

2 Review of the Literature

This review and the appended bibliography are primarily concerned with employee training in matters relating to race relations in Britain over the last 20 years. The use of the term 'employee' here includes people working at all levels: as we shall see, in many cases employees in management grades have been the recipients of training as well as shop-floor workers and office staff. The aim of this review is to provide a short guide to the development of race relations training in Britain and to the debates over principles and practice. The first section summarises the six best overviews of the subject and the second section discusses some of the more important themes and issues of the literature.

Overviews

The bibliography lists many articles, reports and books dealing with race relations training, but a few of them are particularly useful for an overview of developments in Britain over the last 20 years. They are:

Peppard 1980

McIlroy 1981

Shaw 1982

Peppard 1983

Lee 1987

Commission for Racial Equality 1987

Peppard 1980. This article was the first general look at the British race relations training scene. It argued that the provision was fragmented and that the whole subject received insufficient research and analysis. It called for an attempt to be made 'to formulate a rationale and some training models appropriate to this country', and ended with the warning that 'this is an area in which we can no longer afford to be amateurs.'

Peppard observed that so far training had been based on two premises: (i) that training was needed only for ‘practitioner services’ (that is, only in relation to service delivery) and (ii) that its aim was to improve the practitioners’ understanding of minority communities. The narrowness of this perspective of ‘multicultural awareness’ was, however, beginning to be recognised, with teacher training moving away from education for immigrant children and towards education for a multiracial society, and with the police and other agencies turning to consider issues of racial prejudice.

Peppard suggested that the practical objective of race relations training for employees should be ‘to enable staff to carry out their particular duties with equity and maximum efficiency.’ She suggested the necessary elements as (a) a common core of historical, psychological, legal and cultural background information, combined with (b) other subjects tailored to the particular occupational group. The second element should take on the issues of institutional racism and challenge attitudes and belief within the context of professional conduct:

A practical analysis of what is required clearly shows that those attitudes or beliefs which underlie actual behaviour must be seen as the heart of the matter and that to construct a training scheme which tries to ignore them is to beg the question.

Peppard classed training methods under three headings: didactic methods, groupwork methods and experiential methods. Didactic methods are those involving traditional teaching by a lecturer, and there have been mixed reports of their efficacy in reducing prejudice: Peppard cited research by Miller (1969) which suggested that lectures and discussions can reinforce racist attitudes rather than erode them, but she also cited later work by Bagley and Verma (1978) which suggested that teaching ‘may well be beneficial in reducing prejudice’ and at least does no harm. Peppard noted that much depends on the qualities of the lecturer, and on the extent to which the teaching can be rooted in the social world of the trainees. Groupwork techniques (such as those involving small group discussions, role playing and training games) have their origins in mainstream management training. In 1980 these techniques were not widely used for race relations training in Britain, except in the early developments around the idea of racism awareness training. Training that aimed to tackle attitudes about race had been gathering pace in the USA, in several

federal organisations and in the armed forces; in particular, Judy Katz had developed her 'White Awareness' programme at the University of Oklahoma. Experiential techniques are those which aim to modify prejudiced attitudes by inter-ethnic personal contact: by 'meeting, mixing, living and working with members of other ethnic groups.' Peppard noted that American research had, for example, shown a decline in prejudice after desegregation in housing, and that informal evidence suggested some success of the training technique in Britain. American trainers, however, had pointed to a problem (one that recurs in the literature) concerning the difficult position of the black people in such encounters: experiential training puts the responsibility for creating change on their shoulders.

Looking to the future, she pointed to some problems that would stand in the way of a simple application of American methods in this country, problems rooted in the different histories of race relations and different use of language. She also drew attention to the uncertain nature of the connection between individual prejudice and discrimination by organisations, suggesting that the issue was important to a clarification of the aims of race relations training. Calling for an assessment of what behaviour is meant to be influenced by training, the article asked:

Is it face-to-face dealings with ethnic minorities (e.g. by police officers, teachers, social workers), is it administrative procedures which will affect minorities, is it decision-making by high level policy-makers? If we can identify the areas where we think there is a danger of non-equitable or unjust behaviour by holders of key roles, we could move forward from that knowledge to discovering the perceptions, the information and the attitudes which underlie the specific behaviour.

McIlroy 1981. This article looked specifically at industry, welcoming the growth since the mid-1970s in the provision of race relations training and education for management and trade unions. Courses (or special components of more general courses) were run by employers, individual unions, the Trades Union Congress (TUC), the Industrial Training Boards (ITBs), the Industrial Language Training Units (ILTUs) and the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), falling into three categories: those for immigrants, dealing with communication and technical matters; those for black and white workers together, to ease integration, and largely dealing with communication; and those for managers and union officials, largely

about race relations in a broader sense, ranging from patterns of immigration to action on equal opportunities. The article focused on the third type of training – courses involving white decision-makers, which provide an opportunity for dealing with white racialism.

McIlroy noted that an influential approach to such courses at the time was to stick to the provision of technical information regarding race relations and the relevant legislation, and he argued that the approach leaves the prejudices of trainees untouched, or makes an unwarranted assumption that there are no such problems. Furthermore, there is a danger that the isolated provision of detailed information about the law may enable people to continue discriminating with less chance of being caught. McIlroy also warned that concentrating on the suggested solutions to the problem without an analysis of the problem itself could lead to a superficial compliance with the principles of equal opportunities without real commitment. As an example of the general approach, he cited the Rubber and Plastics ITB publication *Managing in the Multi-Racial Company* (RPITB, 1979), which dealt with many aspects of the legislation and equal opportunities but referred only once to prejudice and discrimination: that reference was to the problem of ‘British workers no longer applying for jobs when workers of ethnic minorities are employed’ – in other words, discrimination by job applicants, not by anyone in a position of power.

McIlroy questioned whether the accumulated experience of mainstream management training was a real resource for the development of race relations training in Britain, as Peppard had suggested. His view was that management training was too concerned with ‘maximising the existing organisational position within an economic and social status quo’, and that effective race relations training might require an approach that was too challenging to this managerial paradigm.

The article went on to consider the more sophisticated and increasingly common courses that anticipated the racist ideas of trainees and sought to change them. McIlroy pointed out that a problem often existed with this approach:

...many industrial tutors who accept this conception seem to operate on a rather simplistic conversion-process model in which the attitudes of students are transformed by a mix of ‘the facts’, patient rational

argument and the practical problems that they encounter in role play or case studies.

Racially prejudiced attitudes and behaviour are rather more complex than is suggested by this approach, and they usually exist within a framework of powerful influences in the workplace – influences much stronger than the effect of the ‘cleansing’ race relations course. The correct approach, McIlroy argued, should be more comprehensive than any to date, and the term ‘education and training’ would be an improvement: courses should incorporate more difficult subject matter with the straightforward information. He also argued that we should not expect to be able to eliminate racist ideas held by trainees, but merely to open their eyes and start the process of questioning. Finally he called for more resources for race relations training and education, and for it to be seen as only part of ‘an overall strategy of social change aimed at eradicating the roots of racialism’.

Shaw 1982. This article lamented the lack of unified philosophy and methodology behind race relations training, and behind its predecessor human relations training. It reviewed the techniques used in race relations training, drawing mainly (but not wholly) on US experience, and employing a distinction between ‘content techniques’, which aimed to impart information, and ‘process techniques’, which aimed to improve attitudes and skills. The distinction came from human relations training; in an earlier article he had noted that Peppard’s use of the term ‘didactic methods’ corresponded to the content techniques of human relations training, and her ‘groupwork’ and ‘experiential’ methods corresponded to process techniques (Shaw, 1980).

Looking first at attempts at total organisational change, Shaw discussed the examples of the US Army and the US Health Services and Mental Health Association (HSMHA). He pointed out that there were no UK examples to date. In 1972 the US Army began a programme which included compulsory ‘in-house’ awareness training at all levels, as well as policy changes. A built-in evaluation programme revealed that during the first two years of the programme there were improvements in the career advancement of black soldiers and in racial harmony, partly as a result of the measures taken. But subsequently those improvements tailed off, leaving blacks still in a substantially disadvantaged position, and the evaluation research showed that at army unit level the training was often poor and

commitment to it was weak: 'This case study shows that positive trends stabilised and improvement was halted as organisational commitment to the change programme declined.' Shaw cited the HSMHA as an example of successful change. Top management initiated a programme which began with the circulation of the equal opportunity objectives to all staff; the number of equal opportunities officers was increased, and they were involved in all appointments and promotions; equal opportunities councils were established; and all management staff were given three-day residential training courses on equal opportunities, based mainly on multi-ethnic groupwork, with a small amount of conventional teaching. An evaluation was carried out which showed that the programme led to 'marked improvements in equal opportunity.'

Shaw noted that most training schemes related to race have been pitched at a level less than a whole organisation – usually a small group or individual level. He stressed the value of conventional, substantive teaching on race and equal opportunities issues (content techniques), but argued that the motivation of trainees was of great importance, and that variations in this factor explained the contradictions among the earlier research findings (e.g. Miller vs Bagley and Verma). The adverse reaction by trainees who did not perceive a need for the training had been observed with a range of different methods, and not just with the content techniques. Shaw also stressed the importance of the trainer's credibility – trainers are most successful when they have understanding of and experience in the professional world of the trainee group. Process techniques were also reviewed in the article, but with less firm conclusions. Shaw considered evidence about the value of multi-ethnic discussion groups and role-playing, and although some successes were reported, other studies were less encouraging, and the results of nearly all were ambiguous.

He pointed to the combination of content and process techniques as the best way forward, and gave Katz's white awareness programme as a fruitful example of such a synthesis. He suggested that content and process should be balanced to reflect the needs of the particular organisation and trainees.

Shaw said that three fundamental questions arose from his review. First, whether there was any future in training programmes that were not tied to schemes for organisational change: he felt that there was not. The second question was whether training could be designed to

minimise an adverse reaction from white people: whilst unable to answer to this, Shaw pointed out that work on the US Army indicated that the damaging effects of any adverse reaction were balanced by the greater commitment shown by other trainees to equality and equal opportunity measures. The third question was whether the methods developed so far amounted to 'a sound basis on which to proceed.' He concluded that they did, but that the planning of training needed to become much more specific to the trainees' jobs.

Peppard 1983. In this article the considerable progress in the early 1980s was documented, and the contributions of many organisations and individuals were recorded. Peppard noted that in the absence of any widely-available body of information on techniques and materials, much of the development had been from scratch and the only co-ordination of effort was on an informal basis. She argued that on balance this was a good thing at the time because it encouraged new ideas and led to imaginative experimentation.

After the Scarman Report on the trouble in Brixton in 1981, race training in the police force saw major developments (these proved to be very influential in the general evolution of training in Britain). A working party set up to look at community relations training reported in 1983, recommending a more comprehensive approach and more imaginative training, including groupwork. New courses for trainers and a pilot project on racism awareness training were set up. A major initiative was the establishment of a centre to advise on and assist with police training in community relations. Some forces had already begun to change their training methods. In particular, the Metropolitan Police had adopted elements of the Human Awareness Training programme developed at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, covering interpersonal skills, community relations (including racism awareness) and self-awareness. Among the methods used were role-playing, games, exercises and the screening of videos. Meanwhile a series of annual seminars for senior officers of all forces had been running for several years at Holly Royde College of Manchester University.

Peppard listed a number of developments in other sectors, many of which reflected a diminishing emphasis on minority cultures and a growing interest in the ideas and methods of US-style racism awareness training. She pointed to training moves in the fields of education, social services, local authorities, the prison and probation

services, industry and the civil service. Training was organised by a variety of bodies, some of them specialising in this field, such as the Racism Awareness Programme Unit and the Northern Race Training and Intervention Unit, while others offered race training as only part of their work.

The US military experience, as described by Shaw above, was considered in this article too. Peppard acknowledged that the different histories of race relations diminished the applicability of American lessons in the UK, but said that the US evaluation reports often gave British trainers 'a sense of *deja vu*.' She listed five points of concurrence of trainers' experience on both sides of the Atlantic: (1) a well-prepared training programme will produce some change for the better; (2) the training has to be geared to the occupational situation of the trainees; (3) training has to be built on, and backed up by the efforts of people in power in the organisation; (4) training is better if its focus is widened from issues of race alone to issues concerning other types of discrimination and disadvantage; (5) race relations training must be part of a wider programme promoting equal opportunities within the organisation.

Problems of a peculiarly British origin had emerged in relation to the involvement of black people in training and in relation to terminology. The inter-ethnic ('experiential') elements of courses were limited by the small number of black staff in most organisations, and many groups of trainees were all white, giving an 'us and them' flavour to course discussions. Terminology caused problems because of the changing fashions over words in the race relations field and the different meanings given by different social and political contexts. Commending Banton's discussion (1983) of this issue, Peppard stated:

Trainers and other practitioners may well argue that they their control over the development of language is strictly limited and that they are constantly faced with fashionable usages and interpretations. Nevertheless, this kind of expert academic analysis is invaluable in reminding them of the importance of applying some rigour of thought to defining the premises on which they are constructing their training sessions.

The article also drew attention to three general questions: what is the primary aim of race relations training, what information should be got over to trainees, and how should training be evaluated? Should the primary aim be to change attitudes or to change behaviour?

Peppard's view was that the question itself is flawed: attitudes and behaviour are tied together in a way that makes their logical separation difficult to sustain. In practice, there are few jobs that really involve only 'playing it by the book', and most allow people a degree of discretion, and therefore even when people stick to the letter of their formal duties there is plenty of scope for prejudiced attitudes to find an outlet in discrimination. She also cites Southgate's research (1982) to argue that while it is very difficult to talk people out of their attitudes, training can make them sensitive to the impact of their language and non-verbal behaviour. The choice of what to include in the information element of courses is a more practical problem, because different occupations and different levels of seniority tend to demand different things: Peppard gave examples of social workers' need for cultural information and managers' need for information on the legislation and equal opportunities policy, and argued that the distinction between education and training is an important one in deciding what the balance should be between different types of information. Evaluation was the final issue considered in the article, but its importance was stressed:

Uncomfortable as it may be for instructors and organisers, training will never achieve maximum effectiveness if a smooth routine, accompanied by the filling in by participants of what cynical trainers call 'happiness sheets' at the end of the course, is interpreted as success, and if methods and results are never questioned.

Lee 1987. This paper was a review of two categories of training aimed at promoting equality of opportunity: first, training for ethnic minority workers (such as English language training for Asian workers, access courses and other kinds of positive action training) and secondly, training for white workers aimed at reducing institutional racism and improving interpersonal relationships between blacks and whites. One of her main arguments was that the positive action variety of training had not received enough emphasis and that its development from 1981 onwards had been limited, fragmented and uneven, even when compared with race training for whites. She also pointed out that training provision had developed against a specific social and economic background: the pace of change had been affected by the recession (training budgets had been cut generally) and by the riots of the early 1980s (which gave a particular spur to race training for whites in public organisations).

As regards race training for white workers, Lee pointed out that employers took a variety of approaches, ranging from an emphasis on personnel management competence to attempts to change employees' attitudes towards ethnic minorities; trainers' approaches varied too, from the provision of cultural information through to the use of personal confrontation. For example, the Industrial Language Training Units stressed cultural information when first working with white workers but moved later towards awareness training. This move had not proved simple, meeting resistance from employers and trainees; it was acknowledged that attitudes could not be changed in a six-week course, but positive attitudes could be encouraged and negative ones could at the same time be disturbed. The ILTUs emphasised the importance of work with the trainees after the course.

The paper noted many of the developments in the field during the 1980s. Race relations training was being organised in a growing number of organisations: among teachers; in the health service; in the prison service; in the police; in the probation service; in local authorities; and elsewhere. Lee briefly described the work of the Racism Awareness Programme Unit, which provided training for a variety of bodies, mainly in the public and voluntary sectors. The ILTUs had by then broadened their work to cover race relations training in service delivery, and the Department of the Employment's Race Relations Employment Advisory Service had also expanded into training work. But Lee was critical of the absence of any co-ordinated national training policy, and of the fact that race training tended to happen only because of the interest and commitment of individual organisations. She also noted that innovation was easier for some organisations than for others: some, like trades unions, had to make courses attractive to their members to gain their interest, while 'a professional service or organisation where there is a lead from the top is in a stronger position to take a radical approach.' She also commented on the general under-representation of black trainers in the growth of training for whites.

While pointing out that training could contribute to the elimination of racism, Lee warned that there was a danger of it being seen as a panacea. She cautioned that it might be used as an easy option to allay fears about unrest and to placate consciences without challenging the status quo. She argued that race relations training could not in its own right achieve fundamental structural change in an organisation, and

was only really effective as part of a general equal opportunity programme. This is a theme that emerges repeatedly in the literature. She was careful to point out what race relations training could do, however: it could hasten the implementation of changes, provide pressure to challenge the status quo, and attempt to shift attitudes. Training for ethnic minority workers – that is to say positive action training – could also enable them to operate more effectively, and to negotiate hurdles. A general equal opportunities effort within an organisation gave trainers greater authority and legitimacy in the eyes of trainees, while the training contributed to the general programme by providing a vehicle for heightening the awareness of managers and employees.

Commission for Racial Equality 1987. This publication is the CRE's current guide for employers seeking guidance about race-related training. It is in two volumes, the first dealing with issues of policy and planning and the second giving details of a number of cases studies, four from the UK and six from the USA and Canada. It is a practical guide rather than an academic review of developments, and it advises on good practice. It does, however, give brief and useful accounts of the various issues and arguments in the race training field. It concentrates on training for equal opportunities in the employment field and does not cover positive action training for ethnic minority employees or training for equality in service delivery.

The guide describes race-related training as covering four areas:

- providing information and advice on the implications of the relevant legislation and the Commission's Code of Practice;
- improving the ways in which both individuals and systems operate in a multi-racial society;
- increasing awareness of racism and prejudice, both at an individual and institutional level; and
- assisting staff to work in anti-racist ways.

It is stressed throughout that training should only be a part of a comprehensive equal opportunities strategy.

The guide lists the range of approaches that fall under the heading of race-related training: information sessions on the law and the Code of Practice; guidance on an organisation's equal opportunities policy and its practical application; guidance on discrimination and its

elimination in practice; information on cultural differences and their implications; attitudinal training ('racism awareness'); and training for management and personnel skills for equal opportunities. There is also variety in length and intensity of training, which ranges from a single session to a course of several days. The CRE warns that actual training approaches are not always recognisable from course and programme titles:

Phrases such as 'equal opportunity training,' 'race relations training,' 'racism awareness training,' 'multi-cultural awareness training' are used – often interchangeably – to cover a range of distinct activities...

Considering the debate over racism awareness training, the CRE gives a summary of the arguments put by proponents and opponents. It concludes with its own view that while the distinction between changing attitudes and changing behaviour is not as clear as it might appear at first, the fundamental aim of race-related training should be to 'contribute to the effective implementation of equal opportunity policies, ie the need to see a change in the behaviour of individuals and institutions,' and Katz-style racism awareness courses 'are thus not likely to play a major role in training programmes.' The guide states that training on 'cultural awareness' – on the background of the ethnic minority groups – can be helpful but care has to be taken that minority groups are not as a result portrayed as 'the problem.'

For organisations planning training, the CRE lists eight questions which it sees as key to an effective programme:

1. Why undertake training?
2. What needs analysis is required and what are the priority areas, by employee group?
3. What training and experience do the trainers require?
4. What are the objectives of each training session or programme?
5. What are the appropriate training methods and forms?
6. What is the relationship of race-related training to other training programmes?
7. How do training efforts interact with other steps the organisation should take to ensure effective implementation of its equal opportunity policy?
8. What evaluation needs to be undertaken?

The discussion of these questions in the CRE guide usefully draws together many of the problems mentioned by other authors and offers

practical guidance on them. One point made clear is the need for preparation in advance of any race-related training: for an appropriate allocation of time and resources to gather information and analyse the needs of the organisation at different levels before launching into a programme of courses, and for preparation of the ground within the organisation – to ensure management support in particular. Part one of the guide concludes with a reminder that effective race-related training can only be of use within a context of a general equal opportunities programme.

The case studies give details of the training schemes adopted in a number of organisations and shows how those schemes have related to their general equality programmes. The British examples are Austin Rover, GEC, the London Borough of Hackney, and an un-named large utility company. The examples demonstrate the variety of training approaches in different organisations. In Austin Rover, the scheme comprised a short course (half a shift) for nearly 5,000 managers, staff and manual representatives. GEC in Leicester organised a comprehensive programme for many levels of staff, calling on the services of the Industrial Language Training Unit, the Engineering ITB and a management college. Hackney designed an in-house training scheme to cover all their staff. The utility company also arranged in-house training, but for personnel and management staff only.

Themes and issues

Several general points need to be made about the articles and books on training in the area of race. First, the arguments about training methods are sometimes carried out at a high level of abstraction when they would make more sense related to particular organisational settings. For example, the wisdom of training staff to understand ethnic minority cultures is a subject of some general debate, but the implications of such training differ between types of organisation: the advantages and disadvantages of multicultural awareness training for medical staff are not the same as for shop floor workers in industry, or for local authority personnel staff. Whilst practical and technical points should not become the arbiters of debates over aims and principles, those debates cannot fruitfully be carried on without proper regard for the practical repercussions in specific organisational settings.

The second general point is a caution against judging the early literature on the basis of the recent, more sophisticated arguments. The debates have developed at a rapid pace, and the use of some words and phrases has taken on an importance that did not exist before: to take an obvious example, the use of the term 'racism awareness' in Britain in the early 1980s would not necessarily have been intended to carry the same meaning as it would today. Some of the arguments about aims and strategies still spill over into arguments about terminology; this can obscure the real substance of the debate and the real character of the training methods involved.

The third general point is that some authors firmly locate the development of race training in the history of other race-related events and other general socio-economic developments, among them the recession, the urban riots and the political changes in local government. Others confine their analysis to the developments in the training field.

Fourth, it should be noted that the US experience has greatly influenced the literature on race training in this country; the impact on the development of training in practice has also been substantial. The area of biggest influence has been awareness training, but there have been others, and it is likely that the practical experience of American employers will continue to provide examples of programmes that are of interest here.

Aims

Some of the authors make explicit the aims of training as they see them, while others imply or assume aims. It is useful here to make a distinction between the overall aim towards which training is meant to make a contribution – that of reducing the discrimination and disadvantage suffered by minority ethnic groups – and the specific shorter-term objectives that might be achieved by training. There seems to be no real disagreement about the overall long-term aim, and there is therefore little to be gained from comparing its different formulations, but the shorter-term objectives have varied a great deal. This is clear from some of the titles: *Training to Integrate the Multiracial Workforce*; *The Effectiveness of Teaching Techniques for Reducing Colour Prejudice*; *The Employment of Black Social Workers – from 'ethnic sensitivity' to anti-racism*. We have already noted that Peppard (1980) saw the objective of training as enabling staff to do

their jobs with equity and efficiency, McIlroy (1981) saw it as dealing with white racism, and Lee (1987) saw it as reducing institutional racism and improving inter-ethnic relationships.

Many of the authors stress the importance of an overall organisational strategy to reduce the effects of racism and discrimination, within which training is only a part. This points to a distinction between race-related training and some other types of training: whether or not it involves increasing skills, it is unlike training for specific technical skills (such as for typing or for the use of machine tools) because it is directed at changing the functioning of the organisation, not merely at making the individual a more qualified employee. Many stress that training alone is unlikely to generate change, but different authors place different values on the importance of changes at the individual level and the organisational level.

Part of the general package of organisational change may be positive action training for ethnic minority employees or job applicants, and this is sometimes included in the definition of race relations training. Whether the label is appropriate or not does not really matter, but it is important to understand the distinction between the two types of training. Positive action training provides skills and knowledge to individuals to improve their own opportunities, while race relations training is aimed at people who can affect the opportunities of others, and seeks to reduce discrimination and other acts and mechanisms of racial bias by giving skills and knowledge or by changing attitudes.

Another important distinction is between training to improve equality performance in service delivery, such as in council housing provision and banking services, and training to improve an organisation's equality performance in employment and personnel matters. For example, race relations training in the US army has been personnel oriented, while training in British police forces has focused on dealing with the public; thus the main experiences of these two uniformed services are in two different types of training.

Returning to the analysis of the shorter-term objectives of race relations training, we can see that different authors identify a number of them:

- Imparting cultural information to prevent misunderstandings at work (O'Brien and Gubbay, 1979);

Training for equality

- Imparting cultural information to enable service delivery staff to take account of the different needs of different ethnic groups (HEC/NEC, 1984);
- Making people aware of the history and mechanisms of racism and discrimination, and helping them to develop strategies to oppose racial injustice (TUC, 1983);
- Making people aware of racism underlying their own attitudes and behaviour at work, and helping them to develop strategies to undermine that racism (Edmunds and Powell, 1985);
- Uncovering individual racist attitudes and trying to change them (Satow, 1982);
- Developing skills and encouraging work practices designed to stop discrimination against ethnic minorities in recruitment, promotion and other personnel practices (Carby and Thakur, 1977);
- Developing skills and encouraging work practices designed to stop discrimination against ethnic minorities in service delivery (Housing Training Project, 1980);
- Explaining the meaning of an organisation's equal opportunities programme and the duties that it puts on individuals in the organisation (Schneider, 1987);
- Explaining the race relations legislation and its implications both for the organisation and for the individual's own duties (CRE, 1987).

The literature reveals a general historical trend in the race training field which begins with an emphasis on cultural and legal information, moves through a period of interest in changing employees' attitudes, and then to a period where there is more emphasis on procedures and the duties of employees and managers. To some extent this trend has been the result of a gradual learning process among people working in the field, but it has also been accompanied by passionate debates over short-term aims and over methods. One of the central arguments has been about the relative importance of individuals' views and their actions at work. The debate over 'changing attitudes versus changing behaviour' revolves around a number of problems, including: the nature of racism; the mechanisms of discrimination; the strength and direction of the causal links between attitudes and behaviour; the

malleability of personal attitudes; the extent of management control over the actions of individuals; the proper limits of an employer's concern with an employee's views and beliefs; and the connections between efficiency and equity of outcome. Many of these problems also emerge in the more specific argument over the training courses based on Judy Katz's white awareness programme, which we consider later.

Analysis of needs and evaluation of outcomes

Many of the sources point out that training has to be tailored to the needs of the organisation, and therefore an essential prerequisite for training is a 'needs analysis' to determine what its short-term aims should be. This is stressed by the writers who argue the importance of considering training as just one component of organisational change. Needs analysis is an area where an outside trainer's job spills over into general advice and help with equal opportunities.

Just as needs have to be examined, so do outcomes, but the evaluation of race relations training presents severe methodological problems. What measurable benefits are expected to emerge from the training? The answers depend partly on the long-term and short-term aims of the training, but they only lead us to further problems. If the long-term aim is (as we suggest is generally agreed) to reduce the discrimination and disadvantage suffered by people from ethnic minorities, then operational success should be gauged in terms of the achievement of targets and by other monitoring procedures. But that level of success will be the result of many things, and training is only one among them. Isolation of the precise contribution of training is not possible within a single organisation. If the short-term aims of training are concerned with individual change, then evaluating the real impact of the course is just as difficult: what constitutes an effective measure of change? 'Testing' people on the subject matter of the course is not the answer, because most people are capable of giving the 'correct answers' after a short course, irrespective of any lasting effect it may or may not have had. Evaluation has most commonly been considered in terms of changes in responses to batteries of attitude scales. This approach works on the assumption that the short-term aim of training is to produce a shift of attitudes, but even working with this assumption we can see there are difficulties in accepting an 'improvement' in scores as evidence of a real change in

attitude, because once they have been on a course trainees may well give answers they know to be favoured. Another common approach is to ask trainees whether they think the training has been helpful and what they feel about different aspects of it. Whilst useful things can be learned from the comments of trainees, they cannot constitute an evaluation of whether the training has achieved its objectives.

An argument has been put forward that considerable attention is paid to the evaluation of race training while other sorts of training remain unassessed and unquestioned:

...realistically speaking, no one would demand that efforts be made to evaluate management development training per se. It is accepted that different models and approaches suit different organisations and individuals. It is hard then to justify such a demand on racism awareness training unless of course institutional racism is in operation to control and contain something which many black trainers understand, but many white trainers find threatening. (Celia Turton of the LGTB, in the report on the CRE seminar on racism awareness training, 1985.)

There may be some strength in the political argument here: considering the limited amount of race relations training that has taken place in this country, the interest in the evaluation of its results has been far greater than would have been expected from the attention previously paid to the evaluation of training in subjects such as health and safety, management techniques and general personnel practices. That disproportionate interest might in some cases come from a suspicion of black professionals 'interfering' in the running of white organisations. However, in other cases it is likely to come from a genuine concern to understand the contribution that training can make towards achieving equality of opportunity, given the very limited success that other measures have so far produced. The main appeal of objective evaluation lies in the hope that it might settle the arguments between competing training principles and methods; often authors claim that particular approaches are the right ones and that other approaches are counter-productive. The arguments are carried out in the literature on the basis of personal training experience or argument from first principles. Little hard evidence of outcomes is brought to bear on the debates.

Racism Awareness Training

The question of the effectiveness of racism awareness training has generated more words than any other single issue in the literature. The argument is plagued with confusions because the term has meant different things to different people at different times. Course titles have picked up the terms ‘race awareness’, ‘racism awareness’ and ‘racial awareness’ with no consistency, and during the period when racism awareness training was a fashionable label it was often attached to any kind of training in the field of race. Recently, however, the indiscriminate use of the term has subsided. Our use of the term should be made clear: the discussion below concerns the training principles and methods based on the ‘White Awareness’ programme developed by Judy Katz in the USA. The term ‘racism awareness training’ was taken up by trainers who were incorporating Katz’s ideas and material into programmes for tackling racism in this country.

Katz’s book *White Awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training* was first published in 1978, and comprised an explanation of the programme’s origins and workings and an extensive programme of exercises designed to take white American trainees through a six-stage course. The long-term aims and immediate objectives are best described in Katz’s own words:

The over-all objectives of the program are to help Whites become aware of how racism affects their lives and to help them to change their racist attitudes and behaviours. The program strives to help Whites understand that racism in the United States is a White problem and that being White implies being racist. This understanding is achieved most successfully through (1) confrontation – identifying the discrepancies that exist between what one says and what one does – and (2) a reeducation process – examining history and perspectives through new perceptual filters... If the goals of this program are reached, by the end of the workshop the participants will be able to:

1. Name and clearly define the concepts of bias, bigotry, prejudice, and racism.
2. Describe and examine racism in its institutional, cultural, and individual forms.
3. Identify and articulate personal feelings and fears around the issue of racism.
4. Define ways in which one’s own attitudes and behaviors are representative of racism in the United States.
5. Develop and act on specific strategies designed to combat racism on an institutional and individual level.

Katz's emphasis on the discrepancies between what people say and what they do is a corner-stone of her approach. After reviewing 1960s and 1970s research on racism and personality, she extends the analysis of Gunnar Myrdal's 1944 classic study 'An American Dilemma' to the level of individual psychiatry. Myrdal wrote about the contradiction between American constitutional ideals and the racism which is so evident in American history and in its contemporary social order. Myrdal called this a 'deep cultural and psychological conflict'; Katz goes further and argues that it is a disease. It is this pathological approach to racism that leads Katz's programme to place so much emphasis on the individual.

...All these analyses clearly indicate that racism is a critical and pervasive form of mental illness... it becomes sadly evident that the psychological disorder racism is deeply embedded in White people from a very early age on both a conscious and unconscious level. The disease has locked them in a psychological prison that victimises and oppresses them every day of their lives.

Katz's course is made up mainly of pair and group exercises that are conducted over several days. The programme is intended to be staffed by one or two facilitators with a 'deep understanding of racism'.

In the early 1980s Katz's book provided an exciting focus for the development of race-related training in Britain. Trainers working mainly in the public sector enthusiastically took up and adapted elements of the programme (Satow, 1982; CRE, 1984; Edmunds and Powell, 1985). One reason for its popularity was its practical accessibility: here, in one volume, was a package of principles, objectives and model exercises. In his critique of the movement, Ahmed Gurnah pointed out that its practicality had a political sense too:

It appears to address racism not only at the state and institutional level, as do most political activists and academic sociologists, but it is also rightly concerned with people's personal experiences of racism. But in both structural and individual cases, it addresses racism as a practical problem. Particularly after the summer 1981 black rebellions, we cannot over-estimate the appeal of practical solutions to institutional and personal racism. (Gurnah, 1984)

Before long, however, a considerable amount of criticism of racism awareness training emerged, from a number of different directions. First in line were the criticisms from the 'race and class'

political stance of the Institute of Race Relations (IRR) which took issue with the basic aims of racism awareness training and saw its development as the latest component of a systematic disabling of the emergent black leadership in the anti-capitalist struggle (Wilson, 1984; Sivanandan 1985). But critiques grounded in more orthodox views of the aims of race relations training started to appear at almost the same time, questioning the psychological and organisational principles of racism awareness training and arguing that its methods did not, after all, offer useful practical solutions to training problems (Gurnah, 1984; Southgate 1984; Banton, 1985; Jervis, 1986).

The IRR developed a precise and well-researched critique of racism awareness training, but it is concerned with the problems of revolutionary socialism, and its arguments are not aimed at the improvement of race relations training; some of the arguments would be equally critical of any other kind of race training, and amount to opposition to the analgesic effect of social reforms that absorb activists into the state apparatus. It is surprising, therefore, that a number of articles subsequently cite Sivanandan's critique as a seminal work in the post-Katz development of race training theory. Gurnah's critique is also political, in the sense that it condemns racism awareness training for diverting energies away from anti-racist action and towards a wallowing in middle-class guilt, but it does acknowledge that training and education are important, and that (some) progress can be made as a result of local authority anti-racist programmes. He also criticises the moral atmosphere of the racism awareness course:

The tone of RAT is often accusatory and appears to put people on the spot, in order that they may confront themselves. In this sense, it is highly moralistic. Sometimes, what RAT lacks in content, it makes up in highmindedness... The implication is that whites must be made to feel and accept their guilt, whatever else they actually do. This approach is mistaken because individual guilt rarely leads to positive action; and then, it is unclear that even if it did, that it would constitute the right kind of action.

He suggests other negative consequences of racism awareness training: it can arm white officials with the acceptable language of anti-racism and thereby make them free to discriminate unchallenged, and it can unintentionally encourage tokenism. In these respects, it can help the state to cope with black criticisms and manage them more effectively, rather than respond to them genuinely.

The moral tone of racism awareness training is a theme taken up by others. It should be noted that Katz's stated intention was to avoid using guilt as a training tool:

Unlike many racism awareness programs, this program is not designed to produce guilt or to confront people in a way that 'puts them down.' Guilt often serves to entrench people in their attitudes – to keep them feeling sorry for themselves or others. (Katz, 1978)

In practice, at least some of the training programmes seem to have taken the opposite tack, and critics say that it leads to two problems. Among some trainees, it leads to entrenchment of racist attitudes (as Katz predicted), and, among others, it encourages a perverse lust for guilt and the ritual cleansing of exposure. The popular press have at times been quick to seize on the more lurid stories about racism awareness courses, generally distorting the facts and contributing to a negative image of the whole idea of race training, but there is no doubt that guilt, confrontation and anger have played their part on some of the courses:

The confrontational aspect of RAT is its most potent weapon. It allows for the unburdening of hidden fears and insecurities – and in the process opens a Pandora's Box of accusation, tears and self-recrimination... Resistance to RAT can be difficult. Silencing techniques, the groundswell of group emotion and the use of emotively tinged sociological terminology thinly defined, effectively cuts out critics who attempt to put forward a broader analysis – criticism can be attributed to defensive prejudice. Thus some participants are forced to leave under a cloud while others go through the process but emerge confused, unable to divorce this from their guilt. Others feel angry and resentful – at one particular session participants were required to wear badges stating 'I am a white racist'. (Jervis, 1986)

Vernon Harris, replying to Jervis, argues that the criticisms of confrontational approaches are based on the white mode of arguing (dispassionate, impersonal, non-challenging, and based on the 'myth of open-mindedness'), and fail to appreciate the black mode (animated, interpersonal, and confrontational). He argues that confrontation reveals the relationship between personal racism and institutional racism:

The process of confrontation, if successful, makes it exceedingly difficult if not impossible for white people to regard institutional

racism as an extra-human construct, thereby absolving themselves of all responsibility. (Harris, 1987)

Michael Banton (1985) argues to the contrary that racism awareness training fails precisely because it cannot respect 'the boundary between a person's private opinions and that person's competence on the job.' The concept of 'racism', as it is often used now, mixes up prejudice, discrimination and wrong beliefs, and this leads to a misunderstanding of the objectives of training.

Most of the debate about racism awareness training is impressionistic or based on argument from first principles. There is little systematic attempt to assess its successes and failures. Katz's own evaluations were based on pre-course and post-course psychological testing, and showed statistically significant 'improvements' in attitudes. Peter Southgate's study (1984) of courses organised for the police relied on observation by the researcher and reports of the trainees on their experiences; his findings were fairly critical of the exercise, but his conclusions about the future value of racism awareness training were equivocal. From a training perspective, the bulk of the criticisms of racism awareness courses relate to the weakness of the link between the 'conversion' of individuals' attitudes and changes in the way black people are treated by organisations. Although it has generated a lot of heat and noise, racism awareness training has not been seen as very efficient engine of change. It is wrong to see the argument as being simply between trying to change attitudes and trying to change behaviour. None of the advocates of racism awareness training have been concerned with attitudes alone – they have seen behavioural change as the ultimate objective, but have seen attitude change as a vital prerequisite. The real issue is whether racism awareness training can be successful as a first step on the road to reduction of individual and organisational discrimination.

Although the critics of racism awareness training seem to have won the day, recent commentaries have suggested that the more useful elements of the idea have been incorporated in courses with a broader perspective. Rather than reject the whole idea, trainers have inserted some coverage of attitudes and beliefs into courses that focus primarily on the organisation rather than on the individual. Both Tonkin (1987) and Alibhai (1988) argue that this has long been the case, and that 'pure' racism awareness training has been the exception rather than

the rule. Evidence of the eclectic approach is to be found within the literature, in accounts of practical experience. For example, Edmunds and Powell (1985) describe the evolution of a multi-racial social work course over the previous five years, and while they acknowledge their debt to Katz's exercises, their approach was open and experimental, pulling in resources from different training traditions. Although they introduced a racism awareness strategy in order to move away from the narrow multi-cultural approach of previous courses, they kept an important multi-cultural component in their course.

Even in its brief heyday, RAT was never a single entity, but a family group of methods. Applications within SSDs proved to be more eclectic than its critics allow. In practice, RAT and the antiracist training (ART) now favoured by some authorities often share common features, including the stress on the personal dimension of beliefs about race. (Tonkin, 1987)

In many ways, too, the critics on the left and right have been shooting at an animal that does not exist, wounding others in the process. (Alibhai, 1988)

Practical issues

Splitting issues of theory and principle from issues of practice is in some ways an arbitrary process. However, there are several practical matters which are mentioned in the literature and can usefully be grouped together here to balance the preceding discussion of training principles.

Levels of staff. Which staff in an organisation should receive training related to race? Much of the British literature of practical training applications relates to front-line service delivery (for example, police officers and social workers) or to shop-floor workers and supervisors; in the more general commentaries, however, there is often reference to the need for commitment at higher levels of organisations, where people have more power to change things, and therefore a need for training at managerial grades. Some organisations already have general training programmes which naturally affect a greater proportion of junior staff than they do senior staff; where race training is fitted in with other training it is bound to have a bigger impact on the lower grades, and special measures would need to be taken to draw in more senior staff.

There are indications that training has in practice embraced a growing spectrum of staff levels as the cultural-awareness perspective

has given way to an emphasis on racism and discrimination, and as the focus of concern has widened to cover employment as well as service delivery. In all of the examples given in the CRE training guide the training was given at managerial level as well as other levels.

How much is race training informed by other types of training? It is very difficult to tell how far the practical development of training in the race area has been influenced by the theory and practice of other types of training – for example, training in effective management or training for specific professions such as social work. Some of the race training articles and books refer to texts on other areas of training, but the overall impression is that race training either started from scratch in its search for techniques, or absorbed lessons from elsewhere without acknowledging the process.

Integration of race training into other training. The literature shows that race training has in some instances been incorporated into a course or programme that covers other aspects of a persons' job, and in other instances been organised as stand-alone training. There is little discussion over which is preferable, but in terms of the training written about, the balance is in favour of stand-alone courses or programmes.

Training techniques. Between them, Peppard and Shaw provide adequate concepts for describing the range of training techniques used. Didactic methods (conventional teaching involving lectures and note-taking) are counterposed to groupwork methods (group exercises and discussions) and experiential methods (learning from inter-ethnic contacts); conventional teaching and learning from reference material can be called content techniques, while self-discovery exercises, groupwork and experiential learning can be called process techniques.

As race relations training has become more common, the balance has shifted away from conventional teaching and towards process techniques, although it is an open question how much workplace-based race training ever relied solely on formal lectures. The accounts of the development of training in the local authorities and other parts of the public sector show that discussions and exercises form the backbone of training. The design of the exercises and the 'management' of the discussions by trainers is critical to their success: the risk is that trainees merely thrash around in their own prejudices and lack of information, but good exercises and trainers will use them as starting-points for developing a better understanding. In fact the

exercises and workshops described in the case studies in the CRE guide show that there is a large 'content' element in the practical implementation of process methods: most sessions have a large substantive input from the trainer or built into the exercise. The same is true for the exercises in the 'White Awareness' programme.

Starting in the trainees' world. Training that goes over people's heads is of no use, whatever the subject. It is clear from the literature that trainers are more successful when their approach is rooted in the professional and social worlds of the trainees. The possibility of a negative, defensive response is minimised by ensuring that the training 'syllabus' and language takes account of (without necessarily accepting) the 'realities' of the job as perceived by the trainees. It is unclear, however, whether trainers who have a deep understanding of the professional tasks involved have an advantage over those who can retain some distance.

Follow-up. The strongest item of consensus in the race training literature is the need for training to be a part of a larger process of change in an organisation. In practice, this does not only mean that courses should be run within the context of an overall equal opportunities programme; it also means that in many cases individual trainees are involved in some kind of follow-up after the course.