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What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

SUMMARY

This thesis seeks to interrogate the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education and evaluate the pedagogic relevance and practice utility of teaching social work students about ‘race’, racism and anti-racism. A mixed methods research strategy is drawn upon to explore how professional social work training prepares students to work with ‘cultural diversity’ and ‘cultural difference’ and to evaluate the outcomes of teaching and learning which focuses on anti-racism. The methodological position drawn upon in this thesis is a pragmatic one (Williams, 2006), which recognises the role of both nomothetic and idiographic approaches to enabling us to describe and understand how social work students and tutors experience and make sense of anti-racist social work education and the pedagogic challenges and barriers they face to engaging with this discrete area of professional education.

Anti-racism is the theoretical and conceptual focus of this thesis and it encompasses a broad coalition of different perspectives and academic interests concerned with actively identifying and resisting racism. It has been characterised as a set of disparate polycentric overlapping practices and discourses (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002), whilst exhibiting a politically committed form of practice (Bhatti-Sinclair, 2011). It has also been described as a radical and oppositional project which emphasises the need to actively identify and resist racism (Bonnett & Carrington, 1996; Tomlinson, 2002). Historically it has been associated with the politics of resistance and social movements in support of decolonialisation, anti fascism and equal rights for immigrant workers (Dominelli, 2008). Frequently, it has been characterised as reflecting a radical dualism between ‘white racism versus Black resistance’ (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Within social work education, anti-racism despite its retrenchment and appropriation into a broad ‘anti oppressive’ practice model (Williams, 1999), continues to be regarded as a progressive educational strategy which has a transformative role. It is viewed as an effective
approach to challenging the attitudes and values of individual students (Heron, 2008). It can also lead to ‘perspective transformation’ (Mezirow, 1981), and ‘critical consciousness’ through the process of conscientization (Freire, 1970). Anti-racism is therefore considered to have a valuable pedagogic role in raising awareness of racial inequalities and the processes associated with racial exclusion, whilst also providing a wider critique of the state, its culture, its institutions, ideology, legislation and policy frameworks (Singh, 2006a).

The qualitative and quantitative data presented in this thesis suggests that it is possible to discover the situated experiences of teaching and learning on anti-racism and measure how these pedagogic interventions can affect and lead to knowledge, skills and attitudinal change (Carpenter, 2005; 2011). The empirical evidence drawn upon in this thesis identifies important group differences, related to age, ‘race’ and experience of working with a BME service user, which are important for understanding how anti-racist social work education is experienced differently by learners, and how it leaves a complex set footprints which enable us to appreciate how this educational intervention works in different ways for different types of students. Sometimes these differences are subtle, but at other times they are more evident and suggestive of group experiences which go beyond the individual. The empirical evidence also suggests that social work educators experience anti-racist social work education as a challenging and emotionally supercharged area of the curriculum and that their levels of engagement, preparedness and commitment is often dependent upon where they are positioned socially, culturally and politically.

This thesis is important because regionally and nationally there have been very few attempts to empirically capture how professional social work training programmes accommodate and evidence ‘race’ equality and cultural diversity issues (Williams et al., 2009; Williams & Parrott, 2013).
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**Glossary of terms**

**Bangladeshi**
A person whose ancestry lies in the Indian subcontinent who self identifies, or is identified, as Bangladeshi. Between 1947 and 1971 the land known as Bangladesh was East Pakistan and before that India (Bhopal, 2004).

**Black**
The inclusive term black refers to those who have a shared history of European colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, ethnocentrism and racism. The term embraces people who experience structural and institutional discrimination because of their skin colour and is used politically to refer to people of African, African-Caribbean and South Asian origin to imply solidarity against racism (Goldstein, 2008).

**Black and Minority Ethnic**
The term is used to describe groups in the United Kingdom who are seen as different on the basis of colour, culture, religion tradition, custom and country of origin. This includes people from Black African, African-Caribbean, South Asian and Chinese heritage and other white and non-white minority groups, whose cultural heritage differs from the majority population (Bhatti-Sinclair, 2011).

**Culture**
Culture is used to describe many aspects of social life and includes language, religion, traditions and rituals that people use to compose a collective world view. The term is often used as a group identifier (Karner, 2007) and when it is employed in ‘racial’ contexts its
focus often tends to be on specific customs, beliefs and practices which distinguish a group or people in a minority, stereotypic or exotic sense (Race Equality Toolkit, 2014).

**Cultural Racism**

Cultural racism is a term that refers to the stereotype, and its associated hostility, where some cultures are thought of as inferior or primitive (Husband, 2004). Cultural racism can manifest itself at both individual and institutional levels and in the UK is targeted at certain BME groups which are perceived to be assertively "different" and not trying to "fit in" (Modood et al., 1997, p.9). Cultural racism like racism in general is expressed in different ways in particular historical, regional and national contexts.

**Institutional Racism**

The term refers to procedures, practices and behaviour within an organisation or institution, which support and encourage direct or indirect racial discrimination, reinforcing individual prejudices and being reinforced by them in turn (Bhavnani et al., 2005, p.215). Institutional racism may be unconscious and unintentional as well as overt and deliberate. At the core of the concept of institutional racism is the irrelevance of the intentions of the actors involved. Instead, it emphasises institutional power, practices and responsibilities.

**Muslim**

A term used to describe a person who follows the religion of Islam (Gilligan & Furness, 2010).
Pakistani  
A person whose ancestry lies in the Indian subcontinent who self identifies, or is identified, as Pakistani. Some Pakistanis may have birth or ancestral roots in the current territory of India but identify with Pakistan, a country created in 1947 (Bhopal, 2004).

Personal Racism  
Personal Racism is the expression of individual prejudice and is used to deny BME people dignity and equality. It refers to the negative/antagonistic thoughts, feelings and actions which characterise the outlook and behaviour of racially prejudiced individuals. Personal racism can be open and explicit or covert and implicit (Dominelli, 2008).

Structural Racism  
The term is used to describe how racism is built in to the structure of society and its dominant institutions (Thompson, 2012, p.75). Institutional and cultural racism constitute structural racism because social resources and power are used to sustain structural oppression and discrimination (Dominelli, 2008, p.12).

South Asian  
The term refers to individuals whose ancestry is in the countries of the Indian sub-continent, including India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka. It also includes those political refugees from Kenya and Uganda who are themselves descendants of an earlier migration from India to East Africa.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

The focus of this thesis

This thesis is the first empirical study to explore the impact of anti-racist social work education in the UK. The study evaluates how students and educators experience anti-racist social work education and measures the impact and educational value of this learning. Currently, in professional social work training, anti-racist social work education is considered to be an important strand of teaching which has the potential to lead to transformational learning and critical practice (Singh & Cowden, 2010). The forthcoming Higher Education Academy seminar on ‘Social Work, ‘race’ and racism’ is evidence of the continuing saliency and support it has amongst a critical mass of academics across the four countries of the UK (The Higher Education Academy, 2014).

In social work we have a group of active anti-racist thinkers such as Charlotte Williams, Makeda Graham, Lena Dominelli and Gurnam Singh who are dedicated to what Pierre Bourdieu has characterised as a form of ‘committed scholarship’ which keeps their work grounded in the struggles and experiences of Britain’s Black communities (Bourdieu, 2000, p.44). Despite the pervasive spread of populist and state sanctioned counter-narratives to multiculturalism which has isolated “anti-discriminatory practice as the politically correct fetish of a minority of zealots within social work” (Husband, 2007, p.13), and the assimilationist drift in British ‘race’ relations policy (Bloch et al., 2013), these scholars have nevertheless managed to defend the utility of anti-racist social work education and keep it as a live issue on the social work curriculum (Williams, 2014).

However whilst the majority of these academics have theorised and written about anti-racism, they have not attempted to research into the outcomes of anti-racist social work education, nor sought to evaluate how this strand of teaching is experienced by both students and tutors. This lack of research evidence, demonstrating the utility and outcomes of anti-racist social work education has not been helpful for upholding accountable educational practice (Burgess & Carpenter, 2010), and has made it difficult to defend the relevance of this component of learning in a crowded social work curriculum. In light of the scarcity of research, this thesis seeks to build research capacity and draw upon empirical evidence which enables us to better understand how anti-racist social work education is experienced, and the type of educational outcomes which can be accrued from this strand of learning. Although the empirical work
undertaken here is situated in one post-1992 University based in England, some of its findings may be illustrative of the outcomes and experiences of anti-racist education across the sector.

The overarching research question for this thesis is:
What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

Three sub questions have enabled this overarching research question to be addressed:

1. Why is ‘race’ and anti-racism relevant for social work education?
   1a. What do we know about ‘race’ and racism in society?
   1b. What do we know about regulatory rules and requirements for social work education?
   1c. What do we know about social work’s engagement with ‘race’ and anti-racism?

2. What is the learning task for students and what are we aiming to achieve?

3. What evidence of outcomes do we have in relation to anti-racist teaching?
   3a. How is anti-racist social work education experienced?
   3b. What change can be identified as a result of anti-racist social work teaching?

These research questions are situated within a broad conceptualisation of anti-racism and privilege an epistemic position which recognises the ‘racialised’ nature of structural inequalities and collective experiences of racial oppression (Dominelli, 2008; Lavallette & Penketh, 2014). The implication of this discursive positioning within anti-racism is that whilst recognising fallibilism and the dangers of making absolute truth claims (Williams, 2006), this thesis seeks to challenge the post-modernist ‘kaleidoscope’ view that no one interpretation of the social world can claim epistemological superiority over any other (Gray, 2003). However this does not mean that I am writing this thesis from a particular standpoint which provides the author with an ordained right to write about issues of anti-racism and claim epistemological authority; on the contrary I am approaching this thesis as a reflexive and contested piece of work which recognises that not all social work educators will share or agree with my conceptualisation of anti-racist praxis. Furthermore, by focusing exclusively on ‘race’ issues, the intention in this thesis is not to give the impression of ‘race’ being privileged over other forms of social oppression or to suggest that there exists a ‘hierarchy of oppression’ (Williams, 1999). On the contrary, a focus on ‘race’ issues should be interpreted as working for a more inclusive and
holistic understanding of the multidimensional nature of diversity (College of Social Work, 2012) and the interlocking nature of the “various forms and expressions of oppression” (Macey & Moxon, 1996, p.309).

Situating Self

My interest in writing about anti-racism relates to my lived experiences of racism and professional experiences of teaching social work, where, as a tutor, I have sometimes felt isolated and out of place in the ‘whiteness’ of the academy and often wondered about how my ‘racialised’ identity and cultural difference is perceived by students and how this impacts on the teaching and learning experience (Housee, 2006a; 2006b). I have also experienced and observed a degree of resistance and hostility from colleagues and practice educators when attempting to discuss ‘race’ issues and have witnessed Black colleagues sometimes being sidelined and labelled as being too preoccupied with anti-oppressive practice.

My researcher curiosity to learn more about this aspect of teaching also relates to my wider observations of how anti-racist social work education, in contrast to any other area of the qualifying social work curriculum, is experienced as a highly supercharged and emotive area of learning, which is often contested and sometimes approached with suspicion and caution by students and tutors. However as a tutor I am also interested in learning more about my professional reflections on how, for some students, learning about ‘race’, racism and anti-racism leads to ‘perspective transformation’ (Mezirow et al., 2000) and is the beginning of an existential journey of self liberation which enables them to develop critical consciousness and speak out with confidence and committed understanding against racial oppression.

This process of becoming critical is known as ‘conscientization’ in Freirean pedagogy and is associated with moving between three interlocking levels of consciousness which are always fluid and incomplete. Freire (1970) describes these three levels as ‘magical consciousness’ (where individuals are unaware and unquestioning and hold distorted views of reality which may be epistemic, psychological or socio-cultural in nature); ‘naive consciousness’ (where problems are internalised and individualised and not connected with structural discrimination) and ‘critical consciousness’ (which is the antithesis of ‘false consciousness’ and where a critical understanding of social reality emerges) (Friere, 1970). This thesis is interested in how anti-racist social work education enables students to move from ‘magical consciousness’, where racism and racial oppression is invisible and thereby left unchallenged and maintained, to more critical level of awareness where it is named, challenged and no longer shrouded in a ‘culture of silence’ (Ledwith, 2011).
What this thesis seeks to evidence is how anti-racist social work education as a critical pedagogy leads to a process of self-discovery (Ledwith, 2001) which in turn enables students to challenge neoliberal ideology and develop critical thinking to bring about change for social justice (Cowden & Singh, 2013). The inescapably political nature of education, which resonates with my conceptualisation of anti-racist social work education, is captured well by Paulo Freire when he asserts that education is either an instrument of liberation or a form of domination:

> Educational practice and its theory can never be neutral. The relationship between practice and theory in an education directed toward emancipation is one thing, but quite another in an education for domestication (Freire, 1970, p.12)

These different aspects of personal and professional biography related closely to political self and researcher identity, which will be addressed further in the methodology chapter, have all influenced the selection of anti-racism as the focus of this thesis.

**The contours of this thesis**

This thesis is essentially an empirical case study which explores how anti-racist education is experienced, what the learning task is for students and what we know about the outcomes of this learning. Chapter two establishes the parameters and context of this discussion by considering the relevance of ‘race’ and anti-racism within social work education and mapping out the nature, force and expression of structural and institutional racism in Britain (Singh, 2011). The cumulative evidence drawn upon in this chapter suggests that racism is a real issue for Black and ethnic minority service users and can be evidenced in the minutiae of everyday experiences and institutional practices.

Chapter three focuses on methodology and explores the substantive research issues which are at the heart of this thesis. This involves carefully mapping out the different research stages which have guided my empirical work. These have included conceptualisation and focus, the selection of a research strategy and theoretical frame, the collection and analysis of data and the eventual construction of an insider research account, which bears the strong imprint of my researcher identity.

Chapter four interrogates the different sets of mixed methods fieldwork data and explores what this qualitative and quantitative evidence reveals about how anti-racist social work education is experienced and understood. This chapter also draws upon non-parametric tests
to measure the educational outcomes of a teaching intervention on anti-racism and examines the findings of matched pair questionnaires to consider how this educational intervention works differently for different groups of students.

Chapter five identifies and discusses key themes emerging from the data analysis work and considers how these illustrate the contested nature of anti-racist social work education. This chapter also explores the educational outcomes of anti-racism and draws upon this evidence to illuminate areas of positive learning, whilst also assessing the pedagogic challenges of teaching in this area of the curriculum.

The final chapter considers how the overall empirical work drawn upon in this thesis offers new and grounded insights into the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education, which not only affirm, but also provide a passionate and robust evidenced based defence of its emancipatory potential and place within the social work curriculum.
Chapter 2 - Anti-racism and Social Work Education

This chapter provides an interpretive review of literature and research evidence which addresses ‘race’ and anti-racism issues within British social work education to answer sub question one of this thesis:

1. Why is ‘race’ and anti-racism relevant for social work education?
   1a. What do we know about ‘race’ and racism in society?
   1b. What do we know about regulatory rules and requirements for social work education?
   1c. What do we know about social work’s engagement with ‘race’ and anti-racism?

A literature review method (Aveyard, 2007) is drawn upon to discuss the nature of contemporary British racism and to consider social work’s engagement with anti-racism. A range of accumulative research evidence is also drawn upon to map out the nature of British racism and how its shapes the experiences of Black and ethnic minority service users. This chapter builds upon work already undertaken in my Critical Analytical Study which explored the nature and implications of the discursive shift in public policy and social work education away from anti-racism and into a broad anti oppressive paradigm (Singh, 2010). The intention in this chapter is not to undertake a systematic review but to search for literature systematically (Cooper, 1997) and to offer an interpretive review of seminal work which enables us to understand why anti-racism has efficacy and relevance for social work education and how the outcomes of this learning can be measured and evaluated.

Conceptualising ‘Race’, Racism and Ethnicity

Throughout this thesis I draw upon several terms which have complex and contested meanings in academic, political or public spheres of discourse (Goldstein, 2008). These terms refer to how ‘race’, racism and ethnicity are conceptualised and help us to understand how the difference of ‘others’ is sometimes conceived, represented and encountered (Sharma, 2006).

Given the centrality of these terms in this thesis it is important to discuss each separately and to draw upon formative work which has attempted to define and make sense of these difficult and contested terms. Dominelli suggests that how these terms are defined is important because:
Words indicate understandings of reality, shape interactions within discourses that produce them, and expose specific conceptualisations of power and people’s place in the world... Words both reveal and construct ways of knowing, exposing the epistemological and ontological assumptions that underpin thoughts and behaviours (Dominelli, 2008, p.8).

‘Race’ is an extraordinarily difficult term to define; it has certain elusiveness, but Balbo, (1998), observes that one way or the other we all know what it means. Turney (1996) suggests that a deconstructive approach acknowledges the presence of this term in our thinking, accepting that, while technically ‘empty’, we nonetheless use the word to mean something in our cultural map. She suggests that we deploy the language of ‘race’ as though it ‘does indeed signify’ and as though ‘we know what it means’ (Turney, 1996, p.13).

Stuart Hall (2000), drawing upon the work of Derrida, also cautions against the use of the term ‘race’ and suggests that it should only be used “under erasure... as it is no longer good to think with” (Hall, 2000, p.15). He argues that ‘race’ and related concepts such as ethnicity, identity, and culture -are so ‘discursively entangled’ (incapable of pure meaning) that they should only be used with caveats (Hall, 2000). ‘Race’ is therefore often enclosed in inverted commas to indicate its lack of validity as a descriptive and analytical tool (Woodward, 2003); and to signify its socially constructed rather than biological nature (Spencer, 2006).

However, despite being devoid of any scientific value, ‘race’ retains a central position in public consciousness (Ratcliffe, 2004; Law et al., 2004; Law, 2010), and has been used in sociological work as a metaphor to develop academic theorising into the processes of representation, exploitation and domination (Downing and Husband, 2005). The concept rests on the assumption that humans can be divided into distinct types based on biological and phenotypical differences. ‘Physical markers’ such as skin pigmentation, hair texture and facial features are drawn upon to attach different meanings to different ‘races’ (Pilkington, 2003) and these meanings often involve “hierarchies and hostility, and this is where racism is involved” (Woodward, 2003, p.16).

Within this discourse of ‘race,’ ‘colour symbolism’ is very significant, with ‘blackness’ being historically associated with an inversion of everything European, Christian and civilised (Dwyer, 2004). Three distinct phases in ‘race’ thinking encompassing the fourteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be identified in the literature to help make sense of how
understanding about ‘race’ has evolved. Singh (2002) suggests that the first phase, referred to as the ‘scriptural phase’ in ‘race’ thinking, was characterised by quasi-religious explanations which viewed ‘black’ people as heathens without souls and which associated skin colour to symbolic representations of black and white, with white portrayed as signifying purity, goodness, and spirituality; and black as signifying evil, sin, dirtiness, and death. The second, ‘biological’, phase drew upon Darwinian based pseudo-scientific explanations to justify oppression and slavery based on the supposedly evolutionary inferiority of the Black ‘race’. The contemporary period, referred to as the ‘sociological phase,’ was initially driven by a structural analysis of power and the search for observable and identifiable discrimination, but has increasingly become occupied with a fixation on theoretical abstraction and textual and cultural analysis (Back, 2004).

Rattansi (2005) suggests that the legacy of the ‘scriptural’ and ‘biological’ phase has been the enduring nature of the ‘racialised hierarchy’, which has consigned “non-white” populations to the lowest rungs of the racial ladder” (Rattansi, 1999, p.80). These ‘racial hierarchies’ have legitimised slavery, the policy of indentured labour, and justified Britain’s imperialist and colonialist past (Fryer, 1984). Modood (2013) argues that the continuing relevance of this hierarchy for ordering contemporary social relations and life opportunities can be evidenced through the fact that the more distant an individual or group is in terms of their ‘class, culture and colour’ from the ‘white mythical norm’ the greater their level of marginality and social exclusion (Trew, 2002).

Similarly, what we mean and understand by the term racism is also difficult to comprehend and explain (Law, 2010). The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry simply viewed racism as a system which either “advantage[s] or disadvantage[s] people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin” (Macpherson, 1999, p.20). The term has been also been used to refer to and describe the processes by which certain groups are stereotyped, discriminated against and subjugated to unequal positions and outcomes (Solomos, 2002; Graig et al., 2012).

Miles (1998) suggests that it is important to recognise that we do not just have a one single form of racism which remains bounded and anchored to a particular set of racialised ideologies. He identifies how in recent history racism appears in different guises and is expressed with varying forms of intensity and force. Fanon (1970), suggests that it is “constantly renewed and transformed” (Fanon, 1970, p.41); and Anthias & Lloyd (2002)
propose that the political, economic and ideological condition in which racism operates as a sphere of social relations “is always a fluid and shifting one” (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p.8).

Miles (1998) also views racism as essentially a contingent and open process rather than something which is fixed around a given set of beliefs and practices. He draws upon the concept of ‘racialisation’ to argue that racism is an ideological process in which ‘race’ is given the status of an ‘apparent truth’. Miles suggests that racism is promoted through “a representational process whereby social significance is attached to certain characteristics” (Miles, 1989, p.74). He suggests that certain ‘social signifiers’ give rise to certain racist beliefs and these do not necessarily need to be related to a person’s colour of skin.

Pilkington (2003), suggests that these social signifiers which give rise to certain racist beliefs can either draw upon ‘race’, which entails distinguishing people on the basis of ‘physical markers’, or on ethnicity, which entails distinguishing people on the basis of ‘cultural markers’. These ‘cultural markers’ include a shared language, a shared history, belief in common ancestry, attachment to a real or imagined homeland, a shared religion, social customs and group memories (Pilkington, 2003; Karner, 2007; Brah, 1996). These cultural markers have been linked to positive psychological wellbeing (Robinson, 1995; 2005) and research has also reported that “individuals secure in their ethnic identity act with greater autonomy, flexibility and openness” (Banks, 1999, p. 38). Modood (2013) suggests that within the mosaic of multicultural Britain particular ‘cultural markers’ have been used to promote certain racist beliefs and stereotypes which have tended to view for example ‘South Asian’ people as being imbued with an excess of culture. He suggests that these representations have been used to ‘other’ this group by propagating a ‘primordialist’ understanding of their religion and customs as if it was backward and ossified (Sharma, 2006).

Brah (2007) suggests that under given historical circumstances particular ‘cultural markers’ and ‘social signifiers’ of difference become “etched within asymmetrical power relations” (Brah, 2007, p.138), which lead to discriminatory and oppressive outcomes. For Foucault the meanings which we attach to these ‘social signifiers’ reflect dominant ideas which he refers to as ‘forms of thought’ or ‘regimes of truth’. These are often taken for granted but are in fact historically contingent (Fook et al., 2006, p.10). Foucault suggests that within the discursive field particular perspectives gain authority whilst others are suppressed and this reflects the ‘social organisation of power and knowledge in society’ (Elliot, 2009, p.85). These ‘forms of thought’ and ‘regimes of truth’ are reproduced and influenced according to Derrida by the
binary oppositions which operate in language. Derrida argues that language and the operation of binary oppositions plays a critical function in obscuring and naturalising relations of dominance (Derrida, 1978).

The operation of binary oppositions performs a key function in the construction of dominant and subjugated identities within western culture. Thus concepts such as rational/irrational, good/evil, white/black, man/woman, straight/gay, objective/subjective, moral/immoral, modern/primitive... in which the first is regarded as superior and the second a threat to it, play a critical role in the production and reproduction of oppression (Singh, 2002, p.73).

This analysis of ‘racialisation’ and ‘discourse’ is important because it signals a shift away from viewing racism as simply relating to colour of skin. Modood’s (1992), seminal work on ‘cultural racism’ and the experiences of Britain’s Muslim communities is evidence of this shift away from the grand narrative of ‘skin colour’. Modood’s work is also important for exploring the interplay between ‘cultural racism’ and the concept of ‘Islamaphobia’ which is a useful analytical term for understanding the detestation encountered by British Muslims and the difficulties they are experiencing in moving beyond the ‘terror narrative’ and the ‘clash of civilisation’ thesis (McGhee, 2005; 2008).

Whilst the overarching concept of ‘colour and cultural racism’ remains an important one for understanding the ways in which different ethnic groups “are conceived, responded to and subjected to processes of inclusion and exclusion in the UK” (Platt, 2007, p.18), it is important to move our gaze away from simply viewing racism as solely to do with individual prejudice and individual pathology (Lloyd, 2002). Downing and Husband (2005) suggest that accounting for racial discrimination in terms of “individual prejudice leaves the essential integrity of the social order, and its institutions intact and unchallenged” (Downing & Husband, 2005, p.10). Therefore it is important to understand that racism cannot simply be understood by reference to the personal psychologies and the intentional acts of individuals. The Macpherson Report (1999) drew upon the concept of ‘institutional racism’ to suggest that racism can also be found in the culture of organisations and their routine social practices, which reinforce exclusion and oppression. The report suggests that

‘Institutional Racism’ consists of the collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to
discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness, and racist stereotyping which disadvantages minority ethnic people (Macpherson, 1999, p.28).

Pilkington, (2004; 2011) suggests that the concept of ‘Institutional Racism’ is a useful sensitising device to investigate whether institutions exemplify best practice on ‘race’ issues. He also suggests that whilst there is a real danger of institutional racism becoming a ‘blunderbuss’ concept, it is nevertheless a useful term for assessing the extent to which ‘race’ equality measures are embedded in the minutiae of everyday organisational practices.

However, although there is complete rejection of ‘race’ as anything except a socially constructed and a constantly changing category of exclusion (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2004), it is important to recognise that ‘Race’ like gender and sexual orientation, is real in the sense that it has real, though changing effects in the world. It has tangible and complex impacts on people’s sense of self, experiences, and life opportunities. Thus, to assert that ‘race’ and racial difference are socially constructed is not to minimise their social and political reality. It is, rather, to insist that their reality is precisely social and political rather than inherent and its meanings and functions change over time (Van Soest & Garcia, 2003, p.13, cited in Graham, 2007, p.33).

This sense of change and reconfiguring is captured well in postmodernism, which is critical for understanding the nature of discursively constituted identities and recognising their fluidity and hybridity. Postmodernism warns of the dangers of reifying the dynamic and situated meanings of lived experiences and suggests that identities are always incomplete and in the process of becoming (Hall, 2000). The implication of these insights for my thesis necessitates a recognition of individual identities, as being determined ‘materially’, ‘symbolically’ and ‘relationally’ (Gray, 2003) and of how we are positioned across multiple processes of identification which shift and configure into a specific pattern in a designated set of circumstances...that make a particular identity salient (Brah, 2007, p.143-144).

Such a view helps to avoid a reductionist and essentialist understanding of racial and cultural identity which sees it as fixed and absolute and enables us to recognises identity as multiple, contingent and subject to change.
Beck’s (1992), idea of ‘reflexive modernity’ also suggests that identities within the current social period are characterised by a range of identity making contexts, in which individuals find their own sources of meaning. It is argued that “the construction of the self within these fluid social contexts” is characterised by reflexivity, where “critical reflection and incoming information are constantly used by people to constitute and (re) negotiate their identities” (Fook & Askeland, 2006, p. 46). It has also been suggested that in the current social period of ‘reflexive modernity’ (Beck, 1992), “the form, expression and force” of racist and other oppressive structures may be changing, and that it may be possible, in this period to “make choices which involve challenging, resisting, and remaking the ways in which some of these structures play out in the lives of individual people” (Fook & Askeland, 2006, p.46).

However this type of postmodern theorising has been strongly criticised for its emphasis on ‘agency’ and lack of emphasis on ‘structuration’ (Giddens, 1993) and for fragmenting individuals, which tends to suppress and exclude the collective experiences and histories of Black people (Graham, 2002a; 2002b). Post modernism’s self-declared purpose of opening up and enabling different ways of knowing and a multiplicity of knowledge claims has also been criticized for not recognizing the continuing saliency of ethnic identity-making situations (Modood, 2013) and the realities of racism in the lives of Black and ethnic minority service users and communities. (Bhatti –Sinclair, 2011; Graig et al., 2012)

Clearly the need to recognise the importance of ‘colour and culture’ and the different socio-economic profiles of Black communities (Platt, 2011a; Modood, 2013), enables students to demonstrate sensitivity and competence in working with cultural, linguistic, religious and social differences, whilst at the same time “realising that such differences are themselves ever changing and complex” (Singh, 2006a, p.7). Recognition of the realities of racism and structural disadvantage does not necessarily mean adopting an essentialising discourse, which views identity and experience as determined and culture as fixed (Dominelli, 2008)

Anthias (2002) suggests the need for a reflexive critical multiculturalism to move beyond the apparent impasse between postmodernism and anti-racism. She asks for a critical multiculturalism which recognises the fluid nature of cultural identities as well as their location within racialised social structures; stating that:

the existence of multiple identities does not mean that individuals do not have different investments in different identities at different times...they are not like cloaks
that we can don and then discard but like different layers that can be worn, some on top and some below, at different times (Anthias, 1999, p.6).

Anthias (2002) also recognises the need to acknowledge issues of intersectionality between and across multiple fields of power, and this is taken up in the work of Healy (2005), who suggests that in social work practice we need to understand how other categories of social oppression such as disability and sexuality intersect and differentiate racial and ethnic identifications and experiences.

**Evidence about ‘race’ and racism in society**

Britain’s Black and Ethnic Minority Communities now constitute 20% of the population of England and Wales (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2012) and have generally evolved from the diasporas associated with post-war immigration. However these communities are not homogenous and are comprised of a plurality of ethnic identities. They encompass a number of separate groups who differ in language, religion and history (Modood, 1992). Whilst some of these groups may assert a racial identity based on experiences of racism, others may focus on country of origin, religion and some may even privilege hyphenated identities (Modood, 2013).

The available research evidence suggests that, while the force and expression of racism may be changing, Britain’s Black and ethnic minority communities continue to experience sustained and embedded racial inequalities (Singh, 2011). This type of empirical evidence is instrumental in empowering marginalised groups to “establish that personal experience reflects wider structural inequalities and collective oppression” (Qureshi, 2004, p.120). This type of research evidence is also politically important for maintaining an awareness of ‘race’ issues particularly in a public policy context which is hostile and disinterested in this type of research activity (Williams, 2011). However there is a concern that the tendency to privilege colour racism in research which seeks to expose and make sense of racial discrimination has led to a failure to address and raise awareness of anti Irish racism which has compounded the invisibility of this issue in public policy and social work education (Garrett, 2013).

Recent research work in the area of ethnicity and ‘race’ suggests that the socio-economic position and general life experiences of Black and ethnic minority communities is different from their white British counterparts (Platt, 2011b). These findings have also been evidenced in the work of the Equality and Human Rights Commission in their report ‘How Fair is Britain?’
This report draws upon a range of empirical data and suggests that racial inequality has remained persistent and entrenched. The report argues that a shared understanding of this data, particularly in relation to the multidimensional and intersectional nature of discrimination and inequality, based on objective evidence rather than conjecture or assumption, is central to developing a lasting consensus for action. The Report of the National Equality Panel, (2010) ‘An anatomy of economic inequality in the UK’ also makes an important contribution to understanding the intersectional nature of economic disadvantage and unequal treatment on grounds of ‘race’. The report, commissioned by Harriet Harman who was then Minister for Women and Equality, identifies the cumulative nature of inequality across an individual’s lifespan and identifies what it calls ‘ethnic penalties’ for Black and ethnic minority groups which hamper opportunities for learning and restrict access to employment and income (Hill et al., 2010)

The thrust of other large scale empirical work also continues to suggest that compared to the majority population Black and ethnic minority groups experience higher levels of social inequality. Platt (2011a) suggests that all minority groups experience higher poverty rates and that for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups these are “startlingly higher”, with more than half of adults in Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities living in poverty (Platt, 2011, p.6). Platt’s work is important for developing a more nuanced understanding of the nature of racial inequalities within and between groups (Nandi & Platt, 2010; Hill et al., 2010; Platt, 2011a), which sometimes can be masked in research which adopts a reductionist brush stroke approach by conflating ethnic differences (Back, 2004).

Research data also continues to suggest that, despite the best efforts of ‘race’ legislation and ‘race’ equality policies, “most minority groups, and women in particular” continue to experience “marginalisation, exclusion and disadvantage” (Craig et al., 2012, p. 248) and that these ‘deep and entrenched inequalities’ are exacerbated by everyday experiences of racism (Bloch & Solomos, 2010). Williams (2011) suggests that, despite the proclamations in public policy that we now live in a post ‘race’ society, “the reality is that racial disadvantage is pernicious, deep-seated and enduring” (Williams, 2011, p. 60), and Graig (2013) suggests that, at a time when the dimension of ‘race’ is being regarded as irrelevant in public policy, “racial inequalities are deepening”, ethnic minority groups are being hardest hit by public expenditure cuts and the problem of “structural racism” has yet to be confronted (Graig, 2013, p.6 & p.8).
Powerful descriptive statistics in government reports also show that people from minority ethnic groups are more likely than others to live in deprived areas and be unemployed, compared to white people with similar qualifications, suffer ill health and live in overcrowded and unpopular housing. They also experience widespread racial harassment and racial crime and are over represented in the criminal justice system (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000, p.17). Statistics collected by the state also reveal, for example, that over two-thirds of England’s ethnic minority population lives in the 88 most deprived local authority areas, compared to two-fifths of the total population (Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, 2005). Living in these poor areas will be associated with a range of other ‘indices of deprivation’ which will include income, employment, education, housing, crime, and environment deprivation (Platt, 2007; Platt, 2011b).

The work of the Marmot Review Team, which culminated in their report ‘Fair Society Healthy Lives’ (2010) also acknowledged that the health status of Black and ethnic minority communities was compromised by high levels of deprivation and compounded by wider experiences of racism and discrimination, which were detrimental to health and well-being (Marmot et al., 2010). Ahmad’s (1993) poignant observation captures the interplay between these different factors when he states that

health is fundamentally located in the socio-economic and environmental contexts of people’s lives. Poverty is the most important single determinant of ill health. Struggles for better health are therefore essentially struggles for better jobs, adequate housing, access to education, a safe environment, good public health facilities and civil and legal rights (Ahmad, 1993a, p.7).

Research also suggests that the problem of neighbourhood deprivation may be particularly acute for some Black and ethnic minority young people, who consequently will be more likely to “experience poor education and poor opportunities with higher rates of infant mortality and child poverty as well as truancy, teenage pregnancy and drug problems” (Johnson & Verlot, 2008, p.156).

A range of other research also provides persuasive evidence of continuing social exclusion and suggests that Britain’s Black and ethnic minority communities will experience particular types of social problems linked to poverty, education, health and criminal justice. In the criminal justice field the data continues to point to the disproportionate targeting of African-Caribbean and Asian young people under Section 60 Police ‘stop and search powers’ (Open Society
Foundations, 2014). The evidence also suggests that these communities may experience higher levels of ‘fear of crime’ related to community and family experiences of ‘race’ hate crime and knowledge of racist murders. One hundred people have been racially murdered since Stephen Lawrence’s death (Graig, 2013, p.4).

In relation to experiences of poverty the evidence points to Muslim children from a Pakistani or Bangladeshi background having a much higher incidence of growing up in child poverty (Platt, 2011a) and living in overcrowded accommodation where there are no adults in employment (Crabtree et al., 2008). The research suggests that these children and those from Black African and Caribbean backgrounds will also experience poorer educational outcomes, irrespective of gender (Lawrence, 2012, p.156) and have a significantly higher prevalence for drug abuse (Johnson & Verlot, 2008, p.157). The misuse of substances may be a contributory factor in the higher proportion of young people from some ethnic minority groups suffering from mental health problems (Keating; 2012).

Modood (2008) argues that these differences provide us with a range of cumulative evidence which enables us to understand differential processes operating for different groups. These processes enable us to demonstrate that racism which culminates in racial disparities operates selectively and with different degrees of intensity and force; where the upward mobility of some Black and ethnic minority groups is juxtaposed with the continuing marginalisation of others (Hill et al., 2010). However Modood cautions against one-dimensional and mono-causal explanations to explain these experiences and instead suggests that some of the differences identified in the research above can be explained and understood in terms of class and by different attitudes to, for example, self-employment, education and family, including gender roles and the intergenerational nurturing and support of ambition (Modood, 2013, p.57). He goes on to suggest that any analysis must attend to ‘difference and complexity’ and address ‘intersectionality’.

Modood’s analysis avoids a crude and deterministic focus on ‘race’ as the only explanatory variable. Instead his analysis offers a more sophisticated understanding of the relationship between ethnicity, social class and gendered positions. By going beyond the black and white dyad his analysis challenges mono-causality and instead suggests the need for multi-dimensionality, referred to by Humphries (1999), as ‘multiple causality’. Multiple causality in this respect refers to the complex nature of causes and the fluid and changing relationship between ‘agency’ and ‘structure’ (King, 2005).
The experiences of Black and ethnic minority service users

It is generally difficult to comment upon the experiences of ethnic minority service users, given the dearth of research undertaken in this area (Barn, 2006). Singh (2011) suggests the failure of mainstream research to record the experience of Black and ethnic minority service users has effectively made them invisible. He questions the reluctance of researchers to explore why Black and ethnic minority service users tend to be congregated in the controlling aspects of service provision and under-represented in the welfare and supportive aspects of provision.

The continuing over-representation of some Black and ethnic minority serve users in the controlling aspects of service provision can be evidenced in the ongoing work of a number of leading academics who are concerned about:

- Mixed parentage and Black children being over represented in the care system (Barn, 2006, 2012),
- Black people being compulsorily detained under mental health legislation (Sashidharan, 2003; Fernando; 2010),
- Black children being permanently excluded from school (Wright, 2005; Wright at al, 2009),
- Black children and young people being subjected to the higher end tariff interventions of the youth justice system (Muncie, 2009).

These are real social work issues that require reflective and critical practice appraisal. However it is important not to conflate this over-representation with a charge of blatant racism. Complex narratives, accumulative racial disadvantage and skewed service pathways may all be contributory factors which require careful interrogation and sensitive scrutiny to understand what this data suggests.

Another pertinent question to ask is why some very high profile independent national inquiries into child abuse, mental health, racial violence and racism in the youth justice system; all involving children and young adults from Black and ethnic minority backgrounds, have generally failed to penetrate the social work mindset and sensitise both practitioners and students to the importance of addressing ‘race’ and cultural issues in practice:

All of these inquiries have raised serious and probing questions into the ability of different state professionals, including social workers, to work with cultural diversity and offer appropriate levels of protection and support. These inquiries have also been unequivocal about the need to address issues of systemic racism and develop cultural competence in assessment and intervention skills (Tilki, 2006). Perhaps the Stephen Lawrence Report (1999) best describes the failures of public organisations and professionals to provide an appropriate service to communities and individuals, “because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin” (Macpherson, 1999, p.28).

The limited research activity which addresses ‘race’ issues in British social work practice contexts continues to paint a familiar picture by suggesting that for Black service users and workers “racism remains a major problem” (Singh, 2006a p.73), which is particularly acute in rural areas of Britain, where Black staff and service users will be socially isolated (Butler et al., 2003). Research has also found that that because of the “perceived cultural distance of South Asian clients there may be a tendency to be less able to empathise appropriately with them” (Banks, 1999, p.248); and that practitioner judgements may be based on ‘heuristical notions’ of Asian people and culture and lead to ‘associated biases’ (Patel & Strachan, 1997, p.24), sometimes leading to ‘cultural stereotypes’ about particular groups and the assumption that ‘informal or family support is always available’, resulting in some communities having to ‘look after their own’ (Butt, 2006, p.7). Butt (2006) also draws upon empirical work which helps us to understand how white workers experience working with BME staff and service users:

- white workers claiming that they do not possess the skills and experience to work with Black and minority ethnic families,
- white managers being unable to provide direction to Black and minority ethnic workers,
- white workers experiencing fear of being described and labelled as racist and therefore being unsure about intervening (Butt, 2006, p.7).
Research which focuses on levels of service engagement suggests that because of problems with cross cultural communication and lack of ethnically sensitive service provision, which is often exacerbated by a lack of cultural awareness, BME service users are hesitant and lack confidence in accessing services (Laird, 2008; Gilligan & Furness, 2010). This is particularly the case for mental health services, where research has reported ‘circles of fear’ which stop Black people from seeking professional help. These ‘circles of fear’ are related to Black services users experiencing a lack of respect from professionals, their voices not being heard, and their families and carers being marginalised in assessment and decision-making processes (Keating et al., 2002; Keating 2012). Research suggests that this reluctance to access services may result in mental health problems becoming more severe before professional interventions are put in place and also that this delay in accessing services may have enduring effects upon the children of Black service users, contributing to their over-representation in the child care system (Green et al., 2008).

Research which has focused on the child care system has also identified:

- that the child’s ethnic affiliation evokes little significant response by social workers, confirming a largely universalist approach (Williams & Soydan, 2005). This suggests that a child’s ‘race’, culture and religious background makes little difference in practice encounters and that in assessment work a ‘one size fits all’ ‘colour-blind’ approach prevails.
- that parenting practices in Black and ethnic minority families are either pathologised and seen as deficient or viewed through a cultural relativist lens resulting in intervention as being either overtly interventionist or too cautious (Chand, 2008).

Therefore Barn suggests that “Black families would like not only better access to existing services, but also services that recognise ethnic, cultural and religious diversity” (Barn, 2006, p.3). The accumulative research seems to suggest that in terms of working with BME service users and families the complex interaction between the ‘hand, head and the heart’, reframed in the work of Dominelli, “as the integration of practice skills, intellectual understanding and emotional capacities [including empathy] of the individual practitioner in interaction with those of the client” (Dominelli, 2002, p.64), is seen to be wanting and compromises the appropriateness and quality of professional social work responses.
Social Work’s engagement with ‘race’ and anti-racism

In many respects Social Work’s arduous journey in recognising and working with cultural and “race” differences has mirrored prevailing ‘race’ relations policy, which since the 1960’s has tended to be either ‘culturalist’ or ‘racism blind’ (Barn, 2007). Indeed, up until the mid-1970’s, social work in the UK was an exclusively white profession and there was a reluctance and unwillingness to address anti-racist social work issues in professional education (Singh, 2013). It was not until Barbara Solomon’s (1976) ground-breaking text ‘Black Empowerment’ and Ahmad’s (1990) seminal work on ‘Black Perspectives’ that the social work academy began to reappraise the nature and privileging of its ‘eurocentric’ curricula (Ahmad, 1990). The profession up to this period has been characterised as assimilationist, drawing upon a ‘cultural deficit’ model of practice (Ahmad, 1990). This approach had its roots in the ideologies of slavery and colonialism and placed ‘white European cultures at the apex’ (Barn, 2007). This approach pathologised the lifestyles and structures of ‘black families’ who were viewed as dysfunctional, culturally deprived and in need of state management. Owusu-Bempah (2005) suggests that in this period of social work, professionals grossly misinterpreted child rearing practices. For example, South Asian children, especially girls, were viewed as ‘overprotected, over-controlled or oppressed’, whilst the converse was believed about black children, who were seen to be ‘out of control’ and ‘delinquent’ (Owusu-Bempah, 2005, p.180). This period of public policy and social work practice was also highly critical of black women’s abilities as mothers who were seen as abandoning their children (Williams, 1987; 1989), and personal and social difficulties were viewed as a reflection of individual failure and the inability to ‘acculturalise’ (Fernando, 1989), and assimilate into the norms and values of British society. Enoch Powell’s infamous “Rivers of Blood” speech in 1968 was reflective of this concern about the inability of immigrant communities to integrate.

Social work practice during this period was characterised as the so called ‘colour-blind approach’ (Husband, 2007) which was typified by a “respect for persons doctrine” (Banks, 2001, p.58). This approach was highly influential in social work and entailed treating all services users with equal respect, promoting their individual rights and choices. Colour of skin was considered to be irrelevant: even the basic dietary and skin care needs of Black children taken into care were often neglected and not considered as relevant, due to the professional perception that these children were no different from their white counterparts (Barn, 2006; 2013).
The colour-blind approach—the product of liberal universalism—eschews difference in its search for a universal formula. It suggests that a standard of good practice can be established which fits all. Despite being consistently pilloried as naive, assimilationist and downright oppressive, this approach represents a powerful and tenacious paradigm within social work, both nationally and internationally (Williams & Soydan 2005, p.903).

Public policy criticisms of the ‘colour makes no difference’ approach in the 1970’s led to a policy reorientation towards multiculturalism (May, 1999b). Unlike other European countries, the UK enacted in 1976 a significant and ground breaking piece of ‘race’ equality legislation which for the first time made unlawful both direct and indirect racial discrimination. This new era of progressive ‘race’ relations thinking and policy change also required social workers to move away from a universal and generic approach to practice and to work with the cultural specificities of practice. This multicultural phase was also a reflection of increasing community grass roots mobilisation in Black and ethnic minority communities and many social work departments during this period employed specialist Black section 11 workers to work specifically with their respective communities of interest (Bonnett & Carrington 1996).

Multiculturalism was also brought about by the inner city disturbances of 1981 and the recommendations of The Scarman Report (1981) which suggested that the serious social and economic problems affecting Britain’s inner cities could be addressed through a policy which embraced multiculturalism and tackled racial disadvantage. Tolerance was also frequently used as a term to describe the virtues of multiculturalism and was viewed as the polar opposite of prejudice. However, “for tolerance to be necessary, there must be a prior belief that the person to be tolerated has an intrinsically undesirable characteristic” (Downing & Husband, 2005, p.197). The paradigm shift from assimilation to multiculturalism was also promoted by the highly influential Swan Report (1985) ‘Education for all’, as a strategy for better meeting the educational aspirations of Britain’s ethnic minority children (Gillborn, 2008). In general multiculturalism resulted in better services through recognition of difference and the need to move away from a universal ‘one size fits all’ approach (Modood, 2013).

However multiculturalism has increasingly been attacked in public policy and displaced by the ideas associated with integrationism, which has become a euphemism for assimilation, tantamount to what some writers in the field refer to as the move towards ‘cultural homogenisation’ (Johnson, 2007; Graig et al., 2012; Bloch et al., 2013). This assimilationist reorientation in public policy is concerned that cultural differences, as part of the British
cultural mosaic, are resulting in non-integration in the form of cultural polarisation and excessive intra-community bonding (Parekh, 2000). The new neo-liberal policy emphasis is on ‘culture’ rather than ‘structure’ and on ‘internal’ rather than ‘external’ factors which focus on individuals and their communities, rather than the role and responsibilities of the state and its institutions (Alexander, 2007; Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012).

**Anti-racist social work**

In many respects a focus on ‘identity’ is also a central preoccupation of anti-racist social work practice, which has been referred to as a set of disparate polycentric overlapping practices and discourses (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002). The focus for anti-racist social work remains on the institutional and structural nature of racism and how it is reproduced in state institutions, including social work education and practice contexts (McLaughlin, 2005). In contrast to the liberal character of the terms used by multiculturalists, such as equality, culture, competence, prejudice, customs, ignorance, fairness, and opportunity, anti-racist practitioners and academics have tended to draw upon more hard-edged politicised terms concerned with struggle, structure, power, exploitation and resistance. (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2004). These terms demonstrate why anti-racist social work is considered to be a politically committed form of practice (Tomlinson, 2002), a radical and oppositional project which emphasises the need to actively identify and resist racism (Bonnet & Carrington, 1996).

The usefulness of anti-racist perspectives which have a valuable and transformative role in social work education (Singh & Cowden, 2010) can be identified in a number of areas that include:

- empowering students to identify and name racism (Goldstein, 2008),
- raising awareness of racial inequalities and the processes associated with racial oppression, racial marginalisation and racial exclusion (Bhatti-Sinclair, 2011),
- transforming unequal social relations, shaping intercultural encounters into equal ones by raising self-awareness of prejudices, biases and stereotypes in individual interpersonal relationships (Dominelli, 1988).

Other writers have focused on how anti-racist perspectives challenge representations of Black people in popular culture (Downing & Husband, 2005) and their social construction as ‘dangerous’ which may lead to inappropriate and oppressive social work interventions (Keating,
Kohli also suggests that anti-racist perspectives play a valuable role in drawing attention to asylum seekers who find themselves vilified, detained, dispersed and deported (Kohli, 2007).

Singh suggests that the overall effect of this learning enables social work students to realise that the wider struggles against state sponsored racism, against the asylum, immigration and nationality laws, against deaths in police custody, against stop and search, against racism in the judicial system, against school exclusions, against the premature deaths of black people due to health inequalities, and against the economic policies leading to the devastation of inner cities where the vast majority of black people live are always relevant to worker-client interactions (Singh, 2002, p. 77).

Within Anti-racist Social Work Black perspectives play a pivotal role in the conceptualisation of practice and in the evolution of social work education. (Graham, 2002a; Singh, 1996a). The use of a capital letter ‘B’ in Black perspectives denotes the term as a noun, to identify a politically defined group which has been visibly and politically racialised as the ‘other’, rather than the term implying an adjective based on skin colour. (Banks, 1999; Mirza, 2003). The term “Black perspectives” has operated as an attempted representation of a particular shared experience and a particular construction of unity around those experiences. (Brah, 2005) These shared experiences relate to a common history of colonialism and a collective memory of the British Empire; the existence of immigration and nationality legislation and lived experiences of racial discrimination (Goldstein, 2008). Robinson (1995; 1999) has also drawn upon Black perspectives to explore the processes associated with ‘nigrescence’, which refers to the process of developing a positive Black identity. Ahmad (1990) has also suggested that a Black perspective is a symbol of Black resistance and Black empowerment, and states that the circumstances that shape a Black perspective stem from the experience of racism and powerlessness, both past and presented. The motivation that energises a Black perspective is rooted to the principle of racial equality and justice. The articulation that voices a Black perspective is part of a process that is committed to replacing the white distortion of Black reality with Black writings of Black experience (Ahmad, 1990, p.3).

Graham (2004; 2007), proposes that Black Perspectives also encompass creating and legitimising alternative ways of knowing, which she refers to as ‘Afrocentricity’. She is highly critical of how ‘eurocentrism’ ultimately privileges the voices and perspectives of white social work academics, and suggests that “Anti-racism in social work education must engage in
multiple ways of knowing in order to advance the course of social work knowledge” (Graham, 2000, p.426).

Closely aligned to Black perspectives discourses is the increasing tendency to explore in anti-racist social work the social construction, normativity and ‘race’ privilege associated with white culture and ‘Whiteness’ (Butler et al., 2003; Jeyasingham, 2011). Within this field of theorising there is a recognition that as a dominant discourse “whiteness never speaks its own name [and] its authority and power is based on a certain level of absence” (Turney et al., 2002, p.7). Fook et al (2000) suggest that unless whiteness is named, problematised and critically reflected upon in social work education, it will remain racially ‘unmarked and invisible’. Robinson (1995) acknowledges that most white students are often unaware of how their whiteness accounts for privileges and power and how it acts as a particular lens through which the world is viewed and experienced. However she suggests they can become conscious of their ‘invisible knapsack of white privilege’ (McIntosh, 1989) through the development of ‘white racial identity’ which she suggests should be a strand of anti-racist social work education.

However, despite the growing analysis of white ethnicities and whiteness in relation to its historical and contemporary social and political situatedness (Williams & Parrott, 2012), there is still a general neglect in social work literature to deconstruct the hegemony of the ‘white mythical norm’- the absent centre…the site and the place from where all these differences are being observed, constructed and signified. ‘Difference’ is always ‘distance’ from a point of reference of privileged’ invisibility’- a site which needs to be interrogated (Trew, 2002, p164-165).

Anti-racist social work is therefore a broad coalition of a range of different perspectives and academic interests concerned with actively identifying and resisting racism. However it has been reluctant to embrace a form of practice often associated with a discussion and recognition of ‘cultural issues’ and culturally sensitive practice (Singh & Cowden, 2013). This resistance has often been associated with a professional and political concern that an over-reliance on cultural explanations may distract attention away from the more pressing structural issues associated with power and discrimination (Penketh, 2000). Husband (2000), also suggest that in an educational context a toolkit approach, which focuses on providing information through pre-packaged and formulaic techniques on different cultures, runs the danger of failing to interrogate a student’s own identity and presenting cultures as monolithic. Ambalavaner
Sivanandan, Director of the Institute of Race Relations, is also highly critical of this approach and suggests that whilst there is nothing wrong about learning about other cultures...to learn about other cultures is not to learn about the racism of your own...unless you are mindful of the racial superiority inculcated in you by 500 years of colonisation and slavery, you cannot come to cultures objectively (Sivanandan, 1991, p.41).

However Laird (2008) has suggested that ‘cultural sensitivity’ is “a vital component of anti-racist practice” (Laird, 2008, p.39). She suggests that it is not possible to be anti-racist without having knowledge of different cultures and their values and norms and that there should be an explicit expectation that social work students, irrespective of their geographical location of study, should, as part of their professional training, become familiar with the different cultural backgrounds and experiences of Britain’s ethnic minority communities. Parrott, (2009) makes a similar observation and suggests that the nature of social work practice in a post-national and globally interdependent world necessitates a particular threshold of cultural competence to work with diverse communities and groups.

A typical model for developing culturally competent practice normally consists of four constructs; cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural sensitivity and cultural competence (Papadopoulos, 2006). Laird (2008), insists that developing cultural awareness is not about the ‘passive absorption’ of cultural knowledge, and seems to support the notion that the focus for teaching and learning, particularly when working with ‘culturally encapsulated students’, should be on “developing skills in the cognitive and affective domains [which enable] students to move from ethnocentricity to ethno-relativism” (Lacroix, 2003, p.24). However ‘ethno-relativism’ should not be construed as a form of practice where all professional judgements are suspended ‘in the name of cultural rights’ (Williams & Soydan, 2005; Parrott, 2009). Clearly, what is required is the ability to maintain “a reflexive critique of specific cultural practices that avoids the vacuity of cultural relativism and allows for criticism, transformation and change” (May, 1996b, p.33).

**Anti-racism in British social work education**

Within British social work education anti-racism gained ascendancy in the late 1980’s. The shift towards this politically committed form of practice was associated with the influential work of CCETSW’s (Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work), Black Perspectives Committee, comprising both white and Black academics, concerned about the failure of social
work courses to address anti-racist issues. This committee was instrumental in mobilising support for CCETSW to formally adopt in 1989 the ‘Requirements and Regulations for the Diploma in Social Work in Social Work’, Paper 30, (CCETSW, 1991), which established mandatory anti-racist learning requirements for students undertaking social work training to address issues of ‘race’ and racism, and to demonstrate competence in anti-racist practice. CCETSW’s Paper 26.3 also charged practice teachers with the responsibility of facilitating anti-racist teaching in practice placement contexts (Penketh, 2000).

CCETSW’s paper 30 stated that “racism is endemic in the values, attitudes and structures of British society, including that of social services and social work education. CCETSW recognises that the effects of racism on black people are incompatible with the values of social work and therefore seeks to combat racist practices in all areas of its responsibilities” (CCETSW, 1991, p.6). CCETSW’s paper 30 articulated the need for social workers to be able to work in a society which was multi-racial and multi-cultural, and stipulated learning requirements in relation to anti-racist work, which included:

- demonstrating an awareness of both individual and institutional racism and ways to combat both through anti-racist practice,
- recognising the implications of political, economic, racial, social and cultural factors upon service delivery, financing services and resource analysis,

CCETSW’s requirements went beyond a concern with individual prejudice and culture and sought to expose the structural and institutional nature of racism in British society. However its period of authority in the social work academy was short lived; it was attacked and sometimes ridiculed by a right-wing Thatcherite government and also faced a number of genuine concerns from social work itself in relation to how these requirements were silencing students and not enabling them to speak freely about ‘race’ issues (Macey & Moxon, 1996). These requirements were deemed to have created a hostile learning environment where students were fearful of talking about ‘race’ and where ‘whiteness’ a marker of privilege, did not recognise that some white communities have, in fact, very little social, political, economic and cultural power (Turney et al., 2002).
The requirements were also challenged for encouraging a superficial adoption of a “politically correct perspective” (Macey & Moxon, 1996, p.309), which was not suggestive of deep learning, and for promoting a very simplistic analysis of power which was “theoretically inadequate and informed by neither sociological, political nor economic theory or research on racism in Britain” (Macey & Moxon, 1996 p.297), overly obsessed with ideological concerns at the expense of developing reflexive practice and practical solutions to meet the needs of Black and ethnic minority service users (Williams & Soydan, 2005).

Not only were these CCETSW requirements deemed to be closing and dumbing down discussion but they were also viewed as marginalising issues of class and gender difference (Mirza, 2003), and moving away from an analysis of identity and power based around intersectionality (Anthias 2002). The lack of emphasis on intersectionality was regarded as promoting a crude and deterministic view of lived experience and was seen to be reducing the totality of Black experience to a response to white racism, thereby conferring a ‘victim status’ on Black people (May, 1999b).

Concern was also raised about how these requirements were marginalising the racialisation of other British minority communities, for example, Jewish people, Turkish and Greek Cypriots, by not enabling them to find a voice within a political and cultural space marked out as Black (Lorenz, 1996a; Rattansi, 2005), and instead inadvertently promoting the homogenisation of these different histories, cultures, needs, aspirations and trajectories of migration and settlement, by the use of the singular category Black to describe all ethnic minority communities (Lorenz,1996b).

CCETSW’s requirements were also challenged for:

- maintaining the invisibility of anti-Irish racism (Mac an Ghaill, 1999)
- failing to recognise white-on-white or Black-on-Black racism and erasing any differentiation in the experiences of racism between different ethnic groups (Modood, 1992),
- encouraging a false assumption that Black cultures are free from exploitation and oppression (Keating, 2000).

These criticisms, together with a vehement attack by the right-wing media, led to the anti-racist learning requirements being dropped by CCETSW and subsequent learning requirements make no explicit reference to ‘race’ and anti-racism. CCETSW’s Black perspectives committee was also disbanded and this period marked social work’s abandonment of the anti-racist
Humphries suggests that “what happened over Paper 30 was that arguments put forward by anti-racists - that racism is deeply harmful, that it results in people being excluded from jobs, from welfare services, and in Black people being policed more closely than other groups - were taken and reversed so that they now read that anti-racist activity was deeply harmful, resulting in Stalinist tactics, which exclude some people from a professional education, which deny freedom of thought and speech to tutors and practice supervisors, and which police the language of everyone” (Humphries, 1997, p.290).

The revised learning requirements promoted a different type of social work education, one which recognised and embraced different areas of social oppression, and one which no longer supposedly privileged racial identity and ‘race’ issues over other forms of oppression. For Macey and Moxon “the shift from anti-racist to anti-oppressive social work education [was] radical rather than reactionary [because it moved] from the narrow, exclusive focus on racial oppression to a broader, more inclusive understanding of the links between various forms and expressions of oppression” (Macey & Moxon, 1996, p.309).

However this discursive shift, into a multi-oppression anti-oppressive practice paradigm (Harrison and Burke, 2014), has been criticised on a number of levels. Heron (2004) has suggested that the discursive shift towards anti oppressive practice can be construed as a hegemonic ploy designed to redefine anti-racism as something less threatening. He suggests that replacing anti-racism with the terms anti-discrimination or anti-oppressive not only removes anti-racism from the agenda [but] it also distorts the very meaning of racism. This distortion limits the students’ ability to construct a logical way to understand ‘race’ (Heron, 2004, p.290).

Williams, (1999) also suggests that this discursive shift has also resulted in anti-racist social work practice issues becoming ‘diluted’, and a general reluctance within the social work academy to discuss the nature and causes of racial oppression and evidence how racism is experienced by Black service users. She also suggests that a broad anti-oppressive approach to learning about social oppression, which includes feminist, postmodern, anti-discriminatory and post-structural frameworks (Healey, 2005), has rendered anti-racism ‘politically sterile’ and opened the way to avoid talking about ‘race’ (Williams, 1999).
This avoidance in talking about ‘race’ issues has been compounded by the tendency to aggregate the different oppressions included within the concept of Anti-Oppressive Practice (Wilson and Beresford, 2000) and focus on what Thompson (2002) terms the ‘processes of discrimination’ at the expense of the ‘processes of resistance’, which serves to draw attention away from the ‘specificities of lived Black experience’ (Singh, 2006a, p.94). It has also been suggested the shift towards a broad anti-oppressive practice paradigm has led to the compartmentalisation of anti-racist social work education as a stand-alone and discrete area of learning, which is no longer embedded across the breadth of the social work curriculum (Butler, et al, 2003). This lack of permeation can suggest a degree of tokenism and may promote superficial rather than deep learning (Heron, 2008).

**Regulatory rules and requirements for Social Work Education**

Currently within qualifying social work education in England and Wales we have a set of prescribed standards and capabilities which determine the content and value base nature of professional training. Taylor and Bogo (2013) make an important distinction between ‘standards’ and ‘capabilities’ and suggest that whilst the former are designed to identify threshold level competence for safe and effective practice, the latter are more ‘developmental’ and ‘holistic’ and are there to support professional social work education which goes over and beyond the threshold level of what is ascribed in regulatory standards.

The current standards and capabilities determine the nature and direction of anti-racist social work education and determine the ‘rules of engagement’. They operate within the parameters of equality legislation and other areas of law and policy relating to social work practice as well as professional value positioning statements (BASW, 2012). These requirements place threshold and aspirational expectations on social work programmes to develop curricula and pedagogies which enable qualifying students to demonstrate at different stages of their professional training proficiency in working with cultural diversity and ‘race’ issues.

The College of Social Work Professional Capabilities Framework (2012a), which replaced the National Occupational Standards for social work in England and the Department of Health Requirements for Social Work Training (2002), identifies nine interdependent domains of practice which focus on particular areas of learning. Although all nine domains have pedagogic and practice appeal for anti-racist social work education (Tedam, 2013), it is the domains of Diversity; Rights, Justice and Economic Wellbeing and Values and Ethics which have the most
relevance for this thesis. These domains of the Professional Capabilities Framework require qualifying social work students to ‘recognise diversity and apply anti-discriminatory and anti-oppressive principles in practice’; to ‘advance human rights and promote social justice and economic wellbeing’; and to ‘apply social work ethical principles and values to guide practice’ (The College of Social Work, 2012a).

To evidence this learning students are expected to demonstrate at the point of qualification that they have the capability to:

- work with the principles of Equality legislation,
- manage potentially conflicting or competing values,
- demonstrate respectful partnership work with service users and carers,
- recognise and promote individual rights to autonomy and self-determination,
- recognise the impact of poverty and social exclusion and promote enhanced economic status through access to education, work, housing, health services and welfare benefits,
- recognise the importance of diversity in human experience,
- understand how an individual’s identity is influenced by factors such as culture,
- develop an appreciation of oppression, marginalisation and alienation as well as privilege, power and acclaim,
- recognise personal and organisational discrimination and oppression and with guidance make use of a range of approaches to challenge them (The College of Social Work, 2012a).

These capabilities have been mapped against the Health and Care Professions Council’s Standards of Proficiency (‘SOPs’) for social workers in England (The College of Social Work, 2012b). These specify “what a social worker should know, understand and be able to do” when they have completed their training and wish to register (Health and Care Professions Council, 2012, p.1). These standards of proficiency state that at the point of registration qualifying students should:

- be able to practice in a non-discriminatory manner,
- understand the impact of different cultures and communities and how this affects the role of a social worker in supporting service users and carers,
- be able to reflect on and take account of the impact of inequality, disadvantage and discrimination on those who use social work services and their communities,
- be aware of the impact of culture, equality and diversity on practice,
be able to work with others to promote social justice, equality and inclusion,
understand the need to respect and uphold the rights, dignity, values and autonomy of every service users and carer,
be able to use practice to challenge and address the impact of discrimination, disadvantage and oppression (Health and Care Professions Council, 2012, p.9).

These standards of proficiency and professional capabilities sit alongside the Quality Assurance Academy (2008) benchmark statement for Social Work. This describes the nature and characteristics of social work education and the type of academic standards which graduates should evidence. The benchmarking statement identifies specific areas of subject knowledge and skills, which enable students to understand and critically evaluate:

- the processes that lead to marginalisation, isolation and exclusion,
- explanations of the links between definitional processes contributing to social differences (for example, ethnic differences and religious belief) to the problems of inequality and differential need faced by service users,
- the nature of social work services in a diverse society (with particular reference to concepts such as prejudice, interpersonal, institutional and structural discrimination, empowerment and anti-discriminatory practices)
- the changing demography and cultures of communities in which social workers will be practising (Quality Assurance Academy, 2008, p.8).

These standards operate within codes of practice on conduct and ethics (Health and Care Professions Council, 2010; BASW, 2012) and professional value statements which seek to define the nature and role of social work within an emancipatory and humanitarian-orientated social justice/social change form of praxis (International Federation of Social Workers, 2012). These standards also reside within an equalities framework which has harmonised UK equalities law and shifted the focus away from negative duties concerned with prohibiting discrimination, harassment or victimisation, to positive duties which seek to advance equality (Hepple, 2011).

These ‘rules of engagement’ are consolidated by additional areas of legislation and guidance which include, for example, The Children Act (1989), section 22 (5) (c), which requires social work practitioners to ‘give due consideration’ to the child’s religious persuasion, racial origin and cultural and linguistic background; The National Health Service and Community Care Act (1990), section 46, which requires Health and Local Authority departments, when planning and commissioning services, to be informed and knowledgeable about the different needs of Black
and ethnic minority groups and ‘Working Together to Safeguard Children guidance, A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children’ (2013), which states that children should be able to access services which meet their particular needs.

In essence these different frameworks provide social work education with a mandate to address anti-racism as both a discrete and interlocking area of social oppression. However there have been few attempts to empirically capture how anti-racist social work education is experienced and only one real attempt to see how it can be measured (Bhatti-Sinclair & Bailey 2010).

**Measuring the outcomes of anti-racist social work education**

Carpenter (2005; 2011) suggests it is possible to evaluate the outcomes of social work education and assess the impact of professional education on practice. Carpenter (2005) [after Kirkpatrick (1967) and Barr et al., (2000)] identifies four different levels of outcomes of educational programmes:

- **Level 1: Learners’ Reaction** – these outcomes relate to the students’ views of their learning experience and satisfaction with the training,
- **Level 2a: Modification in Attitudes and Perceptions** – these outcomes relate to changes in attitudes or perceptions towards service users and carers, their problems and needs, circumstances and care,
- **Level 2b: Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills** – these outcomes relate to the concepts, policy frameworks, procedures, and principles of working service users and their carers, and the acquisition of thinking/problem solving, assessment and intervention skills,
- **Level 3a: Changes in Behaviour** – these outcomes relate to the transfer and implementation of learning from an educational programme into practice, prompted by modifications in attitudes or the application of newly acquired knowledge and skills,
- **Level 3b: Changes in Organisational Practice** – these outcomes relate wider changes in the organisation/delivery of care, attributable to the education programme,
- **Level 4: Benefits to Users and Carers** – these outcomes refer to any improvements in the wellbeing and quality of life of people who are using services, and their carers, which may be attributed to an education programme (Carpenter, 2005; 2011, p.124).
These four different levels encompass the domains of knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviour and enable us to measure specific learning outcomes and evaluate whether students learn and apply what we as social work educators hope for. This model promotes accountable educational practice by examining if what we are teaching is effective and whether it enables students to “learn the knowledge, skills and attitudes intended, in line with specified learning outcome” (Burgess & Carpenter, 2010, p.8).

Carpenter’s (2005) work is important for this thesis because his first two levels (‘Learners’ Reaction’ and ‘Modification in Attitudes and Perceptions’; ‘Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills’) provide a useful framework for evaluating the outcomes of learning associated with formal teaching on anti-racist social work. Carpenter (2005) suggests that, when asked about ‘desirable outcomes’ of social work education, service users and carers often emphasise level two outcomes associated with ‘attitudes’, ‘knowledge’ and ‘skills’ (Carpenter, 2005, p.19). Measuring change in these different areas of learning is central to the empirical work undertaken in this thesis, which evidences the outcomes of anti-racist social work education in the cognitive, affective and skills based domains of Carpenter’s (2005) model. Figure 1 below describes how Carpenter’s level one and level two educational outcomes have been measured in the empirical work of this thesis.

*Figure 1, Measuring the outcomes of anti-racist social work education*

**Level 1**

**Learners’ Reaction**

Measured at T2 in questionnaire data addressing general impressions of learning experience, levels of engagement with teaching content and whether this addressed specific learning needs. Also explored in student group interviews

**Level 2a**

**Modification in Attitudes & Perceptions**

Measured in matched pairs questionnaire data focusing on awareness, confidence and perceptions of racial equality. Also explored in student group interviews

**Level 2b**

**Acquisition of Knowledge & Skills**

Measured in matched pairs questionnaire data focusing on knowledge of ‘race’ issues and key skills for multicultural practice. Also explored in student group interviews and tutor interviews
Williams et al (2009), suggests that within the British social work academy there have been few attempts to empirically capture how programmes accommodate and evidence anti-racist social work issues. She goes on to suggest that:

> There has been much assertion and indeed no small amount of capital accrued to the profession from a moral and political stance on race equality but few attempts have been made to assess training inputs and or evaluate outcomes. (Williams et al, 2009, p.4)

The limited research which has been published on ‘race’ issues in a UK social work education context suggests that that there are ‘fundamental questions’ about the way students learn about racism and that it remains largely ‘invisible and insignificant’ (Heron, 2004, p.289). A summary of existing research on ‘race’ issues in a British social work education context identifies some of the following issues:

- Penketh (2000), in her qualitative research involving 20 semi structured interviews with a sample of 20 Black and white students and their respective practice teachers, suggests that practice teachers did not feel supported or confident in addressing ‘race’ issues with students. Her research found that practice teachers lacked familiarity with key ‘race’ terms, concepts and understandings, which restricted their capacity to provide effective practice education support and teaching. She also reports that different conceptualisations of professional role were closely associated with how practice teachers viewed and addressed ‘race’ issues. Those identified as ‘conservative’ practice teachers did not address ‘race’ issues in student learning and assessments, as these were considered to be marginal and irrelevant for practice, whereas ‘radical’ practice teachers, were more motivated and committed to addressing ‘race’ issues in practice learning and identifying relevant opportunities for students to test out new learning and develop practice confidence and familiarity in working with different communities. Penketh’s research also reports that white students often worked ‘unknowingly’ or ‘unquestioningly’ in placement agencies with little concern for issues of anti-racism.

Her research also draws attention to the pigeonholing of Black students as ‘race’ and ‘cultural’ experts and their continuing experiences of service user hostility and racism. She suggests that the “accounts of Black students revealed how racism manifests itself in the institutional practices and procedures of social work agencies. First, in the
application of unhelpful, inaccurate and obsolete cultural stereotypes of the Black population; second, in the lack of knowledge and awareness among white social workers which has a negative impact on service provision; and third, in racist stereotypes evident in the wider community” (Penketh, 2000, p.63).

- Collins et al., (2000) in their research which involved a content analysis of 40 practice teacher reports and DipSW student portfolios, suggests that anti-racist issues were generally absent and that this ‘invisibility’ was compounded further in practice teacher reports, where “attention to racism and anti-racism does not permeate the content of the reports. In fact, racism and anti-racism are rarely featured” (Collins et al., 2000, p.40). The researchers suggest that the absence of anti-racism in student work may be explained by lack of confidence in dealing with ‘race’ issues in practice education contexts by students’ and by the invidious position of practice educators having to teach and assess students in anti-racist practice, when they themselves are lacking in knowledge and skills in this area.

More recent work by one of the researchers involved in this initial study (Collins & Wilkie, 2010), which involved a content analysis of 30 student practice portfolios, suggests that compared to other areas of social oppression ‘race’ issues continue to receive less attention and are not discussed as lucidly and openly by students.

- Heron (2004) in his research, which involved a systematic content analysis of 112 social work assignments on integrated practice issues, also reported low levels of awareness of anti-racism issues and the author suggests that the minimal reference to anti-racism in student assignments raises ‘fundamental questions’ about the way students learn about racism (Heron, 2004, p.289). In his later work Heron (2008) undertook a content analysis of 51 assignments directly linked to practice placements and explored one aspect of pedagogy in social work education, namely the use of written feedback in enhancing students’ understanding of theory and practice. His findings suggest that tutor feedback “is seldom used in a way that might enhance students understanding of ‘race’ issues. If students are developing an understanding of racism and anti-racist practice, then it does not appear to be the result of the written feedback from tutors and practice teachers (Heron, 2008, p.376).
Heron also suggests that there is a tendency by both tutors and practice teachers to use broad ‘umbrella’ terms such as anti-oppression and anti discrimination to encapsulate ‘race’ issues in feedback. Heron suggests that this pedagogic practice does not lend itself well for a more focused and detailed consideration of anti-racist social work issues by students.

- Bhatti-Sinclair and Bailey (2010), in their questionnaire based research undertaken as part of the OSWE - Outcomes of Social Work Education project, evaluated the impact of formal teaching on students' understanding and experiences of ‘race’ and racism. Their research evaluated the outcomes of a common foundation year in the social sciences and focused on how this learning across a number of discrete modules had increased knowledge of ‘race’ issues, developed confidence in challenging racism and promoted personal and professional change. Their research drew upon the ‘null’ hypothesis to suggest that there would be no change in knowledge and confidence. The sample included both social work and social science students and the study was able to draw upon matched pair data for 34 respondents. Although the variance reported in learning between T1 (before teaching) and T2 (after teaching) was not statically significant, their data suggested that “formal teaching about ‘race’ and racism...did influence knowledge among the students surveyed” (Bhatti-Sinclair & Bailey, 2010, p.58).

With the exception of these 6 pieces of research it has been difficult to identify other published research situated in a UK context which has attempted to assess how anti-racist social work education is experienced and evaluated. This clearly demonstrates the need for increased research activity to build a robust evidence base which can be drawn upon to enhance the quality and outcomes of anti-racist social work education (JUCSWEC, 2006). The empirical work reported in this thesis supplements and enriches previous scholarly work in the field and seeks to develop research capacity to provide a better understanding of how this component of professional education is experienced and the type of educational outcomes which can be accrued from a teaching intervention on anti-racism.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the methodological contours of the research reported in this thesis and how this work was conceptualised and undertaken. The aim of this study was to measure the outcomes of a teaching intervention which addressed anti-racism and to assess how this strand of teaching and learning was experienced and understood by both students and tutors. The study adopted a mixed methods research approach which offered opportunities for data triangulation (Bulmer, 2004), working simultaneously across different sets of data, which provided the research with greater levels of credibility and dependability (Orme & Shemmings, 2010).

The combined use of both quantitative and qualitative research approaches within the same study was suggestive of a pragmatic approach which advocated a position of methodological pluralism (Bryman, 2006). It was also suggestive of logic of enquiry which included the use of induction, to discover patterns and build grounded theory and deduction, which involved testing theories and hypothesis (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2006).

In some respects this empirical study was also a continuation of the embryonic work undertaken for phase 1 of this Doctorate when I developed and piloted a questionnaire on cultural competency and conducted a series of group interviews which explored the role of critical and transformative moments in learning (Fook et al., 2006). This initial design and development work was useful for reflecting upon the contours of the current study and deciding upon the suitability of different research instruments, particularly the ones I had used previously with which I had confidence and practice familiarity. However the different research instruments which were developed and utilised in this study sought either to measure anti-racist learning outcomes or investigate hermeneutical and phenomenological issues about ‘race’ and anti-racism (meaning perceptions, ideas and beliefs), whilst also explaining how social and political processes (Thompson, 2012) shape the way the social world is experienced and understood (Mason, 2005). Therefore whilst quantitative data collection attempted to measure learning, qualitative data sought to capture experiences and perceptions.

The nature of my enquiry

The essence of my enquiry is to understand student and tutor experiences of anti-racist social work education and evidence the educational outcomes of a taught stand-alone module which addresses anti-racism. Although this empirical work is framed as a piece of applied social
research, it nevertheless draws upon evaluative research literature which is concerned with ‘developing and improving practice’ (Lishman, 1999). The key tenets of an evaluative approach, which involves collecting data before and after an intervention has taken place to measure change and variance, are evident in the matched pairs questionnaire design of this study (Thomas, 2011).

However, the essence of the enquiry was not simply to measure change but to also discover how this learning was experienced, the challenges and barriers associated with engaging with this teaching and what seemed to work best and for whom (Kazi, 2003; Pawson & Tilley, 1997). Therefore the focus of this enquiry was not on evaluating a discrete teaching approach but was on measuring outcomes and understanding experiences.

The empirical fieldwork encompassed three different strands of data collection. The first was in relation to the collection of matched pairs questionnaire data at two time intervals, before (T1) and after (T2) modular teaching. The two other discrete components of fieldwork involved student group interviews at the end of module teaching in term two and one-to-one interviews with social work tutors, which ran throughout the latter part of the academic year. These different methods of data collection added depth and breadth to the empirical evidence available for analysis.

For the purposes of this enquiry a case study research approach was drawn upon as more of a strategy than a method (Punch, 2005), and this enabled a detailed and intensive examination of the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education in my University department. However the bounded nature of this case study in one University social work department raises important issues in terms of its applicability and generalisability (McLaughlin, 2012). For example, how can one undergraduate programme be considered to be typical of other social work departments across the country and therefore illuminative of practice across the sector? Although this is an important question, which requires careful consideration and pedagogic appraisal, the intention of this study was “not to generalize but rather to understand the case in its complexity and its entirety, as well as in its context” (Punch, 2005, p.146). In doing so, the intention was to offer as full an understanding as possible of the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education at one institution which may be only reflective of some experiences and outcomes at other Universities.

In some respects the University where this study was based was ‘typical’ of a post-1992 higher education institution because of the visible minority presence of Black and ethnic minority
social work students who tend to be concentrated in this sector rather than pre-1992 institutions (Hussein et al., 2006). However the geographical location of this University in a rural County of England also made it untypical and possibly not representative of other social work programmes across the sector which are based in metropolitan areas (Butler et al., 2003).

**Identifying a teaching and learning intervention on anti-racism**

A key strand of the research was to evaluate the educational outcomes of a teaching and learning intervention on anti-racism (Carpenter, 2005). This involved identifying a module within the social work curriculum which could be evaluated using a repeat measures research instrument. After reviewing the content and learning outcomes of all the modules listed on the undergraduate B.A (Hons) Social Work award map, a level five module on ‘Emancipatory Social Work Practice’ which had the overall aim to ‘challenge oppression, discrimination and inequality’, was judged to be the most appropriate educational intervention to evaluate.

The ‘Emancipatory Social Work Practice’ module focused on ‘race’, racism and anti-racism whilst also addressing other dimensions of social oppression. It was considered by some tutors to be the programme’s flagship module for dealing with ‘race’ issues and was the only component of the social work degree programme which addressed coherently this area of discrimination. The teaching on this second year module spanned the first term and involved 4 hours of structured teaching every week, where attendance was compulsory and monitored. The module covered a broad spectrum of learning content which focused on the nature and history of British racism, the experiences of Britain’s Black communities and developing practice responses to social work issues in a multicultural society. The module also offered discrete input on Black perspectives and racial awareness. The teaching was delivered by a white female tutor of Irish heritage who had a practice background and academic interest in working with unaccompanied children seeking asylum. The module ran concurrently with other areas of teaching focused on experiential groupwork and safeguarding vulnerable adults, which were delivered by different tutors.

**Methodological Position**

The methodological orientation of this study is a pragmatic one (Williams, 2006), which recognises the role of both nomothetic and idiographic approaches to enabling us to describe and understand how anti-racist social work education is experienced and understood, and what its outcomes for students may be. This position recognises that there are many ways of knowing and many types of knowledge and does not see any contradiction in accepting
different ways of knowing and different forms of knowledge; “while we wish to reassert the importance of meaning and subjectivity, we also wish to lay claim to the tools of reason and logic, for these are not irrevocably wedded to an objectivist methodology” (Butler & Pugh, 2004, p 67).

The methodological position adopted in this study draws upon Critical Realism and recognises that the social world does exist, it is real and it is there to be observed. It is knowable, “although the process of knowing it is a social process with social content” (Bryne, 2002, p.3). This realist conception of the social also accepts that social actions are crucial in the construction of the social world, and recognises that knowledge which individuals have of their social world affects their behaviour (May, 2002, p.12). Within this realist approach the social world is presented as a dual reality of structure and agency. The ‘subjective’ side of this reality is presented through ethnomethodological, interactionist and interpretivist thinking, emphasising subjective meanings and “uncovering those shared understandings that are taken for granted in social encounters” (King, 2005, p.218), whilst the ‘objective’ aspects draw upon functionalist and structuralist theorising and focus on the operation of social systems and the “resilience of objective structures” (King, 2005, p.218).

However, the ontological position adopted in this thesis is one which recognises that the character of the social world has an independent and objective existence, which “consists of more than the sum of people’s beliefs, hopes and expectation” (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, 23). This position asserts that this reality beyond individuals comprises real material and ideological structures which exist independently of sense data (Baert, 2006), and that these structures, although not immediately accessible to observation, have a generative tendency to influence certain courses of action (Porter, 2002). These generative tendencies can be evidenced in a range of social welfare data which is suggestive of racial discrimination and racialization within society, which has a negative and enduring impact upon the well-being of Black communities (Williams & Johnson, 2010).

Although Critical Realism accepts a place for hermeneutics, it differs from hermeneutic philosophies in insisting that there is also causation in society. The notion of causation in the social world is a contested one and what is being suggested here is not mono-causality but ‘multiple causality.’ (Humphries, 1999) Multiple causality reflects the complex nature of causes and the evolving and changing relationship between agency and structure. However to say
that “causes are real is to say that something generates something else. The something can be a complex generative system rather than any single factor” (Bryne, 2002, p. 2).

Within critical realism the complex generative structure of racism has an ‘a priori’ existence and therefore predates actors currently situated within it; this means that it is not possible to simply explain racist beliefs and actions solely with reference to the attitudes and values of individuals involved. Porter suggests that such an “individualistic approach is unable to explain the origins of individual acts, and it leads to their reification. In order to avoid such a static conception of racism, the articulation between racist attitudes, acts and structured relations needs to be considered” (Porter, 2002, p. 65-66). Porter goes on to suggest that the existence of structural racism does not necessarily mean that all interactions between white and Black individuals will be characterised by racism. He suggests that the structure of racism is both constraining and resisted and that individuals have ‘agency’ to resist and challenge these forces through developing ‘criticality’ and anti-racist understandings.

Porter’s critical insights into the nature of social reality recognise the danger of ‘rooting’ knowledge in the description of individual experience (Oakley, 2006), and seek to avoid the ‘phenomenological morass’ and ‘relativism’ associated with multiple realities or multiple truths based on one’s construction of reality (Oakley 1998). What these writers are suggesting here is that knowledge does not necessarily need to be known and understood interpretively within the confines of methodological individualism and nominalism. Individuals do not necessarily have to remain “hermeneutically sealed from the world outside their theatre of activity” (Cohen et al., 2005 p. 27). Clearly “it is both permissible and desirable to make knowledge claims which extend beyond the individual and accept that there is a reality beyond individuals” (Porter, 2002, p.60).

The critical realist Bhaskar suggests that this reality is stratified. He agrees that it cannot be understood by reference to individual activity and belief alone. Bhaskar argues that social action has emergent properties which go beyond individual consciousness and he makes a distinction between the realms of knowledge that he calls the ‘observable’, the ‘actual’ and the ‘real’ (Bhaskar, 1998a). The realm of the ‘observable’ is what you can see and hear through the senses; the realm of the ‘actual’ may be less immediately evident or observable but it is still there, and the realm of the ‘real’ comprises material and ideological structures. It is generally considered in this respect where realism as an epistemology makes its radical distinction from positivism and subjectivism.
This realm of the ‘real’ allows as knowledge, structures which, even in principle, you could never observe or test empirically. Concepts such as... institutional racism, [which] may generate patterns of observable discrimination, are analytically useful and allow us to think about the world in epistemologically and politically productive ways, yet one can never directly observe them (Dyson & Brown, 2006, p. 37-38).

The ontological position would suggest that, if the social world is organised around racism, then this can be made knowable, through the actions and attitudes of individuals, institutions, and structures which are meaningful components of the social world. In terms of epistemology, if these “distinctive dimensions of the social world (attitudes, actions, and discourses) are knowable – [then] it is possible to generate knowledge about and evidence for them” (Mason, 2005, p.17). Therefore in this study it is possible to make knowledge claims which go beyond the individual and which are suggestive of structural and institutionalised practices which may have causal powers. Therefore linking together ‘agency’ and ‘structure’ enables the integration of hermeneutical issues with wider social and political processes, thereby making sense of subjective meanings and interpretations with reference to the political, social and historically situated contexts in which they were formed.

**Researcher Identity**

A reflexive approach has required me to recognise how as both the ‘interpreter and author’ (Dunn et al), the data which I have drawn upon and the accounts which I have constructed have been influenced by my past and present experiences. As a self-knowing and responsible researcher I have had to challenge the stance taken by some researchers working within ‘politically neutral’ academic research communities who feel that their identities make no difference in the authorial and research speaking positions they take. This position assumes that value free research is both possible and desirable and has been challenged by feminist and anti-racist researchers who claim that “neutrality is not enough, for neutrality is culturally and historically specific.” (Ahmad, 1993b, p.17). It is therefore difficult to see how societal and individual values may be absent from the research I am undertaking and why “researcher identity...is critical to the production of knowledge about the complexities of the social world” (Dunne et al., 2005, p.29).
Consequently, what I have experienced, observed and felt whilst researching and writing up this thesis has been influenced by my researcher identity. Therefore I have had to locate myself squarely within this thesis and acknowledge how my past experiences, political commitments and professional understanding of anti-racism have shaped the research agenda and influenced personal interpretation. For example the questionnaire text and interview questions I have developed and drawn upon in this thesis have been influenced by my “theoretical and social position, substantive interests and biography” (Dunne et al., 2005, p. 46) and the way in which my fieldwork data has been broken down and recontextualised in this thesis has also been influenced by my values and politics as a Doctoral researcher who has a particular interest in ‘race’ issues. Therefore rather than giving the impression of being a detached observer and pretending that I am absent in my work, I have attempted to make myself visible as a self-knowing and responsible researcher with a view to enabling the reader to evaluate the situated knowledge I have produced in this work (Fook, 2000).

We are not robots who collect pure information, but humans with emotions, values, social biographies and institutional locations. They shape the problems we choose, the ways we go about studying them, the eyes we bring to observation, and the relationships we have in the field. Locating ourselves in the work, instead of pretending we’re not there, helps readers to evaluate the situated knowledge we produce (Riessman, 1994, p.135).

The positioning of my research within anti-racism suggests that I have ‘taken sides’, and adopted a position of ‘conscious partiality’ (Becker, 1967). Howard Becker’s claim that social researchers cannot avoid ‘taking sides’ suggests that impartiality is neither possible nor desirable and that research is both a “moral and political activity” (Humphries, 2004, p. 113). Becker argues that as a researcher I should explicitly declare my partiality, because by doing so I will directly challenge the value base and neutrality associated with ‘scientism’. By declaring my research partiality, the mystique and exclusionary nature of ‘scientism’, grounded in an objectifying positivist discourse, is challenged for privileging the status of knowledge, for those who speak from ‘nowhere.’ (Gray, 2003). This challenging allows for the voices of those who speak from ‘somewhere’ to be validated and legitimised.

Therefore it has been important for me to place myself at the centre of my research and avoid the ‘objectivist stance’ which attempts to make me invisible and anonymous. A critical and reflexive form of autobiography (Letherby, 2003), has provided me with the space to reflect
upon and recognise how the nature of different professional and personal experiences have led me to ‘take sides’ and adopt a position of ‘conscious partiality’ (Becker, 1967).

We cannot speak from nowhere, but from where we are positioned, socially, culturally and politically... too many ... appear to speak from nowhere, to be disembodied arbiters of truth and knowledge (Gray, 2003, p. 33).

The partial view from ‘somewhere’ in this respect has more credibility than the relativist view from everywhere or the transcendent, objectifying view from nowhere.

The ‘somewhere’ from which I wish to speak from has been shaped by lived experiences of racial attack, racism and grounded praxis in ‘anti-racist struggle’ which has involved working “in and against the state” (Ledwith, 2011, p.12). As a tutor I have sometimes felt out of place in the ‘whiteness’ of the academy (Back, 2004), and have experienced being perceived as an ‘imposter’ in the lecture theatre and challenged for ‘standing in someone else’s shoes’. These experiences are clearly all significant ‘speaking’ positions. I therefore “speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular experience, a particular culture, without being constrained by that position” (Hall, 1992a, p.258). However I acknowledge that whilst some aspects of my subjectivity are linked to marginalised and outsider positions, which help to produce ‘oppositional knowledge’ (Crabtree et al., 2008, p.16), other aspects of my self identity might serve to maintain and reproduce existing power relations.

It has been important for me to reflect upon and make visible how these experiences have influenced this Doctoral study and to recognise that by doing research in an area where I have a lived experience and personal commitments that my “academic contributions are more likely to come out of a personal, creative, politically engaged self, one that that has a social - and not just an academic - purpose” (Clifford, 1994, p.106).

However whilst planning for this study I recognized that whilst ‘race’ related personal experience undoubtedly influences one’s perspectives and understanding “many current references to it are deterministic and essentialist, one does not have to have experienced an event or a form of oppression in order to develop ‘committed understanding’ ” (Kelly et al., 1995, p.30). Therefore I did not wish to give the impression that I was approaching this study from a particular standpoint which provided me with an ordained right to research into anti-racism or claim epistemological authority. On the contrary, I approached this study as a reflexive and contested piece of work which recognises that not all social work educators will
share or agree with my conceptualisation of practice. However personal biography, which involves acknowledging the commitments, motivations and conditions which have played a part in the production of this research, is critical for understanding what has been written and how it may be interpreted and understood.

**Sampling strategy**

The research adopted a purposive sampling strategy (May, 2002) which involved selecting research respondents for a specific purpose and on the basis of a known characteristic (such as being a year two student enrolled on the level 5 ‘Emancipatory Social Work’ module or a Lecturer in Social Work). This non-random sampling strategy ensured relevance and depth and was deliberately selective and biased because it only recruited research respondents who had knowledge which was valuable to this study (Cohen et al., 2005). Although sample numbers were low (36 students and 8 tutors) it was still possible to “compare and contrast individuals located in different subjectivities and life stages” (Gray, 2003, p. 100). However the limitations of the low sample size needs to be carefully considered when interpreting the findings of statistical tests undertaken to compare group differences related to ‘race’, age and experience of working with a Black and ethnic minority service users. For example, when comparing a sample size of 12 Black students with 24 white students, the difference would need to be high to achieve statistical significance.

**Research Instruments**

**Questionnaires**

The research study drew upon two questionnaires which were concerned with measuring change in student learning and understanding how they had experienced teaching on anti-racism. Matched pairs questionnaires were completed by 36 students before and after teaching. The questionnaire was a key component of the research strategy and involved the design of a self-completion research instrument which would provide quantifiable data to test for variance and change. What also became evident in the design and piloting of both questionnaires was the capacity of these standardised research instruments to deliver mutually supporting qualitative and quantitative data (Kelly et al., 1992).
I was initially drawn to using a questionnaire because of its ability to provide descriptive and inferential statistics which can produce alternative accounts of the social world and which politically had been instrumental to raising societal awareness of racial inequalities and the nature of racism (Law, 2010). I was also conscious of how quantitative data had empowered individuals to “establish that personal experience reflects wider structural inequalities and collective oppression” (Qureshi, 2004, p. 120).

The two questionnaires I drew upon made explicit assumptions about research participants (Holloway & Jefferson, 2000) and these were based upon a research subject who:

- Is knowledgeable about his/her, experience (with regard to actions, feelings, and perspectives)
- Can access the relevant knowledge accurately and comprehensively
- Can convey the knowledge to a stranger
- Is motivated to tell the truth

However these assumptions failed to problematize the research subject who was seen, “as either socially constructed and/or rationally driven” (Holloway & Jefferson, 2000, p.24).

Within my research one way of problematizing this relationship was to focus on the area of ‘response bias’. In terms of my research instrument I was concerned that the ‘genuineness and accuracy’ of what was disclosed may be influenced not only by my ‘ethnic identity and authorship of the questionnaire, but also by the sensitized nature of racialized topics themselves. Questions about racial issues seem to have strong emotional meanings “that defy and confound the rationalist approaches of survey research” (Gunaratnam, 2003, p.57). Therefore the ‘validity and reliability’ of my data may have been compromised by what participants think I want to hear and their apparent defensiveness in not disclosing their real thoughts and feelings. The challenges of these ‘politically correct’ responses, would require that these important emotional and interactional dimensions were fully considered “when entering into some sort of dialogue with the data and vicariously therefore with the respondents” (Dunne et al., 2005, p. 51).

When deciding to use a questionnaire I was also concerned that it could be construed and challenged for representing a “masculinist form of knowing”, where the emphasis was on the “detachment of the researcher” and the collection and measurement of “objective social facts” through a supposedly “value-free form of data collection”(Gibbs, 2001, p.689). I was conscious of how within this Doctorate programme of study there was sometimes a resistance to working
with ‘numbers’ and a preference for ‘words’. Questionnaires, even within my professional teaching department, were viewed by my peers as too hygienic and were criticised for censoring out the mess and complexity of doing social research (Kelly et al., 1995). However as I developed and refined my questions I became more convinced that the questionnaire text itself revealed in quite self evident ways, my “theoretical and social position, substantive interests and biography” (Dunne et al., 2005, p.46), and how this reflected a commitment to racial equality and social justice.

The two questionnaires which I developed attempted to draw upon five distinct types of question content which were related to behaviour, beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and attributes. (De Vaus, 2002). They used standard questions in order to permit for comparison, aggregation and summarisation (Bulmer, 2004). They also drew upon closed and open ended response categories, filter questions and contained space for additional written or typed comments.

The first questionnaire drew upon nominal data categories, was more factual and designed to elicit particular responses to pre-determined issues. The second questionnaire contained more open-ended questions and in places provided respondents with complete freedom to decide the aspect, form, detail and length of their answer (Moser & Kalton, 2004). However both questionnaires (see Appendix 1) sought information on a range of substantive areas which included experiences of societal and service user racism; experiences of working with BME service users; practice teaching support; understanding and perceptions of ‘race’ equality; knowledge about the skills and issues for effective anti-racist practice; perceived learning needs; impressions of overall learning and critical moments which had led to a ‘breakthrough in learning ’ and subsequent ‘perspective transformation’ (Fook et al., 2000).

In some of the questions there was an embedded ‘research hunch’ which predicted particular types of patterns emerging in the data based upon what was already known about the social world (Humphries, 2008). These inbuilt ‘research hunches’ could be refuted or validated when the data was coded and tested and were mainly concerned with how students would react differently to this learning because of their subject positions and wider group experiences. I was also very interested to discover how perceptions and stereotypes of particular South Asian groups may be related to different levels of confidence, awareness and knowledge and whether students could differentiate between different South Asian communities.

The questionnaires also offered the possibility for methodological triangulation within method
(Flick, 2009) because they enabled the inclusion of both open ended, closed questions and ‘Likert scales’. The use of Likert scales was very important for this research and these were carefully constructed to measure confidence, awareness and knowledge (Oppenheim, 2004).

**Individual and Group Interviews**

The empirical fieldwork also involved student group interviews (N=3) and one to one interviews with social work tutors (N=8). These interviews offered the opportunity to develop and reflect upon some of the initial findings emerging from questionnaire data and explore how this teaching was experienced and perceived by different stakeholders. The tutor interviews in particular also enabled an exploration of what the learning task was for students and some of the barriers and challenges to embedding this learning into the curriculum.

The qualitative aspects of this study were important for understanding the different experiences of tutors and students and how they engaged with and made sense of anti-racist social work education. The research design of the study ensured that there was an opportunity in the second phase of fieldwork which involved qualitative inquiry to build on the preliminary analysis of questionnaire data by seeking clarification and progressively focusing on emergent issues which were considered to be important for how anti-racist social work education was experienced by students.

The research interviews undertaken for this study were approached and viewed as a form of ‘conversation with a purpose’ (Mason, 2002) and drew upon a social constructionist methodological position, which asserts that since knowledge is at least partly formed through dialogue and interaction (May, 2002), it is possible to understand and explore the experiences of anti-racist education by simply asking students and tutors to talk about their experiences and understandings.

However within some of the interviews it was sometimes necessary to adopt a more structured form of interviewing, which, whilst still seeking to explore perception and experience, can be characterised as ‘knowledge excavation’ and ‘knowledge extraction’ (Kvale, 1996). In these interviews my role as a researcher could metaphorically be described as a ‘miner’ (Kvale, 1996). This approach was adopted when discussion, particularly in one interview, became stilted and disjointed due to a lack of shared understanding and dialogue. When this happened I reverted back to the safety and structure of my interview script
(interview schedule) and the nature of my questioning became more focused to ensure that I maintained specificity, demonstrated clarity of expression and drilled down on key aspects of my enquiry.

In the group interviews a more ‘active interview’ approach was present (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995) and the group interviewees were seen as the active co-producers of meaning, and not just there to be ‘excavated’ (Mason, 2005). These active dialogic group interviews were in this respect viewed as “sites of knowledge construction, and the interviewee[s] and interviewer as co-participants in the process” (Mason, 2002, p. 227).

In all of the interviews the language research respondents drew upon to describe their reality reflected dominant ideas referred to by Foucault as ‘forms of thought’ or ‘regimes of truth’ (Fook et al., 2006). This was particularly the case in student group interviews where particular types of language expressed viewpoints and perspectives which were anchored in wider discourses suggestive of an overemphasis on ‘racial oppression’ and ‘political correctness’. These discourses are propagated widely in the mainstream media and have been drawn upon to attack ‘race’ equalities work (Husband, 2007).

The choice of group interviews was not simply a pragmatic one based on ‘low cost and rich in data’ considerations (Flick, 2009). The selection and appropriateness of this method was also justified on the grounds that it was able “to elicit a range of interpretations of one particular situation” and that it would allow for “critical debate between perspectives, and for comparison of formative experiences” (Fook et al., 1999, p.171). The use of group interviews in this research was also reflective of the reflexivity I have demonstrated in seeking to recognise and equalise power differentials between myself (the male researcher) and my interviewees, (the majority of whom were women). This was because I was sensitive to the wider power relations inherent in all social research and was therefore mindful of the need to shift the balance of power away from myself and towards the research participants. By the very fact of being in a group interview context rather than in a one-to-one interview situation my influence as a researcher was experienced as diffused (D’Cruz & Jones, 2014). However there was still the lecturer/student power issues which I had to be mindful of and of how these could scupper dialogue.

I was also conscious of the need to ensure that the ‘voice’ and experiences of Black social work students was not excluded, and on this basis I decided that it would be appropriate to provide
choice for these students to access an interview group reserved for Black students only. This was not deemed necessary for other research participants as they were with the exception of one male student all white women. The decision to offer a Black student group interview was also based on a consideration that that “oppressed groups are unlikely to speak freely in mixed settings or to fully explore the central issues of their lives” (Dullea & Mullender, 1999, p.88). Therefore the decision to provide Black students with designated space for dialogue was considered to be a vital part of a research strategy which sought to facilitate and enable potentially hitherto silenced voices to enter the research arena, and for this ‘subjugated knowledge’ (Becker, 1967) to move from ‘the margins to the centre ’ dialogue (hooks,1984). It also reflected a political stance where as a researcher, by choosing to take seriously the narratives of the less powerful, I was also challenging the ‘hierarchy of credibility,’ (Becker, 1967). All of the Black students elected to participate in this component of my fieldwork, which suggested that for this group of students there was ‘something at stake’ (Hall, 1992b) and they valued the opportunity for their voices to be heard.

When planning for the respective individual and group interviews I was concerned that my cultural and racial identity may impact upon what was shared by participants and how this active dialogue may not be truly reflective of the way in which anti-racist education was being experienced and understood by both tutors and students. I was conscious of how the ‘credibility’ and ‘trustworthiness’ of my data may have been compromised by what students and tutors thought I wanted to hear, and their apparent defensiveness in not disclosing their real thoughts and feelings, which may be related to them possibly not wanting to expose the limitations of their current thinking or simply by not wanting to offend me. I was therefore aware of how ‘race-of-interviewer effects’ (Ramji, 2009) can lead to response bias and measurement error and that this would need to be considered carefully when interrogating and making sense of my empirical findings.

I did consider using a different interviewer whom research respondents did not know, but felt that they would be perceived as an outsider who was detached from the research project and parachuted in to don the metaphorical white coat which viewed research as clinical and lacking in emotion. I also felt that an outsider would not have the same level of commitment and engagement from staff and students which was based on collegiality, trust and my positioning as a tutor. I was also concerned that an outsider would lack familiarity and immersion with my research work on anti-racism and that this would hinder their ability to probe and develop
particular strands of dialogue, which was important for a deeper and committed understanding of how anti-racist social work education was experienced.

Two different discussion guides (see Appendix 2) were drawn upon to help navigate the semi-structured group and tutor interviews, with the use of ‘funnelling’ to progressively focus discussion on substantive areas of the investigation (Whittaker, 2009). These interview guides shaped the contours of bounded discussion and reflected the centrality of my researcher identity because this was critical for understanding question construction and the thematic areas I had identified for discussion. The interview guides were provided in advance and it was hoped that this would help focus the mind and add to the quality and depth of dialogue. Probes and invitations to expand on issues raised was also critical to the success of these interviews and I was better able to tune my prompts by remaining vigilant of the interviewees' body language and paralanguage (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

All interviews were audio tape recorded and transcribed verbatim and I also made reflective notes during and at the end of interviews which captured my general feelings and thoughts on how I interpreted some of the silences in interviews. These notes also enabled me to capture what was said in the ‘more informal’ and ‘off stage moments’ (Goffman, 1972). The latter included one tutor ‘wishing me all the best’ and then telling me they ‘still did not see what all the fuss was about’. This comment made me reflect upon how this tutor was simply expressing a viewpoint which was indicative of the current shifts in public policy, where ‘race’ issues have become invisible and superseded by a new discourse which suggests that racism is a thing of the past (Graig, 2013).

These notes and a fieldwork diary which was kept for the interview phase of fieldwork also enabled me to reflect upon how I had experienced some tutor interviews as ‘guarded and cagey’ and another one as ‘simply going through the motions’ where the interviewee was disinterested and reluctant to develop discussion.

**Piloting**

Both research instruments were piloted before they were operationalized in fieldwork, and this enhanced their internal validity and reliability (Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001). The questionnaire was pre-tested with a group of social work students who were in a different cohort from the students in this study. These students were recruited from a research module where I
volunteered to do some optional skills-based workshops on questionnaire design and piloting. In the absence of any other skills-based training these workshops, which ran between lectures, were well attended and, after sharing the nature of my proposed research, a group of students agreed to help me to refine and develop my research instrument.

This piloting work was constructed as a form of reflexivity because it involved asking students to comment upon my questionnaires and their experiences of it through inviting feedback on questionnaire wording, sequencing, structure, meanings and the general saliency of the research instrument. These pre-testing workshops led to changes in both sets of questionnaires which resulted in them becoming more concise, having more open ended questions, incorporating skip questions, abandoning semantic differential scales in preference of Likert scales and ensuring that both questionnaires looked similar and professionally designed. The wording of some key questions also changed to offer better clarity and this was critical for ensuring that the meaning of questions was understood across the different academic abilities of the student group.

Given that I had drawn upon group interviews in phase one of this Doctorate for an exploratory piece of research on cultural awareness, I felt confident using this research tool without the need for it to be formally piloted. The structure and content of my questions was similar to the thematic areas I had previously drawn upon and these had been positively evaluated. However the individual tutor interviews were new and, to build confidence and familiarity with undertaking these and the contents of my discussion guide, I felt it was important to pilot this research tool in a mock interview situation. A former social work tutor agreed to assist me with this task and we agreed a date for a pre-planned pilot interview in my office. We recorded the interview but it was not subscribed verbatim as I did not have their consent to do so. The pilot interview was useful for identifying key questions which worked or didn’t work so well, and the probes which enabled the conversation to move beyond surface responses and into deeper types of reflection and thinking.

However, it wasn’t the actual interview itself which was the source of the greatest learning, instead it was my office and why it was not suitable for tutor interviews. This was because this space reflected and visually projected particular types of office paraphernalia which could influence the type of dialogue which emerged in interviews. From the books on my shelves to the postcards and pictures on my walls a particular type of committed and conformational anti-racism was being which projected, which could stifle dialogue, particularly in light of very few
of these interviewees having familiarity with my office and what it mirrored. Therefore, in light of these observations, I decided not to provide tutors with the choice of using my office space for interviews. Instead all of the interviews were conducted in their offices and, as a researcher, it was interesting to observe and reflect on the paraphernalia in these offices and what it revealed of the identities of interviewees.

**Ethical Issues**

The ethical stance taken in this research study is grounded in the values of the social work profession, which is concerned with demonstrating respect for individuals, promoting self determination, campaigning for social justice and working for the interests of others (Butler, 2002). These principles have been underpinned by ensuring beneficence and non-maleficence in all areas of my research activity (Butler, 2002) and an explicit commitment to upholding the highest standards of integrity to enhance credibility and trustworthiness (Dominelli & Holloway, 2008).

From the initial stage of conceptualisation to the completion of this Doctorate I have assumed full moral responsibility for my work and have been conscious of how a wide spectrum of deontological issues have informed all research decisions (Banks, 2001). I was formally granted ethical approval as a Doctorate student by the University of Sussex Social Sciences Cluster-based Research Ethics Committee to proceed with my fieldwork in August 2011 (see Appendix 3) but also had to apply for approval to undertake this study at the University where I am based. This was granted immediately via email, as the Research Ethics Committee accepted the approval given by the University of Sussex.

At the start of the empirical work a research information sheet was provided to all prospective respondents to enable them to make an informed choice about participation (see Appendix 4). This information sheet was complimented with formal consent forms (see Appendix 5) for all three components of fieldwork, which demonstrated the importance of securing of informed consent (Wiles et al., 2005).

These research forms stated explicitly that involvement in the research was entirely voluntary and that participants could withdraw consent at any stage. However the exact time point at which students and tutors could withdraw consent was a tricky question and, after deliberating over this issue at the September Doctorate study weekend in 2011, it was decided that I had to
specify particular cut off point. For the one to one tutor interviews consent could be withdrawn up to the interview transcript verification stage, and for students completing questionnaires this could be withdrawn up to the end of group interviews. These cut off points were important because they enabled the formal coding and analysis work to proceed without the uncertainty of data interruption.

In a series of planned student information and briefing sessions designed to stimulate interest and support in the study I made it explicitly clear that there was no unspoken gain or hidden penalty from either participating or choosing not to do so. However several staff members, including the module leader who had teaching responsibility for the module the module I was focusing my educational outcomes research on and the head of department, were seen to be actively championing my study with students. Although I welcomed this endorsement and support I was vigilant about how this could be experienced as indirect coercion and therefore had to ensure that participation remained voluntary. One way to do this was to provide individuals with the space to complete questionnaires away from the University and not in formal teaching time where there may have been an expectation for them to provide data. By enabling these students to take their questionnaires away with them or access them electronically and then to return them at a later date, I empowered them to make an informed choice about participation.

I also provided assurances that questionnaires would not be identifiable by handwriting and that they could be returned in a sealed envelope by respondents, but only after they had confirmed on the envelope checklist that they had included their unique student number, which was critical to the matched pairs sample design of this study. These unique student numbers were the only means to ensure matching compliance and some students were concerned that this data made their responses traceable. I therefore had to provide further reassurances about anonymity and my ethical duties to protect and safeguard the interests of research respondents.

However at the start of the module, when the first questionnaire was completed and returned, it became clear that these concerns had been abated and that the response rate had been exceptionally positive. There seemed to be a real interest and ‘buzz’ in the study and a type of ‘snowballing effect’ taking place (Jupp, 2006), where a critical mass of highly engaged Black and white students, which included both the course representatives, had become unofficial research ambassadors for this study and had motivated others to participate. The timing of the
questionnaires was also critical importance, as they were completed in a period of the academic year when no items of assessment were due. This ensured that completing questionnaires did not place students under undue pressure nor did the time spent on completing questionnaires compromise the quality of their assessment work.

For student group interviews clear boundaries were established in relation to conduct and language and the parameters of acceptable discussion. These ground rules minimised conflict and ensured that the group environment remained a safe space for students to speak openly and freely. Students were also asked to refrain from naming and identifying any tutor or practice teacher in group discussions.

The emphasis on preserving ‘contingent confidentiality’ rather than absolute confidentiality (Dominelli & Holloway, 2008), was a particular ethical concern in this study for the component of research encompassing individual tutor interviews. The concern here was in relation to protecting the anonymity of social work tutors and not compromising their personal and professional standing, due to the “fear and consequences of being identified with negative or uncomfortable findings” (Drake & Heath, 2008, p.129). In order to minimise these risks I offered to erase distinctive aspects of identity which would make interviewees recognisable, but, to my surprise, no tutor at the interview transcript verification stage requested for this to take place; indeed several tutors wrote back making a special request for their identities to be made visible. However I made it absolutely clear that I would preserve the anonymity of the University and provide all interviewees with pseudonyms when drawing upon their interview data to protect their identities.

A number of other ethical considerations also influenced the development of my research instruments and field work. These moral obligations and responsibilities went beyond anonymity and informed consent and required a justification about the ‘usefulness’ and emancipatory nature of the knowledge my research was seeking to discover (Truman, 2003). The ethical principle of ‘not to cause harm’ also necessitated reflection on what data needed to be collected and the purpose for which it would be used. Gathering unnecessary data was not only an unnecessary invasion of basic human rights (Strier, 2007), but was also considered to be a form of ‘disinterested knowledge’ (Kelly et al., 1992). This type of knowledge was not considered relevant to politically engaged research (Humphries, 2004, p. 114).
I also considered the way in which individuals who participated in my research may be personally and professionally empowered. Their contribution to making visible an area of emancipatory learning and its transformative potential, and voicing personal and professional experiences of anti-racism may, with the wider dissemination of these research findings, in some incremental way influence the future direction of teaching in this area. The therapeutic effects of being able to reflect on and re-evaluate professional experiences and understandings through engagement with my group interviews and questionnaires was also considered to be of relevance (Maynard, 1995); particularly for those students who felt that their voices and standpoints were marginalised and difficult to express in the lecture theatre (hooks, 1984).

I also considered the ethics of research which, having generated all sorts of issues in the minds of respondents, just leaves them to come to terms with these issues on their own (Kelly et al., 1992); and considered how some students, reflecting on current or past experiences of racial harassment and victimisation, may require some form of pre-arranged post-interview support (Maynard, 1995). I therefore made contact with the University student equality officer and counselling service and agreed with them two dedicated drop-in sessions for students who may refer themselves for support. I also shared this information at the end of all group interviews and, when collecting questionnaires at T1 and T2. I also displayed this information on the student notice board and asked personal tutors to discuss this support with tutees.

**Insider Status**

Throughout the period of my empirical work I was ‘inhabiting the hyphens’ in terms being both insider-outsider and lecturer–researcher, which meant that I was continuously crossing over and working between two different communities (Drake & Heath, 2011). The day job at times took a back seat and it was difficult to think about and prepare for teaching as my thoughts were constantly with my research. For a time I was completely immersed in my data and simply did not want to be away from it. My personal and professional life was completely wrapped around it and, when I shared this with my Doctorate supervisor, I was told that what I was experiencing was ‘being and becoming a researcher.’

The insider positioning of my research also required ‘stimulating reflexivity’ because my relationships and professional positioning within the social work team compromised my ability to critically engage with some aspects of my data. The personal relationships I had with some colleagues, and how I already had a grounded sense of where they professionally positioned themselves on anti-racism, also made it problematic to work through my interview data.
without making assumptions. The relevance of self–triangulation and the critical role of the supervisory relationship with my Doctorate supervisor was critical here for ‘making the familiar strange’ and re-visiting particular aspects of my data which were ‘not speaking back to me’ (Dunn et al., 2005) and which seemed emotionally difficult to handle.

These emotional dimensions involved how relationships were changing, because I had new information about colleagues which could be constructed as negative and risky (Sikes & Potts, 2008). In particular I had information about one colleague and that suggested, in very strong and emotive language, that they had experienced and perceived anti-racism as being similar to being ‘bludgeoned’ and ‘having it shoved down their throat’.

As an inside researcher this information was risky because what would I do? How would I intervene? What if, for example, this tutor decided that they wanted to be the new module leader for the module which focuses on anti-racism and anti-racist social practice? Would I simply remain silent? This information was also negative because, both professionally and pedagogically, these perceptions and experiences may influence the type of support and response this tutor makes to a Black student experiencing racism or a white student’s suggesting that a colour blind approach practice works well and there’s too much emphasis on political correctness.

But as a researcher I had an ethical duty to protect this tutor from harm and because they were expressing an opinion and experience which was reflective of an embedded discourse within the academy which does not wish to recognise ‘race’ and anti-racism (Ahmed, 2012). I therefore felt powerless to act as a researcher, but as a fellow lecturer, even though my personal relationship with this tutor had changed because of the information they had disclosed to me, I felt I had a professional collegiate duty to begin a conversation with this tutor which may enable them to work through their experiences and help them to develop a more nuanced understanding of anti-racism.

As an insider researcher I also had to offer additional support to a student group who shared a particular understanding of cultural relativism in child protection work which professionally was unsafe and unsound. Had I been a detached researcher I may have walked away with this interesting strand of interview data, but, because of my professional identity and dual roles, I felt it was important to provide space at the end of this group interview to enable these students to work through the implications of their thinking and develop new understandings.
Therefore, as a researcher who was researching and also at the same time working in my own institution, the roles and expectations were different and involved me working between and across two different spheres of activity.

As an insider doing research in one’s own organisation I was also confronted with having to deal with the implications of previous professional encounters and the legacy of institutional memory (Smyth & Holian, 2008). One of the tutors I approached to take part in this study did not respond any of my emails and formal expressions for participation. To make sense of this non-engagement I had to reflect back on our encounters which had been challenging and contested and how these may have been important for understanding why this tutor had chosen not to participate. For other tutors their involvement in this research may have been influenced by their recollections of my current Senate role and previous work within the institution, which was anchored in equalities work. These insider pull factors related to institutional memory may have encouraged tutor participation. The social utility appeal and value of being associated with a social work department engaged in insider research activity in this area of praxis, and how it enhances the credibility and status of social work education and the institution itself, may also have additional pull factors which encouraged both student and staff participation in this study.

Coding and data analysis

The data analysis approach involved a recursive and iterative process which was characterised by both deduction and induction and which involved constantly “moving from ideas to data as well as from data to ideas” (Hammersley, 1992, p.48). A grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was useful for helping to build up theory based on the concepts and internal constructs of data and a thematic coding approach provided a rich and detailed, yet complex, account of aggregate themes emerging from both sets of qualitative and quantitative data related to questionnaires and interviews. This enabled the various strands of data to be analysed for relationships, differences and commonalities (Gibson & Brown, 2009).

The process of coding my data did not take place in an epistemological vacuum; my researcher identity and theoretical positioning influenced how this work was undertaken. The coding and thematic work drew upon both a semantic and latent level of analysis, which went beyond a simple description of the patterns in semantic content and data. This analysis attempted work at the latent level to identify the ideologies and experiences of the social order which may have
shaped surface data at the semantic level (Braun & Clarke, 2008). This focus was in keeping with the critical realist orientation to this study, which recognised the nature and power of social structures (Archer, 1998: Bhaskar, 1998b).

The process of organising and making sense of my data was assisted by the use of NVivo 10, which is a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software programme, and SPSS 20, which is a software programme used for descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Both programmes were used as research tools for identifying patterns and discovering regularities in the data which existed at a level beyond that of the individual (Acton et al., 2009). NVivo 10 was particularly useful for clustering and grouping my interview data and coding emergent themes. However I still found it useful to compare the themes I had identified using NVivo 10 with the initial manual thematic analysis work I had undertaken with my interviews. Whilst working with the interview narratives I became immersed in the descriptions of experience and perception was literally ‘swimming in the data’ (Darlington & Scott, 2002). I was also surprised by how both the manual thematic analysis work and my work using NVivo 10 complemented each other and enabled broadly similar themes to be identified which demonstrated a degree of consistency and reliability. However NVivo 10 simplified the task of managing the different strands of interview data and took away the messiness associated with constantly regrouping and recoding responses and working across different data sets.

The SPSS codebook was also a useful data management tool, and involved deciding how to define and label each of the variables in the questionnaire and assign numbers to each of the possible responses (Pallant, 2010). For open-ended questions this required manually scanning all responses to identify common themes before this data could be assigned a number and inputted into a data file. When conducting a preliminary descriptive analysis of the data file it was useful to split this file, to compare and contrast different group experiences. SPSS also enabled missing questionnaire data to be replaced without distorting sample variance and correlations. This procedure was undertaken for question 19 in questionnaire T1 and question 14 in questionnaire T2. The process involved substituting the missing value with a substitution value based on the group mean value for the particular item in question (De Vaus, 2002, p.176).

SPSS 20 was particularly useful for carrying out a number of non-parametric statistical tests which were considered to be important for measuring and evidencing social work outcomes. These tests included the Mann-Whitney U Test to test for differences between two
independent variables on a continuous measure (for example differences in levels of awareness, knowledge and skills between Black and white students); and the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Rank Test for use with repeated measures (Pallant, 2010). These tests were conducted to measure the educational outcomes of an educational intervention on anti-racism. Both tests compared medians, referred to as a ‘resistant statistic’ because it is not affected by extreme values (Gilbert & Fielding, 2002). The Spearman Rank Order Correlation test was also used to describe the strength and direction of linear relationships between two variables. Both research programmes (NVivo 10 and SPSS 20) left a robust audit trail, which was important for demonstrating rigour and accountability. An additional benefit was that the respective data files can be drawn upon for future research work.
Chapter 4 - Data Analysis

This chapter provides an analysis of questionnaire, group interview and tutor interview data collected to answer the second and third question of this thesis:

2. What is the learning task for students and what are we aiming to achieve?

3. What evidence of outcomes do we have in relation to anti-racist teaching?
   3a. How is anti-racist social work education experienced?
   3b. What change can be identified as a result of anti-racist social work teaching?

The data presented in this chapter is suggestive of a range of experiences and outcomes which have left a complex set of footprints in relation to how anti-racist teaching and learning is experienced. The data suggests there is a clear difference between how tutors make sense of their teaching and what students experience as their learning. This leaves a series of different tracks from the teaching and learning, ones which appear to be associated with the political, cultural and social position of the respondents, and their personal biography, age and professional identity. This holds true whether the respondent was a tutor or a student.

Questionnaire data analysis

Socio-demographic data

Socio-demographic data was collected at T1 (before teaching) for a matched sample of 36 students (see Chart 1). The data was invaluable as it enabled the analysis of situated group experiences around ‘race’ and ‘age’. Out of the sample size of 36 students, 24 respondents were white whilst 12 were Black; 19 were over the age of 26 and 17 students were under the age of 26; and only 2 respondents were male (White British and Black African).

In respect of the intersection between age and ‘race’; 7 (58%) of Black students were under the age of 26 and 5 (42%) over the age of 26; for white students 10 (42%) were under the age of 26 and 14 (58%) were over the age of 26. The intersection between age and ‘race’ was an important methodological issue to recognise because it could affect how I attributed causation for any effects found for age.
When data for culture was analysed what was surprising was the complete absence of South Asian students (Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi) and the presence of (N=7) Zimbabwean students amongst the group of (N=12) Black students (see Chart 2). The visible presence of this group of African students on this programme is quite typical of their national profile on social work programmes (Bartoli, 2013). However the complete absence of South Asian students on this programme and the omission of these voices and experiences in this research should be considered carefully when analysing particular sections of the data. For example, would their presence in the classroom have made a difference to the learning taking place and the degree of confidence and cultural awareness students evidenced in relation to South Asian communities?

Data for the cultural background of white students (see Chart 3) suggested that the majority defined themselves as British (N=20) and three others identified themselves as either Scottish
or English. However the use of religion by one student to describe her cultural background was an interesting finding and mirrored the increasing use of religion by Britain’s South Asian Muslim communities to describe their cultural affiliation and background (Modood, 2013).

![Chart 3- Cultural profile of white students]

**Student learning needs**

Students were asked to reflect upon what their learning needs were in relation to this discrete area of teaching and whether these had been met. Students identified a range of learning needs (see Chart 4). The majority of students identified race awareness training and a practical understanding of anti-racist perspectives in social work practice as key learning needs. However a sizeable group of students (N=8) identified cultural awareness as a key learning need, and this was interesting given the reluctance of some social work programmes to incorporate cultural awareness training because of the alleged reductionist and tokenistic praxis to which it leads (O’Hagan, 2001). A small group of (N=3) students identified exploring and understanding the personal and professional impact of racism on Black staff as a key learning requirement.
However when this data was cross tabulated with ‘race’ (see Table 1) and age (see Table 2) some interesting differences emerged. Students identifying cultural awareness training as a key learning requirement were all white, with no Black student identifying this learning need. One possible explanation for this may have been white students reflecting upon their real lived life experiences of being situated in predominantly white communities which are quite typical of the profile of the County.

**Table 1 Student learning needs - ‘race’ cross tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student learning needs – ‘race’ Cross tabulation</th>
<th>Non stated</th>
<th>ARSW Practice</th>
<th>Awareness of racism</th>
<th>Impact of racism on Black staff</th>
<th>Cultural awareness/competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census data for the ethnic population of the County, available on the Office of National Statistics website, suggested that in the majority of the towns BME groups are under-represented compared with the rest of England and hence are not as visible. Therefore the County cannot be described as racially diverse, and this lack of lived experience of multiculturalism and limited contact with BME communities may have led some of these white students to identify the need for cultural awareness training with a view to developing cultural competence (Laird, 2008).
However a documentary analysis of the module specification suggested that cultural awareness and developing cultural competence was not specified as discrete area of teaching and learning or addressed as an explicit educational outcome.

The data when cross tabulated for ‘race’ (see Table 1) also revealed that three Black students, who were all over the age of 26 (see Table 2), identified addressing the impact of institutional and personal racism on Black staff as a particular learning need. This was an interesting finding and suggested that these students had recognised the need to address in social work training the challenges of working within predominantly white organisations and enabling students to develop better coping and challenging strategies. However a documentary analysis of the module specification suggested that addressing the impact of institutional and overt service user racism was not an issue which had been recognised in teaching content or stated as a particular learning outcome.

**Table 2 Student learning needs – age cross tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Non stated</th>
<th>ARSW perspective</th>
<th>Awareness of racism</th>
<th>Impact of racism on Black staff</th>
<th>Cultural awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students experiences of racism**

A surprisingly high percentage of students reported experiencing or observing racism (see table 3) and this suggests that this form of social oppression is quite common and not an unusual occurrence (Williams, 2011). However the data suggested that nearly a fifth of students were not sure about classifying what they had experienced or observed as constituting racism. This suggested either a possible reluctance or inability to name racism or a lack of understanding to confidently name and identify this form of social oppression.
Table 3 Students’ experiences of racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However those students who named and constructed particular incidences as racism referred to four key experiences around service user racism: invisibility, societal racism and racist comments from students and service users (see Chart 5 and 6). Whilst white students were more likely to report experiences of general societal racism and prejudice, racist comments from service users and racist comments from fellow students, Black students, in addition to this, also reported experiencing white service user resistance to working with Black staff.

Chart 5 - White students experiences of racism

This resistance to working with Black staff was differentiated by Black students from racist comments from service users. Black students also reported experiencing a higher level of invisibility, which was a direct challenge to their emerging professional identity/status and sense of belonging within an organisation.
However five Black students at T1 reported not experiencing racism and two lacked certainty about constructing what they had either experienced or observed as racist (see Table 4). This represented over half the Black student group and was an issue which was explored further in T2 group interviews in terms of an apparent reluctance to name racism.

Table 4 Black and white students’ experiences of racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Experienced or observed racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked a direct question about service user racism, rather than the broader question about everyday racism, eight students, 4 Black and 4 white students, reported experiencing direct service user racism (see Table 5). However six white students, constituting (25%) of the white student group, reported a degree of uncertainty in confidently naming and identifying a particular experience as a form of service user racism.
Table 5 White and Black students’ experiences of service user racism cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Racism from service users</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eight students who identified experiencing service user racism cited racist comments (N=4), refusal to engage (N=2) and not feeling respected (N=2) as examples of this type of abuse and experience.

Students experiences of working with BME service users

Despite the under-representation of BME groups in the major towns of the County a high proportion of students (61%) reported working with a BME service user in their first placement (see Table 6).

Table 6 Experience of working with a BME service user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Worked with a BME service user</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BME service users these students worked with came from a range of different cultural backgrounds (see Chart 7) and this would probably be typical of students working in more multicultural areas. I was genuinely surprised by this finding as my impression of the County had always been one of social work in white rural communities. But this may also have been because practice teachers were keen to identify BME families for students to work with.

Students were then asked whether it felt different working with these BME service users or whether it felt no different from working with a white service user. 16 students reported that it felt different whilst 6 reported no difference. When asked to comment on why it felt different, and the challenges and issues in working with these BME service users, students reported a number of important issues (see Chart 8).
Whilst six students adopted a traditional colour blind approach (Williams & Soydan, 2005) and suggested that there was no real challenge or difference to working with a BME service user, the other 16 students identified some important areas linked to praxis and developing cultural competence.

The presence and involvement of family members, problems with cross cultural communication and working with different sets of cultural norms and beliefs were all flagged up as important issues. However when this data was cross tabulated with ‘race’ an important difference emerged (see Table 7). Only white students identified increased self-monitoring,
which demonstrated that they were either self-censoring verbal and non-verbal responses or were conscious of their whiteness and how this was being played out in their encounters and casework with BME service users (Yee & Dumbrill, 2003; Williams & Parrott, 2012).

Table 7 Challenges and Issues in working with BME Service Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and Issues in working with BME Service Users</th>
<th>Language Barriers</th>
<th>Cultural Beliefs</th>
<th>Presence and Involvement of family members</th>
<th>Increased self-monitoring</th>
<th>No real challenges or difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity White students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked to comment upon whether ‘race’ issues were discussed with practice teachers in their first placement (see Chart 9). This question, in light of the high numbers of students working with BME service users, took on an added degree of importance.

![Chart 9 - Practice teacher discussed 'race' issues](chart.png)

Only 12 students reported discussing on a frequent basis ‘race’ issues and, when this data was cross tabulated with ‘race’, only a third of Black students reported ‘race’ as being an active area of frequent discussion for support, learning and reflection (see Table 8).
For the majority of students ‘race’ issues were only discussed infrequently by practice teachers and a documentary analysis of first year placement documentation suggested that there was no expectation, coherent framework or quality assurance system in place to ensure that ‘race’ issues were addressed and not marginalised in practice teaching. Placement documentation only made reference to ‘anti discriminatory practice’ to be discussed in supervision. However the data suggested that for students whether or not practice teachers addressed this area of learning and practice, even in supervision, was very much a much a hit- and -miss affair.

**Table 8 Practice Teaching and ‘race’ issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Teacher discussed ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Only when relevant to casework</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity White students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills and Issues identified by students for effective multicultural praxis**

At T1 and at T2 students were asked to identify key issues they considered to be important and relevant in working with BME communities (see Chart 10). At T2 students were more likely to identify racism as a key issue impacting upon social work practice with BME groups. Although these students did not differentiate between cultural, structural, personal and institutional racism (Thompson, 2012), they nevertheless demonstrated the increasing ability at T2 to identify and name racism as a key issue for practice. At T1 (50%) of students identified racism as a key issue but at T2 this figure had risen to (86%).

Students also increasingly identified transcultural practice, poverty and social exclusion and immigration and asylum issues as important for social work practice with BME groups. However fewer students identified at T2 access to culturally appropriate services and cross-cultural communication as being significant issues for practice and, interestingly, the data for lack of cultural knowledge showed no change at T2 compared with T1.
However when this data was cross tabulated with ‘race’ some interesting differences emerged in the types of issues Black and white students had identified (see table 9). (For ease of comparison percentage data is bracketed and rounded to the nearest percentage point). At T1 only 4 Black students (33%) had identified racism as an important issue compared with 14 (58%) of white students. However at T2 (see table 10) this had increased to 9 (75%) for Black students and 22 (92%) for white students. This data was suggestive of positive learning and a better conceptual understanding of racism and how it impacted upon practice. This data also suggested that at T2 the majority of students were able to identify and name racism as a significant issue impacting upon social work practice with BME groups.

Two other significant differences to emerge in the data at T2 related to ‘poverty and social exclusion’ and ‘cultural awareness’. At T2 only 8% of Black students identified poverty and social exclusion to be a key issue for practice compared with 41% of white students. This was an important finding and suggests that both Black and white students may not have fully grasped how poverty and social exclusion are closely related to being a member of a particular ethnic minority group (Craig, 2013). In terms of cultural knowledge 67% of Black students identified this area as a significant issue for practice compared with 29% of white students. These differences in the data are clearly important and suggest that students have different
levels of understanding and possibly divergent learning needs which are sometimes associated with their racial identities and lived life experiences.

The data at T1 also suggests that it is not useful to assume that, because a student is Black and belongs to an ethnic minority group, they have grasped and understood racism as an important issue for social work practice.

**Table 9 Key Issues identified by Black and white students at T1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1 Issues</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and understanding about different cultures</td>
<td>11 (46%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Communication Problems</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>14 (58%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Asylum issues</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Practice Issues in Childcare, Mental Health and work with</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Culturally Appropriate Services</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Social Exclusion</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Black Resources</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Issues identified</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 Key Issues identified by Black and white students at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2 Issues</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and understanding about different cultures</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Communication Problems</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>22 (92%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2 Issues</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Asylum issues</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Practice Issues in Childcare, Mental Health and work with Older Adults</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Culturally Appropriate Services</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Social Exclusion</td>
<td>10 (41%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Black Resources</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issues identified</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, when data for T1 and T2 was cross tabulated with age (see Table 11 and Table 12), as with ‘race’, significant differences emerged which were suggestive of different experiences and perceptions linked to being a young or older student.

Older students at T1 were more likely to cite racism and cross cultural communication as key issues for practice compared with younger ones. Only 35% of students under the age of 26 identified racism as a significant issue at T1 compared with 63% of older students.

However at T2 the difference for racism was no longer significant, suggesting that positive learning had taken place to enable particularly younger students to recognise racism as a key practice issue. At T2 88% of young students and 84% of older students recognised racism as a significant issue for social work practice (see Chart 11).

The data also suggested that at T2 young students were more likely than older students to identify ‘asylum and immigration’ as a key issue and less likely (24%) to identify ‘lack of cultural knowledge’ as an issue for practice compared with 58% of older students.
These differences related to age suggest that students engage differently with learning content and, during the course of module teaching, developed and refined their perceptions and understandings of what they considered to be significant issues for social work practice with BME communities.

Table 11 Key Issues identified by Age at T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1 Issues</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>Over 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and understanding about different cultures</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Communication Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Asylum issues</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Practice Issues in Childcare, Mental Health and work with Older Adults</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Culturally Appropriate Services</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Social Exclusion</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Black Resources</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issues identified</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 11 - Age and identifying racism as a key social work issue at T1 & T2
Another interesting strand to these findings was in relation to students who at T1 had worked with a BME service user in their first year placement (see Table 13). These students had a higher probability of citing lack of cultural knowledge, asylum and immigration issues and access to culturally appropriate services as key issues for practice compared with students who had not worked with a BME service user. This data suggests that these issues were possibly grounded in real examples of practice and had exposed these students to a different set of practice issues. These students were also more likely at T2 to identify ‘poverty and social exclusion’ as a key issue for practice, 36% compared to 21%, and this may have been related to critically reflecting on their previous placement practice and developing a better understanding of the political and socio-economic context in which it took place.
Table 13 Key Issues identified by students who had worked with a BME service user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1 Issues</th>
<th>Worked with BME Service User</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and understanding about different cultures</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Communication Problems</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Asylum issues</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Practice Issues in Childcare, Mental Health and work with Older Adults</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Culturally Appropriate Services</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Social Exclusion</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Black Resources</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issues identified</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked at T1 and T2 to reflect upon and identify what they considered to be the key skills for effective multicultural practice (see Chart 11). At T1 four prominent areas were identified by students in relation to skills in communication, cultural knowledge, empathy, and self-awareness. However, at T2 a number of additional areas were identified by students which included advocacy, authenticity/respect, and collaborative practice.

When the data for T1 was cross-tabulated with ‘race’ (see Table 14) key differences emerged relating to Black students citing ‘communication’ and ‘cultural knowledge’ as key skills areas, compared with white students who were more likely to cite ‘empathy’.

When this data for skills at T1 was cross-tabulated with age (see Table 15) it emerged that 59% of young students had listed empathy as a key skill compared with only 21% of students over the age of 26.

However at T2 (see Table 16) fewer white students listed empathy as a key skill and this reduction was particularly evident for the under 26 age group (see Table 17).
The key differences to emerge at T2 in relation to ‘race’ were to do with ‘communication’ with 93% of Black students citing this as a key skill compared with 79% of white students; ‘authenticity and respect’ with 42% of white students identifying this as a key skill compared with only 25% of Black students and ‘critical consciousness’ with only white students citing this as key skill for effective multicultural practice.

**Table 14 Key skills identified by Black and white students at T1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1Skills</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>18 (75%)</td>
<td>11    (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>9     (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>11 (46%)</td>
<td>3     (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity and self-awareness</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>3     (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use interpreters</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1     (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Skills identified</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15 Key skills identified by Age at T1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1Skills</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>Over 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>14 (82%)</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>11     (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>4      (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity and self-awareness</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>3      (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use interpreters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2      (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1      (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Skills identified</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16 Key skills identified by Black and white students at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2Skills</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>11 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>17 (71%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity and self-awareness</td>
<td>10 (41%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use interpreters</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity and respect</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative practice</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>2 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths based practice</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical consciousness</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Skills identified</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17 Key skills identified by Age at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2Skills</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>Over 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>14 (82%)</td>
<td>16 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
<td>13 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity and self-awareness</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use interpreters</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity and respect</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative practice</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths based practice</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical consciousness</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Skills identified</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings in relation to both issues and skills suggested that at T2 students were evidencing a different type of skills mix and identifying different types of issues. The number of issues and skills they could identify demonstrated an increase (see Graph 1) and this change was attributable to the educational intervention on anti-racism.

To test whether or not this change was statistically significant a Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Rank Test was carried out (see Table 18). The matched pair signed ranks test suggested that increase in the number of skills and issues identified by students was statistically significant.

Table 18 Matched Pairs Signed rank test for skills and issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statisticsa</th>
<th>T2 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T2 Number of skills identified - T1 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T1 Number of skills identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.581b</td>
<td>-4.537b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.010</strong></td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test
b. Based on negative ranks.
This data was also tested using a Mann-Whitney U Test to determine whether or not Black and white students and those under and over the age of 26 differed in the numbers of issues and skills they identified at T1 and T2. No statistically significant difference emerged (see Table 19 and Table 20).

Table 19 Mann Whitney U Test – ‘race’ difference in issues and skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T1 Number of skills identified</th>
<th>T2 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T2 Number of skills identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>138.500</td>
<td>122.000</td>
<td>110.500</td>
<td>126.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>216.500</td>
<td>422.000</td>
<td>188.500</td>
<td>204.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.774</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>-.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.856\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.476\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.265\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.562\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Ethnicity

Table 20 Mann Whitney U Test – ‘Age’ difference in issues and skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T1 Number of skills identified</th>
<th>T2 Number of issues identified</th>
<th>T2 Number of skills identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>142.000</td>
<td>141.500</td>
<td>157.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>314.000</td>
<td>332.000</td>
<td>294.500</td>
<td>310.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>-.671</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>1.000\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>552\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.531\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>900\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Age

Students conceptualisations of racial equality

At T1 and T2 students were asked to describe racial equality and reflect upon its relevance for social work practice. At both T1 and T2 the majority of students described racial equality in terms of ‘equal opportunities’ (see Chart 12). However at T2 fewer students described it as ‘equal respect’ and a critical mass of students were able to describe it as ‘social justice’. Also at T2 all students were able to offer some description of what this contested concept meant to them.
However when these responses were cross tabulated with age and ‘race’ some interesting differences emerged (See Table 21). At T1 younger students were less likely to frame their understanding of racial equality around ‘equal opportunities’ and more likely to describe it as ‘fairness’ and equal respect compared with students over the age of 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Description of racial equality and age at T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No description</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However at T2 (see Table 22) these age differences in relation to the description of racial equality around ‘equal opportunities’ was no longer significant with 76.5% of young students now describing it in this way. However other differences emerged at T2 in relation to younger
students being less likely to describe racial equality as ‘social justice and older students no longer framing it around ‘equal respect’.

Table 22 Description of racial equality and age at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences also emerged at T1 and T2 in relation to how Black and white students described racial equality. At T1 white students described it as either ‘equal respect’ or ‘equal opportunities’ (see Table 23) whereas Black students also referred to it as ‘fairness’ and ‘social justice’.

Table 23 Description of racial equality and ‘race’ at T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No description</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However at T2 compared to T1 fewer white students described racial equality in terms of ‘equal respect’ and were more likely to contextualise it as ‘social justice’. Also a very high
percentage of Black students were now more likely to describe it in terms of ‘equal opportunities’ (see Table 24). This shift in thinking as evidenced by the descriptions offered by students at T2 compared to T1 are suggestive of a different set of understandings and conceptualisations around racial equality which have moved beyond liberal notions of fairness and respect (Turner, 1986).

**Table 24 Description of racial equality and ‘race’ at T2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked at T1 and T2 to describe the relevance of racial equality for social work practice. The majority of students at both T1 and T2 referred to the relevance of racial equality in terms of ‘equal access to services’ or to ‘anti discriminatory practice’ (see Chart 13).

**Chart 13 - The relevance of racial equality for social work practice**
However a surprisingly high number of both Black and white students at T1 and at T2 (see Chart 14) were unable to identify the relevance of racial equality for social work practice. Although all students were all able to describe racial equality 11% of the group could not specify its relevance for practice.

However at T2 (see Graph 2) more students were able to identify the relevance of racial equality for social work practice but differences emerged in relation to how Black and white students viewed the relevance of racial equality in relation to ‘Anti Discriminatory Practice (ADP)’ and in their ability to ‘identify and challenge racial discrimination’ (see Table 25).
Table 25 The relevance of racial equality for social work at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Unable to identify relevance</th>
<th>Identify and challenge racial discrimination</th>
<th>Empowerment and human rights</th>
<th>Equal access to services</th>
<th>ADP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 8.3</td>
<td>3 12.5</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>13 54.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2 16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 8.3</td>
<td>5 41.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidence in working with different cultural groups

Students reported different levels of confidence in their self-efficacy scores for working with different cultural groups. At both T1 and T2 the mean data suggested that students felt more confident working with White, African and Jamaican service users compared with those from South Asian cultural backgrounds (see Chart 14)
These different levels of confidence were evidenced in the mean scores of both Black and white students, and remained constant over T1 and T2 (see Chart 15). Although confidence levels generally increased at T2 there were two important exceptions to this trend. At T2 the mean confidence score for Black students and Bangladeshi service users evidenced a decrease and the confidence score for Black students working with Pakistani service users showed no movement. This lack of change in confidence may have been rooted in a more realistic self-evaluation of competence levels, which were now more attuned to the complexities of working with these communities.
These different levels of confidence were also demonstrated in data collected at T1 and T2 to measure which cultural groups students did not yet feel confident in working with (see Chart 16). The data suggested that, although levels of apprehension and lack of confidence had declined at T2 for all cultural groups, students still felt and experienced a degree of unease in working with South Asian service users.

However, although the data demonstrated change and increasing levels of confidence from T1 to T2, when this was tested for statistical significance using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, which is the non-parametric alternative to the repeated measures t-test; the results suggested that there had only been a statistically significant change in the confidence scores from T1 to T2 for the Jamaican and Asian group only (see Table 26). For all other cultural groups the change in confidence suggested by the mean scores from T1 to T2 was not statistically significant.

**Table 26 Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test for cultural confidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T2 Jamaican - T1 Jamaican</th>
<th>T2 Bangladeshi - T1 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T2 Pakistani - T1 Pakistani</th>
<th>T2 African - T1 African</th>
<th>T2 Asian - T1 Asian</th>
<th>T2 White - T1 White</th>
<th>T2 Muslim - T1 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.840b</td>
<td>-1.528b</td>
<td>-1.941b</td>
<td>-2.683b</td>
<td>-1.387b</td>
<td>-1.155b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However when this data was tested for differences between Black and white students using the Mann-Whitney U test, statistically significant differences emerged in relation to the confidence these students had in relation to working with specific cultural groups (see Table 27).

**Table 27 Mann-Whitney U Test – Black and white students and different levels of confidence at T1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>T1 Jamaican</th>
<th>T1 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T1 Pakistani</th>
<th>T1 African</th>
<th>T1 Asian</th>
<th>T1 White</th>
<th>T1 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>126.000</td>
<td>91.000</td>
<td>136.500</td>
<td>88.500</td>
<td>109.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>111.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>426.000</td>
<td>391.000</td>
<td>214.500</td>
<td>388.500</td>
<td>409.000</td>
<td>175.000</td>
<td>411.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.674</td>
<td>-2.109</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-2.235</td>
<td>-1.338</td>
<td>-2.015</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.562b</td>
<td>.078b</td>
<td>.804b</td>
<td>.062b</td>
<td>.251b</td>
<td>.120b</td>
<td>.280b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Ethnicity

At T1 Black students were statistically more confident in working with Bangladeshi and African service users than white students. However white students were statistically confident more confident in working with White service users (See Table 28).

**Table 28 Mean Score for working with different cultural groups at T1 for Black and white students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>T1 Jamaican</th>
<th>T1 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T1 Pakistani</th>
<th>T1 African</th>
<th>T1 Asian</th>
<th>T1 White</th>
<th>T1 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 White</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Black</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Total</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However at T2 the only statistical difference to emerge (see Table 29) was in relation to African service users, where Black students had higher levels of confidence compared with white students (see Table 30).

Table 29 Mann-Whitney U Test – Black and white students and different levels of confidence at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T2 Jamaican</th>
<th>T2 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T2 Pakistani</th>
<th>T2 African</th>
<th>T2 Asian</th>
<th>T2 White</th>
<th>T2 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>97.500</td>
<td>96.000</td>
<td>103.500</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>133.000</td>
<td>136.000</td>
<td>131.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>397.500</td>
<td>174.000</td>
<td>181.500</td>
<td>389.000</td>
<td>211.000</td>
<td>214.000</td>
<td>431.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.936</td>
<td>-.1.807</td>
<td>-.1.554</td>
<td>-.2.442</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>-.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.120^b</td>
<td>.112^b</td>
<td>.177^b</td>
<td>.067^b</td>
<td>.728^b</td>
<td>.804^b</td>
<td>.679^b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Ethnicity

Table 30 Mean Score for working with different cultural groups at T2 for Black and white students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>T2 Jamaican</th>
<th>T2 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T2 Pakistani</th>
<th>T2 African</th>
<th>T2 Asian</th>
<th>T2 White</th>
<th>T2 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2 White</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Black</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Total</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However no statistically significant differences emerged at T1 and T2 for the confidence scores of students associated with their age (Table 31). The .057 score recorded at T2 for Bangladeshi service users was not significant as it was not less than or equal to .05.
Table 31 Mann –Whitney U Test – Age and confidence at T1 and T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Jamaican</th>
<th>T1 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T1 Pakistani</th>
<th>T1 African</th>
<th>T1 Asian</th>
<th>T1 White</th>
<th>T1 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>159.500</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>132.500</td>
<td>132.000</td>
<td>144.500</td>
<td>133.500</td>
<td>150.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>312.500</td>
<td>306.000</td>
<td>322.500</td>
<td>322.000</td>
<td>334.500</td>
<td>286.500</td>
<td>303.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>-1.031</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
<td>-.614</td>
<td>-1.134</td>
<td>-.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.950&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.802&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.363&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.363&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.594&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.379&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.731&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 reported confidence in working with a White service user cross-tabulated with working with a BME service user at T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked with BME service user</th>
<th>Mean score for confidence in working with a White Service User at T1</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When this data was tested using the Mann-Whitney U Test a statistically significant difference emerged, which suggested that students who had not worked with a BME service user were more confident in working with white service users compared with students who had (see Table 33).
Table 33 Mann-Whitney U Test – Experience of working with a BME Service User and confidence in working with a White service user at T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>94.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>347.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.053*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However this finding may have been skewed by the presence of 9 Black students in the group of 22 students who had worked with BME Service users, as these students had a much lower mean score for working with White Service users (see Table 28). Nevertheless this finding may be significant and possibly suggestive of students who had worked with a BME service user not taking for granted the cultural identity and cultural affiliation of a white service user because of their apparent whiteness (Garrett, 2013).

Another interesting finding to emerge was in relation to the correlations found in the confidence levels for working with particular service user groups. A number of scatter plots (see Graph 3) suggested particular types of linear relationships emerging in the data for the confidence levels in working with particular cultural groups, which seemed to be correlated.

To test the validity and statistical significance of these initial findings the data for cultural confidence data was tested using the Spearman’s rank order (rho) non parametric test to determine the type and strength of possible correlations.
Graph 3 Scatter Plots - suggestive of strong, medium and negative correlations between different cultural groups
The Spearman (rho) test revealed significant correlation coefficient scores at both T1 and T2 (see Table 34 and Table 35) which were demonstrative of a range of symmetrical relationships between particular cultural groups.

The high correlation coefficient scores implied that the confidence levels in working with particular cultural group were correlated to working with other groups. The Spearman (rho) test at T1 demonstrated that a range of correlations could be evidenced and these varied from one group to another. For example the only correlation found for the White group was with the Jamaican group, where confidence was correlated. For all other groups a range of correlations were evident but what was particularly striking at both T1 and T2 was the high coefficient scores between South Asian groups.

At T2 a definitive pattern emerged where two distinct clusters could be identified which were exclusively correlated to each other. The first distinct sets of correlations were related to the high correlation coefficient scores for African, Jamaican and White service users. This data implied that the confidence level for working with white service users was strongly correlated to the confidence reported in working with Jamaican and African service users. The data was also suggestive of a negative coefficient confidence score for working with a White and Muslim service user.

This second distinct set of correlations were evidenced in the very high coefficient scores between Bangladeshi, Muslim, Asian and Pakistani groups, which suggested that students had similar and highly correlated levels of confidence in working with these groups. These high coefficient scores could also be interpreted as students not being able to differentiate between these groups and conflating cultural differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Jamaican</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td></td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.662**</td>
<td>.734**</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.705**</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.381*</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.420*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 35 Spearman’s (rho) Correlation Coefficient Scores for cultural groups T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>T2 Jamaican</th>
<th>T2 Bangladeshi</th>
<th>T2 Pakistani</th>
<th>T2 African</th>
<th>T2 Asian</th>
<th>T2 White</th>
<th>T2 Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2 Jamaican</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td><strong>.560</strong></td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.529**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td><strong>.916</strong></td>
<td>.093</td>
<td><strong>.570</strong></td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Pakistani</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td><strong>.916</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td><strong>.632</strong></td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 African</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td><strong>.560</strong></td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td><strong>.524</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Asian</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td><strong>.570</strong></td>
<td><strong>.632</strong></td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 White</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td><strong>.529</strong></td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td><strong>.524</strong></td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Muslim</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td><strong>.549</strong></td>
<td><strong>.482</strong></td>
<td>.155</td>
<td><strong>.640</strong></td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

However despite the different levels of confidence evidenced in working with different cultural groups; in terms of overall confidence levels in working with BME service users, the mean data score suggested a significant increase from T1 to T2 (See Graph 4)
When this data was tested using the Wilcoxon matched pairs test the findings suggested that this increase in confidence from T1 to T2 was statistically significant (see Table 36).

**Table 36 Wilcoxon matched pairs test for overall confidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T2 Confidence</th>
<th>T1 Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.985&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test
b. Based on negative ranks.

The mean score data for T1 and T2 also suggested that Black students had higher levels of reported confidence for working with BME service users compared with white students (see Graph 5).
However when this was data was tested using the Mann-Whitney U Test (see Table 37) the results suggested that only at T1 was this difference in reported confidence statistically significant.

**Table 37 Mann-Whitney U Test for Confidence levels between Black and white students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>78.000</td>
<td>104.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>378.000</td>
<td>404.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.499</td>
<td>-1.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.012</strong></td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.026(^b)</td>
<td>.188(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Ethnicity  
b. Not corrected for ties.

This data was also tested for differences associated with age. The mean score data for T1 and T2 suggested a difference in the overall level of confidence with younger students being less confident at both time intervals (see Graph 6). However the Mann Whitney U Test reported that this difference was not statistically significant (see Table 38).
Table 38 Mann-Whitney U Test for Confidence levels and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Confidence</th>
<th>T2 Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>157.000</td>
<td>123.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>310.000</td>
<td>276.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.900\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>232\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Age for analysis
b. Not corrected for ties.

Developing levels of awareness and knowledge

The research data analysis also suggested a change in the mean scores for awareness of ‘race’ issues in social work (see Graph 7) and in how knowledgeable students felt about such issues from T1 to T2 (see Graph 8). When data for awareness and knowledge was tested using the Wilcoxon matched pairs test the results suggested that the increase in both awareness and knowledge from T1 to T2 was statistically significant (see Table 39).
Table 39 Wilcoxon matched pairs test for awareness and knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T2 Awareness of ‘race’ issues - T1</th>
<th>T2 Knowledge of ‘race’ issues - T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ‘race’ issues</td>
<td>-3.266&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-4.554&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score data also suggested differences between Black and White students in relation to their levels of awareness (See Graph 9) and knowledge of race issues (see Graph 10). However when these differences were tested using the Mann Whitney U Test (see Table 40) the only statistically valid difference to emerge was at T1 for awareness. This data suggests that teaching on anti-racism was critical for raising the awareness level of white students.
Table 40 Mann-Whitney U Test for differences in Awareness and Knowledge associated with ‘race’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Awareness of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T1 Knowledge of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T2 Awareness of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T2 Knowledge of ‘race’ issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>65.000</td>
<td>114.500</td>
<td>119.000</td>
<td>119.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>365.000</td>
<td>414.500</td>
<td>419.000</td>
<td>419.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.691</td>
<td>-1.010</td>
<td>-.894</td>
<td>-.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.007</strong></td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.007(^b)</td>
<td>.327(^b)</td>
<td>.416(^b)</td>
<td>.416(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Ethnicity
b. Not corrected for ties.

This data was also tested for differences associated with age, but no statistically important distinctions emerged (see Table 41). However a basic scatterplot suggested testing this data further for possible correlations associated with age because of the apparent strong alignment being suggested between awareness and knowledge (see Graph 11).

Table 41 Mann-Whitney U Test differences in Awareness and Knowledge associated with ‘age’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 Awareness of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T1 Knowledge of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T2 Awareness of ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>T2 Knowledge of ‘race’ issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>148.500</td>
<td>158.500</td>
<td>124.500</td>
<td>137.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>338.500</td>
<td>348.500</td>
<td>277.500</td>
<td>290.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-1.249</td>
<td>-.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]</td>
<td>.684(^b)</td>
<td>.925(^b)</td>
<td>.244(^b)</td>
<td>.452(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 11 Scatterplot suggestive of a strong correlation between knowledge and awareness for students under the age of 26 at T2

When this data for age was tested using the Spearman’s rank order (rho) non parametric test for a possible correlations, the high coefficient scores at T2 suggested that for students under the age of 26 there was indeed a strong relationship between their confidence, awareness and knowledge scores compared with students over the age of 26 (see Table 42).

Although these correlations were evident at T1 they were more profound and statistically significant at T2. The only significant coefficient score for students over the age of 26 was in their confidence and knowledge which was strongly correlated.

These correlation coefficient scores were also different for white and Black students (see Table 43). At T2 the only statistically significant correlation for Black students was in their coefficient score for confidence and knowledge, which was positively correlated, whereas for white students very strong correlations could be evidenced in their high coefficient scores for knowledge and confidence and awareness and knowledge.
Table 42 Spearman’s (rho) Correlation Coefficient Scores for Age-awareness, knowledge and confidence at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>T2 Confidence</th>
<th>T2 Awareness</th>
<th>T2 Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2 Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2 Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
However it also emerged that the experience of working with a BME service user may also have shaped and influenced a student’s awareness and knowledge of ‘race’ issues.

The researcher’s curiosity to investigate this further was triggered by two basic scatterplots which suggested that students who had worked with a BME service user had a different knowledge and awareness profile compared with students who had not worked with a BME service user (see Graph 12 and Graph 13).
These above graphs (Graph 12 and 13) suggested that the data points for students who had worked with a BME service user were more randomly spread compared with students who had not worked with a BME service user. The data points for students who had not worked with a BME service user were clustered around a clear line and less scattered compared with students who had worked with a BME service user. This data was suggestive of a stronger and less moderate linear association between awareness and knowledge for students who had not
worked with a BME service user compared with those who had. When this data for experience of working with a BME Service User was tested using the Spearman’s rank order (rho) non-parametric test; the results suggested that at both T1 (see Table 44) and at T2 (see Table 45) students who had not worked with a BME service user had highly significant correlation coefficient scores for knowledge and awareness compared with students who had worked with a BME service user. However, even though the outliers evident over to the top left of graph 12 might have had a dramatic effect on the correlation coefficient, the data does seem to suggest that students who have not experienced working with a BME service user may have been more reliant upon propositional sources of knowledge, which may have led to these standard textbook types of highly correlated and uniformed responses; compared with students who drew upon experiential and reflective forms of knowledge (Kolb, 1984) grounded in practice, resulting in a set of more individualised and differentiated type of responses.

Table 44 Spearman’s (rho) Correlation Coefficient Scores for experience of working with a BME Service User at T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of working with a BME service user</th>
<th>T1 Knowledge</th>
<th>T1 Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Knowledge Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Awareness Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.876**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Knowledge Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.876**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 45 Spearman’s (rho) Correlation Coefficient Scores for experience of working with a BME Service User at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of working with BME service user in placement one</th>
<th>T2 Awareness</th>
<th>T2 Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Awareness Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Knowledge Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Awareness Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.827**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Knowledge Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.827**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This data suggested that age, ‘race’ and experience of working with a BME service user were important explanatory variables in relation to understanding the complex set of tracks left by students in relation to comprehending and measuring their emerging levels of awareness and knowledge of ‘race’ issues.

**Critical incident analysis and other influences on student learning**

At T2 students were asked to identify a critical incident which had shaped and influenced their learning. Most students were able to identify a critical incident (see Chart 17) but 19% of the group were unable to identify such an incident. However 81% of students did identify a critical incident and the majority specified either the ‘Black Perspectives teaching’ or ‘personal testimonies’ of racism and racial abuse shared by their fellow students as being critical to their overall learning.
When this data was cross tabulated with age and ‘race’ the analysis suggested that ‘personal testimony’ had been particularly critical for the learning of young white students; whereas ‘looking into the mirror,’ which involved some Black students describing in their own words how when they looked into the mirror in the UK, they saw a Black person, compared with seeing themselves in the mirror back at home in Africa seemed to resonate strongly with the older group of white women (see Table 46).

This data also suggests that 15 students, representing 42% of the student group, identified a critical incident involving other students sharing an aspect of personal lived experience which their peers experienced as critical in shaping their learning and understanding of anti-racism.

‘Personal testimony’ and ‘looking into the mirror’ was also cited by 3 Black women as a critical moment shaping their learning and this suggests that these two incidents crossed cultural boundaries and caused Black women to reflect upon ‘race’ and racism. However a third of Black students, compared with only 12% of white students, were unable to identify a critical incident. This data seems to suggest that these incidents were more important for white students in developing and transforming their thinking around anti-racism.
Table 46 Critical incident crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Testimony</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching on Asylum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Perspectives teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking into the mirror</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Testimony</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching on Asylum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Perspectives teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to identify a critical incident</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Perspectives teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to identify a critical incident</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students also cited other influences outside of classroom teaching as influencing their learning around anti-racism (see Chart 18). In particular students recognised the role of personal study, and a very high number identified peer group learning in mixed ‘race’ groups which influenced their learning and understanding of anti-racism. A high proportion of Black students also identified the role of personal tutorials in developing their understanding of ‘race’ issues, and 3 students also identified the role of their African support group in influencing their learning (see Table 47).
Table 47 Other influences on student learning crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Tutorials</th>
<th>Peer Group Learning</th>
<th>Personal Study</th>
<th>University Equality and Diversity events</th>
<th>Challenging behaviour group</th>
<th>Padare support group for African students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>14 (58%)</td>
<td>21 (88%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall experiences and reflections on learning

At T2 students were asked to describe and evaluate the learning which had taken place and how it had been experienced. Students identified 4 key areas of learning (see Chart 19) which had only partly met the learning needs identified by this group at T1 (see Chart 4), particularly in relation to cultural awareness training.

The data analysis also revealed interesting differences in relation to how Black and white students had experienced and valued different aspects of module learning. All Black students recognised their learning around Black perspectives and only one referred to their learning around the social construction of ‘race’ to be of value, compared with (N=9) white students (see Table 48).
Table 48 Learning outcomes crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Awareness of racism and racial discrimination</th>
<th>Black Perspectives</th>
<th>Social Construction of ‘race’</th>
<th>Asylum and Immigration issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>17 (71%)</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However a sizeable group of predominantly white students stated that they were not sure if the module had addressed their learning needs (see Chart 20). The absence of cultural awareness training referred to earlier may have been responsible for this. Three white students were also unsure as to whether the module had developed their understanding of ‘race’ issues (see Chart 21). But the majority (92%) reported that their understanding of ‘race’ issues had positively changed.
Students were also asked to reflect upon whether there had been too much emphasis on ‘race’ issues in module teaching (see Chart 22). Over a third of the group (36%) were either unsure or felt that there had been too much emphasis on ‘race’ issues, to the detriment of exploring other areas of social oppression.
When this data was cross-tabulated with age and ‘race’ some interesting differences emerged in relation to how this learning had been experienced and led to different types of perceptions. In relation to age (see Table 49), (26%) of students over the age of 26 felt there was too much emphasis on race issues compared with only (12%) of younger students. However (24%) of students under the age of 26 were ‘not sure’, compared with (11%) of older students.

**Table 49 Perceptions of module teaching cross-tabulated with age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Too much emphasis on ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>No - too little emphasis on race issues</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Well balanced approach</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26</td>
<td>5 (26%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>11 (58%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of how Black and white students perceived module teaching the differences were more noticeable (see Table 50). Only 50% of White students felt that teaching content was well balanced and 25% felt that there was too much emphasis on race. This contrasted significantly with the perceptions of Black students, where only one student felt that there had been too much prominence given to race issues and one even suggesting there was too little emphasis on race issues.
**Table 50 Perceptions of module teaching cross-tabulated with ‘race’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Too much emphasis on ‘race’ issues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - too much emphasis on race issues</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students</td>
<td>No - too little emphasis on race issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black students</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Well balanced approach</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings suggest a range of experiences which were closely associated with age and ‘race’ in relation to how teaching on anti-racism was perceived and the type of learning which was accrued. Clearly the teaching worked better for some students compared with other students and not all learning needs were addressed. However, the data is suggestive of positive learning for the majority of students, where a better understanding of ‘race’ issues has emerged during the course of focused and structured teaching.
Tutor Interviews

Interviews undertaken with (N=8) University tutors all of whom had specific teaching, tutorial and placement roles on the undergraduate social work programme. These narratives revealed a number of issues which were important for understanding the learning task for students and the utility of anti-racist social work education.

What became very evident at the start of all interviews was that tutors were professionally and politically positioned either in anti-oppressive practice discourses or in anti-racist perspectives (Singh, 2007). These different levels of understanding, and sometimes grounded and lived experiences of racism, influenced the content of discussions and were occasionally evident in the commitment and passion demonstrated by interviewees in the pedagogic challenges of continuing to work purposefully in this area of professional education.

A thematic analysis of the 8 tutor interviews identified a number of recurring themes which were useful for understanding the learning task for students and identifying some of the complexities associated with delivering anti-racist social education. These themes will now be analysed for their underlying conceptualisations of anti-racism and how these were shaped by the latent and semantic content of interview data (Braun and Clark, 2008).

Tutors' experiences of anti-racism in their own professional training

With the exception of one tutor all other tutors had undertaken their social work training in the United Kingdom. Tutors expressed a mixture of experiences whilst undertaking their social work training in relation to how they experienced anti-racism. One tutor referred to it as key requirement of training and suggested that

XX12 Anti-racism was seen as core kind of subject; I think when I trained, we named it. We talked about sexism, we talked about racism... it was in your face and your unconsciousness began to be unlocked...so you start looking at it differently.

Another tutor suggested that anti-racism was not as visible in their training and was shrouded by anti discriminatory practice

TT4 Reflecting back I don’t believe it was there, I think it whilst there was a focus I believe it was kind of shrouded by, um, Anti-Discriminatory Practice...and it kind of, for me, it got lost within the kind of shrouding element of ADP, and it just needed a sharper focus... I really do feel as though the focus was lost somewhat and it just needed to be strengthened and sharpened at some levels.
However one tutor suggested that although anti-racism was a key component of training it was not experienced positively.

**QQ19** It was definitely there and it was quite a strong element and component of the whole course....there was a very kind of, um, left wing, feminist kind of, er, approach on the course, which actually was very interesting I have to say...they kind of forced it down your throat, you know, um, you’re all racists so I need to bludgeon you...fair enough, you know, that’s fine, so obviously I had a lot of that...Bludgeon you to death about kind of you know, hitting you over the head that you’re a racist, you’re a racist.

**SS** Bludgeoning...did that work?

**QQ32** No, no, it actually, it actually, it worked in one sense, but in another sense it didn’t because it just switched people off... I think that this is the difficulty you get, again it’s going back to my experience, it’s having sort of racism sort of like stuffed down my throat...I’ve put myself in so many uncomfortable positions in the past by just putting it out there and going, well...what’s your experience..

The first two responses were quite typical of other tutor experiences of anti-racism as being visible and experienced positively, or being present but shrouded under anti-discriminatory perspectives. However the third response was not a typical one and stood out when this data was being coded.

As a researcher and as a colleague I was concerned about how this tutor had experienced this component of their training and how this may influence their present understanding and commitment to anti-racist education. I also found the words used to describe how this tutor experienced their training emotionally challenging and difficult to grasp, but recognised that this experience for them was real them and socially constructed differently from other tutors.

**Confidence in teaching anti-racism**

The interview data suggested that some tutors were more confident in teaching this component of the curriculum compared to other tutors.

**XX85** I think some people feel more confident than others about talking about race and racial issues, others feel less confident ... I wouldn’t shy away from teaching it, but it can be tricky to manage in a classroom...and I think I have got the confidence to do that in terms of facilitating that conversation and dialogue. I think it’s linked to my politics; it’s linked to personal experience in terms of struggling as a white gay woman...

**TT78** I feel, I feel very confident. I certainly don’t shy away from it. I like to create that debate and discussion; however, it is very uncomfortable for certain students.
One tutor also commented that sometimes tutors open up the debate around anti-racism but when it becomes uncomfortable or challenging they lack the confidence to manage this dialogue and walk away from it, which leaves the student group confused and sometimes angry.

UU203 Some tutors actually started the ball rolling and then just cut it off when it got too difficult

Other tutors suggested that this component of the curriculum made them feel “anxious and distressed” (ZZ79) and another tutor commented that they felt “uncomfortable talking about racism” (QQ253). It is difficult to imagine other areas of the social work curriculum which would engender such emotions and responses. Another tutor commented that whilst

VV328 I like dealing with issues to do with racism, I don’t find it easy. It’s one of those issues where I acknowledge my own limits. Because it’s complex and because it’s inherently uncertain.

One Black tutor also commented that she did not feel confident delivering this component of the curriculum because she felt that her presence in the classroom would shut down dialogue amongst students and lead them to self-censor opinions and thoughts.

YY76 ...I don’t feel as confident to do the delivery, I feel less confident and that’s because I am trying to place myself in the position of the student and thinking, I wonder if they’re thinking she’s got an agenda here, this is a Black woman that’s come in to talk to us about racism. How do we feel...can we argue with her, challenge her, question her views, or is she going to call us racist for doing that...And I feel that sometimes the a Black person teaching anti-racism prevents some students from actually saying what they feel.

Experiences of Black tutors

The interview data suggested that the presence of Black staff in the social work team brought with it different and grounded perspectives on anti-racism and opened up different forms of dialogue, described by one tutor as “honest conversations about race and racism” (XX376).

However there was also the realization that sometimes there was the potential of “expecting our Black colleagues to become race experts” (XX366) and consequently pigeon-holing them into discrete areas of teaching. However one Black tutor recognised and valued what she
described as “using my own experiences” (TT16) to encourage discussion and debate in the classroom but also reflected on how she had experienced “overt and covert resistance” and a “very dismissive attitude towards Black staff who are trying to deliver content” (TT62).

TT98 … and yes, it is very uncomfortable and when I’ve delivered content on the module that involves anti-racist practice… it gets very uncomfortable… and even when I’ve had external visiting lecturers coming in, the responses and the feedback that I’ve had from these Black women, visiting lecturers has been very similar to mine.

Another tutor commented upon how they perceived the role and status of two Black programme leaders in the Social Work team whom they felt lacked real autonomy and power and were simply figurehead appointments to project an impression of diversity and inclusivity.

VV141 you know, we’re in a position where we have two Black members of staff, who are course leads. But as Black members of staff, their autonomy to operate as course leads is nil. There’s no power. So, in other words, it looks good. It looks really good. Look at us, look at us, we’re a wonderfully diverse team and look at us, we promote our Black members of staff, cos our two courses leads are both Black members of staff. Actually, when you sit down with those Black members of staff and say, how much power do you actually have? The answer is nil…practically no autonomy whatsoever …they are systematically disempowered.

Experiences of teaching anti-racism

Tutors reported a range of experiences in teaching anti-racism. One tutor suggested that “too much focus was given to anti-racism” and went onto suggest that it “actually pales into insignificance when we focus on other experiences” (QQ150). However other tutors suggested that when teaching anti-racism it was more comfortable to frame it around diversity issues than to deal directly with anti-racist perspectives, which in their opinion was experienced as more challenging and confrontational.

XX43 Yeah, it’s more comfortable to talk in these umbrella terms, cos’ it’s that kind we’re all in it together. Well, we’re all in it differently. So those honest conversations about you know, structural racism, as well as individual, don’t take place….

Some tutors also spoke about student resistance to this learning which was often evidenced in a “complete resistance of acknowledgement of possible prejudices” (RR129) or by students simply “saying the right thing, but thinking differently” (TT158).

Tutors also reflected on their experiences of managing classroom learning which was described as “tricky” (XX130) at times and the imperative of making students “feel safe” (VV157) to
enable dialogue and contested perspectives to emerge. One tutor also suggested that that the
teaching approach had to be sensitised to the fact that

UU203 if you approach white people to beat them over the head with their racism, they
will go underground and become silent.

Another tutor spoke about the fear white students experienced of being of labelled racist

UU137 I think white students are frightened. I think white students become anxious, when the term racism is raised. I think they feel, and some of that might be about 1. their lived experience – that it’s very limited and 2. – that they may not feel confident with the tutor. I think the fear is around being called a racist. And that’s I think a big fear. I think there is some of that. I think some of that fear and anxiety is also about lack of knowledge, being frightened of being exposed and not really knowing...linked to a general lack of knowledge and understanding.

Tutors also spoke about avoiding large lecture style settings for this teaching to take place and instead facilitating small group based learning sets, where students find it difficult to remain segregated, anonymous and silent.

XX227 It doesn’t feel safe to talk in a group of that size, instead I have split them into two smaller groups...I feel more comfortable in those smaller groups, and actually I say to the silent person I’ve noticed you’ve been listening, is there anything you want to contribute, and to date, there’s never been anyone that’s said no, they’ve always then contributed something.

Another tutor commented upon how she had struggled to deliver teaching in this area because of the very low level of understanding of anti-racist issues within the student group and how this had required her to reappraise both teaching style and content

RR90 I suppose I’ve changed then how I’ve taught it on the basis that I think sometimes I am quite surprised by how little awareness there is of racism and where racism has come from....some of them have no lived experience, and they’ve just got some very parochial thinking... their lens on the situation is very personal.

This observation was also shared by another tutor who stated that it was often older students who struggled with making sense of this area of the curriculum.

YY69 I think the older ones struggle with acknowledging that 45 years later, I’ve actually not really spoken properly to a Black person. I find the younger ones going, well, it’s just where we live isn’t it..., my nursery was all white, my primary school was all white, my secondary school was all white and I’m here, and I’m gonna go and do a placement in...
One tutor also spoke about their experience of resistance from other colleagues in the social work team when they attempted to open an online discussion board on ‘race’ issues. This tutor suggested that they experienced hostility from colleagues who felt that

\[ VV72 \] To allow students to openly share what they believe was too dangerous...the idea was met with suspicion and fear of what if students say the wrong thing ... and what if students get hurt by what other students have written...It can lead to dangerous types of ideas being expressed, I was told you need to manage it, you need to control it, you need to silence it. The kind of resistance I felt... put me off actually wanting to do it... I felt really quite disrespected and silenced within the team.

This tutor went onto suggest that the resistance they experienced in wanting to promote “affective learning with a view to encouraging emotional openness” and to “engage students with the discomfort of realizing that we live in a very prejudiced society”, suggested that there was “a single, political position, that you are not allowed to question” (VV106).

This tutor also gave another powerful example of how they had experienced anti-racist learning being shut down and silenced.

\[ VV42 \] I looked at doing an exercise, I talked to a colleague about an exercise where I wanted to use an externalising conversation...about engaging with issues around racism. But again what was really interesting is - ooh that’s a bit difficult, you’d really need to get in a team of professionals to do that, I’m thinking why, why do we assume, I will find this difficult, where we’re not skilled enough to do this coming from? ...

... I’m thinking that all these incidents are about fear, a real fear about engaging with the complexity and the messiness, and it’s almost like we want to keep a lid on it, creating silence, and not a willingness to admit that there are issues around which...we really don’t know what to do with ...Discomfort I don’t mind, but fear, because that brings the silencing...and that hinders learning because once you get silenced, you then can’t learn. You get shut down to learning. It’s very Maslow by the way, that, you can’t, if your safety needs are not met, you can’t actually move on to the self-actualisation, you can’t even move on to the aesthetic or the cognitive stage if you don’t feel safe.

One tutor also commented upon their frustration and disillusionment in terms of how only a small group of tutors were constantly “championing” (XX450) anti-racism, whilst other tutors in her experience were lacklustre in their support and commitment. Another tutor also warned of the dangers of this learning being sidelined

\[ UU101 \] you know, that it can get lost, you know, a white dialogue will always want to pretend it’s not there and a white dialogue and discourse will always want to, you know, not step into that uncomfortable world of race
Learning task for students

Tutors were unanimous in how they conceptualised ‘race awareness’ as the key learning task for students and the following two interview extracts capture the essence of what tutors had to say about this

UU104 I think for me, the learning task for all students would be about how we raise their consciousness…I think we need them to acknowledge colour as a significant factor in oppression.

RR33 you must raise awareness as to what racism is, how it manifests itself…I think at level 5 it is much more about raising awareness and about, developing ideas around the concepts that can be used to attack, to challenge racism…I think then as you move along it should be much more about levels of institutional racism and what we can do to tackle institutional racism so there’s an emphasis on how it plays out across the field and the psychological impact racism has...

Another tutor conceptualised this learning as a start of a journey which would lead to growing awareness

XX109 I think for some of our students it’s the first time they’re thinking about any of these issues to do with oppression or discrimination… I think it’s the start of a journey, and I think that’s how I’ve kind of come to understand it. We can’t expect students who have never, for whatever reason, thought about these issues in any kind of considered way, to have that sorted in three years, yeah. It’s the start of the journey.

One tutor also suggested that the learning task for Black students should recognise the importance of developing their confidence and resilience to enable them

ZZ129 to disclose any abuse that they’ve experienced, which is what it amounts to, racist abuse... I mean the other thing we can do for them whilst they are here with us is to help build their confidence, their self-esteem, and help them deal with any harm that’s been done to them in the past to make them stronger and more resilient...That’s their greatest defence against insult and abuse.

Some tutors also suggested that the learning task for Black students should encompass enabling these students to recognise and name racism as well as the psychological impact it has on their wellbeing. Several tutors commented that

XX251 What I have noticed with Black students is their hesitancy to name something as racist.
TT88 I think, Black students, minimise their experiences of racism at a group level but also at an individual level as well...they don’t want to...recognise racism, they don’t want to name racism...I think there’s a real fear...

YY136 Our Black students don’t recognise racism.

UU229 I’ve noticed with our African students a fear of naming racism...they have developed a wide range of different language for describing it but not naming it.

One tutor also suggested that for white students the learning task should encompass exploring their whiteness and how they benefit from racism

ZZ225 I think it’s important to challenge white students about how we all contribute to racism, inevitably, by being white in a racist society.

This was also echoed in the comments of another tutor, who suggested that one strand of the learning task should be centred around “getting students to think about their identities and how they view themselves” (TT39).

However other tutors were more specific and identified learning related to “avoiding the dangers of pathologising individuals” (ZZ28); exploring attitudes and values and helping students to practise with different cultural groups as key requirements of the learning task.

ZZ33 students I think? still need help and support to engage in developing cultural competence.

When tutors were asked whether this learning should be a discrete component of the programme, or integrated into different modules, tutors again were unanimous in that this learning should permeate all areas of teaching and learning.

XX78 I think it needs to be integrated into everything…but the degrees of it within each module are probably determined by who delivers it.

This autonomy and degree of freedom within modules for tutors to decide upon focus and content was an issue highlighted by several tutors who suggested that whilst in principle anti-racism should be “embedded in all modules” (TT175) it also had to be made “explicit” (XX331) otherwise it may be sidelined by particular tutors.

UU94 I think that racism needs to be named and we need to have sessions on that. They don’t need to be in particular module. I think they should run across every module...I think there should be a permeation principle.
Some tutors were also concerned that any learning associated with anti-racism, if it was not named as anti-racist practice and made explicit, would be ‘diluted’ and subsumed under the umbrella term anti-oppressive practice. These tutors felt that we had to resist incorporating and delivering anti-racist education under this overarching term, which was viewed as concerned with personal experience and not politically engaged praxis.

XX42 My sense now is that if you mention the word race or racism, students and others become quite scared, so it’s more comfortable to talk in these umbrella terms... I understand that there are overlaps and I understand that there is multiple oppression but these concepts just dilute it... both what you’re looking at but also the impact of certain types of discrimination, And I think now, it’s diluted because we don’t call it anti-racist, we don’t call it homophobic, we don’t call it sexist...we’re no longer treating things separately.

RR69 I think it has diluted anti-racist practice, in regards to the fact that it doesn’t recognise largely the history of racism and its legacy..., it makes it sound like it’s name calling... I think there’s an over-emphasis in focusing on the personal, the personal degradation that’s caused, rather than the structural and institutional...that’s not going to tackle the fact that Black children are over-represented in care, that Black people are over-represented in the mental health system and criminal justice system, that’s not going to address them...

Experiences of practice education

A range of issues were identified in practice learning which either hindered or consolidated learning around ‘race’ issues. Several tutors identified how they had experienced practice teachers referring to the accent of some Black students and making indirect references to this to question the student’s ability to work with service users. One tutor commented that stereotypical remarks like “it’s their accent, it’s a communication barrier....” (XX339) were quite commonplace and, in the initial stages of training, sapped confidence and undermined competence.

One experienced tutor reflecting, on how her placement visiting work with Black students, commented

ZZ107 I’ve been aware of students who are my tutees who have experienced racism, I mean, for example, a very capable student, had to leave a placement. I don’t think it was technically failed, but certainly the placement ended and one of the issues was that her practice teacher claimed that the student couldn’t be understood, due to her accent, I mean that student is articulate, she has a slight accent that can be heard, I think there was other stuff going on, I think that was racist, personally, I’m now visiting
that student in her third year placement which is weird, because it is at the Council for Racial Equality...

Tutors also discussed the challenges of Black students working in predominantly white areas and how this experience was often neglected and not addressed by practice teachers. Two tutors responsible for placements also raised concerns about the subtleties of institutional racism related to securing practice education opportunities for Black students

XX342 if you send a student profile to certain agencies, students with non-English speaking, non-English sounding names, are more likely to be turned down...

TT202 We had to start using student numbers...so that all information would be anonymised because when you gave names, those names allowed practice teachers to identify the ethnicity of a particular student.

However another tutor was quite scathing about the focus on practice teaching and how this distracted attention away from the social work team for not supporting failing Black students and developing anti-racist education resources for practice educators.

VV556 all those Black students who were failing their placements...were also failing essays...but the focus was on the outside - not the inside. And why didn’t we focus on the inside? Why didn’t we focus on us - why did we focus on how practice teachers were letting them down? We didn’t focus on how our preparation for them going on practice had failed. We chose to focus on not on the bit we could control but the bit we can’t control. You know those same students who are failing placements are also failing academically, but the focus in on the outside world, because it’s easier....It’s easier, it’s safer, you feel less guilty.

These tutor interviews revealed some interesting and professionally poignant insights into how anti-racist social work education was conceived of and experienced within a University staff team engaged in professional training. It also highlighted the tensions and complexities of delivering this type of education and the general sense of heightened anxiety associated with teaching ‘race’ issues. A number of key themes could be identified in these interviews which were suggestive of the ‘significance of personal experience’ and how both own training experiences and lived experiences of racism or of discrimination based on other personal realities, such as being white or a gay woman, had shaped and influenced tutors as teachers and their perceptions of anti-racist social work education. ‘Closing down of discussion and debate and the role of emotion’ was also a key theme to emerge in these interviews, and this was evidenced in a lack of confidence and heightened anxiety expressed by some tutors in teaching anti-racist social work education. These tutors experienced anti-racism as an
emotionally ‘supercharged area’ of learning, which was often contested and where classroom discussion was sometimes truncated. However the majority of tutors were committed to enabling ’honest conversations’ about ‘race’ and racism and embedding this component of professional education into the curriculum. These tutors were committed to building confidence in delivery and creating safe teaching spaces for dialogue. However only a minority of tutors wanted anti-racist social work education to be treated as a discrete and named area of teaching within the curriculum.
Group Interviews

This strand of the research involved 3 group interviews which were undertaken with students at T2. One group interview was reserved for Black students and 10 students elected to participate. The other two group interview slots were attended by 7 and 2 white students respectively, which meant that although (56%) of the student group took part in the group interviews; only (42%) of the white student group elected to be interviewed compared with (83%) of the Black group.

The three group interviews raised a number of important issues for understanding how anti-racist social work education had been experienced differently by these students and how this learning had promoted a different type of understanding and engagement with anti-racism. What became very evident in the group interviews was how Black students were positioned differently compared with their white counterparts and how their emerging professional identities and experiences were being shaped by racism. These group interviews, suggested that different social positions will produce different types of knowledge about the social world because different social positions produce different social experiences (Ali, at el, 2004). The group interviews suggested “our knowledge is deeply dependent on our social location, on the places from which we learned to see” (Rossiter, 1996, p. 143).

A thematic analysis of the group interviews identified a number of recurring themes which were useful for understanding how anti-racism had been experienced by students and how this learning for some members had led to transformative change (Mezirow, 2000)

Students experiences of transformative learning

All three groups suggested that the module had been invaluable in terms of raising awareness of ‘race’ issues and developing a better understanding of how it impacts upon social work practice. One student suggested that that;

\textit{AA 1294 It opened my eyes to certain issues…and I think that outside the first year, this is the only module where we talked about discrimination.}

The Black student group suggested that this was a module which

\textit{CC1349 spoke and reached out to them…the issues which were being discussed affect us as Black people…like discrimination and racism…}

This group also spoke about how they had experienced this module as empowering and how it had provided them with legitimate space to discuss issues which for some were real and
grounded in their personal narratives;

CC1380 It gave us self-confidence...in that what I’m saying is going to be acknowledged. Yeah. I’ve got something of value here to say, and somebody’s actually taking me seriously. So, you know, once you’ve got that platform, it gives you confidence, you know it boosts your confidence even more and you participate more and more ... It gives you wings. It emancipates you.

Some members of the Black group of students also suggested that this module provided them with a deeper understanding of racism which had enable them to identify and name how both past and present experiences were shaped by racism;

CC1354 I think for me it was more about being able to actually explain it and identify it. Before I just knew that something was not quite right, but now I can actually point it out and, you know, say it is actually wrong...and that it needs to be addressed. Whereas before, I would probably, just know that there is something not quite right, but maybe not be able to explain it to you, what exactly it is.

Another Black student remarked;

CC152 I am now much more aware and much more prepared to do something about it, because I now know the issues.

This increasing ‘race’ awareness was also shared by some of the white students who suggested that some aspects of the teaching had prompted them to reflect on their whiteness; one white student commented that “since studying [this module] I’ve become a lot more aware of the colour of my skin” (BB1255).

However other students felt a degree of uncertainty in embracing this new type of knowledge. One student in the white group captured this unease when she suggested that although she had a better understanding of discrimination, she was still struggling with letting go of the colour-blind lens through which she had viewed the world;

AA1372 One thing I’d like to say is I’ve learned a lot, , but I’m not sure that this sits easy with me and that I’m comfortable about it, because I don’t, I don’t see colour and I don’t see ‘race’. To me, we are all human beings. I found it very difficult when we did the Black perspectives and all of that, when I was being told, that actually, you’ve got to identify somebody as Black...I don’t see colour as an issue, but maybe I need to, because it will impact on the way I treat people...I’m still struggling with that one a bit, you know, am I wrong, am I right, I don’t know.

Some students also suggested that their teaching on anti-racism had provided them with a more balanced interpretation of the Rochdale abuse case, which was the first of several high profile cases involving paedophile Asian gangs targeting young white girls for sexual exploitation (The Home Affairs Select Committee, 2013). Students suggested that their increased awareness of ‘race’ issues made them more critical of sensationalist media reporting
and the use of stereotyping;

AA1452 I looked at it differently because of the teaching on the module as my awareness was raised

Another student commented

BB1156 I think it made me more aware of when I read things. I was able to identify different ways in which the press were reporting and how they use stereotypes...

Cultural competence and cultural relativity

Students in all three groups were consistent about the lack of cultural knowledge addressed in teaching and the needs for some basic understandings of different cultural groups and how they experience social work. Students cited ignorance, not wanting to offend service users and a lack of familiarity about non-Christian religions as evidencing the continuing need for cultural competence input. Students stated;

CC1979 I'm not confident... because there is a realisation there, that people might have a cultural identity, a cultural aspect that I need to learn about, Yeah, instead of going there and just thinking, I can work with everybody.

BB1119 I didn’t feel as though I learnt as much as I should have learnt about other cultures.

AA1323 I’m worried about being ignorant of cultural practices and possibly, you know, sort of upsetting, you know, a service user.

However in one of the group interviews a concern arose in relation to how students were proposing and adopting an essentially culturally relativist standpoint which was ethically misplaced and professionally unhelpful in terms of the lack of distinction being made between values and behaviours. Two examples in particular demonstrated a degree of cultural relativity which required professional re-appraisal and further reflection because what was being suggested was potentially neglectful and harmful. As both a lecturer and insider researcher I felt I had a professional and ethical responsibility to step outside of my researcher role and offer at the end of the group interview academic and professional support to enable these two students to critically reflect on the inherent dangers of the culturally relativist standpoints they had shared with me (see transcription below).

I felt duty-bound to offer support to these students to enable them to develop a more informed and professionally nuanced position on which to base their practice which whilst culturally sensitive was not culturally relative (Laird, 2008).
AA1488 I worked with a Somali family in my first placement and their culture is so different to ours and I didn’t agree with a lot of things that they did, but, as a social worker, you’ve just got to work with them...They kept having children, you know. She was barefoot and pregnant every 9 months, literally. Well she sat there and smiled all the time, but what’s going on behind that smile...she was so controlled...I couldn’t ask her...she was kept in [her] place... Cultural thing isn’t it and who are we, who am I, to say that it’s wrong...

AA1552 I went out with a health visitor to an Asian family, dad came home, he was a taxi driver, strangely enough, because he knew we were coming round to do the little boy’s 8 month check or whatever, sweet little lad, but again, dad did all the talking, mum could speak English, but she didn’t, the boy was the apple of their eye, they had daughters, but they’d got their boy and...

Oh it was the culturally food bit, it was the food bit, because of what he was, they were letting their child eat...Culturally you would, rice and this and that, whereas the health visitors like, it wasn’t the rice it was the other thing (intake of breath), shouldn’t really be having that sort of food yet, but if they still lived in Pakistan, They wouldn’t be on bland yoghurts...so she was trying to make them rear their child like we would. And I think that’s wrong. And as I say, who’s to say that we’re right, that western society way is the best way.

Hierarchy of Oppression

Students in both of the white group interviews made reference to a ‘hierarchy of oppression’ and ‘double standards’ operating on the programme. These perceptions had been shaped by their experiences in class and students suggested that ‘race’ issues had gained ascendancy and all other areas of oppression were either overlooked or not tackled with the same commitment and vigour by tutors. One student commented;

BB1768 I don’t know, it was just probably paranoia but I felt that there were certain topics...that were sort of being avoided or brushed over quickly.

Other students reflecting on comments made in class by several Black students relating to ‘race’ and sexuality, where they implied “that they would never work with gay people or something to that effect” (BB1647), suggested that tutors had failed to challenge these remarks. Another student reflecting on the same incident commented;

BB1269 There was an incident in class that I found quite offensive, it really kind of, um, made me sit back and think, wow...if I’d done the same, I’d have been thrown out of University......so there’s that double standard which I find very difficult to understand...if I’d said the same I would have been deemed automatically a racist and put out and rightly so......and I found that really difficult, cos’ it was like, I find it hard because to me that’s double standards and if the course practises double standards it’s very difficult for me.
Students suggested that these experiences had left the cohort ‘fractured’ and divided across ‘race’ lines. Interestingly even Black students recognised the ensuing fallout and suggested that;

\textit{CC1457} The aftermath of that was that the white students felt that they’d been really discriminated against and we’d sort of been protected and given special treatment. We were a special group... it created a lot of tension.

However students in the Black group also suggested that homophobic remarks made by some members of their group was being used to make “generalisations about all black students” (CC1316) and how these comments were being used as a smokescreen by some white students not to deal with their own racism;

\textit{CC1410} think they [white students] are in denial, you know, they don’t know what racism is, really that’s what this is all about, they use homophobia as a way of counteracting racism... they think now, all blacks are homophobic... Homophobia becomes an excuse now not to understand racism.

\textbf{Keeping your head below the parapet}

Students in all three group interviews suggested that they themselves or their peers had adopted an approach to learning, which involved a high degree of self-censoring and consciously keeping participation and engagement to an absolute minimum. Several reasons were given for this minimum engagement but the main ones were linked to ‘lack of trust’ and ‘not feeling safe’ in the learning group;

\textit{BB1150} A lot of students I know didn’t feel like they could put their hand up and say anything, because they didn’t feel like it is a safe environment, to like, just say how you feel and like, just debate...

\textit{BB1152} When we came back at the second year, we made a decision to shut up and not participate... [Another student interjecting “yeah, put up and shut up”]. We do keep quite... I mean, I don’t get involved in anything, you know...You need trust within the class.

\textit{CC1277} I don’t talk to certain people now because I’m scared to open my mouth...

The Black group of students also suggested that some of them had decided to self-censor and no longer contribute to class discussions because of their experiences of either being misunderstood or because whatever they had to say was not being accorded the same value;
I think because English is second languages to us, when you start talking people don’t take notice, they might not... give what you are saying much credence at all...

You can’t really express yourself or say anything because it’s always misunderstood ... we don’t really answer questions any more.

Several Black students also suggested that their immigration status, which was still being determined by the UK Border Agency, made them feel more apprehensive and cautious about speaking out and putting forward particular types of perspectives which could be deemed as to challenging;

When you don’t have any status in this country and are waiting for the UK Border Agency to make a decision you don’t really feel able to exercise your rights, ok. But once your status is confirmed you begin to exercise your democratic rights and you begin to challenge issues, where you would have remained silent about, because you had no status.

When I first came into this country I didn’t feel that I had any rights. I wasn’t sure... I didn’t have the power to challenge things that I should have challenged. I might have, sort of, showed that I was displeased about things, but, I would not actually challenge it. I didn’t have the courage because I was thinking, what are the implications going to be on... will I get reported? ...

You know, with an immigration status, comes that power, comes that confidence, because I’m thinking, look, I’ve got the same rights as you... I’ve got a voice now... whereas before, I wouldn’t have challenged, especially people in authority...

With ‘indefinite leave to remain’ you think differently... you get that sense of freedom of expression, to a certain extent and choice because you know there are other avenues... you’re not stuck... when you are stuck, you’ve got to take it because you have no choice... but you have choices when you’ve got your right to stay.

These insights were important for understanding why some Black students may have chosen not to speak out about their experiences of discrimination and why they may have decided to remain silent in classroom. The fear of reprisals linked to their limited immigration rights was very real for them.

The data analysis of group interviews also suggested that some mature students felt that young students in particular were only on the course “to tick the boxes and move on” (AA1128) and had no real interest in exploring the complex set of issues associated with anti-racism;

I think they’re just here to get through the course, tick the Anti-racist ADP box and move on... [Another student interjecting “yeah just tick here to tick the boxes, rubber stamp it and move on”]
Experiences of Groupwork and ‘Padare’

Although students reported a degree of mistrust and lack of confidence in working in the large group; the experiences of learning in smaller groups was more positive. Some students suggested that these smaller groups were not as ‘fractured’ and ‘segregated’ across race lines as the larger group and that this learning was experienced differently;

AA1260 In group work...you've got to learn to trust and know about each other

AA1262 I was with a lot of the black [students], I do admire them, because their narratives are so different to mine, And they have come from such different backgrounds, some very wealthy, some very poor, but they're all very strong...their stories were fascinating and shocking at the same time...

BB1776 I loved our group, I think, you know, I learned an awful lot about racism from it, I absolutely loved it, I could listen all day to different views...

However the ‘Padare’ support group for Black students was experienced by some white students as a form of ‘special treatment’ and a mechanism for ‘additional help’ and fast-track access to tutors. This was perceived with a degree of suspicion and seen as unfair and these perceptions were shared by several students who suggested;

BB1801 they have a Padare group, which is a support group. I don’t know what lecturers are involved in that group but I would imagine they get to know the lecturers because they spend time with lecturers on a different level...probably more on a personal level, which breaks down the barriers of, knocking on their door to go and see them, do you know what I mean...

BB1827 my daughter’s at the University in Stirling, and she’s in the Korean group...and anyone is allowed to join that...absolutely anybody...but I was told I couldn’t join.

BB1838 Students like me are intrigued, yeah, interested or want to be more involved

BB1841 I didn’t know much about [Padare] and I did wonder in first year whether I could join it...but was told by my tutor it was for Black students only

Students in the Black group also commented upon some of this suspicion and lack of understanding by white students about the role and purpose of this support group;

C1115 I’ve been asked [by white students] what do we do in Padare, how come there is not a support for white students...

CC1134 I been made to feel guilty ...your own secret club, that we are not privileged to it ...
CC1121 Padare is really good for us. I feel it’s about supporting each other. But it’s now causing a lot of problems for white students... cos’ I’ve been asked by quite a few of them, are we being taught, are we being helped with assignments...

These group interviews were suggestive of a number of important themes for understanding how students had experienced and reflected on this area of learning. The group interview data offered rich descriptions of how this learning had been experienced differently and how these differences could be illuminated in the collective and individual reflection of students within these groups.
Chapter 5 - Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to identify from empirical data key issues and findings which are illustrative of how students experience anti-racism teaching, the change that takes place and how tutors approach and make sense of this learning task. The research data presented in this thesis is suggestive of a range of experiences in relation to how anti-racism is conceptualised and evidenced in learning. The questionnaire and student group interview data suggests that anti-racist teaching was experienced differently by the group of social work students and left a complex set of footprints which were reflective of different levels of engagement and understanding. This data also suggests that whilst for some students this learning was experienced as transformational for others it may have ‘silenced’ them.

The tutor interview data is also suggestive of different types of pedagogic experiences and conceptualisations of the learning task for students. These interviews also identify some of the challenges and barriers to learning and how students can be motivated to engage with this sensitive and politically contested area of teaching.

When relevant the findings presented for discussion have been triangulated and combined with data drawn from different sources and at different time intervals. Triangulating different sources of data enables the findings of the quantitative research instrument used in this study at T1 and T2 to be corroborated and explicited for further discussion with reference to the data emerging from the individual and group interviews. Triangulation also enables the integrity and validity of the results deriving from a particular method to be cross referenced and checked for consistency and contradictions (McLaughlin, 2012).

The learning task for students

In tutor interviews there was general consensus that anti-racism should be permeated across the curriculum and should not be seen as a discrete and stand-alone area of teaching. However there was less agreement as to whether it should be delivered within an anti-oppressive practice paradigm (Dalrymple and Burke, 2006) which some tutors viewed as potentially depoliticising and diluting anti-racist social work education (Dominelli, 2008).

In terms of who was best placed to deliver this area of teaching, although there was a general sense of tutor anxiety in teaching anti-racism, there was recognition by Black staff members that they may not be the best placed tutors to deliver this area of content. These tutors felt
that their positioning as Black women and student perceptions of them may shut down
dialogue and curtail an open and frank conversation about racism. These tutors felt that white
students may self-monitor what they shared in class because of their fear of offending a Black
tutor and that their white colleagues would be seen as more credible and impartial in
delivering this component of learning and possibly because these white academics would not
see them as having a ‘chip on their shoulder’ (Ahmed, 2012). However some white tutors
were apprehensive about the dangers of speaking into an experience of racism of which they
had no direct experience.

In terms of the learning task for students the research evidence drawn upon from tutor
interviews suggested that teaching should enable a better awareness of ‘race’ issues and help
students to understand and make sense of the nature of contemporary British racism.
Interestingly no reference was made to cultural awareness training and cultural competence
which had been identified as key and explicit area of learning in questionnaire and group
interview data by some students.

Some tutors also identified an additional learning task for Black students which mirrored what
some of these students themselves had cited in questionnaire data in relation to developing
familiarity and confidence to deal with the different manifestations of institutional racism they
would be exposed to in the organisations they would work with (Pilkington, 2011).

**Students understanding and experiences of racism**

The questionnaire and student group interview data suggests that racism was not an aberrant
and isolated experience for students, but was instead a normal and an ingrained feature of the
landscape. In questionnaire responses half the student group reported either experiencing
racism or observing a racist incident. However an equally significant number of students
suggested they had no experience of racism or were uncertain about defining what they had
experienced as racist. For some of these students this uncertainty was related to a lack of
understanding of what racism constituted and how it was experienced in society. This
ambiguity may have been complicated by the changing nature and force of racism which
appears in different guises and is “constantly renewed and transformed” (Fanon, 1970, p.41).
This fluidity may well have made it difficult for some students to grasp what racism was and to
name it with certainty, as it was not fixed and always in a state of flux. This aspect of the data
highlights a key point in that many students seem only to conceptualise racism in its personal and obvious forms rather than in its subtle ideological and structural nature.

The questionnaire data also suggested that the inconsistent nature of practice teacher support in this area may have limited opportunities for students to develop the confidence and conceptual ability to identify and confidently name racism. The dearth of this support was also identified in tutor interviews in relation to how practice teachers did not always recognise the experiences and challenges of Black students working in predominantly white communities, and how they sometimes had to deal with the institutional nature of racism in white state organisations (Ahmed, 2012).

The questionnaire data also suggested a surprisingly high number of Black students reported at T1 that they had not experienced racism or had to deal with service user racism. The implications of this finding were quite profound and indirectly supported the misplaced assertion that we now lived in a post ‘race’ society where racism was no longer an issue or problem within British society (Graig, 2013) and that ‘zero tolerance’ campaigns in the Public Sector had been effective in tackling racial harassment, abuse and violence (Ahmed, 2012). This finding also challenged previous research in the field which suggested that racism was a major problem for both Black workers and service users (Singh, 2006b). What was being suggested by these students was that it was no longer an issue and had withered away.

However a number of important caveats need to be taken into consideration when determining the validity of this finding. For example this data may have been suggestive of a differentiation in the experiences of racism between different ethnic minority groups (Ballard, 1992), and suggestive of the increasing significance of cultural racism (Modood, 1992; 2013), which may not have been experienced with the same degree of intensity and force by the group of predominately Black Christian students. These students' positioning as Christians may have insulated them from experiences of ‘islamaphobia’ and the various manifestations of cultural and religious hatred associated with being a Muslim (McGhee, 2008).

The questionnaire and group interview data also suggested that during the course of teaching students became more conscious of racial oppression. Prior to teaching students lacked an awareness of racial oppression and may have been experiencing ‘false consciousnesses’ due to the processes of ‘interpellation’. The processes on ‘interpellation’ enable us to understand the way in which ruling class ideology is upheld and reproduced by the ideological and repressive
apparatus of the state, which works against the development of class consciousness and an awareness of structural oppression (Althusser, 1971).

However during the course of teaching, previous understandings and experiences of racism, and how these were made sense of, underwent a process of change and transformation. At T2 students were more conscious and aware of ‘race’ issues and previous experiences were revisited and made sense of in light of these new understandings.

It is also important to recognise that for some students their personal, professional and political identities were in a state of flux and that anti-racism teaching was exposing them to new learning which particularly on ‘Black Perspectives’ (Goldstein, 2008), was experienced by some as ‘transformational’ (Mezirow, 1981); and critical for developing ‘critical consciousness’ through the process of ‘conscientization’ (Freire, 1970). This strand of new learning particularly for Black students, may also have been linked to what Robinson (1995) describes as ‘nigrescence’ (a Latin word used to describe the process of becoming Black and developing a positive Black identity). For some of these students teaching on ‘Black Perspectives’ may have been a catalyst to becoming more conscious about the nature of colour racism and how it influenced their collective and individual life experiences (Platt, 2011b). The group interview data for Black students suggested that some of them had indeed become more conscious of their racial and cultural identities and had found a different type of voice which was more critical about the social world and how it was experienced by Black communities.

This growing consciousness was reflected in some students questioning the racialised nature of ‘habitus’ and their experiences of racism in the ‘field’ which had limited their access to meaningful participation and wider opportunities because of their lack of ‘cultural capital’. In the work of Bourdieu ‘habitus’ refers to set of internalised dispositions which reproduce social structures and influence the way individuals see and act in the world (Houston, 2002), whilst ‘field’ refers to independent structures of social relations in which an individual is located and which pre-exist and are independent of the individual (King, 2005).

Some Black students in group interviews suggested that because of their African accents, mannerisms and ways of acting in the social world they were viewed with less value and did not always feel respected by their peers. These students felt that they were not accorded the same professional standing/status as their white counterparts and this experience was unsettling and impacted upon professional confidence and psycho-social health. Some of these issues were also identified in tutor interviews, where, particularly in relation to practice
education placements, there was a concern that Black students were failing placements due to lack of practice teacher support exacerbated by a one-size-fits-all approach to supervision. Some tutors also suggested that these students were being labelled as lacking communication skills because of their accents and faced widespread institutionalised racism.

However questionnaire and group interview data suggested that at the end of module teaching Black students were more confident and knowledgeable in questioning the nature of their ‘habitus’ and how it was experienced and valued in the ‘field’ (Houston, 2002). By the end of teaching these students were more conscious about the insidious nature of racism and how it restricted their access to ‘cultural capital’. Group interview data suggested that these students were able to draw upon this new learning to make sense of being positioned and labelled as ‘outsiders’ (Becker, 1963) and how processes of social exclusion (Platt, 2007) and lack of access to ‘cultural capital’ reproduced the structural socio-economic position of Black communities. Students also had a better sense of populist discourses around immigration and asylum (Kohli, 2007) and some even suggested in group interviews that their reading of the media coverage following on from the organised child abuse cases involving groups of Asian men in Rochdale, Oldham and Oxford had changed significantly as they were now more conscious of stereotyping and ‘moral panics’ (Cohen, 1972).

**Interculturality and cultural confidence**

The complete absence of South Asian students, compared with the visible minority representation of Black African students in the research cohort, raises some interesting issues in relation to how some of the findings emerging from this study should be interpreted. For example, would the presence of a visible number of south Asian students have positively influenced the general levels of cultural awareness and confidence demonstrated by both Black and white students in working with these cultural groups?

The invisibility of south Asian cultural identities amongst the student group may have influenced some aspects of the empirical data. Interculturality and contact with different groups is considered to be an important component of learning associated with attitudinal change:

> Interculturality is a dynamic process whereby people from different cultures interact and learn about and question their own and each other’s cultures. Over time this may lead to cultural change (James, 2008, p.2)
The group interview data suggested that students valued working across cultures in mixed dyad groups and that this experience was particularly valued by white students who found some of the personal testimonies shared by Black students as critical and transformative for their learning (Fook et al., 2000).

Having no South Asian students in the learning cohort may have limited opportunities for shared learning and group discussion, which is considered to be useful for challenging stereotypes and previously held beliefs, what Mezirow refers to as “points of view” or “habits of mind” (Mezirow, 2000 p.19). Hence the absence of this dialogue may have been contributory factor associated with students being more apprehensive in working with South Asian service users (Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Indian).

The visible minority presence of Black students may have facilitated positive learning for white students in enabling these students to develop greater familiarity and confidence in working with Black communities because of their contact and opportunities to learn from Black students in the group. In both the questionnaire and group interview data students made reference to group work and focused classroom discussions which they claimed had been invaluable in enabling them to learn from different students about their respective cultures and experiences of racism. Furthermore, some of the critical incidents referred to, particularly by white students, as being important for developing and transforming their understanding of ‘race’ issues involved Black students sharing their experiences of racism and this recognises the importance of both narrative and empathy to understanding others’ experience of oppression.

The data suggested that inter-group dialogue and contact between students, particularly in group work settings, was important for student learning.

The importance of contact is recognised in the seminal work of Allport (1954), and his ‘Contact Thesis’ supports the assertion that contact between different groups leads to more positive and less negative attitudes, greater understanding and increased tolerance. Hewstone et al., (2007), drawing on their research in Northern Ireland into sectarianism also suggests that group and individual contact can lead to a better understanding of cultural differences, increased community cohesion and that these changes are normally not temporary.

Therefore the lack of South Asian students on this social work programme raises some interesting methodological questions which require some aspects of the data to be approached with caution and interrogated closely for these missing voices (Dunn et al., 2005). What’s been mooted here is that the presence of South Asian students from different faith backgrounds may have led to a different kind of learning taking place, which may have culminated in a
different set of learning outcomes being evidenced by students. For example the presence of South Asian students within the learning group may have led to a more nuanced understanding of South Asian cultures and religions and enabled students not to conflate important cultural and religious differences.

The absence of South Asian students in the learning group may also have been reflected in the different levels of confidence reported in working with particular cultural groups. At both T1 and T2 students were far less confident in working with Muslim and Asian groups compared with other cultural groups. Although at T2 overall confidence increased in working with all cultural groups, students remained far less confident and more apprehensive in working with Muslim, Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups.

These findings were suggestive of a number of possible interpretations; the apprehensiveness demonstrated by students in relation to working with South Asian and Muslim groups may have been associated with their uncritical acceptance of populist and state sanctioned discourses linked to ‘Islamophobia’ which has demonized Muslim communities and stereotyped these groups as monolithic, dangerous and backward (Hasan, 2010). This irrational fear, linked to an unfounded hostility and the continuing saliency of the ‘terrorist’ and ‘enemy within’ discourse, may have been related to students expressing lower levels of confidence and greater apprehensiveness in working with this community. The perceived cultural distance from Asian and Muslim communities compared with Black Christian and white communities in terms of language and religion may also have also been related to lower levels of expressed confidence in working with these communities.

Student responses as evidenced in the high correlation coefficient scores also suggested that they were not differentiating between Asian groups and were instead aggregating these groups together. These broad brush-stroke categorisations may have been linked to a lack of cultural understanding about different groups from the Indian Sub-continent and were suggestive of particular type of naive cultural stereotyping, where all Asian groups were viewed as the same (Modood, 1992).

Skills and Issues for Multicultural Practice and Racial Equality

A high number of students had worked with BME service users in their first placement, 61% (N=22). However (N=6) of these students felt that the ‘race’ and culture of the BME service
users they worked with was of no or little relevance and made no difference to their casework and therapeutic relationships. These students were working at the level of ‘unconscious incompetence’ (Howell, 1982) because of their inability to recognise and work with cultural and racial difference. However (N=16) students suggested that the experience of working with a BME service user had felt different and that these differences were real and grounded in practice and could be evidenced in how they felt more self-aware of their actions and the increased levels of reflection.

Some of these students also suggested that working with BME service users who were not proficient in English made their casework more problematic and that this was sometimes further complicated by responding to a different set of cultural beliefs and in managing the over involvement of extended family members. The recognition of these differences at T1 suggests that some students had already taken the first steps towards becoming ‘consciously competent’ practitioners (Howell, 1982) and had not adopted a colour-blind approach to practice (Barn, 2007).

However during the course of teaching from T1 to T2 students, irrespective of their experiences of working with BME service user, started to identify a set of different skills and issues which they considered to be important for multicultural praxis. The data suggested that students had moved beyond what (Williams & Graham, 2013, p11) call a “rudimentary focus of cultural competency” concerned with “all too often very essentialised” and “first level issues” to a more sophisticated and nuanced understanding at T2.

At T1 students tended to identify “first level issues” which could be evidenced in relation to an over-emphasis on cross-cultural communication, access to services and developing an awareness of cultural and faith-based differences (Furness & Gillihan, 2006).

However at T2 a more sophisticated and critically reflexive multi-level understanding of skills and issues was more evident, which was more concerned with racism, asylum and immigration, poverty and social exclusion, authenticity and respect, transcultural practice and advocacy issues.

At T2 students were also identifying more issues and skills and this increase was statistically significant when tested using the Wilcoxon signed matched pairs test. Similarly students’ conceptualisations of racial equality and its relevance for social work practice demonstrated change and positive development through the course of teaching. Although students’ understanding of racial equality at T1 and T2 remained firmly centred on an ‘equality of
opportunity’ discourse, at T2, students tended to place less emphasis on ‘ontological equality’ in terms of equal respect. Some students at T2 were also able to make indirect references to ‘equality of condition’ and ‘equality of outcome’ (Turner, 1986, p.34) when framing their thinking on racial equality around fairness and social justice and this demonstrated a more sophisticated and critical understanding.

Also at T2 students were increasingly able to identify the relevance of racial equality for social work practice, which was explained with reference to ‘anti discriminatory practice’ and ‘equal access to services’. Although this understanding was not explicitly framed around anti-racism it nevertheless demonstrated an emerging practice awareness of the role and relevance of racial equality.

**Evidencing educational outcomes and learners’ reactions to learning**

The matched pair data for this study suggests that it is possible to measure “the distance travelled by individual students in their learning” (Braye and Preston-Shoot, 2006, p.83) and to evidence particular types of educational outcomes which address level one and level two of Carpenter’s (2005) (after Kirkpatrick, 1967), model of educational outcomes for social work. Level one outcomes are associated with “learners’ reaction” and relate to the students’ views of their learning experience and satisfaction with the teaching; whilst Level 2a and Level 2b educational outcomes are associated with a “modification in attitudes and perceptions” and the “acquisition of knowledge and skills” (Carpenter, 2005, p.6).

The level 2a and 2b educational outcomes related to attitude change and knowledge and skill acquisition and can be evidenced in the distance travelled by students, which, when tested using the Wilcoxon matched pairs tests in relation to Confidence, Awareness and Knowledge, reports that it is statistically significant.

The interval data for these different matched pairs tests suggest that at the end of teaching students have statistically higher levels of confidence, better awareness and feel more knowledgeable about ‘race’ issues. In terms of data for overall learning, with the exception of only 2 students, the remainder (N=34) agreed that the module had developed their understanding of ‘race’ issues. These positive educational outcomes demonstrate the important of anti-racism in social work training (Bhatti-Sinclair, 2011) and suggest that this particular strand of emancipatory education can lead to a more conscious and committed form of anti-racist practice (Cowden & Singh, 2013).
The different strands of data also enable us to “discover what it is about programmes that works for whom, in what circumstances and in what respects, and why” (Pawson and Tilley, 2004, p.19). The questionnaire data suggests that that this educational intervention was experienced and worked differently for Black and white students. For example teaching was more important in increasing the ‘race’ awareness levels of white students compared with Black students; whilst the interval data for awareness showed little variance for Black students, the opposite was true for white students, where the change in awareness levels was very noticeable and demonstrative of positive learning. This suggests that students experienced some aspects of learning differently and on some occasions this learning addressed particular group learning needs. This was similarly true for Black students when it came to ‘Black Perspectives’ teaching which all of them cited as a key component of their learning. For white students this teaching did not have the same impact and was experienced differently. Therefore the different types of learning offered seems to have a struck a particular type of chord with specific groups of learners and has left a complex set of tracks which are suggestive of different types of outcomes for different types of students.

These differences were also very apparent in student reactions to the teaching which had taken place on anti-racism and their overall satisfaction with the learning experience. One in three of white students felt that they were not sure whether the module had addressed their learning needs. This represented a critical mass of white students who were not completely satisfied with the learning offered. The lack of effectiveness of this teaching to reach out and connect with these students is an area of concern and suggests the need to reappraise and revisit some areas of content and delivery. In group interviews it was suggested that some students had ‘simply switched off’ and kept participation and engagement to an absolute minimum because of fear of saying the wrong thing and getting it wrong. This ‘silencing’ was also true for some Black students, who suggested in their group interview that when they spoke about racism they were misheard, not listened to and were generally seen as making “too much noise” (Ahmed, 2012,p.144) about racism. They had therefore decided to refrain from taking these risks associated with speaking about racism and had chosen to become silent.

A significant number of white students in their questionnaire responses also felt that the teaching and learning approach was not well balanced and unduly favoured ‘race’ issues to the detriment of other areas of social oppression, 50% of this group suggested that there had either been too much focus on ‘race’ issues or that they were not sure that the teaching approach had been balanced. On the contrary the majority of Black students demonstrated
high levels of satisfaction with the teaching and learning opportunities made available and the type and range of content covered in teaching.

In both of the group interviews involving white students very strong assertions were made that the programme operated double standards and unduly privileged ‘race’ issues. In group interviews it was suggested that Black students were given special access to tutors and additional academic support via their Black student group ‘Padare’. It was also suggested that only ‘race’ issues were tackled with vigour and commitment, whilst other areas of social oppression, particularly sexuality were addressed superficially and homophobic remarks from Black students were not challenged appropriately and proportionally.

This data was useful for understanding why a significant number of white students felt that ‘race’ issues were in the ascendancy on the programme and why some evaluated their learning less favourably. The absence of cultural awareness training which was identified as a key area of learning in questionnaire data by one third of white students may have also influenced some of these overall evaluations. In group interviews students were very vocal about the absence of cultural awareness training and how this impeded their ability to work across cultures. In these interviews students recognised how their lived experiences of multiculturalism were limited and how many of them lacked basic cultural knowledge around religion which they considered to be essential for practice.

The apparent absence of cultural awareness training, which is used extensively in other areas of professional education, particularly nurse training (Papadopoulos, 2006), may have influenced some of these responses which were suggestive of learning needs not being addressed and overall dissatisfaction with the learning experience.

However in terms of overall learning a number of important educational outcomes can be evidenced from the empirical evidence reported and triangulated in this thesis. These outcomes are suggestive of a general direction of travel which has resulted in positive change and an increased awareness of ‘race’ issues which can also be evidenced in student confidence and knowledge levels. A more sophisticated understanding of ‘race’ issues emerges at the end of teaching and for some students this aspect of professional education has been experienced as emancipatory and as a catalyst for political as well as intellectual growth.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

What conclusions can be drawn from this research?

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the different conclusions that can be drawn in response to the sub questions of this thesis:

1. Why is ‘race’ and anti-racism relevant for social work education?
   1a. What do we know about ‘race’ and racism in society?
   1b. What do we know about regulatory rules and requirements for social work education?
   1c. What do we know about social work’s engagement with ‘race’ and anti-racism?

2. What is the learning task for students and what are we aiming to achieve?

3. What evidence of outcomes do we have in relation to anti-racist teaching?
   3a. How is anti-racist social work education experienced?
   3b. What change can be identified as a result of anti-racist social work teaching?

Bringing together these different strands of evidence makes it possible to address comprehensively the overarching research question: What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

The empirical evidence presented in this thesis provides credible evidence of how, in one case anti-racist social work education can work. This thesis makes a direct contribution to social work knowledge by enhancing understanding of the emancipatory value of anti-racist social work education and of how, as a critical pedagogy, it can lead to ‘perspective transformation’ (Mezirow, 2000) and ‘conscientization’ (Freire, 1970). The empirical findings presented make a direct contribution to social work education by demonstrating that it is possible to measure the outcomes of anti-racist social work education and discover how this teaching and learning is experienced by educators and students. These empirical findings are critical for promoting accountable educational practice and developing research-informed teaching and learning interventions which are grounded in evidence.

This thesis, by demonstrating the outcomes of anti-racist social work education defends the role and place of this area of teaching in an overcrowded social work curriculum. It builds research capacity by demonstrating how research can be used to illuminate the processes and outcomes of anti-racist social work education. The research study also demonstrates “that an
outcome focused approach can be integrated into teaching” (Braye et al, 2013, p.16), this will ensure that anti-racist social work education achieves desired educational outcomes which meet the threshold standards and capabilities of key stakeholders.

This research is the first empirical study in the context of British anti-racist social work education to adopt a mixed methods research design to measure the educational outcomes of a pedagogic intervention and discover how teaching and learning is experienced. This is also the first British study to include a matched pair sample of social work students and combine nomothetic and idiographic approaches with quantitative data work, which uses non-parametric statistical tests to measure knowledge, skills and attitudinal change (Carpenter, 2011) and compare group differences. The study is also the first to triangulate different aspects of data and this enhances further the credibility of the empirical work reported in this thesis.

The empirical findings reported in this thesis offer a detailed understanding of how anti-racist social work education is experienced by a group of tutors and one cohort of students, and how this learning can be evidenced using standard research instruments and measurement scales. The qualitative data findings reported in this thesis provide new insights into the emotionally supercharged nature of teaching and learning in this area of the curriculum, and the way in which some students experience this component of professional education with anxiety and fear, which sometimes close down discussion and curtail learning. The qualitative student group interview data also enable us to understand how this silencing is experienced as disempowering and militates against a learning environment which is considered to be safe and authentic. The research also discovers that, for some Black students, this reluctance to speak freely about racism and ‘race’ issues is related to the uncertainty and fear of reprisal associated with their limited immigration status, which deters them from speaking out against racism.

The qualitative group data also enables us to develop a better understanding of how some students perceive anti-racist teaching as unduly privileging ‘race’ issues and marginalising other area of social oppression; whilst others, particularly Black students, experience this component of learning as affirmative and liberating. The group interviews also offer new insights into the dangers of cultural relativity and how students need to be supervised and better supported by practice educators to work responsibly with Black and ethnic minority service users.
The student interview data also enables us to understand the pedagogic and transformative value of shared dialogue between Black and white students, which builds ‘bridges of understanding’ between different sets of lived experiences and enables some marginal voices, which hitherto have been silenced, to speak about their lived experiences of racism. This empirical work makes a direct contribution to social work knowledge because it enables us to grasp how Black and white students experience anti-racist education differently and understand the importance of shared dialogue and critical moments in learning for transformational change to emerge.

The tutor interviews supplement some of the themes to emerge from student narratives and provide critical insights into how anti-racist social work education is experienced as a challenging and sensitive area of teaching, where educators have different levels of commitment and confidence in delivery. The educator interviews provide new insights into the pedagogic challenges of delivering teaching and learning in fraught contexts where student engagement is often lacking because of fear and unfamiliarity with ‘race’ issues and tutors themselves do not have the confidence or understanding to fully engage with this area of teaching. These empirical findings about tutor experiences and perceptions also enable us to understand the contested nature of anti-racist social work education and how it is conceptualised differently.

The educator interviews also reveal how Black staff experience the classroom differently compared with their white colleagues and are sometimes perceived to lack positional power and authority in the lecture theatre. These interviews also reveal how Black lecturers resist being pigeonholed into teaching anti-racism, but recognise that their racial presence in the classroom sometimes enables them to draw upon personal experiences of racism to promote learning. The educator interviews also enable us to understand how anti-racist social work education is shaped and influenced by a tutor’s own educational experiences and where they are positioned socially, culturally and politically. For example, the empirical evidence suggests that an educator’s self-declared positioning as a Black or gay woman, or as someone who is conscious of their white identity, appears to be closely aligned to how they construct anti-racist education. The above tutors speak with greater levels of conviction and a much stronger personal and professional desire to develop scholarly activity and embed ‘race’ equality in teaching and learning. The tutor interviews also offer important insights into what social work educator’s view as the learning task for students, and how this encompasses particular spheres of anti-racist social work education which are sometimes different from what students have identified as their learning needs. However, when these different strands of data are combined
they enable a more integrated approach to anti-racist social work education, which is based in empirical evidence and capable of measurement.

The empirical findings emerging from the tutor interviews make a direct contribution to social work knowledge by enabling us to identify the learning task for students and appreciate how educators approach anti-racist social work education from different standpoints and experiences, which invariably shape pedagogic responses and levels of commitment.

The empirical evidence drawn from the quantitative aspects of this thesis also makes a valuable contribution to social work knowledge by demonstrating how, in one case, anti-racist social work education achieves measurable educational outcomes, which is what we as educators hope for. These educational outcomes relate to positive learning and statistically significant change, for a matched pair sample of 36 social work students, in their knowledge, skills, confidence, awareness and understanding of race issues. This type of outcome focused evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of anti-racist social work education and supports accountable educational practice.

However the empirical evidence also identifies important group differences, related to age, ‘race’ and experience of working with a BME service user, which are important for understanding how anti-racist social work education is experienced differently, and how it leaves a complex set footprints which enable us to appreciate how this educational intervention works in different ways for different types of students. Sometimes these differences are subtle, but at other times they are more conspicuous and suggestive of group experiences which go beyond the individual.

These group differences are present in the overall evaluations of learning. The empirical evidence suggests that white students were less satisfied with the educational intervention compared with Black students. These students felt that teaching was too focused on ‘race’ issues and had not fully addressed their learning needs in relation to developing cultural competence. The implications of these unfavourable overall evaluations and reactions to the learning experience is significant because they may impact on what Carpenter, drawing upon Kraiger et al., (1993) has proposed as ‘motivational outcomes’, which in the context of anti-racist social work education should lead to “greater determination to change one’s own behaviour in response to learning about racism” (Carpenter, 2011, p.128). However the data suggests that for a quarter of white students these ‘motivational outcomes’ may have been lacking, and that their overall unfavourable evaluations of learning which, irrespective of the positive change measured in their knowledge, skills, confidence, awareness and understanding
of race issues, may impact upon their motivation to embed behavioural change. Therefore just learning about anti-racist social work issues, without experiencing this teaching as motivational and a catalyst for change, will not in itself accrue sustainable educational outcomes.

Another important finding to emerge from the empirical work which enhances social work knowledge is concerned with multicultural praxis and the implications of lower levels of student self-efficacy in relation to working with South Asian service users. Compared with other cultural groups, students were more apprehensive and had lower levels of confidence in working with cultural groups from the Indian sub-continent. Students also conflated important cultural and religious differences which meant that they were unable to differentiate between South Asian groups and lacked cultural awareness of important differences in religion, language and custom. The implications of this lack of social work preparedness and cultural dissonance could mean that social work practice may be compromised and be lacking in south Asian communities, because of apprehensive and culturally unaware practitioners whose qualifying training did not prepare and assess them for the working with South Asian service users.

However because of my positioning as an inside researcher I was able to raise and discuss the implications of this finding with colleagues and make changes to teaching content elsewhere in the programme, which in the interim period would incorporate teaching on cultural competence and working with South Asian service users. This change should also enhance the ‘motivational outcomes’ of anti-racist social work education, which were identified as potentially lacking for a group of white students, who felt that their learning needs had not been addressed because of a lack of cultural awareness input in teaching.

Overall, the empirical evidence drawn upon in this thesis demonstrates the role and value of anti-racist social work education and the type of experiences which may be reflective of teaching and learning in this contested and emotionally charged area of professional training. The empirical evidence drawn upon in this thesis makes an original contribution to social work knowledge, by providing evidence of educational outcomes and how this teaching and learning is experienced as both a challenging and, sometimes, liberating area of qualifying education, which in the words of one student “gives you wings”.
The diagram below captures some of the key areas of teaching and learning which have been identified in this thesis as being of paramount importance for conceptualising and delivering anti-racist social work education. Individually and collectively these different components of teaching and learning affirm the valuable pedagogic role of anti-racist professional social work training.

Figure 2, An integrated teaching and learning approach for anti-racist social work education

Methodological considerations and limitations

The findings reported in this thesis may simply be illustrative of some aspects of experience and educational outcomes accrued from anti-racist social work education across the Higher Education Sector in Britain, rather than definitive. The study ideally needs to be repeated.
across different sites for generalisability to be demonstrated and at present represents only knowledge situated in one particular context. The sample size was also small and there was no control group or a repeated measures design where the same study was repeated with two different cohorts of students. Therefore the findings reported in this study need to be approached tentatively with these provisos in mind.

We also cannot say with absolute certainty that the positive educational outcomes reported in this thesis were due exclusively to the teaching intervention on anti-racism. The positive improvements in knowledge, skills, confidence, awareness and understanding of race issues may have been due simply to being engaged in a professional education programme (Burgess & Carpenter, 2010), the ‘Hawthorne Effect’ of taking part in this study (Payne & Payne, 2004), and students possibly providing socially desired responses. These improvements could also have been an artefact of practice in completing the questionnaires which required students to reflectively interrogate their teaching experiences and think meticulously about areas of new learning.

Moving forward - dissemination strategy and final reflections

Delivering critical anti-racist education in a public policy context which is politically committed to a post ‘race’ integrationist policy is challenging for social work, but keeping ‘race’ on the teaching agenda and helping students to make sense of the overwhelming evidence of structural racism and the nature of institutionalized racist processes and practices, which accumulatively shape experience and restrict opportunity, is important for any learning about the context in which multicultural practice takes place.

The disproportionate impact of continuing public sector cuts on Britain’s Black communities, and how this will further deepen entrenched levels of poverty and restrict access to important community based culturally competent services (Graig, 2013), also requires reflexive practice appraisal about the challenges raised for social work students and educators.

Therefore in the current political context it is important to disseminate the empirical evidence drawn upon in this thesis widely, to encourage debate and dialogue and critical reflection on how we as social work educators evaluate and deliver meaningful anti-racist social work experiences, which enable learners to move beyond ‘magical consciousness’ (Freire, 1970) and become more conscious of ‘race’, racism and anti-racism. To date this research has contributed to a:

- Book chapter on anti-racist social work education (Singh, 2013).
An article on evidence informed anti-racist praxis (Singh, 2011).
Best research poster at an International conference on ‘Measuring Diversity Interventions’ hosted at Bradford University (2012), (see Appendix 6).

The intention now is to draw upon the empirical evidence presented in this thesis and write at least one journal paper for ‘Social Work Education’ and disseminate the key themes emerging from this thesis at UK Joint Social Work Education Conference and UK Social Work Research Conference (2014).

As a researcher I also plan to replicate some aspects of the empirical work reported in this thesis to test educational outcomes for reliability and validity. I plan to undertake identical empirical work with the next cohort of students enrolled on the emancipatory social work practice module. I will be using the same research measurement instruments and matched pairs study design and will be able to compare the educational outcomes of this teaching intervention with those reported in this thesis.

The intention of this follow up study is to investigate whether the same educational intervention with a different group of students results in a similar set of statistically significant educational outcomes for knowledge, skills, confidence, awareness and understanding of race issues. I also plan to undertake a specific piece of research which focuses exclusively on the experiences and educational outcomes of working with Black service users. This practice education focused empirical work is related to the research curiosity which arose when I was reflecting on some aspects of data reported in this thesis which is suggestive of differences between those students who had worked with a Black service user and those who had not. I wish to explore this aspect of experience further and probe deeper to discover how these intercultural practice encounters impact upon educational outcomes. I also plan to look into the findings relating to different levels of cultural confidence and add new cultural groups, for example Roma, Gypsy, Irish, Jewish, Polish and Chinese, to assess whether students differ in confidence levels.

These proposed research projects are testimony to the new skills and methodological understandings I have developed as a Doctorate student and in the process of becoming a researcher. These different areas of academic growth, professional development and maturational effects, associated with being engaged in a professional social work doctorate
programme, can be evidenced in my researcher identity, ontological positioning as a critical realist researcher and epistemological orientation which privileges a mixed methods form of inquiry into aspects of the social world. In many respects all of these areas have crystallised in this thesis, and have enabled me to develop the confidence, competence and research mindedness to now undertake further credible empirical work, which will extend our understanding of the experiences and educational outcomes of anti-racist social work education.
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### 1. About You

#### 1. Unique Student Reference Number

This will only be used to match questionnaires. It will not be used to identify you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. What is your gender?

- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male

#### 3. How would you describe your ethnic background?

- [ ] White
- [ ] Mixed/Dual Heritage
- [ ] Asian/Asian British
- [ ] Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
- [ ] Chinese
- [ ] Any other ethnic group - please specify

#### 4. How would you describe your cultural group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. What is your Age?

- [ ] 18-21
- [ ] 22-26
- [ ] 27-36
- [ ] 37-46
- [ ] 47-56
- [ ] 57+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Practice Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. In your year one practice placement did you have the opportunity to work with Black and Minority Ethnic service users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you have answered yes to question 6 complete the following two questions otherwise proceed to question 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe the cultural background of these service users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any particular challenges or issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T1 EMANCIPATORY SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

9. In your year one placement did your Practice Teacher discuss 'race' and cultural diversity issues with you?

☐ Frequently
☐ Occasionally
☐ Only when relevant to a live case
☐ Not really

10. Have you experienced or observed racism either inside or outside of your social work training?

If no please proceed to question 13

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not Sure

11. Describe the nature of the racism you have either experienced or observed.
12. Has any of the racism you have experienced or observed been from service users? If yes please elaborate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Awareness</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. How aware would you say you are of 'race' issues in social work practice?

Please rate your awareness on the following scale:
1 = no awareness and 10 = comprehensive awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. How knowledgeable would you say you are of 'race' issues in social work practice?

Please rate your knowledge on the following scale:
1 = no knowledge and 10 = comprehensive knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
15. Can you identify 5 key issues in social work practice which are related to 'race'?

16. Can you describe what you understand by the term racial equality? Why is it relevant to Social Work?
**T1 EMANCIPATORY SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

17. Can you identify five key social work skills which you believe are necessary for multicultural practice?

18. At this stage of your training how confident would you say you were in working with Black and Minority ethnic service users?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Fairly Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please choose one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. At this stage of your training how confident would you say you were in working with the following service users?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service User</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Apprehensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black British Jamaican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T1 EMANCIPATORY SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

20. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for taking the time to complete part one of the questionnaire.
# DSW T2 EMANCIPATORY SW PRACTICE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## 1. About You

1. Unique Student Reference Number

   This will only be used to match questionnaires. It will not be used to identify you.

## 2. Learning and Teaching

2. Can you describe the learning which has taken place in this module on 'race' issues?
### DSW T2 EMANCIPATORY SW PRACTICE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

3. Has this module developed your awareness, understanding and knowledge of 'race' issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please choose one

4. Describe how this new learning has shaped and influenced your understanding of anti-racist social work practice?

5. Has this structured modular teaching on 'race' issues addressed your learning needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please choose one
6. Please state what these learning needs were?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Awareness</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How aware would you say you are of 'race' issues in social work practice?

**Please rate your awareness on the following scale:**
1 = no awareness and 10 = comprehensive awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Awareness</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. How knowledgeable would you say you are of 'race' issues in social work practice?

**Please rate your knowledge on the following scale:**
1 = no knowledge and 10 = comprehensive knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Would you say that you have a better understanding and awareness of 'race' issues compared to before you started this module?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please choose one</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. Can you identify 5 key issues in social work practice which are related to ‘race’?

11. Can you describe what you understand by the term racial equality? Why is it relevant to Social Work?
12. Can you identify five key social work skills which you believe are necessary for multicultural practice?

13. Where else has your learning on 'race' issues taken place this term?

If necessary please tick more than one box

- Personal Tutorials
- Peer Group Learning
- Personal Study
- University Equality and Diversity Events
- University Cultural Events
- Other - please specify

14. Do you feel that there has been too much emphasis on 'race' issues compared to other forms of discrimination in this terms teaching?

Please choose one

- Yes to much emphasis on race issues
- No generally to little emphasis on race issues
- Not sure
- Well Balanced Approach
DSW T2 EMANCIPATORY SW PRACTICE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

15. Can you elaborate upon your response to question 14?

16. At this stage of your training how confident would you say you were in working with Black and Minority ethnic service users?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Fairly Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please choose one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. At this stage of your training how confident would you say you were in working with the following service users?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service User</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Not really confident</th>
<th>Apprehensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black British Jamaican Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Service User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. Critical Incident

18. Can you identify a critical incident from this term's teaching which has transformed your practice or made you think differently about 'race' and cultural issues in social work?

Can you describe what happened and reflect upon how this incident has changed your thinking and practice?
19. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for taking the time to complete the final part of this questionnaire.
Appendix 2 Interview discussion guides for student group and tutor interviews

Interview Guide for Social Work Student Group Interviews

1. In terms of your overall social work training to date how well do you feel it has prepared you to work with cultural diversity and ‘race’ issues?

2. How has the module emancipatory social work practice prepared you to work with and respond to ‘race’ issues? What was good about this module? How did it develop your understanding of the issues?

3. What have been the key issues and areas of learning in this module for you?

4. How has this new learning developed your awareness and how do you think you apply this to practice?

5. Have ‘race’ issues been under or over emphasised as part of your training? What have been your experiences? What would you have done differently?

6. Are the issues different for Black students?

7. In your first placement were you provided with the opportunity to reflect upon ‘race’ issues? Did you feel supported by practice teachers?

8. Has anything promoted or hindered your learning? Are there any particular barriers to learning about these issues?

9. Do your social work tutors have similar or different levels of expectation, understanding and commitment to ‘race’ issues? How have you negotiated and responded to this?

10. Are there any particular issues/challenges you think you face when working with Black service users? Are these similar or different to working with white service users?

11. Have you experienced or witnessed any form of behaviour which you would construe as racism? Explain what happened? What did you do? Did you feel supported?

12. Any other comments you wish to make?
Interview Guide for Social Work Tutors

1. In terms of your social work training what was it like for you? How well did your training prepare you for working with ‘race’/cultural diversity issues? Are the issues similar or different now?

2. What terms do you use when thinking about ‘race’ issues in teaching, for example ADP? Racism? Cultural Competence? AOP? ARP? Multiculturalism? Black Perspectives? Why do you use these terms and what do they denote to you?

3. What do you think about ARP? What does it mean to you? What have been your experiences in this component of the curriculum

4. Is it ARSW education/practice still relevant? In your opinion should be mainstreamed/combined with other areas of teaching around social oppression within ‘AOP’ or should it be a distinct stand alone area of teaching?

5. What do you think the learning task is for students?

6. How prepared and confident are you to offer teaching in this area?

7. How confident do you feel in assessing students practice on 'race' and cultural diversity issues?

8. In terms of the areas you teach do you incorporate ARP issues into your curriculum learning content and assessment tools?

9. Are students receptive to this learning? Are there any particular challenges in teaching this area of the curriculum?

10. Are there any differences within the student group in relation to engagement with this learning?

11. Are there any particular challenges and barriers to working with Black students around cultural diversity issues?

12. Are there any particular challenges and barriers to working with White students around cultural diversity issues?

13. How well do students evidence ARP issues in the assessed work you are responsible for? Are there any particular issues that students struggle with?
14. Are the issues different for Black students? Do you offer any particular support to these students?

15. Have you ever had to deal with or respond to a racial incident or allegation of racism in the classroom or in a fieldwork context? What happened? Did you feel supported? What issues did it raise for learning and practice?

16. In terms of tutorial and placement visiting work are ARP issues considered? Are these issues named / incorporated into placement learning contracts? Are they evidenced in placement portfolios?

17. Are their any key issues students identify which either promote or hinder their learning around ‘race’ issues?

18. Reflecting back on your placement work how prepared do you think practice teachers are in addressing ‘race’ issues in practice learning learning?

19. At the point of qualification how prepared do you think our social work students are for working with cultural diversity? What could we do better?

20. In your opinion do social work students lack confidence in working with particular cultural groups?

21. How often do you discuss 'race' and cultural diversity issues with your tutor group?

22. In your opinion how well does the University prepare students for social work practice in multicultural contexts? Do students have a sense of what the issues?

23. Any other comments you wish to make?
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Appendix 4 Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

What is the purpose of the study?

The focus of this research study is on how professional social work training prepares students to work with 'cultural diversity' and 'cultural difference'. The study seeks to evaluate the pedagogic relevance and practice utility of teaching social work students about 'race', racism and anti-racism and helping them to develop cultural awareness and cultural competence. The purpose of the study is to assess the outcomes and experiences of anti racist social work education being delivered at this University. This study is important because regionally and nationally there have been very few attempts to empirically capture how social work programmes accommodate and evidence race equality and cultural diversity issues.

Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. If you are a student by choosing to either take part or not to take part in the study will have no impact on your marks, assessments or future studies.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will be asked to either consent to the release of all questionnaire data and/or agree to take part in a student group or individual course tutor interview. The interview will be audiotaped and transcribed and you will be given the opportunity to comment upon the accuracy of the transcription.

Interviews may take up to 2 hours of your time and you will be provided with comfort break and refreshments.

Please remember that all information collected will be kept strictly confidential and always preserve anonymity.

What should I do if I want to take part?

If you wish to take part in the research study you will be asked to make contact with the researcher and sign an appropriate consent form.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The findings of this research will be used for writing up a Doctoral thesis in Social Work.

Who has reviewed the study?

This research has been approved by the School of Education and Social Work Cluster-based Research Ethics Committee.

Contact for further information
sukhwinder.singh@sussex.ac.uk

If you have any concerns about the way in which the study has been conducted, you should contact Professor Suzy Bray, the students principal supervisor in the first instance.
Appendix 5 Consent forms

CONSENT FORM – STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Project Title: What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

Project Approval Reference: 1011/07/07

I agree to take part in the above University of Sussex research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to

- Complete part one and part two of the student questionnaire.

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the researcher or by any other party.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

________________________________________
Signature

________________________________________
Date:
CONSENT FORM – SOCIAL WORK STUDENT GROUP INTERVIEW

Project Title: What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

Project Approval Reference: 1011/07/07

I agree to take part in the above University of Sussex research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to

- Be interviewed by the researcher
- Allow the interview to be audio taped

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the researcher or by any other party.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

__________________________________________
Signature

__________________________________________
Date:
CONSENT FORM – SOCIAL WORK TUTOR INTERVIEW

Project Title: What are the experiences and outcomes of anti-racist social work education?

Project Approval Reference: 1011/07/07

I agree to take part in the above University of Sussex research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to

- Be interviewed by the researcher
- Allow the interview to be audio taped

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the researcher or by any other party.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

__________________________________________
Signature

__________________________________________
Date:
Appendix 6 Research poster presented at The University of Bradford International conference on 'Measuring Diversity Interventions'

Measuring the outcomes of anti racist social work education

Sukhwinder Singh CSSW

'Taking Sides'
(Becker, 1967)

Becker's claim that social researchers cannot avoid taking sides' suggests that impartiality is neither possible nor desirable and that research is both a 'moral and political activity'.

• Making visible my researcher identity & disclosing my 'authorial partiality'
• Sharing my 'intellectual autobiography' & questioning the neutrality of knowledge production and whether it is possible for anyone to 'speak from nowhere'
• Engagement, dialogue & speaking from 'somewhere'
• Critical reflections on being experienced in the lecture theatre as an 'imposter' and 'standing in someone else's shoes'.

"We all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular experience and a particular culture" (Stuart Hall, 1992, p.258).

Researching into the 'hand, head and heart'

This doctoral study evaluates the pedagogic relevance and practical utility of teaching social work students about race, racism and anti-racism and whether this enables them to develop 'cultural awareness and cultural competence' (CMiC, 2001).

A mixed methods research approach is drawn upon to examine the experiences and outcomes of anti racist social work education and explore the dynamic relationship between the 'hand, head and heart', framed as the integration of practice skills, intellectual understanding and emotional capacities of both students and tutors. The study consisted of interviews and 36 paired sample questionnaires at two time intervals (before and after teaching).

The overarching aim of this research is to explore the pedagogic challenges of working with 'culturally encapsulated' students (Lacarice, 2003).

The value of anti racist social work education

Anti-racism encompasses a broad coalition of different perspectives and academic interests. It is considered to be a politically committed form of practice and a radical practice which emphasizes the need to actively identify and resist racism (Tomlinson, 2002). In contrast to the liberal character of the terms used by multiculturalists, such as equality, fairness, and opportunity, anti-racist educators have tended to draw upon politicized terms concerned with struggle, structure, power, exploitation and resistance. (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2004).

"The wider struggles against state sponsored racism, against the asylum immigration and nationality laws, against deaths in police custody, against stop and search, against racism in the judicial system, against school exclusions, against the premature deaths of black people due to health inequalities, and against the economic policies leading to the devastation of inner cities where the vast majority of black people live are always relevant to worker-client interactions" (Singh, 2002, p.77).

Research Methodology

The social world is discoverable, knowable and changeable. However the social world has an independent and objective existence and this reality beyond individuals comprises of real material and ideological structures which exist independently of sense data. These social structures include racism, which although not always immediately accessible to observation has a generative tendency to influence certain courses of action. The generative structure of racism has an 'a priori' existence and therefore predates actors currently situated within it (Porter, 2002).

The study draws upon realist evaluation to 'discover what it is about programmes that works for whom, in what circumstances and in what respects, and why' (Pawson and Tilley, 2004, p.18).
Appendix 7: JSWEC and UK Social Work Research Conference Presentation 2013

**JSWEC 2013 - Initial findings and reflections on DSW fieldwork**

Study explores how professional social work training programmes prepare students to work with ‘cultural diversity’ and ‘cultural difference’ (Mama, 2001); and the pedagogic challenges of working with “culturally encapsulated students” (Lacroix, 2003).

The aim of this study is to evaluate the pedagogic relevance and practice utility of teaching social work students about ‘race’, racism and anti-racism and whether this enables them to develop ‘cultural awareness’ and ‘cultural competence’ (O’Hagan, 2001.).

**Theoretical positioning**

Anti-racism is the theoretical and conceptual focus of this study and it encompasses a broad coalition of different perspectives and academic interests (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002). It is considered to be a politically committed form of practice (Tomlinson, 2002), and a radical practice which emphasises the need to actively identify and resist racism (Bonnett & Carrington, 1996).

This study is important because regionally and nationally there have been very few attempts to empirically capture how social work training programmes accommodate and evidence race equality and cultural diversity issues.

“There has been much assertion and indeed no small amount of capital accrued to the profession from a moral and political stance on race equality but few attempts have been made to assess training inputs and or evaluate outcomes”. (Williams et al, 2009, p.4)
POSITIVE PRACTICE IN HARD TIMES -
SOCIAL WORK FIGHTS BACK AGAINST THE INVISIBILITY OF ‘RACE’

“Multiculturalism is dead” (Cameron, 2011).
“Equality is now officially a dirty word” (May, 2010)

The dimension of ‘race’ in public policy is largely absent
Public sector equality duty is being eroded
Community based Race equality organisations are being dismantled
A return to colour-blind assimilation

Ideological and Repressive State Apparatus –
  — restrictive stance towards immigration
  — a strident media – portraying minorities and migrants as
    undermining British culture and values, ‘sponging’ on the welfare
    state
  — the enemy within - constructed in everyday discourse as ‘cunning’,
    ‘loathsome’, dangerous and ‘unprincipled’

POSITIVE PRACTICE IN HARD TIMES
The political and professional relevance of anti racism

“minorities are hit hardest by public expenditure cuts... the impact of the benefits cap
characterized by some as ‘social cleansing’ [can also be described as]‘ethnic cleansing’
... women will bear the brunt of the cuts and within that minority women and children
will suffer the most ...[Black communities continue to be ]disproportionately
criminalized in the criminal justice system, and are increasingly affected by racism and
‘race’ hate crime... “ (Craig, 2013. p.5-6)

Craig, Craig. Professor of Social Justice and Community Development at Birkbeck University.

“The wider struggles against state sponsored racism, against the asylum, Immigration
and nationality laws, against deaths in police custody, against stop and search, against
racism in the judicial system, against school exclusions, against the premature deaths
of black people due to health inequalities, and against the economic policies leading
to the devastation of inner cities where the vast majority of black people live are
always relevant to worker-client interactions”
(Singh, 2002, p. 77).
Different ways of knowing about the social world

The research has a critical realist orientation and draws upon a mixed methods approach which examines the hermeneutical and phenomenological issues (meaning, perceptions, ideas and beliefs) relating to teaching and learning around anti-racism and how social and political processes (Thompson, 1995), shape the way this new learning is experienced and understood (Mason, 2005).

The methodological position drawn upon in this research recognises the role of both nomothetic and idiographic approaches which allow us to evidence ‘how social work students learn about anti-racist practice?’

The use of descriptive and inferential statistics to describe and understand a particular type of shared reality

Measuring Transformational Learning

Carpenter’s (2005), (after Kirkpatrick, 1967), model of educational outcomes for social work suggests that it is possible to identify how an educational intervention can affect and lead to knowledge, skills and attitudinal change. Levels one and two outcomes of his model are particularly useful for evaluating and evidencing student learning on anti-racism.

Level 1: Learners’ Reaction

Level 2a: Modification in Attitudes and Perceptions

Level 2b: Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills

Level 3: Changes in Behaviour

Level 4a: Changes in Organisational Practice

Level 4b: Benefits to Users and Carers
My data (36n) students suggests that the emancipatory social work module has left a complex set of which are suggestive of different types of learning outcomes for different types of students.

The outcomes of this educational intervention seems to be associated with a different set of experiences which are related to a students age, their cultural background and wider professional and personal narratives.

For example
• Experience of working with a Black service user/ experiencing racism in a practice setting is associated with variance in C.A.S.
• Being a young student (<26) being a white mother of mixed race child seems to be associated with a particular type of engagement, level of confidence and different sets of learning outcomes.

However ‘race’ is a key explanatory variable in explaining and describing how this teaching and learning is experienced and understood.

The essence of my inquiry
Evidencing Positive Learning in Hard Times

Graph 1 Measuring the outcomes of diversity teaching (median)
Graph 2 Outcomes of an educational intervention (mean)

Confidence in working with BME Service Users

Graph 3 Outcomes of an educational intervention (mean)

Awareness of 'race' issues in social work practice
Graph 7: Types of Skills identified by students

Graph 8: Types of Issues identified by students

Types of 'race' issues identified in social work practice

- Poverty and Social Exclusion
- Specialist Black resources
- Access to culturally appropriate...
- Cross Cultural Communication
- Transcultural Practice Issues
- Immigration and asylum issues
- Racism
- Lack of cultural knowledge

POSITIVE PRACTICE IN HARD TIMES
Graph 9: Relevance of race equality for social work training

Relevance of racial equality for social work practice

POSITIVE PRACTICE IN HARD TIMES

Graph 10: How has this new learning been experienced

Has this module addressed your learning needs

Addressed learning needs

Yes | Maybe | No
---|---|---
White students | Black students

0 | 0 | 0
Reflections on tutor interviews (8n) - Ideal types, nature of insider research & institutional memory.

Disclosure, fear uncomfortable truths, similarities and differences

Student Group Interviews (3 groups) – different issues, concerns, expectations understanding. Reflections on critical incident analysis and sharing of personal narratives. Role of Group work module; Rochdale Case.

Homophobia & Perceived ‘hierarchies of oppression’

Role of emancipatory module leader in transformational learning

Reflections on legal status ‘UKBA CRD’. “frightened to challenge, having to be twice as good... keep quiet”

Experiences of Racism from Asian and White users

As a researcher a real concern about those absent white voices