

'Race discrimination, the politics of knowledge and cultural inequality in England'

Paul Miller, School of Education and Professional Development, University of Huddersfield,
UK

Summary

From the outside, one might assume England's education system is tolerant of diversity, welcoming and pluralistic. The truth is, to some extent it is. There are thousands of Overseas Trained Teachers (OTTs) and teachers of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) heritage working in schools in England. These two groups of teachers experience one thing in common - race discrimination, built on assumptions of cultural inequality, fuelled by structures that promote a deficit model of difference and a politics of knowledge. For, although thousands of teachers work in English schools, only few from BAME heritage and migrant origin make it to leadership positions, despite having similar aspirations, qualifications and work experience. Drawing on evidence from research on OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage, this chapter will show that five items present as barriers to the progression of OTTs of BAME heritage and teachers of BAME heritage as a whole including: policy, race/racism, institutional practices, group membership and religion (Islam). This chapter also provides a reconceptualisation of promotion, progression for OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage based on three criteria: "Affiliation", "Appeasement" (or "Adaptation") and "White sanction". The chapter considers epistemological and ontological misunderstandings of difference, and highlights the need for courageous and transformative leadership from policy makers and institutions in tackling race inequality in education in England.

Key words: Race, cultural inequality, discrimination, 'White sanction', Adaptation, Affiliation

Main Text

Despite significant progress in terms of race relations, recent histories of racial inequality in England have a significant bearing on contemporary practices in educational institutions. Although Phillips (2006) suggests that “Britain is not a racist nation”, he also provides that Britain has a “... deep sensitivity to the dangers posed by ethnic and cultural difference” (p.1). Put differently, although England promote itself as plural and inclusive society, to being inclusive and plural are easier said than done. This partly explains why there exists a “deep rooted and continuing struggle among BAME teachers and academics for equality and mutual recognition (Miller, 2016, p. 1), a struggle that is a significant feature of contemporary educational institutions and a substantial component of discourses on race and ethnicity in education.

Over the past decades, “race” and “ethnicity” in education have become subsumed into wider discourses around “diversity” in education in England. As yet, it remains unclear if the subsuming of race and ethnicity into a single debate on diversity is a deliberate strategy of the government, in the face of rising concerns about the treatment of ethnic minorities in education, or as a response to rising populist criticisms that are demanding less attention is paid to minority ethnic and migrants. It is perhaps for similar reasons that, over the past decade, there has been very little mention, in policy discourses, of Overseas Trained Teachers (OTTs) and their experiences in England, and recent policies concerning them have served to advantage those from White, industrialised societies over those from non-White, non-industrialised societies. Regardless of the government’s motivation, the subsuming of race and ethnicity issues under a single diversity banner, and its policies of difference towards OTTs, is contributing to an invisibility of their quotidian experiences in the educational institutions in which they work. Consequently, OTTs, primarily those of BAME heritage, and teachers of BAME heritage as a

whole, have not ‘experienced’ their institutions, and arguably their profession, in the most positive of ways.

It remains a matter of debate about what can or should be done to improve the experiences of both these groups of professionals since, on the one hand, government policies have subsumed and therefore ignores the larger group, and on the other hand, government policies have disadvantaged the smaller group. However, the current gap between policy and institutional experiences represents a growing concern in relation to what appears to be the government’s stance of creating a two-tier system for teachers based on race, ethnicity, country of origin, and country of original qualifications awarded. Put differently, through its failure to monitor the implementation of existing policies on race equality in England, the government could be culpable of assisting educational institutions circumvent the very policies designed to promote (and ensure) race equality in career progression and other institutional practices. Further, the government’s hostile policies towards migrants creates an environment in which the career progression of OTTs from non-industrialised, non-White countries, is as much linked to race and ethnicity, as much as to country of origin and the country that awarded their original qualifications.

Although the promotion/progression of BAME teachers is an area that has received much attention in terms of research and public debate in the past decade especially, the promotion/progression of OTTs is an area that is less well-ventilated. Nevertheless, from what we know, institutional practices appear to lag behind official policy positions on equality, and despite employing increased numbers of teachers of BAME heritage, leadership roles or positions of responsibility are very often filled by White teachers (Earley et al., 2012; Department for Education, 2018; Higher Education Statistical Agency, 2016). This chapter examines the issue of race, ethnicity, and migrancy in career progression. In particular, it will examine structural issues in the career progression of two minoritized groups of teachers: those

of BAME heritage and those originating from and/or were trained in non-white, non-industrialized country.

Race discrimination and teachers of BAME heritage

Teachers of BAME heritage

BAME teachers make up an important part of the overall population of staff in schools in England. They are an important group of individuals from non-White descent, and although not a homogenous group, their experience of the education system in England in terms race/ethnicity based discrimination is broadly consistent. On the one hand, this makes understanding the race/ethnic based discrimination in education somewhat easier; and on the other hand, it raises significant questions about the practice of educational institutions and educational leaders in promoting or ensuring race equality. There are approximately 451,000 teachers in the state sector in England, including 24,281 principals. Of the total number of principals, approximately 277 are of BAME heritage. Of the total number of teachers, 86.5% (or 395,564) are White-British, 3.8% (or 17,377) are from 'Other White' backgrounds, 1.7% (or 7,774) are White-Irish, 1.8% (or 8,231) are Indian, 1.0% (or 4,513) are Pakistani, and 1.0% (or 4,513) Black Caribbean, and less than 1% Black African (DfE, 2017b). Of the approximately 20,000 qualified teachers from Black and Minority Ethnic heritage, approximately 1200 are in a formal leadership position (including the 277 principals noted above).

The progression of teachers of BAME heritage

Research on the progression of teachers of BAME heritage have spanned nearly two decades and have found several barriers discussed below. For example, Earley et al. (2002) found that racial/ethnic stereotyping was a factor in the progression/ promotion of BAME

teachers to senior roles. This was reconfirmed a decade later, in 2012, by Earley et al., whose research concluded that ethnic stereotyping remain a problem in the progression/ promotion of BAME teachers. Research has also found that marginalisation and indirect racism (Powney, 2003); as well as the subtle influence of informal networks that excludes some groups (Harris et al., 2003) are factors influencing teacher progression generally, and BAME teacher progression, specifically. Bush et al. (2006) also found racial /ethnic discrimination was a factor in the career progression of some BAME teachers. Furthermore, Lumby and Coleman (2007) also found race/ethnicity was a barrier to the career progression of BAME teachers. A decade later, Lumby and Coleman (2017) found circumstances had not changed much for BAME teachers, whose ethnicity remain a problem to their career progression.

McNamara et al. (2009), in research for one of the teaching unions found that although teachers of BAME heritage possess similar aspirations, qualifications and experience as other teachers, workplace discrimination was a major barrier to their progression. Research by Shah and Shaikh (2010) provided new insights to debates on barriers to progression by arguing that religious background, in particular being a Muslim, was as problematic to progression as being of BAME heritage. They reported that being Muslim and male presented exceptional challenges to gaining an appointment as a head-teacher, a situation also reported by Iqbal (2018) from interviews with male Muslim head-teachers. Furthermore, other barriers in the career progression of teachers of BAME heritage include: indirect racism (Powney et al., 2003); the subtle influence of informal networks that excludes some groups (Harris et al., 2003); government policy, social connections, and school level jockeying/interference (Miller, 2014); and race discrimination (Miller & Callender, 2018). I have grouped the barriers identified above into five categories: policy, race/ racism, institutional practices, group membership and religion (Islam) (See Table 1).

Table 1: *Barriers to the progression of overseas trained and teachers of BAME heritage*

Table 1: HERE

The politics of knowledge

Overseas Trained Teachers

An Overseas Trained Teacher (OTT) is any teacher who has undertaken teacher training outside of the European Economic Area and Switzerland and has been recognised by the competent authority in that country (DfES, 2007). Although the cultural backgrounds of OTTs in England differ considerably and they make an invaluable contribution to England's education system and are from many countries including the United States and Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and from regions such as Asia, the Indian-subcontinent, Africa and the Caribbean. Data on OTTs has always been very patchy (Morgan et al., 2005; Miller, 2006), although in 2006, it was estimated there between approximately 43,000 OTTs in the UK. This was approximately 10% of the total teaching workforce, and top supplying countries during the period 2001-2008 were South Africa, Australia, United States, New Zealand, Canada and Jamaica. Although the Home Office and the Department for Education have discontinued the collection of nationality data on OTTs, there is evidence that, over the past decade, the top supplying countries have more or less remained unchanged. For example, based on recruitment activities during the period 2014 to 2016, top supplying countries were the Irish Republic, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and Jamaica (Boffey, 2015). It is important to note here however that, although English is the official language of the top six supplying countries, Jamaica and South Africa are both non-white, non-industrialised countries and teachers from Jamaica and South Africa are required to undertake additional training for the award of UK Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) in England.

The progression of overseas trained teachers

England's decision in the 1970s to admit migrants based on 'educational skills and resources' (Whitaker, 1991, p.19), instead of their racial backgrounds is arguably the basis for the recruitment of Overseas Trained Teachers (OTTs). However, since the mid to late 2000s, England has introduced myriad policies to curtail non-EU migration, largely as a response to populist narratives about non-EU migrants. Changes to existing legislation, and the introduction of new legislation not only affected those not already in the country, but also made it more difficult for those already in the country (Miller, 2008). For example, in 2006 the Home Office changed the qualifying period for those in 'Employment Related Categories' (OTTs included) to be able to apply for Indefinite Leave to Remain in the UK (ILR) was increased from 4–5 years with no recourse for those persons already in the UK at the time of the change. The Home Office also mandated that all migrants, including OTTs, were (and still are) required to complete English language and 'Life in the UK' tests as part of the requirements for obtaining ILR. One year later, in 2007, the Department for Education & Skills (DfES) varied the conditions of employment for OTTs to allow for their deportation, if after four years of teaching in the UK, they had not achieved UK Qualified Teacher Status (QTS).

Furthermore, as at 1 April 2012, the Department for Education (DfE) removed the requirement for teachers trained in Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand to do undergo any additional training leading to the award of UK Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) - although not for other OTTs. As a result, once recruited, this select group can apply directly to the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) for QTS without undertaking further training or assessment in England (DfE, 2014, p. 2). OTTs without UK QTS, or exemption from QTS, are considered "Unqualified teachers" and must undertake appropriate training and assessment leading to the award of QTS. Accordingly, Miller (2008) noted that the non-recognition and the devaluing of the original qualifications and the unfair policy

treatment (Miller, 2018) experienced by OTTs contributes to their lack of progression which had resulted in their careers being “flatlined” (p.14).

Cultural inequality in England

The treatment of OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage in England points to a situation of cultural inequality. As Britain struggles to maintain itself as an identifiable entity due to cultural shifts brought about by migration and globalisation, it is also in a race to prove that it is still in control of its borders. Cultural theory, asserts that in capitalist societies, the group with ownership of the means of material and mental production - will dominate (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), thus leading to the creation of a *dominant* and a *subordinated* culture. It is therefore in the interest of the dominant culture to exercise its power and control over resources and systems and other to sustain its position of dominance. However, to do this, it must first gain the cooperation of the masses, and *inter alia*, pacification or through regulatory frameworks (Ward, 2006) that keep the subordinated culture or those from a subordinated culture in their place (Pratto et al., 1997).

According to Bourdieu (1986), status in society is determined by three kinds of capital, namely:

- Economic - having large amounts of money and economic resources
- Social - having large numbers of influential friends
- Cultural - having high-level skills and understanding of the codes used to describe objects of high aesthetic value, usually passed down within families as a set of understandings of the world - a *habitus*.

Cultural capital, however, Bourdieu points out, can be a major source of social inequality where certain forms of cultural capital are not as valued as others, and where, as a result, hinders one's social mobility (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Accordingly, the standard of training received by OTTs from the Caribbean, the Indian-subcontinent, Asia and Africa, for example, may be

viewed as lower in status and value than training provided by countries in the European Union and in other industrialised nations of the “West”. In Bourdieu’s view, capital is the foundation of social life and capital is responsible for one’s position within the social order. Thus, the more capital an individual has, the more likely they are to exercise more power and influence in society. Similarly, the more capital a society has, the more power it has on the global stage. Put differently, high-status cultural values have high *cultural capital*, and individual and societies that have high cultural capital have automatic or preferred access to levels of social intercourse that will augment their status. As a result, the qualifications of teachers trained in England or in an industrialised nation seemingly guarantee certain privileges that assures them a high status cultural value when presented in countries thought of as having a lower or a similarly high-status cultural value.

Li (2003) points out that the term ‘migrant’ has become a code word for people of colour, those from a different cultural background, and those who do not speak fluent English. As a result, the knowledge and capacities they possess is deemed inferior because their ‘differences’ are thought incompatible with the cultural and social order. Ward (2006) notes that hegemony promotes pacification and disempowerment of peoples and cultures, through regulatory frameworks, in the interest of a *common good*. In the context of OTTs from developing countries in England, a hostile and discriminatory education and migration policy context, led by the government, is steadily undermining their belief in the ability of the system to deliver equality of access and outcomes to and for them. In twenty-first century England where skilled migration is ostensibly no longer based on race and ethnic origin the non-recognition of the overseas qualifications of OTTs from developing countries is functioning as a new ‘head tax’ as a means keep out those deemed ‘undesirable’, and for keeping migrants already in the country, who are from non-white, non-industrialised countries ‘in check’. Concomitantly, differences in how social capital is perceived for

teachers of BAME heritage, and the non-recognition of the original qualifications of OTTs from developing countries therefore promote a hierarchy of knowledge and cultural inequality which maintains and reinforces existing power relations that serve as a tool for appeasing those who are anxious about patterns and levels of migration.

Fleras and Elliot (2002) note that some societies, and individuals within them, “tolerate rather than embrace differences” (p.2). This paradox was appropriately identified an OTT who, based on her experience of the promotion, progression process suggested she seems “*fit to teach but not to lead*”, and by another OTT who proposed that in order to improve their chances of promotion she should “... *commit to speaking the Queen's English*” despite her native language being English. These observations highlight and acknowledge an apparent paradox in England’s education system, where a politics of knowledge exists, and where this politic promotes two types of capital: a “white” capital (linked to industrialised country contexts), and a non-white capital (linked to non-industrialised country contexts). This underscores Goulbourne’s (2006) point that, “what is social capital in one social context may not be social capital in another context”, and Miller observation that “BME capital... is restricted and (can be) restrictive – and white capital – ... has a degree of power and influence that can provide access to predominantly white middle-class spaces” (Miller, 2016, p.14).

Epistemological and ontological misunderstandings of difference

Epistemological misunderstandings of difference

Although one of the key expressions of a multicultural society is its commitment to cultural pluralism, it has been suggested that, for some countries, this claim amounts to “pretend pluralism”. Accordingly, Guo (2005) asserts that:

Although minor differences may be gently affirmed in depoliticised and decontextualised forms such as food, dance and festivities, substantive differences that

tend to challenge hegemony and resist being co-opted are usually perceived by many as deficient, deviant, pathological, or otherwise divisive. (p.4)

Thus, the non-recognition of the overseas qualifications of some OTTs based on a 'deficit model' of difference, and is also a political act, in a political context that prefers sameness to difference. It is reasonable, therefore, to argue that one key barrier preventing Britain from fully recognising the overseas qualifications of some OTTs is its prevailing attitude towards difference. As noted by one OTT, "...*the government should create systems that support the progression of all OTTs and not just some*". Britain's negative attitude towards, and treatment of OTTs, and other skilled migrants, co-exists alongside its commitment to democracy, social justice, equality and fairness, and may be described as a form of "democratic racism" (Henry et al, 2000, p.10). That is, a situation which prevents the government from making changes to the existing social, economic and political order that might improve the low status of individuals and groups, in this case non-white OTTs, for fear that taking such steps will result in conflict with (and a threat to) the mainstream.

As noted by Bourdieu (1986), knowledge is power, and that knowledge has power. However, with respect to OTTs in England, a politics of knowledge, led by the government, places a limit on their knowledge (in the form of their qualification), thus, underlining and reifying notions of hegemony and cultural dominance. Thus, the nature of knowledge prompts a number of important questions: Whose knowledge counts as legitimate, and who sets the parameters for this? Whose knowledge is valued and whose knowledge is silenced, and on what basis? Is knowledge that is acceptable and valid only to be found in white, industrialised societies? Who establishes the criteria for measuring qualifications equivalence and for recognising them? Whose interests are represented and served by said criteria? What should we do with/ how should we treat knowledge that is valid but different? What forms of knowledge might become equivalent to 'ours'? These questions are underlined by Guo's

(2005) argument that, “knowledge is socially constructed, culturally mediated and historically situated. It is never neutral; nor is it objective” (p.4). Furthermore, they also highlight the differential regard England has for cultural capital (in the form of qualifications) obtained in developing countries, and suggest that, to progress in their careers, OTTs from non-white, non-industrialised countries need to be re-cultured (obtainable through retraining), and embedded in this process of retraining is hegemony and cultural domination.

Ontological misunderstandings of difference

The progression of teachers of BAME heritage in England appears to be grounded in two things: positivistic and racial/ ethnic measuring. On the one hand, positivists believe an objective world that exists ‘out there’ which is external to the individual (Boshier, 1994), and that if something exists, it can be measured. On the other hand, race and ethnic discrimination operates in the form of social categorisation that exaggerates differences between individuals, groups and/or countries. Over the past five decades, at least, this ontological view has been a key determinant in the discrimination experienced by teachers and other professionals from BAME heritage. Currently, education and migration policies have not levelled the playing field, but instead have advantaged some teachers over others, the result of which is the potential to normalise a worldview that some teachers are more preferred for leadership roles than others.

In using the criteria of a dominant culture to measure the potential contribution OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage can make, this creates an imbalance and a politics of difference that fails to consider the benefit each teacher can bring to the education system. Accordingly, although the Equality Act, the race disparity audit and other government led initiatives may be seen as attempts by the government to understand or even address the issue of race inequality in education, it is clear these attempts stem from a fear of, and a misrecognition of difference.

Race equality and the law

There is some concern about the effectiveness of policy, legislative and/or other interventions aimed at tackling the race disparity gap in England. The Equality Act (2010) makes it illegal for individuals and/or groups to be discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity. However, whereas educational institutions can encourage people with one or more protected characteristics (e.g.: race or gender) to apply for certain positions, under the Equality Act, educational institutions are unable to take the protected characteristics into account when making appointments, unless they are an essential qualifying aspect of a job (e.g.: women working in women's refuges is a commonly cited example). Further research is needed to ascertain the extent to which educational institutions apply these caveats in recruitment and/or promotion activities. Nevertheless, the Equality Act could be regarded as both a key and as a lock or as an instrument that promotes or encourages greater access to opportunities, although offering no [guarantee] of better or different outcomes.

This apparent paradox is accentuated by the government's failure to implement systems to monitor how educational institutions demonstrate and fulfil their race equality duty, a failure which undermines the spirit, ambitions and the intent of the Equality Act itself. Furthermore, this failure highlights that 'doing' race equality requires more than simply developing [caveated] legislations and policies, but also clear systems and mechanisms for supporting their implementation and for measuring their effectiveness. Accordingly, the current approach to doing race equality in education in England could be described as "primarily a matter of documentation, audits and bureaucratic paper trails" (Bhopal & Jackson, 2013, p. 2), which exposes "the gap between words, images and deeds" (Ahmed, 2007, p. 607).

Race equality and educational institutions

Practices at the level of educational institutions have not always reflected the spirit, ambitions and intent of equality regulations. According to the Equalities Challenge Unit (2011) some initiatives fail due to:

the absence of resources and authority for the initiative, and sometimes fatigue and apathy towards new initiatives where previous staff experiences tend to be of unsuccessful initiatives that achieved neither substance nor sustainability. (Equalities Challenge Unit 2011, pp. 46-47).

Furthermore, other institutions have shown a “lack of commitment to change” (Ahmed, 2007, p.236). Further research is required to identify and establish the myriad factors behind any apparent lack of commitment to change, although the caveats inherent within the Equality Act, as noted above, should not be ignored.

Where educational leaders fail to commit themselves enthusiastically and visibly, outside and within their institutions, to supporting, investing in, and in some cases directly leading race equality initiatives; or where educational leaders fail to appoint individuals with a passion and a clear mandate for tackling race inequality, the content, focus, intended meaning and outcomes of such initiatives may not be realised. Thus, ‘doing’ race equality is serious business, and educational institutions need to approach this with the degree of enthusiasm and interest required in order to make changes that are meaningful and sustainable. Some educational institutions (or units within institutions) do less than the minimum, others do only the minimum, and those that do as much as they can to promote and foster race equality. To enable our understanding of how educational institutions engage with doing race equality, Miller’s (2016) typology of institutions is a useful starting point. He identifies four types of institutions, namely: engaged, experimenting, initiated and uninitiated.

1. In an **‘engaged’** institution, there are BAME staff at all levels of its hierarchy, including in (senior) leadership roles.

2. In an '**experimenting**' institution, there are a small number of BAME staff in posts and a smaller number of BME staff in leadership roles.
3. In an '**initiated**' institution, there exists a framework for meeting its legal duty, BAME staff recruitment is restricted with only few BAME staff in posts, but no BAME staff in leadership roles.
4. In an '**uninitiated**' institution, no framework or plan is in place to meet its legal duty and no BAME staff are in posts (Miller, 2016, p. 13).

As mentioned above, doing race equality is serious business. But, it is also a complex, multifaceted endeavour that requires strong leadership, both at the level of specific initiatives and also at institutional level, supported by appropriate and adequate financial and human resources, as well as by a robust plan of action that seeks and prefers meaningful long term ends over short term wins. Kalra, et al. (2009) note that, for diversity initiatives to be productive, changes to institutional cultures must be promoted, underlining the need for leadership that is committed in speech and in action, and which cuts through the paralysis of action associated with diversity issues (Ahmed, 2007; Mirza, 2008).

Responding to structural and cultural inequality

The minority ethnic status of OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage in England appears to confer on them two common struggles: a struggle for mutual recognition by white gatekeepers and a struggle to reposition themselves in the face of histories of misrepresentation about their talents and abilities. This struggle is highlighted by Saran (2007), who acknowledges that “[p]eople of color do not always get the respect and recognition for their academic achievements that they deserve” (p.68). In an effort to get this recognition, their voices heard, and their knowledge legitimated, Miller (2016) observed three patterns of behaviour in which teachers were involved: activism, brokerage and acquiescence.

- Activism: engaged in research – as doers, participants or both – and in seminar and conference presentations, contributing to public debate. Research, seminar and conference presentations
- Brokerage: involved in mentoring other BME staff, being mentored by a BME and/or white staff member, and joining and/or forming professional networks, whether formal or informal
- Acquiescence: those who have ‘given up’ due to being ‘fed up’ and ‘tired’ of a system (and institutions) that has consistently let them down and in which they feel that they will not be able to progress (p.13).

Reconceptualising teacher progression

Recently, a new body of research has emerged, which has identified three primary enablers for progression among OTTs teachers of BAME heritage (Miller (2014, 2015, & 2016). These are, “Affiliation” or membership of an “in-group”, “club” or “network”, “Appeasement” or “Adaptation” and “White sanction”. Although several of the factors identified as enablers to progression could simultaneously serve as barriers, this evolving body of research attempts to provide a counter-balance to existing debates on the progression of teachers of BAME heritage, and to reformulate our understanding of barriers and enablers in the progression of teachers of BAME heritage (including OTTs).

Affiliation

In 2014, Miller found several “marks of affiliation” could contribute to the progression of teachers. In particular, he found government policy, social connections, and school level jockeying or interference were important factors in teacher progression. In terms of government policy, successful completion of a programme of activity through the government sponsored Leadership, Equality & Diversity Fund (LEDf) is believed to stand OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage a (better) chance of progression. To date however, there is no clear evidence

of the numbers of participants from BAME heritage who have gained access to a programme or who have secured an appointment as a result of participating in a programme. One criticism of this programme however is that schools have to bid to the government to access this Fund, and since inception in 2014, a modest 655 persons have completed programmes through 40 lead schools (*DfE Review*, 2016).

In terms of social connections, progression is not actually based on what skills, qualifications and composite experiences a person possesses, but rather, on the basis of who they know or by whom they are known. This places OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage at a disadvantage since, in the main, it is believed their social capital is limited or restricted. Furthermore, interference or jockeying occurs where an applicant is deliberately advantaged or disadvantaged by someone not directly connected to a recruitment or promotion process, but who is nonetheless in a position to influence the outcome of such a process, usually, because the applicant is known by this person or is connected to someone who knows this person. There is nothing underhanded about knowing persons with the power to influence. However, this becomes problematic when this power is used to interrupt, and as a result, disadvantage others who participated in a recruitment or progression process, legitimately, and in good faith in.

Appeasement or Adaptation

In 2015, Miller also found that when OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage “proved themselves”, or [later] became part of an “in-group” or “network” or “club”, although not guaranteed, their chances of promotion, progression were improved. This implies that OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage lack something, and that in order for them to be in with a chance of gaining a promotion, they need to position or conduct themselves in ways that are likely to increase and/or improve their chances of being “proven” or being understood. Miller’s observations were consistent with research previously undertaken by Halpern (2005) who

found that connecting “through intermediate social structures – webs of association and shared understandings of how to behave” (p.3) are crucial to career progression. Thus, OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage appear to stand a better chance of promotion, progression where they, at first, look like, second, share cultural habits and patterns of behaviours similar to British citizens, or third, where they are prepared to ‘adopt’, ‘adapt’ and ‘adjust’. This process of ‘adopting’, ‘adapting’, and ‘adjusting’ is consistent with what Frye (1992) described as “behaving whitely” and amounts to cultural domination which trivialises the social, political, historical and cultural contexts that have socialised OTTs, and teachers of BAME heritage.

White sanction

In a later study, Miller (2016) found that progression/ promotion of teachers of BAME heritage is, to a large extent, and in many cases, linked to or is reliant upon the support and endorsement of a white colleague, a situation he described as ‘White sanction’. Miller defines ‘White sanction’ as a deliberate act “where the skills and capabilities of a BME individual are, first, acknowledged and, second, endorsed/ promoted by a white individual, who is positioned as a broker and/or mediator acting on behalf of or in the interests of the BME individual” (p. 11). Although acknowledging that ‘White sanction’ positions white colleagues as gatekeepers, and is therefore problematic, Miller notes that ‘White sanction’ can lead to positive outcomes for the BAME teacher who has been endorsed by a white colleague. In particular, Miller argues that, ‘White sanction’ has two important outcomes: legitimacy (where a BAME teacher or academic and their knowledge, skills and experiences are accepted as equal on the basis of merit); and enabling (where the BAME teacher or academic is afforded different opportunities despite their race/ ethnicity). Miller (2016) cautions however:

That not every act of acknowledgement is itself ‘White sanction’ and, for ‘White sanction’ to occur, it must satisfy three conditions: acknowledgement/recognition,

endorsement and ‘brokerage’. Brokerage is about leveraging opportunities for the BME individual. (p.11).

From his research on race in education in the United States, McClendon (2004) concluded that “Whiteness has a certain invisible quality” (p. 223), a view sustained in recent research on Black school leaders in England, by Miller and Callender (2018) who concluded that whereas personal agency was an important factor that keeps head-teachers in post and enable them to succeed against tremendous pressures and odds, ‘white sanction’ was the single most important factor in getting them ‘through the door’ in the first place (p. 12). Taken together, the conclusions reached by Miller (2016), McClendon (2004) and Miller and Callender (2018) acknowledge that Whiteness has a quality and a power to open and/or close doors.

Implications

A number of implications have emerged. However, for the sake of space, I present only four, which, I believe are the main ones.

1. Corruption as redemption? Problematic as it is, the evidence suggests that OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage need to be engaged in some degree of ‘game playing’ in order to secure promotion, progression opportunities. That is, in order to progress, and the further they are likely to progress, they need to show evidence of at least one or more of the following: “affiliation”, “appeasement”/ “adaptation” and/or “white sanction”. Being able to demonstrate one or more of these characteristics confirms that OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage are interacting with, and integrating within their education system, and its structures. This situation positions OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage as pawns in a corrupt system where meritocracy is secondary to the power of whiteness, and where sameness is preferred to difference.

2. Interest convergence/ divergence. There are epistemological and ontological notions of difference and recognition in England. Successive governments and educational institutions have appeared much more comfortable in seeking to tackle issues of social class and its relationship with social mobility, although much less comfortable in seeking to tackle issues to do with race inequality and social mobility. Who benefits from not having a multi- ethnic, multi-racial teaching profession? Who benefits from not having educational leaders that are as racially diverse as the student populations they lead? Whose interest is served by the fact the Equality Act does not guarantee equal outcomes for all and not just some? That the government has introduced the Leadership, Equality and Diversity Fund (LEDF) is not a solution. And the success of the LEDF is potentially undermined by the fact that access to this fund is through voluntary bidding by schools that may or may not have the interest, motivation, resources, etc., to design and develop a successful programme, or which may choose instead to focus on other protected characteristics - which is allowed under the Fund. Official policy, practice and attitudes towards regarding race equality in education and in society, thus appears to be one of interest divergence and interest convergence.

3. Regulatory disempowerment; Hegemony; Neo-colonialism. Many OTTs have been recruited to teach in schools in England, some from white, industrialised, and others from non-white, non-industrialised countries. OTTs from white, industrialised countries, although not the others, have had their teaching qualification accepted at face value, as equivalent to a teaching qualification awarded in England. In addition, the Home Office and the Department for Education have created and introduced regulations limiting the number of years OTTs can teach without Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) - which has a direct knock-on effect on their career progression and flourishing in the system. Since OTTs from white, industrialised countries do not have to undergo assessment for UK QTS, it is to be noted that through its regulatory and policy apparatus, the British government disempowers some OTTs (whilst

simultaneously empowering others), and in the process, appears to be engaged in a pogrom of hegemony, (white) cultural domination and neo-colonialism.

4. Social vs cultural capital. As noted by Bourdieu (1986), social capital includes having large numbers of influential friends whereas cultural means having high-level skills and understanding. The promotion, progression experience of OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage presents a disjuncture that puts social and cultural capital on pathway to collision. In education, and in life, which is more important? One of the fundamental teachings of education is that education (or cultural capital), has potential to increase social mobility for all- no matter their colour or creed. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that the original qualifications of OTTs (cultural capital) from non-white, non-industrialised countries are restricted and restrictive. And, in the case of teachers of BAME heritage, whereas a teaching qualification and a degree may get them through the door, social intercourse and access to predominantly white middle-class, male-dominated networks (Bhopal & Jackson, 2013) appears a stronger and more certain indicator of career progression.

Is there a role for educational leaders?

The apparent lack of OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage in (senior) leadership positions in UK schools is not an issue to be ignored or taken lightly. It is an issue that requires constant foregrounding by policy makers and educational leaders who must show consistency and commitment in their attitudes and endeavours towards creating meaningful change. Thus, leadership from government and educational leaders must dovetail around collective agendas and endeavours, towards changing cultures, attitudes and behaviours. As Miller and Callender (2018) argue:

Government needs to create an environment in which existing policies are implemented and monitored and where failure to comply cannot mean business as usual. ... a continuing push towards getting schools to actively seek out and deploy

talent from suitably qualified and experienced BME individuals in an attempt to change the face of school leadership... is required. (p.12)

The kind of leadership required to tackle these challenges must not only be activist in intent and orientation, but must also be deliberative and focused. That both the Cabinet Office through the Race Disparity Audit and Department for Education through its annual School workforce data acknowledge the complexity of the problem of race inequality in education itself not a solution. By not challenging educational leaders/institutions, and by not making them more accountable for the development and progression of all and not just some staff, the government's current approach serves only to deepen and widen the existing gap between what is espoused and what is enacted, as well as to impair and potentially erode the goodwill of many OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage who would wish to be included in meaningful change agendas.

Due to the embedded and multifaceted nature of race inequality in England, successfully tackling this issue requires leadership "that is neither top-down nor bottom-up, but that is encompassing, synergistic, innovative, and practical" (Miller 2012, p. 9). This kind of leadership calls upon policy makers and educational leaders to convert policies and their intent into actions and deliverables by devising and inventing tactics and pathways which addresses pipeline and progression issues, since current pathways and tactics appear incapable of dealing with the plethora of complex and myriad challenges facing 21st century educational institutions (Pont et al., 2008). Courageous leadership, according to Freeman (2008), involves:

Courageous listening, courageous decision-making, courageous action, the courage to set and enforce standards of behavior, and the courage to do what it takes to change destructive existing habits. Courageous leadership requires people to see what others don't want to see, and do what others don't want to do. (p.1)

Courageous leaders possess the strength, conviction and stamina to move from wanting to change to finding ways to implement and lead change. They show moral purpose that is greater and more consequential than themselves, and they are willing to put themselves on the line in trying to create inclusive and socially just work environments. The attitude of educational leaders is therefore crucial in enabling and empowering all who study, work in, and are otherwise associated with their institutions, to develop and manifest attitudes that support harmonious existence within these institutions and in a society that is culturally diverse.

Educational institutions are microcosms of society, and they need leaders from all racial and ethnic groups, and persons who study and work in these institutions need persons in positions of responsibility and seniority who look like them, who understand their histories and struggles, who can empathise with them, and who can relate to, and identify with them. This means, persons from all different race and ethnicities should be supported, and not merely encouraged, into leadership positions. Policy deliverables which are not mandated, or for which failure to implement carries only limited or no consequences, serve only to entice educational institutions to implement as little as they can, or to get away with as much as they can. Put differently, where (and if) institutional practices are not monitored and regularly scrutinised, and where privileges afforded to institutions are maintained despite lack of compliance, accountability will be a zero sum game. As Miller (2016) notes:

Light-touch and self-serving... interventions are those that are superficial (voluntary or otherwise) and lacking in accountability, and that, by their existence, reify notions of exclusivity which highlight weaknesses in policy leadership and educational practices, from the nursery to university. (p. 14)

Leading change in race equality in educational leadership requires courage from policy makers and educational leaders in order to improve conditions and create sustainable change within a national education system. The position and status of educational leaders provides them

enormous latitude and a significant opportunity to advance race equality agendas and practice by challenging and removing barriers and structures that inhibit, and replacing these with structures that encourage, promote, facilitate and enable equity (See Table 2 for suggested policy and practice change interventions).

Table 2: *Tackling race inequality in England: suggestions for policy and practice*

Table 2: HERE

Meaningful improvements in race equality in educational leadership must derive from a collective endeavour and a broad-based coalition that appropriately draws upon voices and talents from different segments of a national education sector, including: policy makers, school leaders, teaching unions, teachers, professional and technical staff, student, parents, and those representing school boards. Crucially, input from teachers and researchers of migrant and BAME origin is necessary, for helping others to understand the severity of the issues through their lived experiences, but also to involve them in debates, design and development of interventions. This inclusive approach to leading change is an opportunity for new understandings to emerge, and for meaningful and sustainable change agendas to be decided and designed that will have greater appeal and buy-in. The inclusion of OTTs and teachers of BAME heritage in the debate, design and development of interventions should not preclude the involvement of white teachers and leaders, whether of migrant or local origin, since they can use their racial privilege to agitate for, initiate and lead change, and since regardless of their experience with racial or cultural diversity, they are already imbued with "... a considerably rich body of knowledge about social stratification, social mobility, and human differences based on their life experience" (Carr & Klassen, 1997, p. 3).

Conclusion

Racial inequality in educational leadership remains a problem for schools because race inequality remains a problem in education and in society as a whole. The experience of Overseas Trained Teachers (OTTs) from non-white, non-industrialised countries could potentially put off other teachers thinking about making the move to England and to other developed countries for fear their experience will be the same, or worse. When the qualifications awarded by the “competent authority” in a country of origin are not recognised or are devalued by the education system in the recruiting or host country, this not only calls into question the qualifications of the bearer, and places a limit of their career progression and likely success, it also calls into question the integrity of the education system that has awarded the qualification. The actions of the British government should be carefully studied by major teacher recruiting countries such as Canada and the United States, and elsewhere. As cultural capital, qualifications may increase or decrease in value, depending on the country of origin of said qualification, the destination country in which said qualification is presented and based on the market conditions existing in the country receiving said qualification - at a particular point in time. Furthermore, the experience of teachers of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) heritage make them susceptible to opting-out of teaching as a choice of career or profession, thus creating a major challenge for schools as, by default they become sites of Whiteness, even in communities with large minority and/or migrant populations.

The Equality Act identifies race as a protected characteristic. However, by not allowing the protected characteristics to be taken into account in appointment processes, the authority and reach of the law, as a force and a tool for social change, is arguably curtailed. Supposed weaknesses in the law aside, education institutions are microcosms of society and therefore they cannot be divorced from the culture of society, the mood of a country or what society views as acceptable. Nevertheless, educational leaders have a moral duty to create, promote,

facilitate and embed race equality within and throughout their institutions. This however requires leadership that is activist and courageous, and that is also inclusive, drawing upon the widest and best pool of guidance and support available, including teachers and others from BAME heritage who can provide situated accounts and examples of their experiences and insights into what change could look like and mean for them. How educational leaders act toward race inequality has a far-reaching effect on students and teachers of BAME heritage, the education sector and society as a whole. Nevertheless, the key to successfully tackling race inequality in educational leadership rests, in large part, in the hands of those [white] educational leaders who are willing to publicly challenge and denounce race inequality and stand up for race equality by taking action within their institutions, and lobbying for policy changes and actions across the sector. Without their personal courageous and transformative leadership, there is significant risk of race inequality being trivialised, if not normalised.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2007a). The language of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(2), 235-256.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870601143927>
- Ahmed, S. (2007b). You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing. Diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(4), 590–609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701356015>
- Arday, J. (2015). Creating space and providing opportunities for BME academics in higher education. In: Alexander C and Arday J (eds) *Aiming higher: Race, inequality and diversity in the academy*. London: Runnymede Trust, pp. 40–41.
- Bhopal, K., & Jackson, J. (2013). *The experiences of black and minority ethnic academics: Multiple identities and career progression*. Southampton: University of Southampton.

Bush T, Glover, D., & Sood, K. (2006). Black and minority ethnic leaders in England: A portrait. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(3): 289–305.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217725326>

Carter, J., Fenton, S., & Modood, T. (1999). *Ethnicity and employment in higher education*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Deem, R., Morley, L., & Tilli, A. (2005). Equal opportunities and diversity for staff in higher education: Negotiating equity in higher education institutions. Project 3. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Department for Education, (2016). Leadership, Equality and Diversity Fund. Briefing Paper, Retrieved from:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/573553/Equality_and_Diversity_analysis_of_participant_survey.pdf

Department for Education, (2017a). Schools, pupils and their characteristics: January 2017. SFR28/2017. Retrieved from:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/650547/SFR28_2017_Main_Text.pdf

Department for Education, (2017b). School workforce in England: November 2014. SFR 25/2017. Retrieved from:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/620825/SFR25_2017_MainText.pdf

Earley, P., Evans, J., Collarbone P, Gold, A., & Halpin, D. (2002). Establishing the current state of school leadership in England. Department for Education and Skills research report RR336. London: HMSO.

Earley, P., Higham, R., Allen, R., Allen, T., Howson, J., Nelson, R., Rawal, S., Lynch, S., Morton, L., Mehta, P., & Sims, D. (2012). *Review of the school leadership landscape*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Equality Challenge Unit. (2011). *The experience of black and minority ethnic staff in higher education in England*. London: Equality Challenge Unit.

Equality Challenge Unit. (2012). *Equality in higher education: Statistical report 2012. Part 1: Staff*. London: Equality Challenge Unit.

Equality Challenge Unit. (2014). *Equality in higher education: Statistical report*. London: Equality Challenge Unit.

Equality Challenge Unit. (2015). Eight universities first to receive award following end of trial for Race Equality Charter. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/news/eight-universities-first-to-receive-award-following-end-of-trial-for-race-equality-charter/>

Equality Challenge Unit. (2016) About ECU's Race Equality Charter. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/race-equality-charter/about-race-equality-charter/>

Equality Challenge Unit. (2018). Race Equality Charters. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/race-equality-charter/members-award-holders/>

Feistritzer, C.E. (2011). *The Profile of Teachers in the U.S.2011*, Washington, DC: National Centre for Education Information

Fenton. S., Carter, J., & Modood, T. (2000). Ethnicity and academia: Closure models, racism models and market models. *Sociological Research Online*, 5(2). Retrieved from: www.socresonline.org.uk/5/2/fenton.html

Freeman, D. H. (2008). *Courageous Leadership*, New York: *Law Journal Newsletters*.

Retrieved from: http://www.davidfreemanconsulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/courageous_leadership.pdf

Goulbourne, H. (2006). Families, communities and social capital. *Community, Work and Family*, 9(3): 235–250. doi:10.1080/13668800600743412

Halpern, D. (2005). *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harris, A., Muijs, D., & Crawford, M. (2003). *Deputy and assistant heads: Building leadership potential*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Higher Education Statistics Agency (2014). Staff. SFR 225. Retrieved from: www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1898&Itemid=634

Higher Education Statistics Agency (2016). Students. SFR 224. Retrieved from: <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/stats>

Kalra, V.S., Able, P., & Esmail, A. (2009). Developing leadership interventions for black and minority ethnic staff: A case study of the National Health Service (NHS) in the UK. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 23(1): 103–118. doi:[10.1108/14777260910942588](https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260910942588)

Kendall, F. (2006). *Understanding White Privilege: Creating Pathways to Authentic Relationships across Race*. New York: Routledge.

Klassen, T., & Carr, P. (1996). The role of racial minority teachers in anti-racist education. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 28(2): 126-142. Retrieved from:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/252287986> The Role of Racial Minority Teachers in Anti-racist Education

Kohli, R. (2016). Behind School Doors: The Impact of Hostile Racial Climates on Urban Teachers of Color, *Urban Education*, pp.1-27. [doi/10.1177/0042085916636653](https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916636653)

Law, I., Philips, D., & Turner, L. (eds) (2004). *Institutional Racism in Higher Education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Lipsitz, G. (1998). *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Loke, G. (2015). Breaking the race inequality cycle in higher education: A change of focus is needed to break the statistical Groundhog Day. In: Alexander, C., & Arday, J. (eds) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*. London: Runnymede Trust, pp. 42–44.

Lumby, J., & Coleman, M. (2017). *Leading for equality: Making schools fairer*. London: SAGE

Lumby, J., & Coleman, M. (2007). *Leadership and Diversity: Challenging Theory and Practice in Education*. London: SAGE.

Matias, C. E., & Liou, D. D. (2015). Tending to the heart of communities of color: Towards critical race teacher activism. *Urban Education*, 50 (5), 601-625. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085913519338>

McClendon, J.H. (2004). On the nature of whiteness and the ontology of race: Towards a dialectical materialist analysis. In: Yancy G (ed.) *What White Looks Like: African-*

American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. New York: Routledge, pp. 211–226.

McNamara, O., Howson, J., Gunter, H., & Fryers, A. (2009). *The leadership aspirations and careers of black and minority ethnic teachers*. London: NASUWT and National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services.

Miller, P. (2014). Becoming a principal: exploring perceived discriminatory practices in the selection of principals in Jamaica and England. In: Beycioglu, K., & Pashiardis, P. (eds) *Multidimensional perspectives on principal leadership effectiveness*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, pp. 132–147.

Miller, P. (2015). Perceived barriers to progression in UK universities: Preliminary findings from an exploratory study. In: *IIEP Policy Forum on Planning Higher Education Integrity*. Paris: France, 18–20 March 2015.

Miller, P. (2016). 'White sanction', institutional, group and individual interaction in the promotion and progression of black and minority academics and teachers in England. *Power and Education*, 8(3), 205-221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757743816672880>

Mirza, H.S. (2008). *Race, Gender and Educational Desire: Why black women succeed and fail*. London: Routledge.

Morgan, C., Hall, V., & Mackay, H. (1983). *The selection of secondary school head-teachers*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Olivos, E.M. (2006). *The power of parents of parents: Critical perspectives of bicultural parent involvement in public schools*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Phillips, T. (2016). *Race and faith: The deafening silence*. London: Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society. Retrieved from: <http://www.civitas.org.uk/content/files/Race-and-Faith.pdf>
- Pilkington, A. (2013). The interacting dynamics of institutional racism in higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 16(2): 225–245. Retrieved from: <http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/4234/10/Pilkington20134234.pdf>
- Powney J., Wilson, V., & Hall, S. (2003). *Teachers' careers: The impact of age, disability, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Puwar, N. (2001). The racialized somatic norm and the senior civil service. *Sociology* 35(3): 651–670. <https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000335>
- Puwar, N. (2004). *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. New York: Berg.
- Ryan, J., Pollock, K., & Antonelli, F. (2009). Teacher diversity in Canada: Leaky pipelines, bottlenecks, and glass ceilings. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32(3), 591-617. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ859264.pdf>
- SecEd (2015). Improving diversity among leaders. Retrieved from: www.sec-ed.co.uk/best-practice/improving-diversity-among-leaders/
- Shah, S., & Shaikh, J. (2010). Leadership progression of Muslim male teachers: Interplay of ethnicity, faith and visibility. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(1): 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430903509733>
- Shilliam, R. (2015). Black academia: The doors have been opened but the architecture remains the same. In: Alexander, C., & Arday, J. (eds). *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*. London: Runnymede Trust, pp. 32–34.

Singh, G., & Kwhali, J. (2015). *How can we make not break black and minority ethnic leaders in higher education?* London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Solomon, R. P. (1997). Race, role modelling, and representation in teacher education and teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22(4): 395-410. doi: 10.2307/1585791

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender and social class locations. *Educational Foundations*, 6(2): 7–32.

Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 9(3): 243–259.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320600807550>

Villegas, A., & Davis, D. (2007). Approaches to diversifying the teaching force: Attending to issues of recruitment, preparation and retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(4): 137-147. Retrieved from:
http://www.teqjournal.org/backvols/2007/34_4/16villegas%26davis.pdf