11 above) and incorporate targets for raising the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils into school improvement plans.

13. Seek effective strategies for raising the achievement of White/Black Caribbean pupils. Strategies need to target White/Black Caribbean pupils as part of the larger group of Black learners as well as targeting the specific barriers to achievement faced by White/Black Caribbean pupils. Evidence gathered during the course of the current research suggests that appropriate strategies might include all or some of the following:

   a. The senior management to provide clear guidance as well as learning opportunities for staff, parents, pupils and members of the community to discuss and understand the use of acceptable and unacceptable terminology for referring to mixed heritage groups as part of a wider focus on terminology used in relation to all minority ethnic groups.

   b. The senior management in collaboration with the LEA to provide in-service training opportunities for staff to understand the barriers to achievement and the educational needs of White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage and minority ethnic groups.

   c. The school to reflect mixed heritage and other minority ethnic experiences and identities in the formal curriculum and in wall displays.

   d. The school to provide effective role models for White/Black Caribbean and other mixed heritage pupils within an overall strategy of increasing the numbers of Black and minority ethnic teaching staff and mentors. Effective role models include White, Black and Asian ‘mono’ and mixed heritage people who have an understanding of the experiences and identities of mixed heritage pupils;

   e. The school to provide targeted learning support for White/Black Caribbean pupils along with other Black pupils at risk of underachieving at key stage three and four.

   f. The school to provide supplementary learning opportunities for White/Black Caribbean and other learners within a school at risk of underachieving in the form of Saturday schools or after school sessions.

   g. The school to establish strong links with individual parents of White/Black Caribbean and other minority ethnic groups with the purpose of better understanding the educational needs of these groups of pupils and to provide regular feedback on pupils progress and information about ways for parents to support their children’s learning.

   h. The school to include the parents of White/Black Caribbean pupils in meetings of Black parents’ groups.
**Areas for further research**

On the basis of the present study we have identified what we believe are key areas for further research into the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils. The list below is not exhaustive.

1. There is a need to better understand the links between family structure and educational achievement of mixed heritage pupils at risk of underachievement. There is scope here for both qualitative and quantitative approaches.
2. Whereas the focus of the present study has been largely on White/Black Caribbean pupils, there is a need for research to better understand the specific educational needs of other mixed heritage groups, including ones who are not at risk of underachieving.
3. There is a need for school based action research projects to identify educational needs and to develop specific strategies for meeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils.
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### Appendix One: Tables

Table 1: Numbers and percentages of mixed heritage pupils by region 2003 (primary and secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>White/Black Caribbean</th>
<th>White/Black African</th>
<th>White/Asian</th>
<th>Any other mixed background</th>
<th>All mixed heritage</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>60,635</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14,973</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>33,313</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,980</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>168,901</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6,779,932</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15,052</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>353,841</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15,052</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>975,833</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11,748</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>716,049</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12,059</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>598,808</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>11,805</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>23,998</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>766,259</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>17,116</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>755,620</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>18,243</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>54,151</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>908,701</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>8,871</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22,327</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>303,654</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>9,372</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,234</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>31,824</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>605,047</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5,813</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,622</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>22,495</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1,050,351</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9,803</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>654,470</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished statistics supplied by DfES and based on PLASC
Table 2: Numbers and percentages of mixed heritage pupils by region 2003 (primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>White/ Black Caribbean</th>
<th>White/ Black African</th>
<th>White/ Asian</th>
<th>Any other mixed background</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>37,128</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9,591</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>5,784</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished statistics supplied by DfES and based on PLASC

Table 3: Numbers and percentages of mixed heritage pupils by region 2003 (secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>White/ Black Caribbean</th>
<th>White/ Black African</th>
<th>White/ Asian</th>
<th>Any other mixed background</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>23,507</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished statistics held by DFES and based on PLASC
Table 4. Key Stage 1 Results 2003 (% Level 2 and above averaged across reading, writing and maths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Difference from all pupil average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupil groups</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5. Key Stage 2 Results 2003 (% Level 4 and above averaged across English and maths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Difference from all pupil average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Key Stage 3 Results 2003 (% Level 5 and above averaged across English and maths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Difference from all pupil average</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-22.5</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7. Key Stage 4 Results 2003 (% 5 or more GCSE/GNVQ A*-C grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Difference from all pupil average</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>-18.4</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Attainment at each Key Stage compared to the average for all pupils analysed by ethnic group, gender and free school meal eligibility (Key Stage 1, 2 and 3 results are averaged across English and maths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>KS1 L2+</th>
<th>KS1 L2+</th>
<th>KS2 L4+</th>
<th>KS2 L4+</th>
<th>KS3 L5+</th>
<th>KS3 L5+</th>
<th>KS4 5+A*-C</th>
<th>KS4 5+A*-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British Boys</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish Boys</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Carib. Boys</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Afric. Boys</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian Boys</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Boys</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Boys</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi Boys</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean Boys</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African Boys</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Boys</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils (Boys)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>KS1 L2+</th>
<th>KS1 L2+</th>
<th>KS2 L4+</th>
<th>KS2 L4+</th>
<th>KS3 L5+</th>
<th>KS3 L5+</th>
<th>KS4 5+A*-C</th>
<th>KS4 5+A*-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British Girls</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish Girls</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Carib. Girls</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Afric. Girls</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian Girls</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Girls</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Girls</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi Girls</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean Girls</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African Girls</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Girls</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils (Girls)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Pupils achieving Level 2C in the end of KS1 tasks/tests in 1999 achieving Level 4 and above in the end of KS2 tests in 2003 (averaged across English and mathematics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Girls eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Girls not eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys not eligible for free school meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White/Black Caribbean</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 10 Pupils achieving Level 4 in the end of KS2 tests in 2000 achieving Level 5 and above in the end of KS3 tests in 2003 (averaged across English and mathematics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Girls eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Girls not eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys not eligible for free school meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White/Black Caribbean</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Girls eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Girls not eligible for free school meals</th>
<th>Boys not eligible for free school meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black African</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Two: Thumbnail Sketches of Schools

School A is a mixed comprehensive secondary school situated in a highly deprived ward in LEA 1 noted also for its gang and drug related crime. The area also has higher levels of unemployment than the rest of the city and nationally. The school population currently stands at approximately 700 pupils, drawn from 20 primary schools with 3 main feeder schools. Approximately 60 per cent of pupils are eligible for free school meals, which is well above the national average. The school population is made up of approximately 80 percent of minority ethnic groups, largely Black Caribbean and Asian, with about 6 percent of pupils from White backgrounds and the rest from other categories of minority groups from Iraq, Thailand, Malaysia, and Afghanistan. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are doing as well as all groups within the school and that the school is performing above average for similar schools within the LEA.

School B is a mixed comprehensive school located in the north-east of a large city in the East Midlands. Approximately 38 per cent of the pupils are eligible for free school meals, which is above the national average. The majority of pupils come from surrounding housing estates. The school serves one of the most socially deprived areas in the LEA although it is located in an area that is not classed as socially deprived. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population.

School C is a newly formed mixed comprehensive secondary school that is located in the south-east of a large city in the north-west. It formed in September 2000 out of an amalgamation of two failing schools in the local area. The area that it is situated within was traditionally a White working class area with a BNP presence but which has been changing in the last decade. Both the overall social and economic background of the pupils and their overall level of attainment on entry to school at age 11 are low and well below the national average. The school itself has a large percentage of children on free school meals (approx. 65 per cent) and one-third of the school population is from minority ethnic background. The school intake is largely made up of pupils with low attainment at entry and with lower than national average attainment at KS3 and KS4. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.
School D is a mixed comprehensive secondary school on the northern edge of a large city in the East Midlands. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. The majority of the pupils at the school come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Over 50 per cent of the pupils are eligible for free school meals, which is well above the national average. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are doing as well as all groups within the school and that the school is performing above average for similar schools within the LEA.

School E is a large mixed primary school in the east of London in an area of high levels of deprivation, unemployment and crime. Over 50 per cent of the school population come from minority ethnic backgrounds. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 10 per cent of the overall school population. The number of pupils supported through EMAG is very high, and well above the national average. Approximately 30 per cent of the pupils are eligible for free school meals. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are doing as well as all groups within the school and that the school is performing above average for similar schools within the LEA.

School F is a Church of England secondary in London in an area of high levels of deprivation, unemployment and crime. Over half the school population is eligible for free school meals, which is well over the national average. Over 75 per cent of the school population is from minority ethnic backgrounds with the largest percentage coming from Black Caribbean and African backgrounds, whilst a fifth are refugees mainly from Turkey. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School G is a large, mixed primary school – 457 pupils compared with the national average of 241 pupils. Pupils from mixed heritage backgrounds account for 20.3 per cent of the school population (10.9 per cent White/Black Caribbean) making this the largest ethnic minority group in the school, after the Black school pupil population (19.1 per cent of which 12.3 per cent are Black Caribbean). 52.9 per cent of the school population is White. The school therefore is extremely ethnically diverse. Pupils at the school are largely drawn from the local community and reflect the mix of social class in the area – predominantly middle class but with significant pockets of working class. The mixed heritage pupils are performing above the average of the pupils in the school and in some cases are the highest achievers in the school.

School H is a mixed primary school in the east of England situated in a predominantly White area. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 10 per cent of the overall school population. Over 50 per cent of the school population are SEN pupils, which is very high for both local and
national levels. Thirty-seven per cent of the pupils are eligible for free school meals. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School I is a mixed Roman Catholic primary school in London. Approximately 55 per cent of the total school population come from minority ethnic groups, mostly Black Caribbean and Black African. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 10 per cent of the overall school population. Over one quarter of the pupils are eligible for free school meals. Many of the pupils come from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School J is an above average size mixed primary school in a large city in the West Midlands. Forty-seven per cent of the school population is eligible for free school meals. Just under half of the school population has English as an additional language. The mixed heritage pupils make up approximately 10 per cent of the overall school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School K is an 11-18 mixed comprehensive school with technology college status, based in a large city in the north-west. It is an above average size school with a pupil population of approximately 2000 and a teaching staff of just under 200. The school caters to a wide range of communities that are both economically disadvantaged and prosperous. There is a mixture of ethnic groups represented at the school, with approximately 35 per cent of pupils in the lower school from minority ethnic groups and the rest are White UK pupils. This is different in the upper school where approximately half of the pupils are from minority ethnic backgrounds. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. The school is very popular with parents and is heavily subscribed.

School L is a Specialist Arts College that also has a hearing impairment unit, located in a large city in the West Midlands. It is a mixed comprehensive with a total population of approximately 1600 pupils. The school is predominantly White and is located in a White ‘working class’ area with a history of strong BNP support and activity. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of overall school population. Some of the intake areas for the school score very significantly with deprivation levels as high, or higher, than many inner city areas on national indices of deprivation. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School M is a large inner-city mixed comprehensive Church of England school in the North West with approximately just over 1000 pupils. It has technology college status and has recently become a beacon school. It receives pupils
from over 90 different primary schools from across the region. The numbers of pupils on free school meals is above average and 50 per cent of the school population are from minority ethnic groups. The mixed heritage population of the school is approximately 5 per cent of the overall school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are underachieving at this school.

School N is a mixed infant and junior school located in an area of significant levels of social deprivation and ethnic diversity within a large city in the West Midlands. The school’s intake reflects this diversity and has 96 per cent of its pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds, in particular large percentages of Black Caribbean, Indian, Pakistani, Somali and Black African pupils. Forty per cent of the pupils are eligible for free schools, which is higher than the national average. The mixed heritage population at the school is approximately 10 per cent of the total school population. Performance indicators show that mixed heritage pupils are doing as well as all groups within the school and the school is performing above average for similar schools within the LEA.
Appendix Three: Research Instruments

PUPILS INTERVIEW SCHEDULES (PRIMARY AND SECONDARY)

Introduction by interviewer

- Introduce self
- What are your names? What class are you in?
- Do you know why I want to talk to you today? I would really like to have a chat with you all about yourselves and about your experiences at school?
- I am interested in hearing about how children of all different colours and from different cultures and religions are getting on at your school including those who are ‘mixed heritage’. What do you think mixed heritage means? We mean children whose parents are different colours (black/ brown/ white etc.) or have different religions (Christian, Muslim, Hindu etc.) or come from different parts of the world (The Caribbean, Africa, India, Pakistan, China etc.)

Identity

1. Do you like this school? Tell me about your school? [prompts: other groups of children, religion, languages, mixed children]

2. Tell me about your background? [prompts: where parents/grandparents are from, religion, languages]

3. How do you describe yourself? How do your parents describe you? And what about people at school?

4. What do you think about being mixed? Do you think about it much?

5. Have you ever felt picked on because of your colour? Have you ever felt special because of your colour?

Expectations

1. How do you feel about going to secondary school? How do you think it will be different? (*SECONDARY SCHOOL: How does secondary compare to primary school? How do you feel about leaving school?)

2. What do you want to be when you leave school? [prompts: college, university plans]
3. Do your parents expect you to do well at school?

4. What do your parents want you to do when you leave school? [prompts: college, university, career]

5. Do your parents expect you to behave in a certain way [prompts: background, religion, beliefs]

6. Do your teachers treat you the same as everybody else? [prompts: other pupils, other people in school]

7. Do your teachers expect you to do well at school? [prompts: subject/career advice]

8. Do your teachers and classmates expect you to behave in a certain way [prompt: background, religion, beliefs]

**Role Models**

1. Do you have any teachers/teaching assistants/dinner ladies from mixed backgrounds? Does it/would it make a difference?

2. Do you know any other mixed heritage people? Any famous mixed heritage people?

3. Do you have any mixed heritage mentors? Would you like some in this school?

4. Do visitors ever come to school that are mixed heritage or talk about being mixed heritage?

**Curriculum/Classroom Visibility**

1. Do you learn about people who are different colours, come from different parts of the world and who have different beliefs or religions in your school?

2. Do you ever learn about people who look like you or who come from similar backgrounds?

**Policy Visibility/Support Mechanisms**

1. Who do you turn to or what do you do if you have problems with other pupils/teachers because of your background or other reasons?

2. Do people get bullied or called names at this school because of their colour or background?
3. Who do people tell if they get bullied? Who would you tell if you got bullied?

**Peer Group and Community Factors**

1. Are your friends in this school mostly black, white, Asian or mixed?

2. Are there any groups of pupils around whom you feel you can and cannot ‘hang’ out with? [prompts: friends and parents’ influence]

**Any other Issues**

1. Is there anything else you want to say about being mixed heritage or about your school?
PARENTS FOCUS GROUP SCHEDULE

Introduction by interviewer

- Introduce ourselves
- We are trying to find out more about the educational experiences and needs of children from different ethnic backgrounds. The purpose of our research is to find out about the educational needs of children of mixed heritage. By ‘mixed heritage’ we mean children whose parents each come from different racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- Anything you say will be treated in confidence, written anonymously and will not be reported to the school.
- Ask them to introduce themselves and talk a little bit about themselves [prompts: work, household structure]
- Ask them why they have attended the meeting

Identity

1. How do you describe your children’s racial/ethnic identity? Have you always described your children in this way?

2. Have you heard of any other terms? Why would you/wouldn’t you use these?

3. How do you describe your own racial/ethnic identity?

4. How do people react to you and your children?

Expectations

1. What do you think of the school? [prompts: helping child fulfil potential? What school does well? Barriers to achievement?]

2. What sort of expectations do you think the school has of your child? [prompts: encourage study in particular subjects, career choice]

3. What do you hope your children will do when they leave school?

4. On the whole, do you think your children are treated as equally as other groups of pupils in the school?

5. Is your son/daughter expected to behave in a certain way because they are mixed heritage? If so, how and by whom?
Role Models

1. Are there any teachers/teaching assistants/mentors from mixed backgrounds? Does it/would it make a difference?

2. Do visitors ever come to school that are mixed heritage or talk about being mixed heritage?

3. Do your children have any mixed heritage role models? [prompts: family, community, historical, contemporary figures] Do you think it's necessary?

Parental Links

1. Does the school keep you informed about your children’s progress?

2. How does the school involve parents? [prompts: open days, parent evenings, sports days]

3. Do your children discuss their school experiences with you, particularly to do with being mixed heritage?

Policy Visibility/Support Mechanisms

1. Does the school discuss race issues with the pupils or parents?

2. Is racism an issue at this school? If so, what does the school do about it?

3. Has your child ever been bullied because s/he is mixed heritage? [prompts: bullying a school problem?]

4. What does the school do about bad behaviour? [prompts: detention, exclusion]

5. Has this ever been an issue for you?

Curriculum Visibility

1. Does the school acknowledge difference and diversity? [prompts: pupils encouraged to learn about/respect other cultures?]
Community Factors

1. Tell me about the local area [prompts: length of time living in area, ethnic/racial tensions]

2. Does the school involve black and minority ethnic members of the community in its activities, including people of mixed heritage? [prompts: visitors, workshops]

Any other issues

1. Is there anything else regarding your children’s schooling and/or identity that you would like to talk about? [prompts: recommendations to DfES]
TEACHERS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction by interviewer

- Introductions
- Establish extent of knowledge of project
- The government is trying to find out more about the educational experiences and needs of children from different ethnic backgrounds. The purpose of our research is to find out about the educational needs of children of mixed heritage. By ‘mixed heritage’ we mean children whose parents are from mixed racial and ethnic background
- Establish teacher’s role and length of time at school

Policy visibility and School Leadership

1. What’s the school like? What are the key issues in relation to minority ethnic achievement?

2. Is school management/leadership aware of the specific educational needs of mixed heritage pupils?

3. How would you describe your leadership style/the headteacher’s leadership style?

4. In your opinion, how are pupils of mixed heritage performing at this school compared to other groups of pupils?

5. What do you consider to be the main barriers to achievement, if any, facing pupils of mixed heritage? [prompts: different to barriers for other pupil groups?]

6. Are there any strategies in place overcome the barriers to achievement and to meet the needs of mixed heritage pupils? [prompts: are these different barriers from other minority ethnic groups? How effective have any initiatives taken been at raising attainment of mixed heritage pupils? How would you measure this?]

7. Does the school have a race equality policy? Does this document make any reference to children of mixed heritage?

8. Does the school have a behaviour policy and if so does it make any reference to the mixed heritage and/or other minority ethnic pupils?

9. Are there any special mentoring arrangements in place for mixed heritage and/or other minority ethnic pupils?
10. What does the LEA do with regards to meeting the educational needs of mixed heritage pupils? [prompts: any training for teachers offered, local initiatives and success of? Support of LEA race equality work?]

**Monitoring**

1. How is the school monitoring mixed heritage achievement [prompts: distinct category, specific targets in school development and /or strategic plan?]

2. Does the school monitor exclusion by ethnicity and gender? [long term, fixed term exclusion data] If yes, how do the figures for mixed heritage pupils compare with other groups?

3. Does the school monitor truancy by ethnicity and gender? If yes, how do the figures for mixed heritage pupils compare with other groups?

4. Does the school monitor bullying, including racist bullying? If yes, how do the figures for mixed heritage pupils compare with other groups?

5. Are there any measures in place to reduce exclusion and truancy rates?

6. How does the school make use of data related to mixed heritage pupils? [prompts: access of members of staff]

**Curriculum Visibility**

1. Does the school make an effort to reflect mixed heritage identities and histories within the curriculum?

2. Are mixed heritage identities and histories evident around the school, in wall displays and whole school activities?

**Role Models**

1. Has the school ever had any mixed heritage teachers/teaching assistants?

2. Do the mixed heritage pupils have many mixed heritage role models? [prompts: in the community, invitations to mixed heritage professionals]

**Expectations**

1. Do you think teachers have the same expectations of mixed heritage pupils as they do of other pupils?
2. What sort of expectations do the parents of mixed heritage pupils in this school have of their children?

3. What sort of expectations do the mixed heritage pupils have of themselves?

4. What are the perceptions of the behaviour of different ethnic pupil groups by other teachers?

School Culture

1. Do you think a culture of respect and diversity exists in this school?

2. How easy is it for staff to talk about issues of race, culture and diversity with each other and with school leadership?

3. Do you think it’s easy for pupils to express their views about race, culture and diversity in the school?

4. Is there a common language in the school to talk about mixed heritage? [prompts: terminology]

Parental Links

1. Have you ever talked to parents of mixed heritage pupils about particular issues with regard to identity and achievement?

Peer Group Sub-cultures

1. What are the main peer group sub-cultures that exist at the school?

2. How do mixed heritage pupils fit within these sub-cultures?

Community Factors

1. Is there any evidence of racial/cultural tension within the community?

2. How are interracial relationships and mixed heritage pupils viewed in the community?

3. How do you think mixed heritage pupils are treated within the community?
Any other issues

1. Is there anything else you would like to mention in relation to mixed heritage pupils’ identity and achievement in the school? [prompts: recommendations to DfES]