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Abstract

This thesis explores the effects of forced migration on the educational aspirations of relocated Montserratian students in British schools. It first discusses the circumstances that influenced migration to the UK, particularly from the latter half of 1997, then compares and contrasts the educational experiences of relocated student to those of other African Caribbean and refugee migrant groups.

As a British Dependent Territory Overseas (BDTO), the way of life in Montserrat has been guided and influenced by its status as a country under British jurisdiction. Yet, Montserratians have no formal citizenship rights and have therefore been positioned in a political limbo. Expectations from home and school create a constant struggle for relocated students as they juggle a range of conflicting identities. The thesis argues that a clash of ambiguous identities has forced relocated migrants to rethink and reconstruct a sense of place, as well as redirect thoughts on educational goals and aspirations.

Fieldwork conducted with relocated students, their parents/guardians and teachers has revealed that the effects of forced migration have affected relocated students’ educational aspirations. The high levels of achievement motivation that students had prior to relocation, have been greatly diminished due to several in-school and out-of-school factors. The thesis identifies the fragmentation of the Montserrat community as a major contributing factor. It also discusses the strategies that the UK-based Montserrat community groups and organisations have implemented in an effort to restore and sustain relocated students’ pre-migration levels of achievement motivation, via a sense of an ‘island’ community.

Finally, the thesis considers the main arguments against the backdrop of relocated migrants’ perceptions of achievement, and their implications for future research, policy and practice.
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Glossary

Ash: Volcanic particles less than 4 mm in diameter.

‘Centres’: The accommodation provided by the Ministry of Education, Montserrat, to conduct classes in the safe zone after the April 1996 official evacuation from all areas South of Belham Valley. The ‘centres’ were a combination of private buildings and tents.

Danger zone: Restricted area due to high levels of volcanic activity. See Appendices VI - X.

Exceptional Leave to Remain (ELR): The immigration status granted at the discretion of the Home Secretary, for ‘humanitarian or administrative reasons’. Relocated Montserrat immigrants were initially granted two years ELR. Because of the ongoing volcanic crisis, from June 1, 1998, relocated immigrants were granted indefinite ELR.

Lava dome: Rounded, steep-sided mounds built by very viscous magma, usually either dacite or rhyolite. Such magmas are typically too viscous (resistant to flow) to move far from the vent before cooling and crystallizing. Domes may consist of one or more individual lava flows. Although lava domes are built by non-explosive eruptions of viscous lava, domes can generate deadly pyroclastic flows.

Levels in the Montserrat School System: There are four levels: (i) pre-primary or nursery (1 to 5 years); (ii) primary (5 to 11+); (iii) secondary (11+ to 16); and (iv) tertiary or post secondary.

Montserrat Community Support Trust: The Montserrat Project was renamed the Montserrat Community Support Trust (a registered charity) in February 1999. The focus became consolidation, education, community development, training and employment.


Phreatic Eruption: A steam-driven explosion that occurs when water beneath the ground or on the surface is heated by magma, lava, hot rocks, or new volcanic deposits (for example, tephra and pyroclastic-flow deposits). The intense heat of such material (as high as 1,170° C for basaltic lava) may cause water to boil and flash to steam, thereby generating an explosion of steam, water, ash, blocks, and bombs.
Pyroclastic flow: High-speed avalanches of hot ash, rock fragments, and gas that move down the sides of a volcano during explosive eruptions or when the steep edge of a dome breaks apart and collapses. These pyroclastic flows, which can reach 1500 degrees F and move at 100-150 miles per hour, are capable of knocking down and burning everything in their paths.

Relocated students: Students who migrated from Montserrat to the UK after the volcanic crisis began on 18 July 1995.

Relocated parents: Parents of the relocated students, who migrated from Montserrat to the UK after the volcanic crisis began on 18 July 1995.

Safe zone: The area considered to be free from ‘danger’ of volcanic activities. See Appendices VI - X.

‘Shelterees’: Persons who were housed in the ‘shelters’ as a result of internal displacement.

‘Shelters’: The accommodation in churches and school buildings in the safe zone provided by the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC), for persons who were internally displaced because of the volcanic activities.

Students: In this study ‘students’ refer to all children of school-going age. In Montserrat, children at all levels of the school system are referred to as students.

The London Forum: An association of Montserrat community action groups, co-ordinated by Janice Panton, Officer at MGUKO, representing members of the following associations:
• Hackney Montserrat Association (HMA);
• Keep Montserrat Alive (KMA);
• Montserrat Action Committee ’89 (MAC’89);
• Montserrat Overseas Progressive Peoples Alliance (MOPPA);
• The Montserrat Community Support Trust (MCST).

The Montserrat Project: Established in January 1998 in London for the purpose of offering advice and support to Montserratian evacuees who had opted to settle in the United Kingdom as a result of the volcanic activity in Montserrat. It is administered by Refugee Action, a sub-organisation of The Refugee Council.

The UK Montserrat community: All Montserratians living in the UK –migrants who arrived after the volcanic explosions of the late 1990s, as well as post-war economic migrants and their descendants.
Map of the Caribbean Islands

(Location of Montserrat in Relation to its Caribbean Neighbours)
Montserrat – Pre 1995: Before the Soufriere Hills Volcano Erupted
Montserrat – Post 1995: 'Safe' and Danger Zone Division -
Northern, Daytime Entry and Exclusion Zones
Chapter 1
Introduction

I open my eyes and see our trek from our LITTLE BAY,
Heading northwards.
A large bite of the apple, evacuating ourselves from the
Promised Land to the land of promise.
In vain I look for the ancestors of those who will return,
But I am blinded, for I weep, I weep for them and I weep for us who
remain.
(Karney Osborne 1998:95)

Introduction

This thesis examines the effects of forced migration on the educational aspirations of relocated Montserratian students in London schools in the late 1990s. The factors that have affected the relocated secondary school students' educational aspirations entail 'homelessness' and the loss of the Montserrat community. Additionally, they have experienced negative aspects of fractured identities to which stereotyped ideas of teachers and fellow students in the UK have contributed. The thesis relates how the adjustment by relocated Montserratian migrants to the ever changing circumstances brought about by their forced migration has necessitated the construction of new, multiple identities. It also explains how assuming these new roles sometimes brought about identity clashes and conflicts with Montserratian cultural values that too, have impacted on relocated students' educational aspirations. This chapter outlines the historical context of this study, the rationale for researching the educational experiences of the post 1995 Montserratian migrants and the aims of the study. It details the research questions that were developed to help me to achieve these aims, the significance of the research, and the structure of the thesis.

Historical Context and Rationale for the Research

In the 1990s, migration from Montserrat in the Eastern Caribbean to the UK was not a new phenomenon. About two decades into the post-war period, approximately 4000 economic Montserratian migrants were living in England (Philpott 1973:32). A new form of 'forced migration' began after the awakening of the Soufriere Hills Volcano on July 18, 1995. Chapter 5 will highlight the major volcanic activities that led to forced migration.
The rationale for undertaking this research has a two-fold dimension – moral and academic. Moral because of my alliance with the relocated informants, and academic because this research can add to the body of literature on forced-migrant groups.

I arrived in the UK as a post graduate students about the same time when the exodus from Montserrat to the UK began. In 1998 for my MA degree, I conducted an investigation that provided a general picture of the educational experiences of relocated students in the UK (Shotte 1998b). Embedded in the several pertinent issues that emerged from that study, were concerns about identity and community that are linked to educational achievement. This research has its genesis in that work.

My experience as a teacher at three (primary, secondary and tertiary) of the four levels in the Montserrat education system, has allowed me to build a 'special' relationship with many students, undoubtedly influenced by the milieu of a small, close-knit community. It has also afforded me countless opportunities to assist these and other students during the first critical months of the crisis. For these students, the pre-migration period was one burdened with trauma, stress and physical discomfort. My school and community experiences with the students during the volcanic crisis, coupled with a genuine concern for the students’ educational and general welfare, have moved me to investigate their educational experiences in the UK, with a view to providing pertinent information to the persons who can assist them to progress. Although by legal definition (See Chapter 7), the relocated Montserrat children are not refugees, generally, they have been so labelled and thus, inadvertently have become victims of political and social circumstances that may impede their educational aspirations and progress.

**Complaints and Concerns**

From early 1998, numerous complaints and concerns relating to students educational progress were reported by parents, social workers, teachers and other concerned citizens to the Montserrat Government United Kingdom Office (MGUKO) and Montserrat Community Support Trust (MCST). These complaints revealed that relocated students were experiencing educational problems of various kinds, and that their parents were deeply concerned about their children's educational plight. This situation seems a delicate irony since many parents’ decisions to relocate to the UK rather than another Caribbean island -
or even Canada and the United States of America (USA) were influenced by the widely accepted notion that a 'British education is best'. Moreover, it was generally thought that the transition from the Montserrat to the British education system would have been a smooth one since Montserrat remains a British Dependent Territory (BDT), and to a large extent operates within the confines of that status.

In 2001, four years after the 1997 exodus from Montserrat, parents' high hopes and aspirations were yet to be realised. Feelings of disappointment and frustration remained common. In response to complaints, the London Forum, a Montserrat organisation, coordinated three education workshops during the summer of 1999 (June 26, July 20 and August 24), to address parents' concerns. This study was further influenced by the workshop reports, which revealed that students were intensely worried about their educational progress, and parents equally distressed over the depleted levels of achievement motivation among relocated students (Shotte 1999a). Achievement motivation for this study simply means the desire to succeed or achieve educationally – to accomplish something and this concept permeates the development of this study. Concepts of achievement and achievement motivation are discussed in Chapter 8.

Based on past experiences, I contend that Montserratian students' high levels of achievement motivation were sustained before, and during the crisis by a robust home-school-community network. This echoes Kaprielian-Churchill and Churchill's reference to Boothby & Steinbock's analysis of their study on unaccompanied refugee children (Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill 1994:101). With regards to fostering emotional stability and general well-being among children, they refer to the family, community and school as the first, second and third rings of security, respectively. In the close-knit, Montserrat community context, these three rings, although physically separated, often operated as a single unit. This meant that in some instances, Boothby & Steinbock's 'positions' of security were shifted to fit the circumstances in which the 'players' found themselves. For example, sometimes the school or the community represented the first 'ring of security', in that either of them takes on the responsibility of the family. At other times they were rolled into one, that is, operating as a unified 'ring of security'. It was this flexibility within a cohesive network that had helped to promote and sustain students' high levels of achievement motivation in Montserrat, as is discussed in Chapter 8. However, it was this
that appeared to have been damaged through forced migration. It was this concern that prompted the research on which this thesis draws.

**Aims and Research Questions**

This study has three main aims. They are:

- To explore some key educational experiences of relocated Montserratian secondary school students in London schools;

- To assess the impact of these experiences on the relocated students' educational aspirations;

- To add an educational dimension to the literature on relocated Montserratian migrants' experiences in the UK.

To help me to achieve these aims, I developed a set of research questions that are directly related to the main issues to be explored. The development of the research questions for this study are grounded in Creswell's position on developing research questions for a qualitative study - a single, overarching question and several sub-questions (Creswell 1998:106). The central question for my research is, how have reformations of identity and community among relocated Montserratians in the UK since 1995, affected relocated students' educational aspirations?

I view the issue of relocation to the UK as important because it has transformed the lives of these Montserratians in unimaginable ways. Relocated Montserratian migrants, as a community, were forced to make a transition from a more settled and predictable past to a different and as yet, unpredictable future. Such a transition inevitably necessitates unexpected and rapid adjustments to a foreign culture. In such circumstances, existing identities are transformed and new ones are created. There is a correlation between identity and community since cultural, ethnic and national identity, suggest a sense of community and play a vital role in the construction of personal identity (Coelho 1998; Davidson 1996; Camino 1994). To research relocation issues therefore, implies a preoccupation with identity and community.
My interest in the relocated students' educational aspirations is directly related to relocation, identity and community. This interest is born out of concern for the maintenance of cultural values, which, over the past century have helped to shape a Montserrat identity. Ingrained in these values are aspirations for educational success in a national context where education extends beyond formal schooling and embraces the totality of human potential. This brings into focus the achievement motivation issue, for the average Montserrat student's desire to succeed was also fuelled by successful participation in village and/or island community activities that have been an integral part of his/her overall educational experiences.

The sub-questions seek to explore the ways in which the participants interpret the world in which they find themselves (Cohen & Manion 1996:8). They are:

- How do relocated Montserratian students describe their educational experiences?
- How do teachers describe the educational experiences of relocated Montserratian students?
- What are relocated parents' perspective of their children's educational experiences?
- How do relocated Montserratian students' educational experiences compare and contrast with those of other migrants, particularly refugees and African Caribbean students, in British schools?

By addressing the major concerns of the study, the sub-questions have expanded and illuminated the overarching question as well as the aims of the thesis.

**Significance of the Study**

Several people have written about various aspects of the Montserrat volcanic crisis - political implications and imperial neglect (Pattullo 2000; Skelton 2000), migration and settlement (Aymer 1999; Sives 1999; Skelton 1999; Skinner 1999), evaluation reports of Her Majesty Government's (HMG) response to the crisis (DFID 1999) and policy recommendations to the Government of Montserrat (GoM) (Panton & Archer 1996). But there is no direct focus on education in this literature. There are, however, widely circulated unofficial reports among the relocated community, about the numerous problems that relocated students are experiencing. Undoubtedly, the aforementioned aspects procure
important documentary and historical reviews in their areas. I deem an investigation into
the educational aspect of the crisis as equally significant.

Researching the educational experiences of Montserratian students in British schools can
provide much needed information for all interest groups in the education system. Among
the many interest groups, the following beneficiaries are my primary targets: policy makers,
education planners, curriculum developers, administrative and management officials,
principals, headteachers and teachers, parents and students.

It should be noted that the above-named groups are not ranked in order of importance. On
the contrary, the students, although listed last, should appear very high on the agenda since
they are the ones who will ultimately benefit from an efficient, well-structured education
system. It is not only imperative for education officials and teachers to have background
information of the students’ traumatic experiences prior to relocation to the UK, but also to
have a sound knowledge of such students’ educational past. Such information will allow
teachers and education officials to provide the necessary assistance for the students as they
‘strive for excellence’ in a new and ‘foreign’ learning environment.

One of the goals of MCST is “to enable the resettlement efforts of Montserratians and
enhance their social, economical and cultural well being” (MCST 1999:5). MGUKO strives
to inform national policy for the benefit of the Montserratian community (GoM 1998b).
The findings of this research are intended to provide MCST and MGUKO with some of the
information needed to help them to achieve their goals.

The Structure of the Thesis
The thesis is presented in ten chapters. The introductory chapter has discussed the
contextual background against which the study is set and explains the rationale, aim,
research questions and significance of the thesis. Having identified the main themes under
discussion, Chapter 2 frames these themes in a theoretical context by way of a literature
review. It illustrates the interrelationship that exists among the themes and discusses how
this interconnection plays out in various circumstances. Chapter 3 relates how I proceeded
to find answers to the research questions identified in Chapter 1. It describes methods and
procedures of data collection and analysis that were used in the research process. **Chapter 4** presents a historical review of the cultural milieu from which the relocated students come. It highlights some political, economical and social (educational and cultural) aspects of Montserrat society. **Chapter 5** describes the ongoing volcanic crisis and circumstances that influenced islanders' decisions to relocate. The chapter also explores how the society has functioned in the wake of disasters and the considerations that were given to migration - internal and external, forced and 'voluntary'. **Chapter 6** focuses on the school experiences of relocated Montserratian students. It links the 'invisibility' of relocated students to particular bureaucratic practices, racism, stereotyping, culture and language. The discussion is developed against the background of published literature accounts of the educational experiences and achievements of African Caribbean students in British schools. **Chapter 7** continues the discussion on relocated students’ experiences in British schools, but as refugees. It discusses students, parents and teachers’ views on whether the educational needs of relocated students, as refugees, are sufficiently catered for by the education system. Published academic literature and theoretical reviews on the achievement of refugee children in British schools form the contextual framework for this discussion. The chapter also considers how homelessness has affected relocated students’ educational progress. **Chapter 8** explores the concept of achievement motivation. It compares and contrasts students’ pre and post relocation levels of achievement motivation. **Chapter 9** considers identity formation. It shows how relocated students utilised different strategies to cope with varying educational experiences. It further explains what 'a sense of place' means to Montserratians and relates how this is an integral part of what defines Montserratness. **Chapter 10** highlights the importance of home school and community school collaboration as noted by several research findings. It explains how the London-based Montserrat organisations and some evangelical churches have attempted to help relocated students to restore their pre-migration levels of achievement motivation. **Chapter 11**, the concluding chapter, presents a reflective summary and review of the study. It evaluates the thesis and the data-collection methods and procedures, discusses some implications for refugee education and makes some suggestions for future research, policy and practice.
Chapter Two

Migration and Identity: A Discussion of Literature

There is no sorrow above the loss of a native land (Euripides).

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine literature that frames the focal themes in this study - migration and identity.

I wish to emphasise that this study is not positioned within a specific theoretical framework for it is an issue-oriented case study (Chapter 3). However, I have identified specific theoretical perspectives that helped me to understand the links between the concepts that emerged from the study. Because the main themes under discussion in this thesis are embedded in a given social context, it was problematic to pin a particular theory to a specific situation for the process of identity formation is highly responsive to the ever changing contextual socio-political and socio-economic conditions, often shaped by large migratory flows. Hence, there are shifting distinctions between individuals’ patterns of behaviour in relation to new and different social structures (Sheets 1999; Liebkind 1992).

Conceptually, migration and identity are inextricably related. On the basis of studies relating to the nature of refugee adaptation and the dynamics of cultural change, it is generally acknowledged that ‘settling in’ and the continuous constructing and reconstructing of new identities have affect forced migrants’ educational achievement (Krulfeld & Camino 1994). Migration, but more so involuntary migration, inevitably brings about numerous and varied challenges, hardships and changes in migrants’ lives. But that is nature of population movements as is discussed in the next section.

Migration: The Panacea for a Better Life?

In this section, as is in the literature, population movements, migration and mobility are used interchangeably although there are subtle distinctions between them (Mills 1997; Brah 1996; Buijs 1993). Migration, which assumes different forms in different periods, is a dynamic process that involves the movement of people. It is this changeable characteristic that defines the dynamism of migration, as noted in this statement:
The history of these ‘modern’ population movements is peppered with ‘voluntary’ and ‘involuntary’ immigration, ranging from enslavement of African peoples, indenture of peoples from Asia, Ireland and so on, the ‘mass migration’ after 1815, especially of Europeans to the Americas, Oceania, and South and East Africa; through the displacement of peoples during the two World Wars, the labour migrations following the Second World War; to the refugees, ‘asylum seekers’, and the wealthy business, professional and cultural entrepreneurs traversing the globe during the 1980s and the 1990s (Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill 1999:5).

The above statement has made clear that ‘contemporary migration’ has expanded to the extent where migratory flows that traditionally focused on the ‘poor’ labour migrant and refugees, now include the wealthy ‘business-class’ professional migrant, albeit to a lesser degree. Acton (1999:144) suggests that this new form of ‘social migration’ has evolved from international and transnational economic practices, a product of globalisation, while Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill (1999:5) advance that migration is a key dimension of globalisation. Castles & Davidson (2000:8) propose a bond between globalisation and migration by suggesting that globalisation means the rapidly increasing mobility of people across national borders. They identify two phases of global migration since 1945:

(1) Post-war economic boom stimulated a large-scale labour migration to old industrial countries from less developed areas. This phase ended with the 1973 ‘oil crisis’.

(2) From the mid-1970s, capital investment shifted away from the old centres, and transnational production and distribution reshaped the world economy. Migratory flows at first decline and were partly reversed before growing again (Castles & Davidson 2000:55)

As will be discussed in Chapter 4, these phases resonate with different phases of migration from Montserrat (p.83).

Sassen utilises the following explanation of ‘global cities’ to show the relationship between globalisation and migration:

Global cities are poles of attraction for these international flows of people and capital, emphasising in particular the creation of an immigrant underclass often working in the informal economy, which is juxtaposed with a ‘post-industrial’ class of professionals (Sassen 1996, in Wallace 1999:185).

Sassen’s emphasis on the creation of an immigrant underclass underscores Brah, Hickman & Mac an Ghaill’s statement in relation to classes of migrants (p.11). In accentuating this distinction, Sassen also draws attention to the complex nature of population movements and
'new' migratory trends. These new trends, according to Castles & Davidson (2000:8) began after 1945 and gathered momentum from 1980. Their 'newness' is marked by two features: (1) their sheer scale and (2) the ethnocultural characteristics of many of the immigrants. The features are described this way:

- They affect all regions and all countries of the world simultaneously. The speed at which new ethnic minorities have emerged has confounded policy makers and undermined laws and practices concerned with integration and citizenship.

- They come from areas that are increasingly distant – not only in kilometres, but also in cultural terms. They often originate in former colonies or areas of military presence of the receiving countries: North and West Africans in France; Caribbeans, Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis in Britain; Mexicans, Filipinos, Koreans and Vietnamese in the USA; and so on (Castles & Davidson 2000:9).

Such large-scale migration has affected the policies and practices of both the host country and the country of origin. For example, with regards to the host countries in European societies, Solomos & Wrench (1993:12) saw the need for governments to (1) develop policies that would tackle discrimination more effectively; (2) make links between policies on immigration and policies on social and economic issues; and (3) develop positive social policy agenda to deal with the position of both established communities and new migrants.

With regards to the country of origin, I refer specifically to the 'brain drain' issue. This concept refers to “the migration of highly skilled individuals who are trained in one country and take up residence in another” (Grubel 1994:554). Whether these highly skilled migrants are lecturers/teachers, executives, technicians or business personnel, the economic loss is great since the loss of highly skilled workers frustrate economic development - especially in small states such as the Caribbean (Mills 1997:2-5). Prospects for better income, professional opportunities, more appealing working conditions and sociological-cultural aspects of life are identified as the dominant motives for persons with high levels of training to migrate (Grubel 1994:555). From a Caribbean perspective, I wish to add the 'foreign is better' ideology to these motives.

The complex relationship between education and migration is emphasised by the interplay between the nature of the motives for migration and the reality of the situation in the receiving country. Many Caribbean parents have high aspirations for their children's
educational future, thus educational opportunities in Britain often served as incentives for persons to migrate (Bryan et al 1985; Stone 1981). Many migrant parents shared this view as Tomlinson noted in her work that investigated issues relating to home-school relations in a multicultural society:

Whatever the class position, educational levels and colonial backgrounds of migrant parents, they mostly share high expectations about education, and they view schools as places where children’s life chances should be enhanced (Tomlinson 1984:52).

The complexity between education and migration deepens when migrants’ expectations, for ‘equal opportunity’ or for familiar cultural and religious practices, are not met. These unmet expectations themselves raise issues regarding ethnicity. From among the many scholarly definitions of ethnicity offered by the literature, I find the following most appropriate to show the link between ethnicity, racism, culture and migration:

Ethnicity describes a sense of commonality transmitted over generations by the family and reinforced by the surrounding community. It is more than race, religion, or national and geographic origin. It involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill a deep psychological need for identity and historical continuity (Giordano & Giordano in Slonim 1991:5)

Ethnicity suggests belonging to a particular group – having shared aims. I equate the notion of shared aims to two characteristics of diasporic communities: (1) the construction of common features of ‘home’ from which the migrants come, and (2) the collective experience of journeying and transition (Unterhalter 2000:111).

If ethnicity transcends national and geographic origin, then a migrant takes with him/her an ethnic label that is recognised by himself/herself, other migrants and people in the host country. And if this ethnic identity is reinforced by the surrounding community, it seems reasonable to assume that the host country, which now in a sense becomes the national community, plays a significant part in determining the social boundary in which the ethnic group thrives.

I view interaction within this new social setting from two perspectives – a primordialist and an optional-situational approach. A primordialist approach highlights how immigrant ethnic groups remain defined by particular similarities such as physical appearance, nationality and language. An optional-situational approach indicates that these very
‘primordial’ characteristics, although ingrained, can change within specific circumstances. For example, some migrants may denounce their ‘citizenship by birth’ and acquire another or may settle for dual nationality. Also, others may become bi-lingual or multi-lingual and thus may be in a position to shift ‘allegiance’ if the situation warrants it. The latter approach is the one favoured by symbolic interactionists who view ethnic identity as fluid, situational and changeable (Lee 2001: 51). This study is mainly concerned with a priomordialist approach since there is no scope for change with regards to Montserratians’ nationality and language in light of their BDTC status and their official language, English. The study therefore questions whether physical appearance facilitated or hindered the ‘settling in’ process, with particular reference to their educational needs.

Physical appearance as a feature of ethnicity, classifies one as belonging to a particular ‘race’. Britton (1999:135) asserts that skin colour is an essential feature of one’s ethnicity and further explains that the skin colour signifier has contributed to the persistence of processes of racialisation which have negative implications for those classified as non-whites. Given that ‘black’ and ‘white’ were posited to be opposites, it follows that non-whites are ‘black’. This dichotomous classification implies that the term ‘black’, which commonly defines persons of African-Caribbean origin (Britton 1999:136), incorporates all ethnic minority groups in Britain, despite their colour of skin. Miles (1993:37) notes that post-war migrants, refugees and asylum seekers who are classified as ‘blacks’, are objects of racism. But it is problematic to employ such a skin colour distinction since many Asian migrants do not define themselves as ‘black’, nor do African Caribbean migrants view them as such. Apparently, skin colour in this context represents more than a visual characteristic for Brah (1993:196) explains that it was the ‘non-whiteness’ within the racism confronting the post-war immigrants that provided a common point of reference, not the various shades of skin colour.

There is no precise meaning of the term black in the literature, but explanation of ‘black’ has been considered against the backdrop of historical, cultural and political discourses. For the purpose of this study, I have utilised Cross Jr., Strauss & Fhagen-Smith’s conceptualisation of ‘blackness’ to analyse particular behaviours among relocated Montserratian students. Instead of using a single trait to epitomise ‘blackness’, Cross Jr. et al propose an identity profile “formed by drawing a line between a series of points, each
representing a discrete identity operation (Cross Jr. et al. 1999:3). For them, identity is a combination of behaviours displayed in a range of different settings. Cross et al. researched the development of social and racial identity among African Americans. I deem the comparison of African Americans in the USA with African Caribbean in the UK as practical because there are striking similarities in patterns of racialised and ethnic relations within both nations (Small 1993:234). Small further explained that the US boasts the more dominant scholarship in the field of racialised and ethnic relations and the influence on researchers in England has been "pervasive and profound". This thesis examines the extent to which this "pervasive and profound" influence in patterns of racialised and ethnic relations has impacted on relocated students educational aspirations.

To return to the issue of racism, The International Council on Human Rights Policy (ICHRP) explains what it entails:

Racism is about distribution of resources. In the globalised market economy, the losers are frequently – if not systematically – members of certain ethnic groups whose particular vulnerability results partly from a history of discrimination, oppression and exploitation. In contrast to fifty years ago, when it was closely linked to colonialism, contemporary racism adopts the form of xenophobia and social exclusion (ICHRP 2000:12).

In light of the foregoing, I conclude that social inequality is the fundamental, if not chief factor that encourages and justifies discriminatory and racial practices against particular ethnic groups such as refugees and asylum-seekers. Research findings on refugees' experiences in Britain confirm this conclusion, as noted by the following:

• Almost all asylum-seekers spend time in temporary accommodation. This has implication for other services such as health and education.

• Unemployment rates are high, even among those refugees who have been in Britain for a long period of time.

• Many adult asylum-seekers have completed higher education courses at home – refugees are a much better educated group than the population as a whole – and have suffered a major fall in their standard of living in migrating to Britain (Rutter 1998:28).

The effects of social deprivation and exclusion have affected refugee students too. Jones & Rutter disclose:
“Anti-refugee sentiment in schools is alive and well. It flourishes alongside other forms of racism, xenophobia and narrow nationalism” (Jones & Rutter 1998:9).

The social issues affecting refugees are complex and varied. If refugees are to be socially integrated into the mainstream society, it becomes imperative for government policies to reflect support for their predicament (South 2001:13). But according to Castles’ assertion, it is within government policy framework that social deprivation and racial discrimination are bred (1993:24). Educational nationalists deny this allegation as noted in Tomlinson’s report on their claim: there are no barriers “placed in the way of minorities to prevent them from achieving educational credentials and training, other than those they create for themselves by inertia, unreasonable demands, lack of fluency in English, or a desire to hold on to their own cultures” (Tomlinson 1990:37). This theory is based on educational nationalism. Thus, by asking minority groups “to give up adherence to their own culture” (p.37), educational nationalists, are rejecting the dynamism and heterogeneity of cultural, in that they fail to acknowledge that people’s sense of, as well as their expression of a particular cultural identity “is continually negotiated and recreated” (Gillborn 1995:84). They are also banishing ‘cultural difference’ into oblivion by denying that “it is at the heart of issues of belonging, identity and politics” (Brah 1996:234).

In light of the foregoing, this thesis investigates whether there was evidence of inertia among relocated Montserratian students, and if so, whether it was created by self or by other extenuating and/or adverse circumstances. The thesis also questions the issues of ‘unreasonable demands’, lack of fluency in English, and a desire to hold on to one’s culture as self-created barriers, in relation to relocated students’ educational aspirations. This raises this issue, which is open to debate: are monocultural education policies conducive in helping immigrant students to achieve their educational goals?

The presence of migrant ethnic groups in British schools has not only sparked several debates about their cultural disposition, but has also added new dimensions to discussions about their education. Their presence has also brought about policy changes. Castles contends that it was the changes in migratory patterns and the increase in the frequency of
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1 Educational nationalism is a philosophical orientation that identifies with the presence of ethnic minorities in the British education system. It favours monocultural education policies and is developed around the idea that minorities have complete choice and full opportunity to assimilate into the British way of life and British culture.
mass population movements during the last two decades that forced host country
governments to develop new immigration policies. The purpose of these policies was to
address the many complications that arose with regards to settlement. But, because these
policies overlapped at political, social and economic levels, many contradictions surfaced.
This situation created a culture of racism that developed processes of ethnic exclusion, thus
socially alienating ethnic minority immigrant groups (Castles 1993:24). But how do victims
of social alienation respond to their plight? ICHR provides this answer:

..... oppressed communities .... isolate themselves from the larger society that
oppresses them. Communities live separately, often literally. They may fall back
upon a distinct culture, and may do so in a way that is negatively inward looking.
Such a response also internalises, though in a different way, the expectations of the
wider society. An extreme example is the ghetto. A less extreme example is offered
by the informal and complex physical compartmentalisation and layering of
numerous minorities within cities in the United States (ICHR 2000:20).

Taking refuge in one’s culture by grouping together is noted to be the usual reaction of
migrants who are socially excluded by the host society (Hall 1998; Brah 1996). Researchers
who investigate refugee experiences, generally agree that for persons in exile who are
socially alienated, culture becomes central to the process of moving forward, preserving a
sense of self and national identity, maintaining links with the country of origin and
establishing a collective identity. (Coelho 1998; Camino 1994; DeVoe 1994; Kaprielian-
Churchill & Churchill 1994). For example, Palestinian women migrants in West Berlin
baked and ate ‘Palestinian’ bread although it was difficult to get traditional ingredients
(Abdulrahim 1993:65). Bangladeshi refugees in Britain have tried to retain the Bangladeshi
custom of ‘good’ child-rearing, while new Somali refugees were initiated into the Somali
Community and Cultural Association for the purpose of forming “strong, mutually
supportive friendships (Summerfield 1993:87 & 90). In a similar vein, Eastmond observed
that Chilean refugees in the USA started Saturday schools with a view of transmitting
particular values and strands of knowledge to their children. They also engaged in intense
and vibrant community activities “with a variety of cultural expressions” (Eastmond
1993:41). Against this backdrop, this thesis looks at whether culture remains central to
relocated students’ educational progress and whether community activities organised by
UK-based Montserrat organisations have been points of transmission for ‘particular values
and strands of knowledge’.
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While taking refuge in one’s culture has proven to be beneficial to migrants, a community can venture to the other extreme by “closing in around its culture”, and thus becoming authoritarian (ICHRP 2000:20), and/or isolated in certain respects. ICHR’s caveat seems reasonable in the light of Summerfield’s observation. Summerfield noted that Bangladeshi migrant women in Britain only mixed with their own kinswomen. They visit relatives either on feast days or for family celebrations, thus remaining isolated from one another and from the host community (Summerfield 1993:90).

Thus far, I have examined large-scale migratory movements that to a large extent may be classified as of a permanent nature. But not all migratory patterns are marked with a label of ‘permanent settlement’.

In examining population movements that characterise third world migration, Parnwell (1993:13) explains migration as the permanent or quasi-permanent relocation of an individual or group of individuals from a place of origin to a place of destination. Parnwell has taken this explanation further by identifying the different types of migratory or population movements that do not involve a permanent change of residence. For example, step migration occurs when a migrant arrives at a destination after a series of short-term moves to other locations, and return migration happens when the migrant leaves the destination to return to his/her place of origin. While admitting that it is problematic to exact a strict definition for the various types of population movement, Parnwell asserts that time and space are two important variables that can assist in distinguishing between the different types of movement.

In a ‘migration’ context, the temporal and the spatial dimensions overlap to a considerable degree. The interconnection is understood within a ‘distance’ framework, which is a significant element of the spatial dimension. Migratory movements spread along a ‘time continuum’ that ranges from a few hours to a lifetime, and along a ‘distance continuum’ that ranges from short distances within a local environment to long cross-continental distances. Whether with reference to distance or time, cost plays a decisive role. (Parnwell 1993:15-20). Evidently, there is a direct relationship between distance and cost since cost often determines whether or not persons are able to migrate, and where they can migrate. Castles (1993:21) advances a similar view. He noted that destitute people within a given
area are less likely to migrate for migration requires financial resources. This implies that people are more likely to migrate if financial assistance is made available to them. The issue of resources and migration from Montserrat is explored in Chapter 5.

With reference to the relationship between distance and migration, Parnwell also explained that the further people move from their home area the greater will be the contrast in the social and cultural environment (p.16). On this basis, if movement is voluntary, those persons who are ‘fearful’ of an unfamiliar social environment may be quite selective about where to migrate. But even when persons are forced to migrate there is still a degree of selection (Parnwell 1993; Khan & Talal 1986). This does not mean however that adaptation to an unfamiliar culture cannot become a rewarding experience since cultural adaptation as a progressive element can move a migrant on from “a sense of ethnocentric perception bounded by what is familiar in the home setting to a state of ethnorelativism, where new perceptions of the culture in the host country can be integrated to make a new world view” (Unterhalter & Green 1997:14).

In addition to contending with social and cultural differences, forced migrants encounter significant barriers to a smooth and successful settlement in the destination country. Such difficulties have been noted to characterise refugees and other displaced persons’ experiences in some receiving countries (Coelho 1998; Mortland 1994; Parnwell 1993). It might therefore appear somewhat incongruous that migrants continue to exchange one set of difficult circumstances for another – and at times much worse than the one left behind. Yet, the tide of migratory flows has not been stemmed, for globally, there is an increase in population movements (Platt & Isard 1999; Castles 1993). Brah has identified some of the factors that influenced the increase in population movements in the latter part of the last century:

Economic inequalities within and between regions, expanding mobility of capital, people’s desire to pursue opportunities that might improve their life’s chances, political strife, wars and famine are some of the factors that remain at the heart of the impetus behind these migrations (Brah 1996:178).

There are other factors that have been identified to influence an upscale in mass population movements - ethnic and religious discrimination (Awake 2002:10) and environmental disasters such as hurricanes, floods and volcanic eruptions (Kaprielian-Churchill &
Churchill 1994; Khan & Talal 1986). Inevitably, the forenamed factors, particularly environmental disasters, affect people from a cross section of a population - from the highly qualified to the unskilled. It is probably such widespread devastating effect that prompted the popular colloquial description - ‘social equalisers’ - for these disasters. But regardless of the reasons for migrating, the search for a ‘better’ life is a common factor, given that better represents educational progress and the capacity to function effectively in a given social setting.

Suarez-Orozco (1995:14) discovered that some Mexican immigrants were successfully absorbed into the US labour market. Likewise, forced migrant Hungarian students in the UK did well in science and engineering to the extent where they had “made their mark” as an impressive group (Platt & Isard 1999:227). However, not all immigrants realise the ‘better’ life that they seek. Parnwell (1993:7) noted that many who used migration as a means of escaping poverty found that their movement brought only a change in location, not circumstance. This observation was extended to embrace other voluntary and involuntary emigrants. Parwell explained:

This may be in part because, due to the distorted image of other places which is created by the media or which is conveyed by returning migrants, their perception of life and opportunities in the chosen destination may be quite widely divorced from reality. Thus the expectations, which may have underpinned the decision to move, may not be fully realised (Parnwell 1993:7).

Generally, Parnwell’s explanation holds true. However, with regards to relocated Montserratian migrants in the UK, this explanation prompts these questions: what role did first-wave migrants’ silences on the hardships they suffered and returning migrants’ rose-coloured impressions of life in England, play in conveying ‘distorted’ images? How much influence did the media (specifically television) have on persons’ decision to relocate, considering that Montserratians had no access to BBC Television until two years into the volcanic crisis, and therefore had no ‘visual image’ of British life before relocation? Was the ‘greener pastures’ ideology, particularly with reference to education, a major decisive factor that influenced relocation?
To return to the discussion on types of population movements, I have selected and adapted three typical movement types from Parnwell’s classification to describe the forms of movement that are pertinent to this study (See Figure 2.1).

**Figure 2.1: Quasi-permanent Forms of Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ← A ———&gt; B ———&gt; C</td>
<td>Step Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ———&gt; ⟷</td>
<td>Return Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ———&gt; ?</td>
<td>Refugees, Evacuees - displaced by an Ecological Disaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Parnwell 1993:14)

The three types of movement illustrated in Figure 2.1 were selected for discussion principally because they identify with particular migratory movements of Montserratians since July 1995.

In many instances, forced migration result in “a permanent change in the place of residence, although for many there may be a great deal of uncertainty concerning their final destination” (Parnwell 1993:15). Parnwell’s depiction of one question mark (on the left) instead of an arrow at the end of the return journey, represents uncertainty for many refugees clinging to the forlorn hope of eventual repatriation.

Uncertainty, by any measure, will inevitably prevent migrants from making a satisfactory adjustment to the social milieu in which they have now come. Social and cultural differences also prevent them from fully positioning their former social circumstances within this new environment, thus they remain on the margins, between ‘two worlds’. Migrants who find themselves in this conflict are said to have experienced ‘social dislocation’ (Suarez-Orozco 1995:61).
The issue of 'social dislocation' brings into sharp focus the psychological toll that migrants pay for immigrating to another country. Economic improvement, to whatever degree, cannot compensate for the ruptures made to the immigrants' "supportive interpersonal bonds" that are critical to the maintenance of psychological well being (Rogler Malgady & Rodriguez 1989:25). Adequate available social support and sufficient psychological resources to withstand trauma are what Suarez-Orozco (1995:62) identified as needed for immigrants to realise personal enrichment and psychological growth. In this regard, social support is especially crucial if immigrants are to overcome the following typical patterns of psychological problems:

- Persecutory anxiety - the host environment, which was once idealised is experienced as hostile and persecutory;
- Depressive anxiety - the individual is preoccupied with losses due to migration; and
- Disorienting anxiety - results from attempting to adjust to new customs and circumstances (Grinberg & Grinberg 1989 in Suarez-Orozco 1995:62).

Grinberg & Grinberg further noted that bouts of anxiety may lead to feelings of inadequacy and inferiority that can cause children to doubt their ability to succeed in their new environment. Thus some may manifest hopelessness with regards to their educational aspirations by dropping out of school, while others may be determined to achieve despite the 'odds'. This thesis probed whether similar psychological problems as mentioned above were noted to exist among relocated Montserratian migrants in the UK.

The rupturing of "supportive interpersonal bonds" has also affected the development of a positive sense of personal identity, which Suarez-Orozco (1995:67) maintains is in the most crucial task facing migrant children. The next section discusses how this sense of identity is shaped and influenced by the sum total of an individual's experiences as he/she interacts with the world around him/her.

**Identity: Congruence of Self-definition, Self-esteem and Educational Success**

Identity is developed in reciprocal relationships between individuals and social contexts (Mansfield & Maguire 1999:85). This implies that it is only in relation to others that a sense of self (identity) can be developed. I thus take identity to mean the way in which persons
define themselves within the framework of social relationships - a definition that is acknowledged by significant others.

There are several strands of identity – racial identity, cultural identity, social identity and national/political identity – terms that are commonly used by researchers. For example, Richardson & Silvestri (1999) examined social identity models to explain racial identity (white identity) formation among whites in the USA; Cross, Jr., Strauss & Fhagen-Smith (1999:29), in their research discussion of black identity development among African American, contend that social identity is grounded in race, ethnicity and status. Carrington (1999) made reference to the construction of cultural identities in his ethnographic analysis of the significance of sports within black communities in the UK; and Clarence (1999) studied the way in which Australian national/political identity was constructed during Paul Keating’s time as Prime Minister (1991-6).

Sheets sees the various strands of identity development as developed by at least four integrating, intersecting and overlapping dimensions that begin at birth and continue throughout one’s lifetime:

1. Content components – components such as awareness, self-labelling and attitudes operate at individual and group levels.

2. Categorical ascription – adoption of ethnic practices are influenced by factors such as physical, cultural and ethnic markers, competition, power and participation.

3. Situational and environmental context – children’s ethnic development is affected by varying contexts in the home, school and community.

4. Processual continuum – a continual socialisation process shapes the self to include recognition, significance, and importance of ethnic identity, which in turn enhances a sense of self and peoplehood (Sheets 1999:94-96).

Sheets’ reference to interconnection and continuity is in line with the principle of process, which states in part, that human growth and development is a continuous evolvement, albeit not always in an uninterrupted positive direction (Gay 1999:198). Gay identifies the relationship between ethnic identity development and multicultural education. This link, asserts Gay, should be made evident in the goal of “helping students from different ethnic and cultural background develop positive self-concepts” (Gay 1999:202).
As integral parts of any ethnic group, social and cultural practices overlap at every level as individuals try to identify and/or, affiliate with the group. This conclusion was drawn on the basis of Gay’s writings on ‘ethnic identity development’ and ‘Camino’s research on immigrant Latin American adolescents in the USA (Gay 1999; Camino 1994). It suggests that the development of an ethnic identity is a multifaceted process. Sheets proposes content components, categorical ascription, situational and environmental context and processual continuum as the four dimensions within which ethnic identities are formed and developed. Sheets further advocates that these dimensions are consequential to all aspects of human development since “they are interwoven and embedded into the ways individuals process information cognitively, interact socially and display behaviour” (Sheets 1991:93).

Similarly, Ekermann argues that cultural traditions are shaped, influenced, sometimes transformed by forces generated from within the various environments in which the group participates (Ekermann 1991:27). Sodowsky, Kwan and Pannu, cited in Lee (1999:108), appear to equate ethnicity with culture in these words: “sharing of a cultural heritage, a sense of social relatedness, and symbolic cultural ties define ethnic identity”.

In light of the foregoing and given that culture is often synonymous to ethnicity, is central to identity, and its definitions suggest that it bears an educational component, it seems reasonable to conclude that schools are perfectly positioned to nurture and enhance individual and group identities. This conclusion prompts the question: do schools utilise their knowledge of students’ cultural background to promote educational achievement? That seems to depend on whether teachers perceive the understanding of ethnic identity development as beneficial for migrant students in a multicultural society.

The fluid and incomplete nature of identity makes it a complicated concept. There is an infinite array of options and circumstances within which identity formation is made possible. Yet, a choice of identity, whether personal or collective is limited because of social constraints such as age, physical capabilities, economic situation, and spatial location. With regards to factors that impact upon identity choices, Roseneil & Seymour observe:
All identities are not equally available to all of us, and all identities are not culturally valued. Identities are fundamentally enmeshed in relations of power (Roseneil & Seymour 1999:2).

Social and cultural theorists share a similar view and therefore interpret identity formation and development within a social and historical context although each strand offer contrasting views on what identity entails. The social identification theory focuses on personal or self-identity, whereas the poststructuralist cultural theory concentrates on changing forms of collective identity (Rutherford 1998; Deaux 1992). Both strands however offer the principle that identity construction is dynamic and fluid, thus rejecting the traditional philosophy that perceives identity as “essential, unitary, fixed and unchanging” (Roseneil & Seymour 1999:3). Roseneil & Seymour have even proposed that instability, fluidity, fragmentary and processual character of identities are more emphasised by the cultural strand, probably because the issue of power and resistance is central to the poststructuralist theories of identity. Power and resistance, as noted by Whitehead, are both creative and subversive – “the disruptive moments within, and alternatives to, dominant organisational and gendered discourse” (Whitehead 1999:117).

Whitehead’s assertion was made in reference to self-identity processes within organizational life. I wish to extend this principle to the school environment where identities are often created within ‘dominant gendered structures’ such as gangs and peer groups. It is within these structures that students work hard to manage the contradictions of their own multiple identities. This raises the question: are self-identity processes central to creating a sense of identity within the school environment?

Given that identity development is interpreted within a social and historical context, identity then becomes a product of past and present experiences as noted by this comment:

Each individual is the synthesis not only of existing relations but also of the history of these relations. He (sic) is a précis of the past (Rutherford 1998:20).

Identity development then is rather complex since there is no fixed rationale that establishes and controls it. Rutherford further explains that identity formation can only be interpreted within the context of this articulation, in the intersection of everyday experiences with the political and economic relations of subordination and domination. But whether one bears a
subordinate (as of a marginalised group) or dominant identity, contradiction, resistance, fluidity and past experiences remain at the core of what identity formation represents. Weeks (1989) explains it this way:

Identity is not inborn, pregiven or ‘natural’. It is striven for, contested, regulated and achieved, often in struggles of the subordinated against the dominant. Moreover, it is not achieved by an individual act of will, or discovered hidden in the recesses of the soul. It is put together in circumstances bequeathed by history as much as by personal destiny (Weeks, cited in Forrest 1994:100).

Michael Foucault’s perception of what identity entails is in direct contrast to what Weeks has advanced:

Identity is what is naturally given and is therefore considered as a possession, yet it is also that which possesses the individual. If, on the one hand, identity is constituted by a personal experience and an individual history, it is also inevitably a product of the otherness of culture, social and linguistic determinants. As the individual reconstructs and reflects upon an imaginary identity, he/she cultivates an illusion of conscious control that only serves to occlude the aleatory and contingent nature of this imaginary essence. Thus, in a sense, identity is our metaphysical refuge, it is the gap between our history and History, between our self-conscious and the purposeful use of language and the Logos that make our speech possible (Racevskis 1994:21).

The above perception implies that identity is largely defined by difference and that the gap between the ‘histories’ remains and/or widens over time since it is a difficult task to discard “the logic of our past and the histories that run through our lives” (Angela 1998:72). This makes identity formation a progressive natural occurrence – a position that Weeks opposes. Yet, ‘history’ remains the common factor in Weeks’ and Foucault’s analysis. This suggests that an individual’s experiences are influenced by societal mores and that identity formation is a product of a complex matrix of different experiences, past and present, hence there is no single process that determines ‘a final construct’. Nevertheless, out of this complex involvement with others comes a sense of individuality, “a sense of personal location” (Weeks 1998:88), that is a sense of belonging that stabilises one distinctiveness. This situation aptly demonstrates the complex nature of identity for every individual lives with a variety of ‘contradictory’ identities that constantly battle within us for loyalty. For example, second generation migrants whose parents are of Caribbean origin may be regarded as ‘British’, African Caribbean, West Indian or Trinidadian, and when gender, class or race are taken into consideration the complexity gets greater. The identity that surfaces or takes
precedence depends on a multitude of factors, including cultural and personal values that allow one to reside in that 'metaphysical refuge', albeit for a transitory period.

This situation raises the issue of cultural difference – a notion that is not adequately addressed in the literature – especially where African Caribbean emigrants are concerned. It is probably the literature’s silence on cultural difference that has led to numerous misconceptions and stereotypical judgements of migrants by the host population. Here in England, more often than not, persons of African Caribbean descent are considered as Jamaicans. Generally, African Caribbean people are perceived as one homogeneous group with one cultural heritage. Nothing can be further from the truth. “Caribbeanness” aside, there are as many, and more, cultural orientations (resulting from ethnicity and patterns of settlement) as there are islands bordering the Caribbean Sea. Is it possible therefore that such misconception might have influenced the manner in which teachers dealt with relocated students? Is it also possible that being wrongly labelled could have created tensions that impacted negatively on relocated students’ educational progress? These are two issues that this thesis examined.

With reference to the inadequate coverage of cultural difference in the literature, writers who focus on the impact of a single social construct (such as ethnicity or nationality) on migrants’ lives, do not take ‘habitus’ into consideration. Bourdieu’s notion of habitus suggests that a multiplicity of social factors and practices is at work in the construction of identities – individuals internalised and operationalised these social experiences (Bourdieu 1977:54). This implies that there are several factors that define the interplay between the social circumstances that help to shape specific identities.

Although the term ‘habitus’ is most closely associated with Bourdieu, it is not ‘purely’ a ‘Bourdieunian’ concept. Mansfield & Maguire (1999:93) note that Bourdieu was not the first to use it and that other sociologists have utilised the term extensively. Sociologists Garnham & Williams have expanded this concept by asserting that although habitus is internalised and operationalised by individuals, it is regarded as a unified rather than an individual phenomenon (Garnham & Williams 1986:117). They argue that this unified phenomenon produces an ethos that relates to all the practices produced by a unifying set of principles, thus making habitus a family, group or class experience. Garnham & Williams
based their conclusion on the logic that if individuals are to respond collectively to a common set of material conditions, their practices should be regulated. This regulation, which I interpret to represent ‘categories’, seems to be different from the regulation that breeds domination that stems from ‘political antagonism’ (Rutherford 1998:21) and the regulation that engenders the construction of subordinate identities by confining spaces that allows opportunities for self-actualisation (Angela 1998:73). Mansfield & Maguire advance this position on habitus, which is similar to Garnham & Williams’ views:

A person’s habitus is the enduring disposition that suffuses their way of living. Individual habitus is inextricably connected with a shared social habitus evident in specific social settings (Mansfield & Maguire 1999:93).

Like Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, the intricate connection between individual and social habitus suggests that several factors are at work in the personal development of an identity. Against this backdrop, I propose that there is a correlation, to whatever degree, between habitus, power and identity. This proposal is based on the thinking that with regards to individual habitus, the inextricable connection to ‘a shared social habitus’ appear to confirm that “humans beings have little agency against the power of discourse, to resist or transform dominant discourses and therefore to produce new identities” (Roseneil & Seymour 1999:5). In a similar vein, Hall (1996:6) contends that identities are “points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us”. In this way, identity construction is a conscious exercise that is developed from a point of ‘otherness’, where one recognises and accepts differences.

At this point, I depart from the notion of ‘habitus’, and return to Weeks’ explanation of identity (p.45) that says in part, that identity “is put together in circumstances bequeathed by history as much as by personal destiny”. The assumption here is, individuals have little or no control over the circumstances that shape their lived experiences and particular identity developments are mapped out in advance. To accept this position is to make no allowance for an unexpected occurrence that may necessitate a change of social conditions.

Changes in social conditions, particularly those brought about by forced migration often frustrate the continuance of social norms and cultural meanings. These changes threaten individual as well as national identity (Krulfeld & Camino 1994: x). Caught in a position of transition, forced migrants employ ‘old’ as well as ‘new’ experiences to influence
patterns of negotiations in the construction of new and different identities. But for displaced persons, the manipulation of identities is not simply a ‘before and after’ affair, but rather a continuous and complex process that begins in the ‘home’ territory. Krulfeld & Camino (1994:xi) points out that refugees are forced to confront “otherness” in their own societies during the course of the traumas they experienced. This thesis investigated whether or not identity manipulation for relocated students began some time before relocation to the UK. It also examined the effect of internal displacement on identity changes and development.

New identities are constructed as individuals adjust to the mores of a new society. The relationships that emerge from these multiple identities, which Rappoport, Baumgardner & Boone (1999:97) refer to as a pluralistic sense of self, sometimes produce negative tensions. Nineteenth century and early twentieth century writers like William James and George Meade view this ‘multiple personality’ as normal (Deaux 1992:18). Deaux further explained that contemporary researchers also endorsed the principle of multiplicity – from a sociological perspective, Thoits (1983) proposed that multiple roles diffuse the stress experienced in any single role, and from a psychological perspective, Linville (1987) suggested that greater self-complexity, as assessed by sorting of potentially self-relevant attributes, acts as a buffer against stress. Rappoport, Baumgardner & Boone (1999: 101) also share Linville’s view. In fact, they contend that the conditions of life in a post modern society encourage and virtually require the development of a pluralistic sense of self and assert that are there benefits to be gained from maintaining “a dynamic portfolio of alternative self-concepts as they move through the life span” (p.99). This is known as simultaneous pluralism. The conclusion drawn from these positions is, constructing multiple identities is conceptually reasonable as well as psychologically desirable. But if one cannot recognise what the different identities are and locate the relationship between them, the stress experienced in any single role may increase rather than diffuse. This brings the ‘self’ into focus for personal action is required to determine both situations.

To explain the concept of self in relation to personal and social identity, I draw on the symbolic interactionists’ position that focuses on “the active, interpretive self of individual constructing reality” (Lee 2001:47). Herbert Blumer who coined the term ‘symbolic interactionism’, summarises its basic tenets as follows:
• Human beings act towards things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them.

• Meanings arise out of social interaction.

• Social action is a result of a “fitting together of individual lines of action” (Lee 2001:48).

The above principles have shown individuals as actors whose actions are influenced by particular situations – a position taken by many social theorists. These principles have however failed to emphasise how the co-equal existence of social interaction and social structure can cause conflicting relationships to emerge as persons construct and reconstruct new identities. Friction is possible, as cultural theorists would argue, because of the complex way in which society is structured with its various institutions and diverse groups, and the problems that arise from cultural differences (Roseneil & Seymour 1999:3). Moreover, persons respond differently to the same situation, which implies that ‘self’, as suggested by the identity theory, has a ‘choice’ role to play.

Identity theory is based on the notion that the many parts of the ‘multifaceted self’ sometimes reinforce and conflict with each other (Lee 2001:49). This view challenges the traditional symbolic interactionist view that persons construct their own social reality in an uninhibited manner. Identity theorist Stryker provides this precept: “If society is highly differentiated, and if self reflects society, self, too, must be highly differentiated” (Stryker 1981:23).

The aforementioned analyses of self as advanced by social, cultural and identity theorists have shown that our concept of self as individuals is manipulated or restricted by our social context. Social constructionists have moved this position on by contending that society is not an independent superior body contrasted to individuals, but is rather embodied within and saturates the structure and nature of the individuated self-concept itself. Sampson explains it this way:

We do not begin with two independent entities, individual and society, that are otherwise formed and defined apart from one another and that interact as though each were external to the other. Rather society constitutes and inhabits the very core of whatever passes for personhood: each is interpenetrated by the other (Sampson 1983, in Kitzinger 1992:227).
Sampson's explanation suggests that social construction of self depends heavily on the influence of 'others' in society, thus one's self-concept (how one thinks of oneself) is influenced or restricted by his/her social context. The basic assumption of social constructionism is, 'culture infuses individuals, fundamentally shaping and forming them and how they conceive of themselves and the world, how they see others, how they engage in structures of mutual obligation, and how they make choices in the everyday world' (Kitzinger 1992:224). This position tends to assign a greater degree of influence to the society than the individual.

Cross, Jr, Strauss & Flahagen-Smith (1999:30) seem to have taken a similar stance to Sampson's by identifying two components of self-concept: (1) a general personality or personal identity dimension, and (2) a reference group orientation, group identity or social identity component. Cross et al have utilised these two components as a foundation for their conceptualisation of 'black identity'. The common thinking on 'black identity' focuses on low self-esteem and internalised racism (Early 1993; Clark 1983). Cross et al have moved beyond this widespread view by highlighting the wide range of ethnic identities that were found to exist among African Americans. They contend that no single trait can define 'blackness' and have identified five key operations or functions that define the 'black identity profile': buffering, bonding, bridging, code-switching and individualism. Cross et al further explained that these five operations are revealed within the Black social identity development throughout an individual's life, hence the need for analysing these functions against the background of these six sectors of development:

1. Infancy and childhood
2. Pre-adolescence
3. Adolescence
4. Late adolescence and early childhood
5. Adult nigrescence
6. Identity refinement across lifespan (Cross et al 1999:35)

The recognition of the above developmental sectors has implications for school practices. Educators are faced with the choice of whether to operate with a single factor or take a multi-dimensional position on 'black identity'. Admittedly, there are several ways in which one can interpret multiplicity. However, it seems useful for teachers to identify the various
ways in ‘black identity’ is played out in the students’ concerned lives. Additionally, because the functions can be taken to extremes, teachers should guide students to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of each function with a view to helping them to reflect on the functions and use them wisely.

The unfolding of high and low salience identities are central to the aforementioned developmental sectors and therefore become pivotal to any discussion on ‘black identity’. Stryker (1992:873) explains that salience is the probability that a given identity will be invoked, or called into play, in a variety of situations. For example, an emigrant’s culture may take precedence in a given situation, at another time another aspect of his/her life may be more prominent. In the context of Cross et al’s investigation, “high salience identities characterise Black social identities for which race and African culture are of central significance”, and “low salience identities refer to Black social identities or reference-group orientation that accord only minor significance to race and African American culture in determining what is, and is not, important in one’s everyday life” (Cross et al 1999: 29&30). For the purpose of this study, I am interested in the Pre-adolescence and Adolescence Sectors, particularly because the relocated student sample for this study are positioned within these Sectors. Cross et al (1999:36) assert that it is within these developmental sectors, chiefly Sector 3, that a broad range of high and low social identities come to fruition.

**Conclusion**

This chapter set out to discuss some of the theoretical literature that guided the development of this study. It identified migration and identity as the main themes under discussion and highlighted the inextricable interrelationship that exists between them, as well as the issues that have emerged from this complex relationship.

Many strands of literature have influenced this study, but it is not framed within a particular theoretical position. Ideas drawn from ‘symbolic interactionism’, poststructuralist cultural theory and identity theory have been used to help me to make sense of the interconnection between the themes concerning education, migration and identity that lie at the heart of this study.
Relocated Montserratian secondary school students are the primary participants in this study. The next chapter will consider the methodological principles that guided the data collection and analysis procedures for the research into their educational experiences.
Chapter Three

Methodological Approaches and Methods Used in the Research

Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is to discuss the principles that guided the methods of data collection, recording and analysis for this study. It is presented in three sections – methodological approaches, methods of data collection and analysis and verifying data quality. I have included an addendum that discusses some reflections on power and power relationships during the interview process and reflections on my experience as a researcher.

Methodological Approaches

Methods Associated with Two Paradigms

Twentieth century philosophers have divided social science methodology into two camps – quantitative and qualitative, with the pretext that each paradigm stems from opposing epistemological stances – positivist or empiricist and constructivist or naturalistic, respectively (Creswell 1994:4).

Quantitative research has been influenced by the natural science model of research (Bryman 1994:59). The quantification of data to develop theories with a view to substantiate hypotheses and related proposals, is central to this method of research. Proponents of this method argue that quantification of data is of paramount importance since it creates situations where variables and/or concepts in question can be compared and analysed. The quantitative approach is governed by a numerical logic. Sayer articulates it this way:

Advocates of quantitative methods usually appeal to the qualities of mathematics as a precise, unambiguous language which can extend our powers of deductive reasoning far beyond that of purely verbal methods, and, as with logic, the validity of mathematical reasoning is a ‘black-and-white’ affair, being subject to internal rather than empirical check (Sayer 1984:158).

The above position not only forces the researcher to convert opinions and attitudes into numbers (Tesch 1990:1), but it also allows a researcher to establish links between the data
collected and the hypothesis under consideration by comparing and analysing variables and/or concepts. This seems to be the message from Bryman who charges that quantitative research is about the causal rapport between concepts (Bryman 1988:30).

The position taken by researchers who employ a qualitative approach is in direct contrast to the above position. Bryman notes:

Qualitative research has been influenced by an epistemological position that rejects the appropriateness of a natural science approach to the study of humans; this position finds its expression in such theoretical strands as phenomenology and symbolic interactionism (Bryman 1994:59).

This contrast is made even clearer by Cohen & Manion’s juxtaposition of the dimensions of comparison as conceptions of social reality. I wish to refer to three of these dimensions:

1. **Theory**: For the positivists, this is a rational edifice built by scientists to explain human behaviour, whereas the naturalists’ perception is sets of meanings which people use to make sense of their world and behaviour within it.

2. **Research**: Positivists perceive this as an experimental or quasi-experimental validation of theory, while naturalists view research as the search for meaningful relationships and the discovery of their consequences for action.

3. **Methodology**: Abstraction of reality, especially through mathematical models and quantitative analysis, is the position taken by positivists. Naturalists take this stance – the representation of reality for purposes of comparison and analysis of language and meaning (Cohen & Manion 1996:10).

These contrasts fit into the logic of either of two theoretical processes of research – deductive and inductive. In quantitative research, “theory is an interrelated set of constructs or variables formed into propositions or hypotheses that specify the relationship among variables, typically in terms of magnitude or direction”; whereas in qualitative research theories are defined as “patterns” (Creswell 1994:82). Theories in both camps not only carry different connotations, but they are also employed in different ways. The following statements define the distinction:
In quantitative studies one uses theory deductively and places it towards the beginning of the plan for a study. In quantitative research the objective is to test or verify a theory, rather than to develop it. One thus begins the study advancing a theory, collects data to test it, and reflects on whether the theory was confirmed or disconfirmed by the results in the study. The theory becomes a framework for the entire study, an organising model for the research questions or hypotheses and for the data collection procedures (Creswell 1994:87 & 88).

Analogically, qualitative studies employ an inductive approach. Neuman explains:

Pattern theory does not emphasise logical deductive reasoning. Like casual theory, it contains an interconnected set of concepts and relationships, but it does not require casual statements. Instead, pattern theory uses metaphor or analogies so that relationships "make sense". Pattern theories are systems of ideas that inform. The concepts and relations within them form a mutually reinforcing, closed system. They specify a sequence of phases or links parts to a whole (Neuman 1991:38).

Such disparity, as noted above, fuel and therefore sustain the ongoing debate on the methodological divide between quantitative and qualitative research. This does not mean however that features of each method are less valuable whenever either is utilised. In support of this refrain, Hammersley proffers this comment:

Indeed it seems to me that all research involves both deduction and induction in the broad sense of those terms, in all research we move from ideas to data as well as from data to ideas. What is true is that one can distinguish between studies that are primarily exploratory, being concerned with generating theoretical ideas, and those, which are more concerned with testing hypotheses. But these types of research are not alternatives; we need both (Hammersley 1992:48).

Admittedly, from a strict scientific viewpoint and in 'probability' terms, empirical data is necessary to prove or confirm a hypothesis. However, empirical data is not as effective in the study of human behaviour "where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomenon contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world" (Cohen & Manion 1996:12).

Although there is an obvious distinction between the two methods, some researchers take sides with Bulmer who assert: "when scrutinised critically neither the logic nor the methodological line between qualitative and quantitative methods is a hard and fast one" (Bulmer 1986, in Qureshi 1992:101). It is perhaps this recognition that influences the integrating of both methods. Hazel Qureshi for instance, combined both methods to conduct a case study of carers (Qureshi 1992:102).
Evidently, the advocates of each paradigm would put forward arguments that not only reveal the merits and demerits of both, but also sustain the quantitative-qualitative dichotomy. In the light of these claims, I conclude that the theoretical justification for employing either approach lies in the researcher’s ability to ‘distinguish between studies’ and select the method that is better suited for his/her study. For example, this study was not concerned with behaviour per se but rather with how respondents made sense of that behaviour, hence the need to utilise a social science method that allowed me to understand how the respondents interpret ‘their world and behaviour within it’. The nature of qualitative research lends itself to this kind of study, as is discussed in the next subsection.

**The Nature of Qualitative Research**

Qualitative research is multi-faceted in nature, and is held together by a framework of terms such as naturalistic, interpretive methodology, inductive reasoning and social reality (Cohen & Manion 1996:22-25). A similar view is put forward by Denzin & Lincoln who affirm that qualitative research crosscuts disciplines, fields, and subject matter (Denzin & Lincoln 1998:2). There are several strands of the inquiry process that combine to represent qualitative research, as Creswell’s definition suggests:

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyses words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting” (Creswell 1998:15).

From Creswell’s description of qualitative research, I have identified four main features that are combined to complete the methodological process of a qualitative design – a distinct tradition of enquiry, a social or human problem, a detailed analysis and a natural setting. It is generally acknowledged among researchers that qualitative research is better suited to understanding particular social behaviours, that is, how persons negotiate social contexts in which they find themselves (Cohen & Manion 1996; Hammersley & Atkinson 1995; Creswell 1994; Giddens 1993). This acknowledgement emphasises the interpretative nature of qualitative research since the researcher seeks to understand the informants’ perspectives. But qualitative research also pays attention to informants’ behaviour. In doing so, it seeks to describe and explain the informant’s perspectives as well as his/her behaviour.
since one's perspective is not necessarily an outcome of his/her behaviour, and "may even be a discrepant if it" (Hammersley 1992:45).

The emphasis in qualitative research seems to be on the 'how' rather than the 'what', in that the researcher makes a deliberate effort to search for patterns of relationships between sets of concepts. Thus, in addition to the preservation of chronological flows, researchers can have a more accurate understanding of 'which events lead to which consequences'. This seems to put qualitative research in a reasonable light since the researcher's ultimate aim is to acquire an accumulative understanding of the social phenomenon in question. This objective often translates into constant interaction with informants. Involvement in an informant's world, with a view to appreciating his/her perspective is inevitable, especially when the phenomenon under discussion is of a sensitive nature (Qureshi 1992:109). I deem the issues relating to the relocated Montserratian students' educational experiences as of a sensitive nature and therefore view the qualitative design as well suited for this study. This brings the question of subjectivity into focus.

Subjectivity in Qualitative Research

Critics of qualitative research regard researcher subjectivity and neutrality as weaknesses (Bernstein 1974; Argyle 1978). They reason that the qualitative researcher has "an obligation to seek an objective which is not necessarily that of any of the participating actors at all" (Rex 1974 cited in Cohen & Manion 1996:34). They also contend that subjective reports are sometimes incomplete and misleading in that meanings of situations are negotiated by the actors involved. This contention implies that subjectivity is irrational and invalid. But this view is challenged by social scientists such as Bourdieu (1993), Giddens (1993) & Nagel (1986) who assert that the researcher is part of the reality that he/she investigates. This position sustains the theory that suggests that subjectivity is intrinsically related to any rigorous academic exercise since perceptions, interpretations and analyses within social science are guided by one's own experiences and certain conceptual categories (Kleinmann 1994:130). This prompts the question; can the researcher remain an impartial observer? In this case, the answer is 'no' for researchers use themselves as instruments by getting actively involved in the research when investigating complex social phenomena (Miles & Huberman 1994; McCracken 1988). Another contention is the
researcher's 'interest' or 'passion' for the phenomenon in question, which the critics argue, may blind him/her to scientific truths.

I argue that it is these very 'interests' and 'passions', honourable or dishonourable, are capable of influencing scientific truths. This can be explained within the context of 'the power of knowledge' - the greater the quantity of knowledge within a particular science, the more advanced is the science (Bourdieu 1993:11). Bourdieu's explanation seems to imply that only when 'interests' and 'passions' coexist with scientific knowledge, they are scientifically accepted, albeit not in a full way. This is not to say that employing a qualitative approach will reveal ultimate truth. But such an approach does help us to make sense of our world since it offers "explanation, clarification and demystification of the social forms which man (sic) has created around himself" (Beck 1979 cited in Cohen & Manion 1996:26). I align myself with the sociologists who contend that the subjective representation of the social world is legitimately part of the 'objective' truth (Bourdieu 1993:12). This position allowed me to make sense of primary informants' interpretation of their personal experiences by seeking clearer understanding on issues that relate to their educational experiences. Taken from this position therefore, the subjectivity in qualitative research suggests strength rather than weakness.

Why A qualitative Approach?
A qualitative approach for this study was selected primarily because of the nature of the central research question – 'How have reformations of identity and community among relocated Montserratian students in the UK since 1995, affected relocated students' educational aspirations?' Implicit in this question, are concepts of change, rehabilitation, betterment and/or denigration. This study sought to 'make sense' of the interrelationships that exist between these concepts.

This study was not concerned with establishing cause and effect, but rather with finding 'what was going on' in the lives of the relocated Montserratian secondary school students in London schools, that is, how they interpreted the experiences that brought about the reformations referred to in the central research question. This approach necessitated an interactive process of inquiry, that is, co-operating and intermingling with the respondents in a manner that contributes to the production of the data. In other words, research is
conducted from the participants' viewpoint (Engelard 1992:1), and social experiences are understood and interpreted through the actors' eyes (Parkin 1982:19). I view the qualitative method as most useful in discovering how respondents make sense of the world in which they live.

Creswell (1998:17) proposes that researchers should choose a qualitative approach if “the topic needs to be explored” – that is, finding out how respondents make sense of the world and their behaviour within it. This study considers specific educational experiences of relocated Montserratian students in British schools. I have therefore selected the qualitative approach, which is particularly appropriate for exploratory studies. Moreover, because of the sensitive nature of the issues under consideration, it was necessary to select an approach that would allow me active involvement in the research process. Having selected a qualitative design, I ensured that the intellectual underpinnings and theories that supported the conceptual framework of this study are congruent with the characteristics of a qualitative design.

**Philosophical and Intellectual Assumptions**

The study was guided by five philosophical assumptions – ontological, epistemological, axiological, rhetorical and methodological (Creswell 1994:5). I wish to point out that these assumptions are contrasted on different dimensions within the quantitative and qualitative paradigms. This means that what an assumption represents in one camp is in diametrically opposed to what is represented in the other. Because this study is a qualitative study, the explanation that I use to show how I attempt to link philosophy with practice come exclusively from a qualitative perspective.

The *ontological* assumption speaks to the nature of reality. In reporting the multiple realities (of the researcher, the informants, the audience) that exist in the research process, the researcher depends on the voices of the informants. The *epistemological* assumption addresses the relationship of the researcher to that being researched – the interaction with informants for the duration of the study. On the *axiological* assumption, it is a question of values – the researcher admits and reports the biases that are brought to the study. The researcher’s use of a particular literary style of writing (such as the use of the personal “I” and metaphors) is the crux of the *rhetorical* assumption. The *methodological* assumption
emerges from the aforementioned assumptions. It is concerned with how the researcher conceptualises the entire research process, generally from an inductive logic (Creswell 1998:76-77).

I wish to mention here however, that with regards to the epistemological assumption and with reference to the relocated informants, there was hardly any “distance” or “objective separateness” (Guba & Lincoln 1988:94) for me to try to minimise. To explain, there was minimum shifting of role from “outsider” to “insider”, for although I tried to act as an outsider (as a neutral researcher), I often found myself playing the insider role – a perceived and accepted role by the relocated informants. As an insider, I had access to privileged information that a researcher who is considered an “outsider” may not be able to gain access to. No doubt I was accorded this privilege because of my relationship with, and background knowledge of the relocated informants. I deem my “insider” role as beneficial to the study for in addition to facilitating data collection and analysis, there were no social and cultural barriers to cross. Admittedly, my role as an insider and my relationship with the participants had implications for the axiological assumption. How I dealt with this issue is discussed under the subheading ‘Verifying Data Quality’ (p.54).

**Case Study Design and Supporting Perspectives**

This study has employed a qualitative case study design. A case study has been described as an exploration of a bounded system with a specific focus or “heart” (Miles & Huberman 1994:25). The “heart” or focus of the study is a group of secondary school students who have settled in London after relocating from Montserrat and attend schools in a particular London LEA.

Creswell (1998:39) insists that in addition to identifying clear boundaries for the case, a researcher should “have a wide array of information about the case to provide an in-depth picture of it”. Having taught in Montserrat before and during the volcanic crisis, I have an “array of information” about the case. I have also drawn on a wide array of information from interviews, documents and observations. An intrinsic case study was therefore undertaken because I wanted a better understanding of the phenomenon in question (Stake 1994:243). I have adapted Stake’s format that illustrated the sequence of development of a case to demonstrate how the issue in this study was developed (Table 3.1).
Table 3.1: Issue Development for the Case Study of Montserrat Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topical issue</th>
<th>Levels of achievement motivation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreshadowed problem</td>
<td>Diminished levels of achievement motivation are affecting the educational progress of relocated Montserrat students, at varying degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue under development</td>
<td>To what extent have levels of achievement motivation among relocated students been diminished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertions</td>
<td>The absence of a Montserrat community, plus problems associated with 'refugee' settlement, are mainly responsible for decreased levels of achievement motivation among relocated students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Stake 1994:243)

However, because of the "real-life context" of the phenomenon under investigation, it became necessary for me to incorporate into the field activities, perspectives from two other qualitative traditions of inquiry that have contributed to the investigation of the case study - phenomenology and ethnography.

My decision to use supplementary perspectives was initially influenced by Creswell’s 'Before and After' continuum. On this continuum, Creswell positioned the five traditions of qualitative inquiry (biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study) according to whether they were used before asking questions and gathering data, or after data collection (Creswell 1998:85).

Phenomenology was positioned at the "Before" end for the reason that in a phenomenological study, the researcher decides before hand to examine meanings of experiences of individuals and therefore "starts into the field with a strong orienting framework" (p.86). This study began with 'a strong orienting framework' that emerged from a preliminary study that found that relocated students' levels of achievement motivation had diminished due to a multiplicity of factors brought about by forced migration (Shotte 1998:87-97). This particular orientation was guided by a sociological perspective (social phenomenology) that is concerned with how individuals consciously develop meaning out of social interaction, that is, making meanings of their everyday lives.
With respect to this study, these meanings relate to the direct educational experiences of relocated Montserratian students since their relocation to England.

To help me to understand how respondents make meanings of their lives, it became necessary for me to add an ethnographic perspective to the research process since relocated migrants’ cultural experiences formed the basis for the explanations and interpretations of their lived experiences. Moustakas (1994) cited in Creswell (1998: 236), explains that the term ‘lived experiences’, emphasises in phenomenological studies the importance of individual experiences of people as conscious human beings. From this explanation, I infer that lived experiences are interpreted by individuals even before ‘outsiders’ attempt to interpret or theorise them. This seems to imply that informants can, and do make sense of their experiences, and therefore have a story to tell. I set out to hear that story on the basis of Husserl’s ‘intentionality of consciousness’, which means that the reality of an object is inextricably related to one’s consciousness of it and is therefore perceived within the meaning of the experience of that individual (Gurwitsch 1982:64-68). My application of this is, although relocated migrants have experienced the same phenomenon (uprootedness), each individual has his/her own story to tell. And as a researcher who hails from the same cultural background as the relocated migrants, I consider myself in an advantageous position to try to understand and interpret each story and the interrelationship between them.

Adding an ethnographic flavour to this case study provided me with the opportunity to be reflexive and flexible, conditions that are necessary for qualitative researchers to gain “imaginative insights” (McCracken 1988). An ethnographic angle also makes a meaningful contribution to the overall study, in that this slant allows me entry into the informants’ world, that is their personal feelings, actions and reaction to their educational and everyday experiences. For the purpose of this study, I align myself with anti-positivists who view knowledge as subjective, personal and unique and therefore consider the subjective experience of individuals as a phenomenon of utmost importance. Cohen & Manion (1996:6) contend that social reality is not external to individuals, but rather is a “product of individual consciousness”.
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Ethnography, like phenomenology, was positioned at the “before” end of Creswell’s continuum. Case study was placed at the midpoint of the continuum because it employs theory in different ways – before and after. However, this study is not guided by a specific theory, but rather is an issue-oriented case study (Stake 1994:243). Yet, combining perspectives from the same traditional position (before or after) on the continuum can serve to substantiate the assertions, and the descriptive elements of the study. Besides, traditions of inquiry that are positioned on the same end of Creswell’s continuum, utilise common methods for data collection activities and similar strategies for data analysis. This suggests that combining inquiry from either end of the continuum enhances, rather than adulterates the methods used for data collection and analysis. It should be noted however, that the main purpose for using additional perspectives is to assist understanding of informants’ perspectives rather than to ‘upgrade’ or ‘contaminate’ the design.

By using additional perspectives alongside the main tradition of inquiry, this study has enriched the qualitative methodology employed by making use of different means of data collection strategies. It is generally acknowledged that drawing on multiple sources of information, describing the case, and analysing issues are characteristics of case study research (Stake 1995; Yin 1989; Merriam 1988). The next section will explain the different methods used in working with these complementary approaches.

Methods of Data Collection, Recording and Analysis

Piloting the Study

The fieldwork began in July 1999 with a pilot phase. Ten respondents (4 students, 4 parents and 2 teachers), from one London LEA participated in this phase. Students, parents and one teacher were selected on the basis of location and accessibility. The second teacher was a first-wave Montserrat migrant to the UK who had become a secondary school teacher. This selection – a unique case selection – was made on the basis of status (Merriam 1988:50). The purpose of the pilot was to ‘test run’ the interview schedules that focused on the main issues in the study, before the formal study began. I paid particular attention to how informants interpreted, and responded to the questions, with a view to addressing issues such as the wording and sequencing questions and the reduction of response rate before the actual study began (Oppenheim 1992:47).
Piloting the study proved to be an extremely profitable exercise. The insights that I gained allowed me to make alterations to the interview schedule.

Having analysed the data and explored relationships between themes and categories, I modified all the interview schedules by trimming, merging and refining previously expanded categories (Huberman 1994; Kvale 1996; McCracken 1988). Teachers and students’ interview schedules were tailored to fit a shorter time span. Despite the changes made, educational achievement remained the central theme in all the interview schedules. See Appendices I, II and III for a sample of the restructured interview schedules used in the main study.

**Sampling, Sampling Parameters and The Researcher’s Role**

The presence of a post 1995 relocated Montserrat community in London provided me with the opportunity to collect information from this group, focusing on one Local Education Authority (LEA). This is known as opportunistic sampling. From this ‘universal’ sample, I selected informants to participate in the research process. Based on parental concerns and reports from MCST and MGUKO, a degree of deliberateness was exercised when I selected the informants and the setting, in that, a particular group was selected from among the relocated student population. Opportunistic sampling was thus converted to judgement sampling, a type of non-probability sampling (Honigman 1982:79).

A total of 40 relocated students from 9 secondary schools in a single London LEA participated in the study. The focus on secondary school students was influenced by relocated parents’ concerns about their children who “will soon leave school and be lost in the big British society”. It was generally thought that since the relocated primary school students “have more time to adjust and catch-up”, attention should first be given to secondary school students. The number of students in each year group represented 100% of the relocated students in that particular group at the 12 schools selected. See Table 3.2.
Table 3.2: Composition of Student Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR GROUP</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers are influential actors in students’ educational successes. Their evaluation of students’ progress as well as their perceptions of the students’ overall standards, are important to any assessment of educational progress. I considered teachers’ contributions as important to this research, hence my reason for making the teachers of the sampled students, part of the research process. It should be noted that it was not convenient to have all the teachers of a given student in the sample interviewed. The 25 teachers who were interviewed, were those who had the most, or reasonable contact time with the relocated students. All the relocated students in a given class had the same subject teacher, hence the unequal representation of student to teacher total. Headteachers and/or, heads of department selected the teachers for participation in the research. The teachers represented a cross section of teachers. However, form tutors, heads of year, mathematics and English language teachers dominated the selection.

Thirty-one (31) relocated parents/guardians of the selected students were also interviewed. Prior to relocation 23 of these were engaged in managerial/professional employment. A great majority of the parents/guardians were unemployed at the time when the interviews were conducted. It was necessary to hear the parents’ voices not only because parents have
a strong influence on children's educational attainment, but also because relocated parents' decisions to relocate to England were largely influenced by the continuation of their children's education (GoM 1997:10).

The research was carried out in a London LEA at secondary schools where relocated students were registered. The choice of setting was not only a matter of convenience. Issues and problems as reported by relocated parents to the MGUKO and MCST came from a cross-section of the city, but the LEA selected for the study was one where a relatively high concentration of concerns focussed. Although as noted by the reports, the issues and problems were reasonably congruent across LEAs, a single LEA was selected on the premise that "naturalistic" generalisation is possible, albeit in a restricted sense, for it is based on personal experience. Lincoln & Guba (1985:120) assert that if information is presented in a form that persons experience it, it is possible for them to make "useful extensions of their understandings", that is apply the information in similar contexts.

The Researcher’s Role

In recognition of my role as the primary data-collection 'instrument', I have identified the personal values, assumptions and biases that I brought to the study, explained how I gained access to the participants and the ethical issues that were considered.

Schooling in Montserrat was severely disrupted as a result of the volcanic crisis and because of my involvement in several support projects organised by community groups, PTAs and the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC), invariably, I had to ‘work’ along with students and parents - from the onset of the crisis up until mass relocation began. Furthermore, since I had the opportunity to teach at different levels of the education system, I am fully aware of the many factors that have influenced students' learning. Thus, because of my prior knowledge of the principal informants and my past experiences as a Montserrat teacher, I was ever mindful of the fact that I brought certain biases to this study. For example, if a student addresses a teacher or an older person by his/her first name, as happened sometimes in the schools that I visited, I view this as being disrespectful. For the observation sessions, I would have preferred to be inconspicuous so as not to influence students' actions, but that was not practical. Therefore, as I did for the interviews, I made my purposes of the observation exercise as unequivocally clear as I could (Miles &
Huberman, 1994:p.266). There were no stated objections to my requests. However, I did not take this to mean that the students would be unaffected by my presence.

Admittedly, there were times when my perception and understanding of the data I collected, were shaped by my cultural bias. Nevertheless, as much as possible, I avoided any situation that openly condemned how certain issues such as exclusion and other disciplinary actions were dealt with, that would have ‘confounded’ any aspect of the research process.

I met, and discussed my research project with the Policy and Planning Co-ordinator of the Education Council in the LEA selected for the research. The Co-ordinator was subsequently presented with a copy of my research proposal. I gained access to schools via a letter from the Co-ordinator, sent on my behalf, to all the headteachers concerned. I followed-up this action by visiting each school and presenting a full explanation of my intentions and the purpose of the research to the headteachers (Creswell 1994:148). Having gained access to schools, I gained access to the students after the schools sought and received permission from the parents concerned. Access to parents was made possible via snowballing from relocated Montserratian migrants.

Generally, gaining access to schools was a laborious and frustrating exercise because of some teachers’ aloof attitudes and dismissive reactions to my requests to set up appointments for interviews. I was forced to make several visits to some schools before I was finally granted access. I recognised that my eventual success was realised because I was courteous and I entered negotiation armed with connections, accounts and knowledge (Loftland & Loftland 1995:37).

It was difficult at first to determine which school had registered relocated Montserratian students, for students from the Caribbean are registered as African Caribbean students and teachers were unable to identify the Montserratians within that classification. Additionally, because of the Data Protection Act, teachers were obligated to withhold certain information from me. To overcome this obstacle, I prepared a ‘location information sheet’ (See Appendix IV), which I distributed to relocated parents at a social function held by the Montserrat Overseas Progressive People’s Alliance (MOPPA) in September 1999. Parents
who attended, willingly provided me with the information that I needed. I then returned to the schools with this information and was able to receive confirmation of relocated students’ registration and other related information.

During the initial stages of my visits to schools to set up appointments, I realised that I was nearly always directed to departments for English as a Second Language (ESL), or English as an Additional Language (EAL). I found this interesting since English is the official language of Montserrat. I do not know if relocated students’ attachment in these departments were based on written or verbal assessments, or whether it was because refugees are generally characterised as persons who “speak little or no English on arrival in Britain” (Refugee Council 1997:3). I however used that characterisation to my advantage, for it helped me to find relocated students in instances where there was uncertainty about registration of Montserrat students.

Before the volcanic crisis and particularly since the crisis began, several persons have conducted research in Montserrat (Montserrat Reporter 2000). From all reports, generally, Montserratians were always willing to assist researchers - Montserratians and non-Montserratians alike (Skelton 2000:117). Perhaps assisting researchers, particularly visiting researchers, was taken as another opportunity to extend the legendary Montserrat hospitality. In addition to my positive experiences as a researcher in the Montserrat community (before 1995), my general knowledge of the informants was a useful factor in this study. I experienced no difficulties in arranging meetings with parents/guardians in their homes, at agreed convenient times. Moreover, ‘data protection’ is alien to the Montserrat culture, so locating contact details was always quite simple. In fact, a large proportion of the student and parent sample was reached via snowballing from relocated Montserratians.

The fieldwork was guided by a code of ethics that included honesty, accuracy, consent to participate, confidentiality and data protection. Participants were assured that their position as informants was ‘protected’ and ‘safe’. Informants’ rights to privacy, to refuse to answer particular questions, and to continue to participate, was always be respected (Oppenheim, 1992:p.83), but no one refused or discontinued participation. Because of the nature of the study, some sensitive information was revealed. I therefore ensured that confidentiality was
maintained and that informants had the choice to remain anonymous. All names used in the narrative report are pseudonyms.

**Data Collection, Recording and Analysis**

From formal and informal discussions held with informants, I concluded that the most worrying changes brought about as a consequence of forced migration are the diminished levels of achievement motivation among relocated students. This assumption emerged naturally from the initial informal interviews and therefore became part of the focus for the formal interviews. Subsequent discussions therefore focused on the factors that were perceived to have influenced these particular changes.

*Informal Interviews*

Discussions and conversations were held with persons who were not in the sample. I refer to these as informal interviews. The ‘informal’ interviewees were key representatives of the Montserrat organisations in London, representatives of other migrant minority group associations, members of parental outreach teams and social workers from the LEA where the study was conducted. I found the discussions to be extremely valuable in bringing to the fore settlement issues that are common to migrant ethnic minority groups. The informal interviews gave insight into migrants’ notions of uprootedness, identity, acculturation and educational attainment, and how these notions are constantly challenged, changed and revisited.

On several occasions, I held discussions with the Information Officer at the Montserrat UK Government Office and the manager of MCST. Both persons were well aware of the issues affecting relocated migrants since both offices were established to oversee the needs of relocated migrants in the UK. I used every available opportunity to “chat” with persons who have assisted relocated migrants, in any possible way. Information from all the discussions was documented as field notes. These notes were useful in assisting me to probe issues, particularly those relating to low levels of achievement motivation among relocated students.
Formal Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were used for the 'formal' interviews. Because they allowed a desired level of flexibility, I was able to explain and or, modify questions accordingly. My main objectives for using semi-structured interviews were:

• To ensure that particular themes identified on the interview schedules were adequately covered by asking specific questions on specific issues;

• To collect a variety of data in an informal (semi-structured) way;

• To provide the respondents with an opportunity to give in depth answers, which in turn allows me to investigate motives and related experiences; and

• To provide the researcher and the respondents with an opportunity to explore meanings of questions and answers together (which a questionnaire would not allow).

I recognised that as an interviewer, my presence might influence or bias responses. I however remained convinced that this method of data collection was well suited to a qualitative design, since interviews allowed the researcher to increase flexibility (on-the-spot changes), quantity (more data) and quality (greater depth).

It is generally agreed that non-standardised (semi-structured) or exploratory interviews, by virtue of their informal nature, are well suited for group, as well as one-to-one interviews (Kvale 1996; Breakwell 1995; Creswell 1994; Fielding 1993; Oppenheim 1992). The main purpose of this approach is essentially heuristic - a developing of ideas and research hypotheses rather than a gathering of facts and statistics (Oppenheim, 1992:p.67). This purpose supports a qualitative design for McCracken (1988:p.17) explains that the purpose of a qualitative interview is to gain access to the cultural categories and assumptions according to which one's cultural orientation construes the world. It is the categories and assumptions that are central to the research rather than the people who hold them.

Closed questions were used mainly to obtain personal details. A greater portion of the interviews focused on open-ended questions. These allowed respondents to express their own ideas in their own language (Oppenheim 1992:113). For the student one-to-one interviews, in some instances where questions did not produce an in-depth account of respondents' feelings on particular issues, it was noted that these same issues were freely
and openly discussed in greater depth in the group discussions. It was difficult for me to
determine whether the skeletal responses that resulted in one-to-one interviews were as a
result of students' discomfort with the tape recorder, the phrasing of the question or the
one-to-one setting, or a combination of these factors. What was evident was that generally,
students seemed more relaxed, and tended to contribute more in the group settings -
perhaps because group sessions provided the opportunity for students to be in a familiar
Montserrat setting. Yet, there were a few instances when some students communicated to
me that they would rather discuss certain issues in private. This request did not only come
from among the group of 10 who were my former students, or the other 8 whom I knew and
therefore had a 'special' relationship with me. In fact, it seems reasonable to conclude that
all the students knew of me – either as the teacher from Kinsale School (a school at which I
worked before and during the initial stages of the crisis) or the Montserrat teacher. This was
the way I came to be known in the LEA where the research was conducted. Knowledge of
me was disseminated either by their parents or my former students. This is not unusual in
the Montserrat context. Anyway, it seemed that familiarity was not the catalyst that evoked
a positive climate in students' reactions to the interviews. Students' expressions of gratitude
and their willingness to share information, led me to conclude that they were simply
grateful to have someone who understood and shared their educational sentiments. I was
equally anxious to learn of their general progress.

All the students in the sample participated in the group discussions at their respective
schools. Group interviews focused on the same themes noted in the interview schedules.
With reference to group interviews, Stewart and Shamdasani (1990) cited in May
(1993:94), note that group size is usually small and may range from 8 to 12; and a typical
group session may last from one to two and a half hours. For this study, group size ranged
from 2 to 12, depending on the number of relocated students who were registered at a
particular school. The duration of the sessions too, was much reduced. On average, the
sessions lasted from 30 minutes to one hour. Sessions were scheduled so as not to affect
students' class time, hence before and after class, as well as 'half break' sessions were
arranged. This seems a reasonable arrangement since May (1993:95) affirms that group size
and length of discussions may vary according to the purposes and circumstances of the
research. Besides, despite the relative size of the groups and the length of sessions, the
group discussions provided a wealth of information in a more economical way (Oppenheim
1992:79). Admittedly, the groups of twos and threes limited the dynamic effects of group interaction and expressed opinion. However, there was total involvement for no one was able to “hide behind” the size of the group. Moreover, the discussions did provide me with fresh ideas and relevant information for precoded categories. In this regard, I support Fielding (1993:137) who noted that the strength of group discussions lies in the insight they offer, rather than their sizes.

Some interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for analysis. For others, I took notes as the interview progressed and then wrote a fuller report later. I also wrote notes on some interviews after they were terminated (Burgess 1993:118). I used both verbatim and selective transcripts, according the nature of the interviews (Newell 1993:146).

Time was a great constraint in the teacher interviews. Interviews were conducted over lunch or during non-teaching times (of which I got a fraction). Yet, those sessions proved to be very informative. As the interviews progressed, I became increasingly aware of teachers’ lack of background knowledge of relocated students. Rutter (1998:24) asserts, “it is very important for teachers to appreciate the variety of refugee children’s backgrounds and prior experiences”. But if teachers are to “appreciate”, they should first have the “knowledge”. I therefore volunteered as much background information as possible in the limited time that I was allotted. Teachers were not only thankful for the information, but were also quite surprised (to put it mildly) at the revelation. Perhaps such information may help to readjust some teachers’ casual perceptions of relocated students. I must point out that I did not slight what teachers articulated because they lacked background knowledge of relocated students. All information was taken seriously and given the analytical attention that it warranted.

Teachers’ tight schedules made time a serious issue; I was forced to abandon the tape recording of several interviews. As much as possible, verbatim notes of responses were taken.

Time was not a serious constraint for the parent interviews. And although there were many distressing moments during these interviews, parents always looked forward to our meetings. The interviews were conducted in respondents’ homes at convenient times decided by mutual arrangement. Since time was not an issue, I was better able to clarify
certain questions, probe some responses, and even offer advice on how to handle sensitive issues. Some parents even took control of the interviews. Often, after the introductory remarks, parents led the discussions in directions that addressed ‘burning issues’. Despite the deviations, the issues addressed were related (directly and indirectly) to the themes on the parent interview schedule. The length of the discussions depended on whether the parent(s) had visited schools to discuss issues relating to their child/children’s progress, or whether they had received related correspondence from the schools, and the extent to which they were able to engage with the material.

In some instances, arranged visits for interviews and discussions went as planned. At other times, it was necessary for me to do repeated visits to follow-up on particular ‘evolving’ events such as cases of exclusion and ‘moving house’. And yet at other times, some parents just wanted to “talk” and preferred not to have their “business” tape-recorded. I therefore took notes - verbatim and paraphrased. When I rechecked my notes with parents, they were satisfied that their accounts were accurately represented. Additionally, information collected from one visit sometimes influenced the questions asked on subsequent visits. Themes emerged during different stages of the fieldwork and it became necessary for me to adopt an inductive-deductive approach to the investigation. Such an approach allowed me to make across-the-board associations from the informants’ responses, as well as create a basis for establishing ‘credibility’.

Interestingly, a great majority of the parent interviewed were females from female-headed households. Constraints such as work schedules and other family commitments prevented me from interviewing mothers and fathers together.

Observations
As an observer, I had two roles – participant and non-participant. I assumed a participant observer role when I accompanied relocated parents to schools to sort out particular problems. These sessions provided me with added opportunities for data gathering, thus sustaining the ‘holistic’ approach to my data collection procedures. They have also reinforced my rationale for using supporting perspectives and have verified that the narrative description is based on insights from a range of data collection activities.
Observation sessions were organised with some teachers and were conducted at different schools at convenient times. For these sessions, I was a non-participant observer. Because of timetabling and other administrative factors, it was not convenient for me to observe all the students in a classroom setting. An initial analysis of interviews provided me with the opportunity to select particular students for observation. These were the students whom I noted as having concerns relating to exclusion, irregularity, discipline and absenteeism and thus were the ones who had several follow-up interviews.

At the onset of the study, via quota sampling – arbitrary selection from a list – (Merriam 1988:50), I selected two students from each school to observe them in their classroom/school setting. I expected to pay attention to students':
(a) reactions to instruction from teachers;
(b) interaction with their classmates;
(c) adjustment to a ‘foreign’ classroom/school environment; and
(d) general comfort level.

As the study progressed, an additional objective was added to the above list. This was as a result of an initial analysis of the material received from some teacher interviews. I was particularly concerned about some teachers’ perceptions of relocated students’ behaviour and deportment. In probing on particular behavioural issues, some responses of some teachers were dismissive and it was difficult for me to determine if behaviours were habitual or whether they were related to a particular incident. I wrote next to each ‘questionable’ response - “check this out”. I therefore decided to find out, via observation, if particular behaviours of the students in question were exhibited during the times I visited. Students were observed at different times in formal and informal settings (before, during and after classes, and at lunchtime).

Although my presence as an observer seemed to have “contaminated the natural setting” (Scott 1997:166), that is, influenced students’ reactions, I nonetheless was able to make connections between what I observed and what the teachers had said. I was also able to make a reasonable assessment of students’ social interaction within a ‘foreign’ school setting. This is not to say that ‘observing’ was a simple process, for schools and classrooms are complex environments and the interactions and communication patterns are just as
complex (Hitchcock & Hughes 1995:234). I managed to maintain a degree of detachment from the students during classroom sessions by remaining as inconspicuous as possible. However, at the end of the sessions, I had a ‘short chat’ with the students in order to clarify certain impressions that I had recorded. Some impressions were recorded on the observation schedule that I constructed for this purpose (See Appendix V); others formed part of the field notes.

**Personal Accounts and Reports**

Documentary data (such as personal accounts, reports and field notes) are important to qualitative research (Hodder 1998; Macdonald & Tipton 1993; Burgess 1982). To supplement the material from the interviews, and to ground the investigation in the context of the problem being investigated (Merriem 1988:109), I requested that students write abbreviated accounts of their educational experiences since relocation. This was an optional exercise and students who accepted were reminded to write their accounts at convenient times that would not interfere with their school or family affairs. Students had the choice to write on a specific occurrence or give a general impression of their ‘new’ school life. Twenty-four (24) students responded to this request. I will refer to these accounts in subsequent chapters. These non-mediated accounts of how students perceived their experiences helped me to secure conceptual hunches, as well as to obtain a historical understanding of students’ educational experiences since relocation to England. The students recorded what was most important to them and in doing so they unconsciously revealed something about their “own attitudes, values and beliefs” (Burnett 1977, in Burgess (1982:132).

Some teachers volunteered to write reports about relocated students’ progress. It seemed that the principle reason for this action was “time”. These teachers communicated to me that it was easier for them “to write a report in their own time”, rather than to schedule time for an interview. I found the reports to be very useful for they not only addressed the themes on the teacher interview, but they also provided fresh insights on factors that affected relocated students’ progress and teachers’ attitudes to students. Therefore, in subsequent sessions when time became an issue, I asked the teachers concerned to write similar reports. The response to this request was positive and the material was equally informative.
Data Analysis

Creswell (1994: 153) suggests that data analysis should be a simultaneous process for persons conducting qualitative research. As the fieldwork progressed, this process became evident as I found myself engaged in several activities – collecting, sorting and categorising, reducing and interpreting data. I began by looking for causal links and exploring rival explanation. Creswell (1994:137) refers to this as “explanation building”. Progressively, I developed ‘concept webs’ that I later used to coin themes and construct categories. I looked for relationships between different categories in order to gain insights and further understand the connections among the concepts. In comparing responses across interviews, I found that new themes were emerging and that there were definite correlation and patterns between them. Having identified patterns and correlation between themes, I summarised them and formulated new categories. (Huberman 1994; Kvale 1996; Silverman 1993; McCracken 1988). Driven by Loftland & Loftland’s assertion that diagrams and diagramming are integral and central to the analytical process, I constructed diagrams to show the relationships among the categories of information (1995:147). The search for patterns and relationships was a repetitive exercise throughout the data collection and analysis process, thus there was a continuous refinement of findings. As patterns and relationships emerged, these were compared with patterns predicted from theory with a view to providing structure for my interpretations (Creswell 1994; Bryman 1988; Strauss 1987). By repeatedly searching for patterns and relationships between themes, I was in a better position to make logical interpretations of the findings. The next section will explain how I attempted to make the findings credible.

Verifying Data Quality

Internal and External Validity

I used multiple methods of data collection (interviews, observations, personal accounts, reports) – triangulation, to establish the “credibility” of this research (Bryman 1994:63). Since triangulation was used to help establish credibility with respect to data, I have also employed “member checking” with respect to constructions. In addition to having some teachers and parents in the sample check my interpretations and conclusions of particular data collected, I also co-opted “knowledgeable individuals of interested source groups” (such as the Montserrat organisations and parental outreach teams) to assess general interpretations and conclusions (Lincoln & Guba 1985:315). I was therefore able to
restructure erroneous conclusions. Credibility was further established when I clarified the biases that I brought to the study as described under the subheading ‘The Researcher’s Role’ (p.55) (Creswell 1994:168).

It is hoped that a ‘thick description’ (Creswell 1994:16) of the narrative report of the study will provide a solid foundation for comparison, thus allowing for “transferability”, that is making it possible for interested persons to make application of the material in similar contexts. If this can be done then external validity will be assured. I am mindful of the fact that there are unresolved issues as to what constitutes “proper” thick description. However, purposeful sampling along with an inclusion of a wide range of information in the thick description, does allow for transferability (Guba & Lincoln 1985:316). It should be noted that this study does not provide an index of transferability. Rather, it provides the ‘data base’ (thick description) necessary for potential appliers to make transferability judgements, based on their knowledge of both contexts – the one researched and the one to which the researched information can be applied.

**Reliability**

Oppenheim (1992:p.144) premises that validity and reliability overlap and interconnect, and that demonstration of validity is sufficient to establish reliability. It seems reasonable to conclude therefore that similar methods may be used to ensure validity and reliability. For this study, the overlapping method that was used was triangulation, that is, a multi-method approach to data collection (Cohen & Manion 1996:235). This does not mean however that I have relied solely on credibility to establish dependability although there is some merit in this practice. Lincoln & (Guba 1985:317) recommend that dependability should also be demonstrated separately to show its usefulness in principle and practice. I have therefore depended on my detailed account of the rationale for the design and the data-collection methods and procedures, to demonstrate a separate case of dependability for this study, since a well-detailed account of procedures can allow another researcher to replicate any part of the study in another setting (Creswell, 1994:159).

**The Qualitative Narrative**

Miles & Huberman (1994:299) agree that the reporting of qualitative data is a fertile field and therefore has no fixed formats. However, it is generally accepted that a detailed rich
description is the format often used in most naturalistic or interpretative research (McCracken 1988; Creswell 1994; Kvale 1996).

Creswell (1998:186) notes that a case study research report may be simply descriptive, analytical as in cross-case comparisons, or a mixture of description and analysis. The structure of the written narrative is shaped by the overall purpose of the study. This connotes that the researcher is permitted to exercise a degree of flexibility depending on the nature of the research question and the context and setting of the case. However, within this area of flexibility, it seems imperative that the researcher pay attention to the relationship between data analysis and the narrative as well as how much literature is emphasised in the overall structure. Since this study has employed a qualitative case study design, the report is presented mainly as a descriptive narrative with some analytical interpretations and assertions. It should be noted however, that analytical interpretations might assume dominance in some sections of some chapters.

The use of the personal “I” in the narrative report underlines the researcher’s active involvement in the research process. Thus the researcher became part of the creation of contextualised knowledge that is anchored in particular convictions of the one who creates it (Kvale 1996: 14).

**The Question of Power**

This section discusses the issue of power relations during interviews. It is generally accepted that the researcher occupies a position of power over the participants during the interview process (Kvale 1996:126). I question this generalisation for in this study, my power versus that of the respondents was ‘felt’ to a limited degree in different settings. I noted that different respondents positioned themselves in particular modes in accordance to the subject under discussion, and their general knowledge of me. I have therefore acknowledged that respondents’ reaction depended largely on how they viewed me, and this in turn may affect the “purity” of the data collected (Block 1995:38).

**Teachers and I**

I felt a sense of authority as the one conducting the research, but during some teacher interviews I recognise that there was a transfer of authority for some teachers felt that their
‘space’ was invaded and I could only be accommodated on their terms. Understandably, teachers are running a tight schedule within an “overloaded” curriculum at a period when “raising standards” seems to be the be-all-and-end-all of the education process. I am not certain whether some teachers were not fully aware of my overall objective, or whether they thought that the research was not very important. But the ‘get-on-with-it’ attitudes and the seeming disenchantment exhibited by some teachers forced me to question the source of power during the interviews. It seemed that teachers did not view me as a researcher in a strict sense for although teachers were informed that I was “a researcher from the Institute of Education”, I was often referred to as “the teacher from Montserrat”. It is perhaps some teachers’ social construction of me that clouded the importance of the research. Some teachers who perhaps did not understand the importance of the research, saw me as just another researcher who “interrupts teachers’ work”. Such an attitude created an invisible ‘social distance’ that sometimes made my data collection task as an “outsider” very frustrating. It was at times like these that I felt totally powerless. In my view, to a large extent, teachers’ perceptions of me affected how they responded to the research exercise.

As a researcher, my experience with the teachers led me to conclude that there are shifts of power in the research process and shifts depends on the respondents’ perceptions of the researcher.

**Students and I**

Generally, students viewed me as a Montserrat teacher who still possessed the same level of power and authority as in the island community (Teachers and authority in the Montserrat context will be discussed in Chapter 4). I would use the terms dignified and respectful to describe students’ attitude towards me. There was a natural fluidity in the interview process and although students were relatively open in one-to-one interviews, they seemed more at ease in the group discussions, possibly because these were a bit like ‘a class’ in Montserrat. Throughout the work on this project, I felt a sense of genuine concern for students’ well being and their needs as “refugees”.

I presented myself to the students as a research student, but this did not seem to register well for I did not at any time get the impression that I was perceived as a researcher, but rather as “my teacher” or as a Montserrat teacher. It was generally expected that I would
assess, 'grade' and comment on their progress and ultimately report their progress to their parents/guardians. It was also believed that I was in a position to help them to overcome their 'educational obstacles'. This resulted in me paying repeated visits to the schools, with a view to assisting students to cope with their perceived obstacles such as dealing with complaints and transfers. I sensed a mixture of trust, dependability and security for I was viewed as the teacher who knew and understood family backgrounds and pre and post migration experiences; hence the increase in expectation to assist in any way possible. These expectations however did not infuse a sense of power into me for more often than not, I felt rather 'powerless' since I was unable to live up to all the expectations. Yet, at times when I communicated to the students my failure to meet expectations, their responses suggested a sense of 'respectful' satisfaction. Such reactions implied that my teacher status was an obstacle to levels of frankness for it is highly likely that any disappointment or dissatisfaction might be communicated to peers but not to me.

**Parents and I**

Parents' perceptions of me were similar to those of the students. I was hardly, if ever, viewed as a researcher although that was how I presented myself. Parents seemed rather comfortable in accepting me as a student (not a research student) since many of them were also students. I was placed in the same multi-purpose role (doctor, parent, social worker and even policeman) that Montserrat teachers are accustomed to occupying. Sensitive and painful issues were revealed to me because of my Montserrat identity and open relationship with the parents. I was ever conscious that as a researcher I had an obligation to treat these matters as confidential. Besides, I felt a similar sense of obligation in the perceived roles of social worker, counsellor and psychologist. The confidence and trust that parents placed in me, were no doubt influenced by parents' background knowledge of me as a teacher and community worker.

Whenever parents asked me to accompany them to their children's schools to assist them in dealing with cases of exclusions, it was not because they were not aware of my busy 'student' schedule for this was discussed when setting up meetings for interviews. It was rather because they truly believed that I could assist them in handling an "embarrassing" situation. I was deeply moved by the reports that outlined the reasons for exclusions. I was particularly distressed by parents' alarm and defeatist attitude to exclusion, a practice that
was unheard of in the Montserrat education system. My awareness of the fact that exclusions were not exclusive to relocated students, did little to blunt the pain I experienced, when I realised that some of those excluded were my “nice” students. As I was expected to help the parent to help their children, especially those who were having problems at school, I found myself doing regular visits to these homes. My relationship with the parents did not compromise my relationship with the students, in the sense that I did not make trade-offs or play one against the other when dealing with sensitive issues. However, it was sometimes necessary to provide bases for mutual agreement.

Interestingly, various sensitive issues such as housing, finance and health were raised, but it was for the ‘education’ issues that parents solicited my assistance. I do not know if other persons were solicited to help in other areas, but parents’ attempts to have educational issues resolved as quickly as possible, does underscore the importance that relocated parents place on their children’s education. Similar issues were also reported to MCST and MGUKO.

Throughout the parent interviews, I never felt that I was in a superior position of power, but rather in a partnership working towards a common goal, that is, helping their children to make educational progress. It is also possible that shared pre-volcano as well as pre-relocation experiences helped to maintain the balance in power between parents and I.

During the entire data collection process, not only was I forced to wear several hats, but I also oscillated between the ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ role. Each role brought with it difficult moments and a degree of satisfaction for both functions had their merits and demerits, albeit in varying degrees and under different circumstances. This ‘identity-shifting’ situation tested my research skills and abilities as well as exposed my vulnerability, particularly as an ‘insider’, and brought with it a mixed bag of emotional experiences as will be discussed under the next subheading.

**My Experience as an Interviewer**

The interview process was a taxing experience, not because of the extensive and intensive interviewing and repeated follow-up activities, but because of the interplay of emotions that continually bombarded my psyche. These emotions were stimulated by the different roles
in which I found myself - researcher, mentor, counsellor, social worker, psychologist and Montserrat teacher. Emotions ranged from tender-hearted empathy to bitter compassion. It was indeed demanding to switch roles, but it was even more demanding to draw a definitive line between roles and this provoked several questions such as - When and how do I draw the line between social worker and researcher? Would it be beneficial to the researcher or the informant, to interrupt a ‘story’? Should I ignore the recognised roles and remain ‘the researcher’? I am still trying to come to terms with these issues. Occasionally, I was forced to unwind by sharing my interview experience with fellow students and relocated and first wave migrants.

There was no need to prove to relocated parents and students that the research was important since they viewed any activity relating to educational attainment, as highly important. Although I was not regarded as a researcher in its strictest sense, my visiting schools “to check on students’ progress” was enough to convince the parents and students that the “good job” I was doing, was important.

With regards to some teachers however, it became necessary to point out to them that their understanding of relocated students’ background and educational experiences, was important; and that recommendations from research findings, if taken on board, can help teachers to better understand and cater for students’ individual and collective needs.

Creswell (1998:131) suggests that researchers should “say little during the interview”. I found it difficult to “say little” during most of the interviews. Obviously, I ‘said much’ during the parent and student interviews. Lengthened “I” involvement was provoked and sustained by the “latest volcano update”, “a recent pyroclastic flow”, “continued dome growth” and repatriation issues. These ‘unavoidable’ topics inevitably led to discussions about their implications for educational achievement. My experience as a teacher during the volcanic crisis was the commonality that enhanced complicity between the relocated respondents and me. Sometimes conversations relating to pre and post migration experiences were introduced at the beginning or the end of the interviews, at other times they came out of the interviews when discussing related themes. I think that my participation in sharing experiences sparked a sense of trust, encouragement and hope for according to one parent, “we all in this together and we should help one another”. I saw this
as an equalising of power in the interview process. A positive consequence of this
equalising of power was that parents were very co-operative throughout the interview
process. On the other hand, parents sometimes steered the interview in the direction that
they desired. On more than one occasion, parents asked me questions about relocation and
settlement issues and how I was “coping in this country”.

For the teacher interviews, my extended “I” involvement was used to relate my personal
‘volcano’ experiences. This was done to explain my interest in the relocated students’
educational experiences, to clarify the ‘Montserrat refugee’ issue and to highlight the
importance of the research.

Throughout the interviews, there was a process of reflection as relocated respondents and I
revisited pre-migratory experiences and related emotions - ranging from heights of hope to
depths of despair. The interviews provoked re-evaluations of the current situation and
provided stimuli for a way forward. For example, there were follow-up debates on
imminent repatriation. I recognise that the interviews were not totally responsible for the
intuitive thoughts and reflections, for from my own experience, whenever I see a relocated
migrant or hear a “refugee” or “volcano” newsflash, I involuntarily go into a reflective
mode. However, the interviews did serve as links between the various thoughts and
reflections.

My Montserrat identity as well as the open relationship I had with students and parents
made data collection a smooth, but challenging exercise. I describe the process as smooth
because making arrangements and conducting interviews were relatively problem-free; and
challenging because of the range of emotions that I experienced. Because I was able to
identify with many of the situations that were discussed, it was not always easy to remain
completely objective when analysing the data. However, this did not result in the
documenting of incorrect interpretations and conclusions for I feel that I have put the
necessary mechanisms in place to ensure data validity and reliability.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has outlined the theoretical underpinnings of the methodology used for this
study and described the methods of data collection, recording and analysis used for the
fieldwork. It explained why a qualitative approach was best suited for the study and why it became necessary to incorporate other perspectives into the case study design. A phenomenological perspective was chosen to allow the respondents to interpret or make sense of their lived experiences, while an ethnographic slant was added to highlight the cultural orientations that influenced relocated migrants’ perceptions of their ‘new’ experiences. Thus, the researcher was better able to understand how respondents make sense of the situation in which they find themselves.

The next chapter presents a description of the social (educational and cultural), political and economical orientation of Montserrat society, which formed the cultural base of the relocated migrants.
Chapter Four

The Emerald Isle: A Historical Account

To live without history is to live without a form of memory. Without history, you, your family, your tribe, or even your nation would seem to be without roots, without a past. The present would seem to have no foundation and little if any meaning (Awake 2001).

Introduction and Background

This chapter presents a historical account of the political, economic and social circumstances that have shaped and influenced the relocated Montserratian lives. It also examines migratory patterns from Montserrat since 1838. The discussion begins with some background information.

Montserrat is a 102 sq.km/39.5sq.mls volcanic Caribbean island that is situated in the inner arc of the Leeward Islands, approximately 25 miles south-west of Antigua, its international gateway. It is a British Dependent Territory Overseas (BDTO) whose pre-relocation population of approximately 10,000 was predominantly black, that is, of West African origin. Up until the volcanic crisis, the white population of Montserrat represented 1% of the whole (Philpott 1973:25) and this ratio was maintained up until 1990s (Daly 1996:14).

Montserrat’s membership in the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean State (OECS), allows it to share a common currency with other member states. Although Montserrat remains a BDTO, because of its connections via the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and other regional organisations and institutions, political, economic and social issues affecting these establishments also affect Montserrat.

Political, Economic and Social Developments

Slavery, colonialism and cultural traditions such as steelband, calypso and carnival are the commonalties often used to describe the historical background of Caribbean peoples. It cannot be denied that sharing the same Caribbean Sea implies a tale of similarities and sameness. However, despite these common factors each island boasts its unique features - physical and social. Consider this comparison between Montserrat and Antigua. A ‘tiny’ proximity of (25 miles) speaks a vast difference of mountainous and volcanic versus flat and coral; and an Irish heritage does not feature in Antigua’s social structure. In fact,
Montserrat is the only Caribbean Island that has inherited an Irish tradition left by the Irish settlers who were the island’s earliest European settlers, thus making it the sole Caribbean observer of St. Patrick’s Day (March 17).

I consider these differences to be just as important as the similarities that have helped to shape the Caribbean societies, for it is within these contrarieties, however subtle, that the peculiarities of an island people are identified. These peculiarities too have become part of the matrix that has framed the life patterns of the nation. Hence, I did not find it shocking, or even out of place, to find that interviews conducted with relocated informants revealed that they were angered when labelled Jamaicans or simply African Caribbean. The issue of misnaming will be further discussed in the next chapter. It is indeed a grave misconception to view Caribbean peoples as a total homogeneous group.

**Political Developments**

**Settlement Patterns**

The Amerindians (Caribs), early inhabitants of Montserrat named the island Alliouagana (Irish 1973:4). It was the Spanish explorer, Christopher Columbus, who renamed the island Montserrat “in honour of the mountain abbey of that name outside Barcelona in Spain” (Fergus 1994:10). Having named the island, Columbus continued his Caribbean exploration, so it was the influence of Amerindian, Irish, English and French settlement, rather than the Spanish, that has helped to shape the island’s political, economic and social development before and after colonisation. Despite Frances’ occupation of the island from 1665-67 and 1689-1712 (Fergus 1994:23), Montserrat was established as English from 1678 onwards (Skelton 2000:107).

Africans took their place in the settlement chain in 1654 when they were brought to the island as slaves to work on the sugar plantations. In that same year, a colonial structure (an Anglo-Irish planter class with a sizeable black slave population) materialised (Fergus 1994:19).

European planters and their families first grew tobacco. When sugar was introduced in the 1640s, larger plots as well as a greater labour force were required. One school of thought is
that slaves were brought to the island from that date. However, there is no documented evidence to support this belief. The recorded date that is officially accepted for the first slave importation to Montserrat is 1651 (Fergus 1994:60).

As the sugar industry expanded, so did the slave population. In 1672 there were 523 slaves on the island and subsequently there was a steady increase with a peak of 10,000 in 1774. Thereafter, there was a steady decline up until emancipation. By 1838, the slave population had decreased to 6,401 (Fergus 1994:61). The total population of Montserrat in 1869 was 7,645 and it had increased by 12.1% in 1871 (Daly 1996:6). Given that the slave population increased since emancipation, it follows that the black and coloured population was to a great extent the dominant ethnic group in 1871. Since that period Montserrat’s population has remained predominantly black (Daly 1996:6).

Governance and Status
Montserrat has been a British dependency since its colonisation in 1632. A system that empowered a single government officer to introduce bills (the representative system) was in place until 1866 when the island became a Crown Colony. Historian Sir Professor Howard Fergus describes the situation this way:

The narrow Old Representative system came to an end in Montserrat in 1866, giving way to a more subtle exclusive system as far as the free blacks were concerned. There was only room in Crown autocracy for whites or their wealthy coloured equivalents. The auspices for a balanced and equitable development of the new society were not favourable (Fergus 1994:100).

I have concluded from the foregoing that such a situation increased the control of the British Government - a control that still exists despite the emergence of democracy and constitutional governance during the 1960s. Thus, Montserrat remains one of the oldest BDTOs for Montserrat not only rejected Associated Statehood in 1967, but it also declined independence during the 1970s and 1980s, a period when the rest of the English-speaking Caribbean saw decolonisation as the way forward.

Statehood in association with Britain was a quasi independence under the guardianship of the United Nations that guaranteed security and protection of the state’s rights (Fergus 1994:212). From 1974 onwards, the United Nations Decolonisation Committee (UNDC)
paid periodic visits to the Caribbean to discuss issues relating to independence. Montserrat’s immediate neighbours (Antigua and Barbuda and St. Kitts and Nevis) who accepted Statehood no doubt viewed this stage as a stepping-stone to independence.

The Independence Saga

Montserrat’s hesitancy to divorce itself from colonial rule might have stemmed from the fear of future political instability, at least in the opinion of one of its former Chief Minister (CM), P. Austin Bramble:

In a tiny territory like Montserrat, an independent government could very easily abuse its power and disrespect the rights of its people, and militant minorities could for selfish interest bring about disruption and turmoil (quoted in Fergus 1994:212).

The above comment is part of the rationale CM Bramble presented to the nation in 1980 to justify his commitment to colonial status. In 1984, when an economic downturn severely maimed the Caribbean economies, Bramble reiterated his view when commenting on reports of the ruling party’s (People’s Liberation Movement - PLM) independence thrust:

At a time when widespread political instability in so many parts of the world coincides with economic recession, Montserrat should commit itself unambiguously to maintaining the constitutional status most likely to nurture stability (Fergus 1994:213).

Bramble was not a lone political voice crying out in the wilderness for another political leader, Bertrand Osborne, echoed similar sentiments to the UNDC on their 1982 mission to Montserrat. The UN team noted however, that a few “strategic” persons believed that the government should begin to prepare for independence for they saw independence as “a legitimate and logical goal towards which the island should strive” (Fergus 1994:214).

Apart from the views of these few “strategic” persons, I am not certain whether the aforementioned views on independence were widely held. What was evident was that during John Osborne’s time as CM (1978-91), he constantly and persistently advocated political independence for Montserrat. He saw independence as the gateway to global connections that would eventually activate economic growth.
W. H. Bramble became Montserrat's first CM in 1961 (Fergus 1994:161), after the island had gained more self-governance via a 1960 legislative act (Skelton 2000:107). More self-governance via constitutional reform allowed a ministerial system of government in which an elected Minister headed a ministry (education, finance and trade among others) – a notable change from the merchant-planter class oligarchy. For Montserrat however, self-governance has had limited meaning since the country still operates under British jurisdiction. In the ministerial system, a government is formed by a team of elected ministers with the CM as its head; but a Governor who is appointed by the Crown on the advice of the Foreign Secretary, remains the head of state. In addition to defence, external affairs, internal security and the public service, in 1989, the Governor became responsible for international finance services. He also gained the authority to introduce and put into effect legislation on matters relating to “his reserve powers” and the right to delegate responsibility to a Minister “or any other person or authority” (Fergus 1994:209). The Governor’s “reserve powers” allows him to effect legislation without the approval of the legislative council.


Currently, because of the poor state of the economy brought about by the volcanic crisis, DFID oversees and controls the Montserrat’s economic affairs (Government of Montserrat 1998). Consequently, it seems that independence is further away from Montserrat than it was twenty years ago. An explanation of the foregoing comment is probably best summed up by the following:
As a consequence of the ongoing volcanic crisis, Montserrat has become a recipient of budgetary aid. According to HMG procedures, if an Overseas Territory receives budgetary aid on a regular annual basis, or is likely to do so, then the finances of that territory must come under the supervision and, in effect control of the Secretary of State (DFID 1999:126).

When compared to the island’s economic progress during the 1980s, this arrangement of control may be considered a climb-down. The occasional tensions that arise from this situation are evident in the view that government is “disappointed with the slow pace of project approval by DFID" (Montserrat Reporter 2001).

**Citizenship**

Interestingly, Montserrat’s vintage colonial status does not bring it under the umbrella of the Old Commonwealth for in this context ‘old' encompasses Canada, New Zealand and Australia. The ‘new’ is reserved for the Asian, African and Caribbean Commonwealth countries (Skelton 2000:107). Taking into consideration the dominant ethnic composition of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ territories, such a division suggests a clear racial distinction in broad categories of white and black. Nonetheless, as a member of the New Commonwealth, Montserrat’s newly (from 1998) renamed BDTO status still does not allow its ‘quasi citizens’ automatic British citizenship despite their possession of a ‘British’ passport. I use the term ‘quasi citizens’ because Montserrat could not confer citizenship on Montserratians since it is not a nation state. Britain as a nation, did not confer citizenship on Montserratians either. Via Parliamentary Acts, the definitions and redefinition’s of former nations of the Empire that resulted in renaming colonies BDTOs (with the exception of the Falkland Islands), were not enough to effect a ‘new’ status since Britain’s Immigration Acts excluded citizens of the BDTOs, except patrials. It should be noted however, that this new arrangement does not affect residents of Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands who acquired British citizenship in 1981 and 1983, respectively (Dispatch 1998). Therefore, taking into account the ethnic structure of the Montserrat population, British citizenship by descent (patrial status) for the most part, is a remote possible for Montserratians.

A White Paper released by the British Government in March 1999, emphasised partnership as a way forward for Britain and its BDTOs. One of the ways in which Britain promised to commit itself to this partnership was by extending British citizenship to BDTOs citizens.
who wanted it. In 2001, Baroness Amos, Minister for Overseas Territories, in a discussion of the British Overseas Territories Bill reported that the bill would supplement or amend the 1981 Nationality Act so as to:

(a) to replace references to "dependent territory" with "British overseas territory and to rename "British Dependent Territories citizenship" as "British overseas territories citizenship";

(b) to grant British citizenship to everyone who is a British overseas territories citizen (BOTC) at commencement (except for BOTC of the Sovereign Base Areas);

"BOTC who become British citizens will retain their status as BOTC unless they renounce it; and they will be able to renounce British citizenship if they do not want it" (Amos 2001).

Baroness Amos also made reference to Clause 3, which explains how “British Overseas Territories citizens will automatically become British citizens, with the right of abode in the UK, on commencement of the citizenship provisions of the Bill”. It should be noted however, that there was no given date for when the bill would be effected as the date of commencement would be decided by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs by statutory instrument. The Secretary must first be satisfied that the practicalities for implementation of the citizenship provisions are in place. FCO Minister, Ben Bradshaw again commended the Bill to the House of Commons on 22 November, 2001, (Bradshaw 2001). BOTCs are now entitled to full British citizenship².

Economic Development
The presence of the old sugar mills and plantation structures in Montserrat tell a tale of the dominant sugar economy that existed on the island during the slavery years. Fergus (1994:41) noted that in 1729 98.5% of all cultivated lands were under sugar cane. It should be noted however that tobacco was the earliest crop to generate huge profits. Between 1683 and 1684, 47,500 pounds of tobacco were exported to England. By the end of the nineteenth century, a diversification in the agricultural industry saw crops such as limes, coffee, cocoa, ginger and fruits as profitable “alternative industries” (Fergus 1994:123). But

² As of 21 May 2002, all BOTCs are entitled to full citizenship passports. Under the Overseas Territories Act, BOTCs are allowed to hold both a BOTC and a British Citizenship passport (Montserrat Community Support Trust 2002:1).
it was cotton production that took over the economy when the sugar industry declined during the first decade of the twentieth century. Lack of technology and the return of wealthy landowners to England, among others, are reasons cited for the decline in sugar production. Cotton production was a significant economic factor up until the early 1950s when "able-bodied labourers left in droves" for Motherland England (Fergus 1994:137). The industry experienced its peak production in 1941 when 1,175,935 pounds of lint were produced from 5,395 acres. Cotton was initially a primary industry, but from the 1970s became an integrated industry with the inclusion of "the manufacture of fabrics, garments and other household articles" (Fergus 1994:134).

Following the sugar and cotton era, changes were made in the structure of the economy. In 1973, under the leadership of P. A. Bramble, Montserrat attracted new industries by offering tax incentive such as import duty relief, tax holiday relief and capital grants to foreign and local investors (GoM 1973:1). One of the objectives of the government development plan was "to build a balanced and healthy economy based on a wide range of profitable industrial and manufacturing activities". CM Bramble reinforced that such development was to "bring new jobs, new income and new strength to the economy" (GoM 1973:1&2). I do not wish to focus here on the extent to which the objectives of the development plans were realised. However, Figure 4.1 does show that a structural change brought about new jobs in primary, secondary and primary industries.

Figure 4.1: Distribution of Employment in Montserrat - 1973

Derived from Government of Montserrat (1973:13)
Successive CMs have continued to focus on the transformation of an agricultural base economy “to a service and export-oriented economy with tourism, light manufacturing (electronic assembly and textiles) and construction as the main industries” (Daly 1996:1). Additionally, because of its membership in CARICOM, Montserrat was able to undertake several economic activities in association with other member states.

Notably, it was during John Osborne’s time as CM (1978-91) that the island experienced significant economic growth as noted by the following statement:

In 1982, the island graduated from grant-aided status, two years before the time that the British Government had scheduled for it. Osborne was on target in realising his dream of seeing every Montserratian ‘with his own house and car, a good job and money in the bank’. By 1981 the island experienced a growth of 4.6% in the economy, although the agricultural sector remained stagnant (Fergus 1994:205).

Yet, it was generally thought by the electorates that the economy was too fragile and it needed “substantial economic improvements” to take Montserrat into independence, hence the preference for a colonial status (Skelton 2000:105). The qualifier ‘substantial’ does suggest that the island had experienced some degree of economic improvement, albeit at levels that were generally perceived to be unsatisfactory for independence. Daly (1996:46) has noted confirmation of this degree of improvement in economic conditions in an analysis of the 1991 Montserrat Population and Housing Census. Skelton describes the general socio-economic situation before July 1995 this way:

A quiet and relatively prosperous ‘small place’, Montserrat had good levels of employment, high standards of health care and education provision, an estimated per capita income of over £2000 per annum, and boasted one of the highest standards of living in the Caribbean for its population as a whole (Skelton 2000:104).

However, in June 1995, Thomas Fitzgerald and Howard Fergus in their study that investigated what defined Montserratian national identity, noted that Montserrat was “faced with economic woes” (Fitzgerald & Fergus 1997 in Skelton 2000:114). In the light of Daly’s analysis and Skelton’s description, this observation may seem a contradiction. The following analysis is perhaps the context in which such a ‘woeful’ description can be interpreted.
Prior to the volcanic crisis (July 1995), Britain provided an annual developmental aid package of about £1 million, which was to be reduced by 1996; and the island had not received budgetary aid (finances to pay salaries and wages, among other governmental duties) since 1981 (Skelton 2000:114). However, following the devastation (over 95% of properties damaged) of Hurricane Hugo in September 1989, perhaps in recognition of its responsibility to Montserrat, Britain provided a £16 million aid packet for the redevelopment of the severely damaged infrastructure (DFID 1999:15). This provision no doubt helped to influence the speedy physical recovery (repaired infrastructure and residences) that the island made in the wake of such a destructive disaster. By 1994, it was the general view of visitors to the island that Montserrat was “back on its feet again”. According to DFID (1999:15), Montserrat “had largely recovered from the impact of Hurricane Hugo in 1989”. DFID’s analysis of the situation seems to support the visitors’ view.

The volcanic crisis has had a devastating effect on the Montserrat economy. Prior to the volcanic crisis, the Montserrat economy realised an average growth rate of 2% per annum between 1991 and 1994 (DFID 1999:115). Early in 1995, the government’s Medium Term Economic Development Plan projected continued growth in agriculture, tourism and manufacture for the period 1995 to 1998. There was also a forecast for the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) “to increase by an average of 4.7% per annum in real terms between 1995 and 2003” (DFID 1999:115).

Whether these projections were over ambitious, is debatable. The fact is that the volcanic crisis not only retarded the island’s economic growth, but it also rendered the 1995 economic projections invalid. Since July 1995, Her Majesty’s Government (HMG) has become totally involved in “almost every aspect of Montserrat’s social and economic life and administration” (DFID 1999:23). Hence, there is now a greater need for economic stability. Such a rapid economic downturn has affected every aspect of national development. Thus, Montserrat’s social development has not gone unscathed.
Social Development

The factors that have shaped the social milieu of relocated Montserratians are many and varied. For the purpose of this discussion, I wish to examine two of those factors that relate directly to this study - education and culture - two factors that are not only interrelated but are also as complex and as all-encompassing as the 'social umbrella' itself. I consider these two factors as important because they relate directly to the issues in that, it is within a Montserratian cultural boundary that relocated students have framed and interpreted their educational experiences in England.

Education

When formal education for Caribbean people was introduced during the later decades of the nineteenth century, it provided Montserratians with a long-awaited opportunity to make positive advancement, by building a progressive and productive society. By 1995, the start of the volcanic crisis, formal education had developed and expanded to embrace many levels and components – pre-primary, primary, secondary and tertiary levels, technical, special and adult education. However, for this study, I will describe only two levels – primary and secondary.

Primary Education

At the turn of the twentieth century, there were 13 primary schools in Montserrat. Twelve of these were denominational schools - 8 Anglican, 3 Methodist, 1 Catholic and the other private; the government owned no schools. Although in theory primary education was compulsory, poor socio-economic conditions caused attendance figures to drop. Irregularity was a major problem as noted by the following:

Children were required to assist their parents in the fields in the interest of survival, and for most of the first half of the century, school space was, in any case, inadequate to accommodate all the children. Besides, some parents who could not provide the requisites such as books and slates kept their children at home (Fergus 1994:173).

Schools were run by dual management - by a Board established by Government under the 1925 Education Act of the Federal Acts of the Leeward Islands, and by managers who were generally ministers of religion. Financial problems developed at an administrative level for although the Government bore the greater part of the financial burden in this dual
arrangement, its contributions were insufficient for the effective running of the school system (Fergus 1994:174).

Problems of another kind surfaced. The religious leaders not only owned the ‘school’ buildings, they also hired the teachers. So when the Board of Education imposed on these managers compulsory regulations concerning school management, they responded by making denominational membership a necessary condition for teaching. This condition led to a situation where “the best qualified persons were not always employed” (Fergus 1994:174). Some children were also adversely affected for in many instances, these children had to travel relatively long distances on foot to attend schools ‘of their parents religious persuasion’, despite the fact that there were schools in their immediate neighbourhood. Moreover, Government had to turn a blind eye to obvious problems since the schools belonged to the churches and government was not financially able to take over the schools (Fergus 1994:175). Administrative inefficiency and disparity in conditions of service between the two types (denominational and government) of school were two such problems that the government chose to ignore. These and other problems were not addressed until 1945 when the government finally assumed full responsibility of all the schools. The Catholic School however, remained under the administration of the Catholic Church.

The economic strides (a 4.6% growth) that Montserrat made during the 1980s (Fergus 1994:205), brought about an improvement in conditions for schooling. The problems of overcrowded classes and inadequate accommodation mentioned above, were among the many ‘schooling’ problems that were addressed.

Heavy out-migration during the post-war period (Philpot 1973:21) as well as a dramatic decline in birth rates (Foster & Evans 1978:28), seemed to have been directly responsible for the reduction in school enrolment, hence alleviating the problem of overcrowding. By 1994, the average class size was 19.8 (Ministry of Education 1996:25) – a significant improvement over the 1950s average of 64.

In the 1970s, new schools were constructed to replace the church schools that were judged ‘unsuitable’ by a government inspection team (Foster & Evans 1978). The decline in school
enrolment was more significant in some schools than others. Therefore in the interest of financial gains, the government decided to close the schools that had very small enrolments (less than 50 pupils). Consequently, Long Ground, St. Patrick’s and St. Peter’s schools were closed in 1981. One private school, Piper’s Preparatory was also closed in 1981. The Plymouth Primary School had already replaced the St. Mary’s and Wesley schools in 1976, hence by 1985 there were a total of 12 primary schools - 9 government, 2 denominational and 1 private (Bray et al 1985:15). When the volcanic crisis began, there were 11 primary schools because the lone private school was closed in 1994 (Ministry of Education 1996:4).

Up until 1986, final year pupils (11+) wrote the CEE to gain access to The Montserrat Secondary School (MSS) that was established in 1938. Pupils were tested in English, Mathematics and Intelligence and those pupils who did not pass the CEE were allowed to enter the Junior Secondary School system (established in 1972) – a three-year integrated practical and academic programme. The curriculum and methodology adopted within the primary schools were influenced by the CEE. Although the CEE served as a motivation to achieve academic excellence for pupils and teachers alike, it was generally thought that the examination had a deleterious effect on primary and secondary education. There were concerns that accelerated promotion through the primary system might endanger children’s social development as well as curtail certain work that had to be omitted or rushed over. It was also noted by some teachers that some subjects (Social Studies, Science and the Creative Arts) were neglected at the expense of English and Mathematics, the core subjects for the CEE. English and Mathematics dominated every school’s timetable. 60% of the time was equally apportioned to English and Mathematics, while 8% was allotted to Intelligence Test (Bray et al 1985:25). This meant that other subject areas were shortened since approximately two thirds of the timetable was spent on CEE related work. Besides, it was highly unlikely that one subject area was used to enhance another because of the rigidity in time-tabling - the same time was allotted to a subject in each class. Other concerns were that CEE ‘league table’ encouraged teachers to concentrate on the more able students, thus neglecting the students who truly needed assistance (Bray et al 1985:24&25).
The controversy that surrounded the CEE gave rise to the restructuring of the Montserrat education system in 1986. The two main objectives that the government considered might be achieved through restructuring were:

- To extend the period during which all children would have access to education; and
- To avoid an element of social stratification in which some bright children gained places in the Montserrat Secondary School on completion of their primary school, but others were 'doomed' to attend the less prestigious and less academically oriented junior secondary schools (Bray et al 1985:9).

A Pre-Vocational Programme (PVP), thought to be crucial to restructuring was introduced as part of the restructuring. At Form 4, an academic base syllabus was combined with practical activities in commerce, industrial agriculture, craft and hotel trades.

Like most changes, the restructured programme generated criticisms. These criticisms did not emerge from rigorous research findings, but rather from anti-change sentiments within particular groups. It seems too that the 'low social status' that was attached to the PVP may have influenced some of the criticisms. Fergus (1994:191) noted that there were four basic criticisms:

- It leads to low achievement at the primary level;
- Instead of automatic promotion from grade to grade children should be allowed to repeat classes;
- The PVP creates a cadre of intellectually backward students; and
- Comprehensivisation means a general lowering of standards and therefore the CEE should have been retained, to motivate pupils.

In 1992 however, a Review Body headed by Dr David Pennycuick of the University of Sussex confirmed support for comprehensivisation. The Review Body was appointed by the government. In general, the team supported the abolition of the CEE.

Shortcomings of the restructured system seemed to have stemmed from pedagogical weaknesses and failure on the part of some officials to adequately prepare for such an innovation, rather than the restructuring itself. Nonetheless, there were some amendments,
including the adjustments to automatic promotion that needed to be given practical consideration. This does not mean however, that the abolition of CEEs is neither practical nor desirable. In 1994, leader of a University of the West Indies (UWI) education reform group, Professor Errol Miller, recommended that “the entire sub-region should follow the British Virgin Islands, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis in providing universal secondary education to all children up to the age of 16” (Fergus 1994:192).

The government hoped that restructuring would bring about a system that was more comprehensive and less divided. From 1986 onward, all primary school children gained automatic access to MSS. A Grade Six Examination (GSE) replaced the CEE that was then abolished. The purpose of the GSE was to determine how students would be streamed on entering MSS. Let me hasten to add that the scope and depth of the content and the general quality of the GSE were of no less rating than the original CEE. However, the conditions under which the GSE was administered was different and perhaps, less formal. Students wrote the examination in their respective primary schools, but general administration remained the responsibility of MoE.

Based on discussions held with some Grade 5 and 6 teachers, and on my teaching experience at these levels, I would venture to propose that the GSE arrangements, to some degree, avoided the backwash effects of the CEE on the curriculum. For example, teachers were noted to pay more attention to basic mathematics and reading skills and devote ‘quality’ time to the non-core subjects. However, I have also noted that teachers were still concerned about content coverage since it was generally believed that students who were exposed to more content were most likely to secure an ‘A’ position on the overall GSE ‘league tables’. Moreover, a school’s ‘good’ rating by the general community was usually defined by the number of ‘A’ places that school attained.

The Overseas Development Administration (ODA), played a leading role in concretising the restructuring idea in 1986. It commissioned a team to produce the project. The team, which included two local educators, was headed by a lecturer from the University of London (Fergus 1994:190).
On July 18, 1995, almost a decade after the education system was restructured, the Soufriere Hills Volcano sprang to life. As the crisis escalated the education system was gravely affected and schooling was severely disrupted. However, up until then there was a general improvement in primary education despite the ‘up and down’ in school enrolment. In 1987, primary enrolment was as low as 1351 but was increased by 50 the following school year (Teschner 1992:29). This fluctuation in enrolment continued until the beginning of the 1994 / 95 school year, although enrolment never exceeded the pre-restructuring figures. Average annual attendance was relatively good - always above 90 % as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Average % Attendance - Primary Schools Montserrat 1991-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from Ministry of Education (1996:24)

Montserratian students were nurtured in a sound, stable primary school environment. It was this background of stability that relocated students brought to the UK.

Secondary Education

After many financial struggles and repeated efforts to establish secondary education, the Montserrat Grammar School was opened in 1928 with 26 boys (Fergus 1994:183). Prior to this occurrence, a few children from wealthy families had secondary education in neighbouring Antigua and St. Kitts, and further south, Barbados. Notably, at that time there was no secondary education available for the girls, although a Miss K. L. Gray, an English woman, had set up a Girls’ High School in 1926. This venture lasted for five years.

Four years after the opening of the Boys’ Grammar School, a Mrs A. G. Horner, another English woman, established a Girls’ High School. This school had a life span of six years.
for in 1938 the Grammar School and the High School were amalgamated and renamed the Montserrat Secondary School (MSS) (Fergus 1994:183).

Amalgamation of both schools was not automatic. Debates on secondary education for both sexes, as well as dissatisfactions concerning the elitist nature of the ‘tone’ of the Grammar School, influenced the move to join both schools (Fergus 1994:183). At that time, children of working class families were never given the opportunity to access secondary education. The disparity was clearly noted even by the manner in which funds for schooling were distributed by the government. Relatively substantial amounts were spent on the children of the elite class while very little was spent on ‘poor’ children. The ratio of percent of public funds to secondary students was approximately 1:1.5 children, while the ratio of percent of public funds to elementary children was approximately 1:42 children (Fergus 1994:183). The Grammar School structure was a mirror image of the class divisions of the society, as is suggested by the following comment:

A study of the surnames of the 24 students on roll in 1934 is very revealing sociologically. Seven boys belonged to a single-family group, four to another family and at least seventeen stemmed from merchant and planter houses. None came from the labouring classes, whose sweat and toil sustained the school (Fergus 1994:184).

Other forces fought against the entry of ‘ordinary’ children to Grammar School. Entry tests were culturally biased. Poor rural parents performed poorly in culturally biased interviews that were prerequisites for their children’s entry to the Grammar School. Additionally, only a limited number of children were allowed to write the entrance scholarship examination. These chosen few unknowingly helped to maintain the status quo, for they ultimately became eligible-candidates for the prestigious Leeward Islands Scholarship. Students, who gained this scholarship, pursued particularly the learned professions of law and medicine. Hence, Grammar school students were perceived to be not only head and shoulders above, but also ‘elitely’ miles apart from elementary students (Fergus 1994:185).

In 1955, major systemic changes occurred at MSS. A general curriculum was offered ‘with a strong infusion of practical subjects’. Fees were abolished but admittance could only be gained by passing the highly competitive Common Entrance Examination (CEE). When a technical department was added to the school in 1963, woodwork and metalwork (for boys)
and home economics, needlework, straw work, typing and shorthand (for girls) were added to the syllabus (Fergus 1994:186).

Dissatisfaction with the recognised difference in the status of local and overseas certification for the technical programme and the mainstream programme respectively, led to a reorganisation of the system in 1966. Although all students then entered secondary education via the CEE, two years later, they were ‘siphoned into one or other of two different but parallel courses according to interests and aptitudes’ (Fergus 1994:187). Again this arrangement was short-lived, for the bias towards the literary curriculum appeared to have created the ‘old’ Grammar School ‘elitist’ atmosphere.

The next change came in 1972. A Junior Secondary School (JSS) system came into existence in that year. Students who failed to qualify for entry to MSS were prepared for the job market. They were exposed to three years of academic and practical training. Students who performed exceptionally well at the end of this cycle were admitted to the third form at MSS. This arrangement too, proved unsatisfactory, for an Advisory Committee to the MoE recommended that the system be restructured to ensure secondary education for all students. This recommendation was made in 1976, but action to bring this about was not initiated until 1984. The system was eventually restructured in 1986 by abolishing the CEE and granting secondary education to all students. There was a steady increase in enrolment at MSS up until 1995 as shown in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991/1992</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/1993</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ministry of Education 1999)
During the last century, education in Montserrat underwent several changes that resulted in an improved system. Relocated students came from a settled, well-functioning secondary school system. The volcanic crisis interrupted a period when MoE was making significant strides in its thrust for educational excellence.

Culture
In this study, culture is used in a context that explains culture as “a system of beliefs, values, and modes of construing reality that is shared by a group or society” (Saljo 1994:1242). Saljo posits that this is the symbolic side of culture, in which language plays a decisive role.

Interwoven into Montserrat’s core culture of creative expressions of music, literature and traditional customs, are Amerindian, African, European (particularly Irish) traditions, as well as Caribbean and North American influences. It is within this tapestry of traditions and influences that the identity of Montserratians is manifested. Since relocation to England, other cultural forces constantly challenged this identity.

The Irish legacy is worth mentioning not only because Montserrat is the only Caribbean island with an Irish legacy, but also because indelible Irish imprints have become an integral part of the island’s heritage and are thus intrinsic parts of the Montserratian identity. From the many national symbols of Irish origin, I wish to make mention of the Irish names that have become typical Montserrat names. Surnames such as Allen, Bramble, Dyer, O’Brien, O’Garro, Riley and Tuitt, symbolise Montserrat in Caribbean circles.

It was knowledge of the Irish/Montserrat names that helped me to identify the Montserrat students from a list of African Caribbean students on the schools’ registers when selecting my sample for the interviews. Relocated migrants use a similar strategy to locate other relocated migrants. For example, when a relocated student learned that a new student with surname ‘Dyer’ had come to her school, she concluded that the new student was a Montserratian and almost immediately set about making contact. In this instance, the student’s conclusion was correct. This does not mean however that all such assumptions hold true, although more often than not a Montserrat connection is involved. What remains
true is that ‘Montserrat’ names are much more than labels; they represent an implicit strand of ‘Montserratness’.

The masquerades, the string band, calypso and steelband (both originated in Trinidad) are cross-cultural ethnic influences that have become an integral part of Montserrat’s cultural.

Particularly since the 1980s when American cable television became the major media attraction, North American influences have had a powerful effect on some traditional customs such as story-telling and folk dancing. Soap operas among other television and electronic entertainment replaced story-telling while cheerleaders took the place of folk dancers at some sporting and festival events.

Cathy Buffonge had this to say about cheerleading, Montserrat culture and American television:

......perhaps we can say that cheerleaders have become assimilated into local culture, since they have been a part of the Festival now for at least 12 years. On the other hand, they can also be viewed as a symbol of the cultural imperialism imposed by too much American TV (Buffonge 2001).

American TV also influenced preferred sporting activities. It may seem peculiar that the American media impacted so greatly on the residents of a BDTO. But it was not until early 1997, perhaps because of the volcanic crisis, that Montserratians first had access to a British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) television channel. By contrast, American Cable television (over 40 channels) was accessible in Montserrat since the 1970s. Thus generally, Montserratians who considered relocation to the UK had very little knowledge of the British way of life.

3 These masked dancers in colourful costumes have employed a mixture of ethnic influences to create what has now been generally recognised as a Montserrat tradition. To explain, the Masquerade’s outfit resembles the Belizian and Jamaican jonkonnu, the musical ensemble consists of the Irish fife and the African kettle-drums, a boom drum, a boom pipe, and a shak-shak. The folk religion and drum beat are African, while the quadrille and the polka (dance steps) are Irish. The dancers also dance to folk songs that are created from Caribbean experiences. Noticeably, there is an overall weightier African influence in this interpolation. Little wonder that Fergus hails the Masquerades as “the richest expression of African folk art in Montserrat” (Fergus 1994:242).

4 A folk band that features the Hawaiian ukelele.
‘Maroons’\(^5\) and ‘box hands’\(^6\) are two notable communal activities that have become an integral part of Montserratians’ way of life. Both are associated with economic assistance and have provided valuable assistance for the Montserrat migrants in England (relocated and first-wave). Prior to the volcanic crisis, several parents/guardians were known to have used their ‘takings’ to buy their children’s uniforms, textbooks and other needed stationery.

The Irish influence is a key part of Montserrat’s culture, but a mixed bag of other cultural influences has also taken root in Montserrat’s heritage. From this pot pourri of influences has emerged a culture that, although constantly under attack by invading foreign ‘media’ influences, remains quintessentially Montserratian.

It should be noted however, that it is not solely on the home front that cultures are eroded. ‘Contamination’, and ultimately a gradual cultural change result from the varied settlement patterns of global population movements. The extent to which out-migration has affected the traditional Montserrat culture is debatable, but Montserrat does possess a history of out-migration since the late 1830s, as the next subheading will explain.

**Migratory Patterns Then and Now**

*Post-Emancipation Migration*

Patterns of mobility and reasons for out-migration from Montserrat are explained in Table 4.3.

---

\(^5\) A ‘maroon’ is “the voluntary co-operative activity of a number of persons who combined to assist one or more persons in a particular task. Typical tasks were the building or moving of a house, the preparing of land for planting and the harvesting of a big crop” (Fergus 1994: 258).

\(^6\) ‘Box hand’ is the term given to a rotating credit association. A central organiser collects and distributes fixed amounts to members of the ‘box hand’ on a weekly basis. For example, if there are 25 persons in the ‘box hand’, an individual weekly take at £10 per week is £250. The organiser arranges the order of collection. Membership and weekly deposits vary according to the mutual agreement of the organiser and the persons involved.
Table 4.3: Phases of Migratory Movements from Montserrat – 1838 to 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>How Characterised</th>
<th>Reasons for Out-migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>- Inter-territorial Phase (1838-1885)</td>
<td>- Several persons left the Colony to work on plantations in Trinidad and British Guiana. Planters from these two territories organised and sponsored recruitment programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>- Inter-Caribbean Migration Phase (1885-1920)</td>
<td>- Migratory movements expanded to include non-British Caribbean territories (Cuba and Santo Domingo). - Scores of persons of the labouring and other classes left Montserrat for Panama when the USA took over the building of the Panama Canal in 1904.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>- ‘Oil Refinery’ Phase (1920-1940)</td>
<td>- A considerable portion of emigrants left Montserrat for Curacao and Aruba to work in their oil refineries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>- Movement to the Metropole (including North America) (1940 to 2001)</td>
<td>- Significant migratory movements resulted from the response to the call from the Metropole to remedy labour shortages after World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>- The ‘New’ Caribbean Migration Phase (1965 to 2001)</td>
<td>- ‘New’ migratory movement within the Caribbean. Some countries that were ‘net exporters’ of labour, became ‘net importers’ of labour. Montserrat was in that category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As shown in Table 4.3, from as early as 1838, there have been heavy migratory patterns from Montserrat to the Region and the Metropole (See Figure 4.2). Little wonder that the island has been characterised as one of out-migration (Ebanks 1988; Foster & Evans 1978; Philpott 1973; Mckee 1966). In discussing this, my main focus will be on the phases that
relate directly to issues in this study - the post-war phase of movement to the Metropole and post 1995 migration to Britain.

Figure 4.2: Patterns of Mobility from Montserrat (1838 – 2001)

Source: (Shotte 1999:15)

Post-war Migration
Philpott (1973:29) noted that during the post-war phase, it was the economic ‘pull’ factor rather than the ‘push’ factor that determined Montserratian migration to England. Philpott also confirmed that Montserrat had a higher proportion of migration to England than other Caribbean islands although all the islands were exposed to the same “pulls”. Other demographic factors along with political and economic problems that existed in the island during the 1950s, were proffered as reasons for this interesting phenomenon. This seems to bear some merit since many of the economic migrants to the Dutch territories, instead of returning to Montserrat, travelled directly to England on termination of their contract...
(Philpott 1973:32). Put against the other Caribbean islands, what makes the proportion even more interesting is the fact that the post-war migratory trek from Montserrat to England began in 1952, comparatively later than the other islands. Yet, by 1965 approximately 33% (4000) of the population of Montserrat were living in England, up until then the largest out-migration from Montserrat (Philpott 1973:32). It is this same post-war migrant community that is now featuring in the resettlement of the relocated migrants.

From informal interviews conducted with some post-war migrants, I noted that it was every post-war migrant’s desire was to ‘make big bucks’ and return to Montserrat. I have not ascertained whether or not the migrants anticipated hardships in their venture to attain their ultimate economic goal. However, they did experience hardships of various kinds, in particular, verbal and physical racial attacks, discrimination in housing, jobs and education (Bryan et al 1985:136). Yet, according to some respondents, letters that were sent to them by relatives or friends in England, did not communicate such hardships. Besides, the occasional visitor returnee tended to present a rose-coloured impression of life in England by claiming that generally ‘all was well’. Perhaps the remittances, land certificates and the new ‘English’ homes were the tangible evidence that convinced islanders that all was indeed well. Besides, ‘foreign is better’ was still a widely held and accepted notion among islanders.

It is reasonable to conclude then, that the post-war migrants’ silences on hardships coupled with the ‘foreign is better’ ideology, served as added incentives for post 1995 migrants who relocated to England. Reasons for relocation aside, the crux of this section is that there was a sizeable Montserratian community in England before the volcanic crisis began.

**Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the historical background of relocated Montserratian migrants. It explained that mixed cultural influences of European, West African and Caribbean origin have shaped their cultural orientation, and how political, economic and social factors have influenced their perceptions of life in England.

The chapter also explained that the process of nation building in Montserrat has been characterised by a constant struggle for political stability and socio-economic growth.
Colonial dependency was preferred to independence because it was generally thought that against the backdrop of worldwide economic recession, remaining a BDTO would secure a level of stability. Hence, Montserrat remains a protégé of Britain; but because of its Caribbean connections, the island engages in, and benefits from the region’s development and expansion programmes. These connections enabled the Ministry of Education to run a reasonably well-resourced and well-structured education system that provided a sound base for Montserratian students.

Montserrat has had a history of heavy out-migration since the beginning of the post-emancipation period and for several decades the economic ‘pull’ was the major determinant of emigration. The next chapter explains the nature of the crisis that brought about the largest migratory movement to the UK in the history of Montserrat.
Chapter Five
The Volcanic Crisis and Mass Migration

Volcano bad, volcano bad, volcano bad, bad, bad, bad (Desmond ‘Flasher’ Daley)
A jus can’t run away, A jus can’t run away (Alphonsus ‘Arrow’ Cassel)

Introduction and Nature of the Crisis
This chapter chronicles the series of ongoing volcanic activities that influenced mass relocation to ‘safer’ shores. The Soufriere Hills Volcano thundered to life on July 18, 1995; thus began a crisis that has transformed the physical and socio-economic landscape of Montserrat.

Buried villages, collapsed roofs, crumpled walls, shattered machinery and burnt bodies mark the destructive trail etched by the Soufriere Hills Volcano since its awakening on July 18, 1995. The volcanic crisis completely changed the physical landscape as it did the lives of the islanders. Hopes soared whenever there was a lull in volcanic activity and plummeted when activities revived. This roller-coaster emotional existence that had become the way of life for residents, has left psychological and emotional scars that seem irreparable.

August 21, 1995 temporarily made Plymouth and its environs a Biblical, modern-day Egypt when ‘darkness covered the land’ as a result of a massive eruption of black ash that completely blocked out the light of the sun. This eruption led to the first large-scale evacuation of the affected areas, to the ‘safe zone’ beyond Belham River. Fear of the unknown coupled with no immediate accommodation caused several persons to flee the island, but most returned within a few weeks. A decline in volcanic activities, perhaps erroneously interpreted as the beginning of the end of the crisis, appeared to have influenced persons’ return. Although the ordered internal evacuation officially ended on September 7, 1995 there was a continuous flow of internal migration as persons in affected

---

7 Any area outside the Exclusion Zone (the area where pyroclastic flows and surges have been deposited or are likely to be deposited). See Appendix VIII. It should be noted that the ‘safe’ zone is not free from ash or pebble deposits.
relocated to less affected zones. But as conditions worsened, forced migration was inevitable. Table 5.1 highlights the significant volcanic events that occurred during the first year of the crisis.

Table 5.1: Major Volcanic Activities – July 1995 to July 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/7/95</td>
<td>Persistent rumbling sounds coming from the mountains</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unusually strong smell of sulphur</td>
<td>Some residents from the south relocate to northern areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Light ashfall in southern Montserrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/7/95</td>
<td>Wet ashfall in Plymouth 7 environs</td>
<td>Residents officially informed of minor eruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Earth tremors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-26/7/95</td>
<td>Continued earth tremors and minor eruptions</td>
<td>Official announcement of southern areas at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To date, 1200 persons left by air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Families encouraged to get the elderly off the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/7/95</td>
<td>Eruptions in the far East (Lang Soufriere)</td>
<td>Residents of Long Ground encouraged to move to nearby Bethel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/7 to 20/8/95</td>
<td>Orange stage of alert (means volcanic activity is present)</td>
<td>Residents remain on alert and contend with Hurricane Luis’ visit on August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/95 ('Ash Monday')</td>
<td>Major phreatic eruption</td>
<td>Darkness covers Plymouth and environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/8/95</td>
<td>Increased volcanic activity</td>
<td>Official evacuation of all areas south of Belham Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hundreds leave the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/95</td>
<td>Lull in volcanic activities</td>
<td>Evacuation is lifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many residents return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/7/95</td>
<td>Decreased activity and visit of Hurricane Marilyn</td>
<td>Sea swells cause landslide and coastal erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/95</td>
<td>Volcanic activity at Castle Peak</td>
<td>The Glendon Hospital and Margeson Memorial Home relocate to the North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appearance of a dome at Castle peak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Phreatic eruptions continue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11/11/95</td>
<td>More phreatic eruptions as dome continues to grow</td>
<td>Residents in affected areas wear masks as they go about their daily business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3/12/95</td>
<td>Increased seismicity</td>
<td>All southern and eastern areas evacuated to the North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1/1/96 - Lull in volcanic activity - Evacuated residents return to their homes

1/96 to 4/96 - Increased seismicity - More phreatic eruptions - First pyroclastic flow down Tar River Valley - The third official evacuation to the ‘safe’ zone, of all areas south of Belham

12/5/96 - Heavy wet ashfall in the ‘safe’ zone - First pyroclastic flow to reach the sea

6/96 - Continued dome growth - More heavy ashfalls - More pyroclastic flows down Tar River Valley - High levels of stress and hardship as residents experienced the eleventh month of volcanic crisis

18/7/96 1st - Dome continues to grow - More ashfalls - ‘Safe’ and unsafe zones
Anniversary

28-29/7/96 - Massive pyroclastic flows accompanied by thunder and lightning (biggest to date) entered the sea and caused it to boil - Trees burnt, all vegetation in Tar River valley destroyed - Some livestock killed - Steam from boiling sea rose several thousand feet in the air

31/7/96 - Another massive eruption accompanied by thunder and lightning - Total darkness - Power cuts - Cement-like ash covered everywhere

Derived from Buffonge (1999)

**Volcanic Activities That Influenced Mass Migration**

Two months into the second year of the crisis just before midnight, with a persistent, thunderous roar, the Soufriere Hills Volcano vomited a barrage of gravel and pebbles for about an hour. Cathy Buffonge, who documented a chronicle of the volcanic events, describes the September 17 event this way:

Volcanic pebbles, from gravel size up to two inches in diameter, formed projectiles, which dented cars and in some cases punctured car roofs and smashed windscreens, as people sought to leave some of these areas to the safer far north. For the first time, several houses at the evacuated village of Long Ground on the eastern side of the volcano were burnt, with local radio reporting seven houses and a church gutted by falling red hot rocks which fell through their roofs and set them on fire (Buffonge 1999:74 & 75).

As volcanic activities fluctuated between high and low levels, scientists at the Montserrat Volcano Observatory (MVO) constructed a volcanic zoning map (Appendix VI) and devised a detailed system of alert stages. The stages ranged from white (little or no activity)
through to yellow, amber, orange, red and purple (continuous explosive eruption). The alert stages had oscillated between amber, orange and red, but remained on orange for most times even when activities were “in full blood” (the red phase). (Shotte 1998a:117). The powers that be (politicians and/or scientists) seemed reluctant to announce a ‘Red Alert’ phase. This apparent hesitancy to ‘call a spade a spade’ even when the evidence proved otherwise, seemed to have had a three-fold effect on residents – perplexity, more anxieties and mistrust (of the politicians and scientists).

It was perhaps situations like the foregoing that influenced this general sentiment among residents: “they (the politicians) are telling us lies on the radio” (Francis 1996:40). Further dome collapses and increased activities on November 28, 1996 forced the scientists to rezone the southern and south-eastern areas (Appendix VII).

The first major pyroclastic flows that occurred in the Galway’s area on 30-31 March 1997, threatened two outstanding landmarks – Galway’s Soufriere (sulphur springs) and Great Alps Waterfall. Both landmarks were completely destroyed on April 11 by further pyroclastic flows over Galway’s Wall. Up until the beginning of June, Montserratian residents were gradually migrating to the UK although volcanic activities continue to escalate. Again the scientists were forced to revise the risk map. W. H. Bramble Airport, which was formerly in Zone E, was now in Zone C (Appendix VIII) because it was under serious threat. On June 25, 1997, the volcano claimed its first victims (19 presumed dead) when pyroclastic flows devastated several eastern villages and forced the closure of W. H. Bramble airport. Buffonge relates:

The hot pyroclastic surges from these flows spread over nearby areas, covering an area of several kilometres. Trees, houses and churches were reportedly set ablaze in several villages, two of which were completely submerged in hot volcanic material, as the flows rushed at high speed down the Tuitts and Paradise ghauts. The affected villages included Harris, Windy Hill, Streatham, Farrels, Bramble Village, Tuitts, Bethel, Farms, Spanish Point and Trants (Buffonge 1998:34).

Volcanic activities shifted to higher gear after this cataclysmic event. And for yet another time the scientist at the MVO released a revised risk map on July 4 – the ‘safe’ zone area was decreased, the letter zone system and the colour alert systems were abandoned and the island was divided into Northern, Central and Exclusion Zones (Appendix IX). The burning of houses in Plymouth began on July 6 when hot surges flowed down Fort Ghaut, but it was
the August 3 events that caused the total destruction of the capital. This was followed by "a series of explosive eruptions every ten to twelve hours", which continued throughout the week (Buffonge 1998:69). By September 1997, all shops, businesses and offices were relocated to the far north as Salem was now in the Exclusion Zone (Appendix X).

The ongoing volcanic crisis had brought about severe economic hardships in Montserrat (DFID 1999:17). Shelters\(^8\) were overcrowded and the 'safe zone' not only became less 'safe', but it also was getting smaller as volcanic activities increased. St. John’s Primary School, one of the 10 primary schools, was converted to a hospital and all other schools were used as shelters. So, in addition to the threats from a raging volcano, the economic and social situation got progressively worse, thus islanders were forced to emigrate.

Islanders began to emigrate at the onset of the crisis. The increased volcanic activities that followed the 'Ash Monday' (August 21, 1995) blackout caused hundreds of islanders to flee to neighbouring Caribbean islands. Antigua became the priority destination primarily because it is Montserrat’s international gateway. By mid-September 1995, volcanic activities had subsided and "many Montserratians" returned from "neighbouring islands" (Buffonge 1999:18). However, as danger levels waxed and waned and uncertainties grew and expanded, a gradual migration from the island was effected. The local politicians, perhaps threatened by the perceived loss of their political status should the migratory pattern persist, consistently minimised the crisis. Bowen Wells (MP) reported that the construction of houses north of Belham Valley (the then designated safe zone) was opposed by the then CM, who did not want to spread "alarm and despondency" among islanders (Wells 1998), as this would indicate the seriousness of the situation.

The CM's action neither curtailed the spread of "alarm and despondency", nor lessened the terror that struck residents whenever volcanic activities escalated. Many persons responded to the politicians seeming insensitivity by putting their own personal contingency plan into action. Bernadette Irish, a secondary school teacher who migrated to England in 1996, echoes the sentiments of many islanders:

\[^8\] The Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) provided accommodation in churches and school buildings in the 'safe' zone for persons who were internally displaced because of the volcanic activities. These places of accommodation are called 'shelters'.
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So I put my contingency in motion
For I cannot let "Too late be my cry"
Too often we deny the reality
And remain stagnant in times of adversity
While we are treated like pawns on a chess board
Or puppets on a string
Where the confused are being lead by confusing dictators
While Mother Nature is tilting precariously, on edge
Gritting her teeth in anticipation (Irish 1996:93).

From the above, it can be concluded that many persons did not trust the politicians' analysis of the crisis and therefore depended on personal assessment to influence decisions to relocate.

**Voluntary Relocation and Assisted Passages Schemes**

The UK government, perhaps in recognition of its responsibility to Montserrat, one of the six remaining British Dependent Territories (BDTs) in the Caribbean, introduced a voluntary relocation scheme that was effected from November 1, 1995. The terms of condition were:

"Resident Montserratians were to be granted two years Exceptional Leave to Remain (ELR) in Britain. This means that whilst Montserratians are resident in Britain, they are entitled to appropriate housing, social security benefits, permit-free employment, healthcare and education for their children" (Montserrat Project 1998).

By 9 May 1996, about 20 persons had migrated to the UK under the scheme and about 200 had requested further information (Panton & Archer 1996:5). Persons who migrated under that scheme had to pay their own fares, thus only a limited number were able to take up the offer.

The June 1997 tragedy prefaced, and probably influenced the UK government's introduction of an Assisted Passages Programme (APP) two months later. This programme later became known as Montserrat Assisted Passages Scheme (MAPS). By means of this programme, financial assistance was made available to Montserratians who wanted to relocate to Britain and other Caribbean islands (DFID 1999:21). Relocated Montserratians were expected to benefit from the terms of the UK's 1996 Housing Act and successive statutory provisions:
• Montserratians are to be regarded under the category of ‘Priority Needs’;
• Montserratians are not to be subjected to the Habitual Residence Test;
• a £1,500 per property grant was made available to local councils by the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, to enable them to bring properties up to a habitable standard, to allow Montserratians to be accommodated;
• a grant was made available by the Department for Education and Employment, and administered by the British Council, to finance the tuition fees and living expenses of students who had relocated to Britain. (Montserrat Project 1998:1)

Other relocation schemes were effected for persons who left the island before MAPS was introduced. Montserratians who were resident on the island on August 16, 1997, and who wanted to relocate to other Caribbean territories, received financial assistance under another British government scheme - an Assisted Regional Voluntary Relocation Scheme (ARVRS). The criteria for persons to benefit from this scheme were that they had to:
1. demonstrate that they were resident on the island on 16 August, 1997; and
2. provide written certification that they did not possess savings or assets outside the island of a value exceeding £10,000 as at 20 August 1997 (DFID, 1997).

Yet another scheme was introduced for Montserratians who had relocated to the Caribbean, and who left the Colony before August 16, 1997, but after July 18, 1995, the start of the volcanic crisis. This is known as the Voluntary Evacuation Scheme (VES). According to official reports from the Montserrat Community Support Trust (MCST), persons who benefited from this scheme received a total of EC$10 000 (approximately £2141), in three instalments (Montserrat Community Support Trust 2000).

**Demographic Issues**
It has been difficult to obtain demographic information from Montserrat on statistics relating to out-migration because of the nature of the crisis. According to unofficial reports, the Montserrat Immigration Department (MID) was unable to complete its data collection activities because of the chaos caused by internal displacement during the initial stages of the crisis. Also, the November 1997 Social Survey that was conducted by the Montserrat Statistics Department (MST), was done at a period when many persons had already relocated to other shores. Therefore in some households there were no persons available to provide information for the survey. However, the approximations that were forwarded by
these departments were useful in providing a reasonable representation of the migratory situation.

It was equally difficult to obtain exact figures from immigration officials in the UK, for according to officials at The Montserrat Project (the ‘care-taker’ organisation for relocated Montserratians in the UK), there was a breakdown in communication between persons responsible for compiling such records. Furthermore, in May 1998, Heathrow Travel Care was asked by the Home Office Emergency Operations Room to assist the “evacuees from Montserrat”, including those who arrived at Gatwick (Mennear & Lancaster 1999:25). Relocated migrants who came to England via MAPS, were met on arrival by Travel Care and therefore were registered by Travel Care. Those who did not use MAPS were thus not registered by Travel Care and it seems that there were no other person(s) or group(s) assigned to this task. In an effort to determine the number of relocated persons who came to England, MCST set up a registration programme. Unfortunately, several persons have not yet registered, hence MCST is still experiencing difficulties in totalling the number of relocated persons in different London Boroughs and other non-London areas where migrants settled. In light of the foregoing, the data presented in this chapter include some approximations.

According to a 1998 report from MID, by December 1997, approximately 3500 persons had relocated to England. The 2001 figure was approximately 5000 (MCST 2001), for since the introduction of MAPS, relocated figures to England has increased by approximately 30%. The MSD 1998 reports showed that by July 1998, approximately 7700 persons had migrated to 28 countries, thus decreasing the population by 70%. Of this group, 73.5% were relocated to the UK, 14.5% to other Caribbean countries (OCC), 8.7% to Antigua, 2.1% to the United States of America (USA) and Canada and 1.2% to other destinations (see Figure 5.1).
In comparison to 1997, by 2001 social services and schooling facilities in Montserrat showed some improvement, but the uncertainty regarding the levels of sustained volcanic activities, still persisted. MVO informs:

As the Soufriere hills Volcano enters its sixth year of activity, the evidence is mounting that it may prove to be a persistently active volcano, which erupts continuously or intermittently, perhaps over a number of decades. On the basis of the emerging scientific evidence, the group now considers that there is about an even chance that the volcano will prove to be erupting over a period exceeding a decade (Montserrat Volcano Observatory 2001:8)

MVO’s information suggests that the 1998 figure of 7700 emigrants may yet increase. Besides, some persons who had chosen to have their children complete their secondary school education in the Caribbean region, are now migrating to England so that their children can pursue further education in England.

Unlike the early economic migrants who had come voluntarily to Britain, post 1995 migrants came because they were forced to, but with the expectation of a ‘better’ life in the Motherland. Many hopes are yet to be realised. Local historian, Sir Professor Howard Fergus expresses migrants’ disappointments this way:
Thanks to the ulcers of Soufriere
and their erratic inflammations
we are in the capital at last,
we do not walk on gold but have tasted
streets on ice and the white Christmas
which we dreamed has become a grey reality
with a light drizzle of kindness
(Fergus 1998a:83)

The post 1995 migration is not only the largest scale of out-migration from Montserrat, but it is also the migratory phase that has put extraordinary pressures on migrants’ psyche because of the losses incurred, resettlement problems and the uncertainty of returning due to the unpredictable nature of the prolonged, ongoing volcanic crisis.

**The Post 1995 Migration Phase**

This phase has been characterised as an involuntary or forced migration phase. This implies that relocated persons had no choice, but this is not entirely true since an element of choice was involved. In fact, as noted from formal and informal discussions with relocated migrants, it was after careful contemplation and deliberations on the issue of external displacement that some families eventually relocated to other territories. This does not mean however that persons minimised or underestimated the seriousness of the situation; rather, it was because of the gravity of the situation that careful considerations were necessary. Local radio announcer, Jacqueline Brown echoes these communal sentiments:

Living with a Mountain
you cannot divorce
because you have got
children and property!
navel string and foundation
buried together

Living with a Mountain
you cannot leave
because you have got
no money
to start anew
in a friendless country
(Brown 1996:86)

The above lines aptly identify the nature of some issues (posterity, property and finance) that families were forced to contemplate before making a decision to relocate. It seems no
accident that Brown mentioned the children first, for the children’s welfare influenced parents’ decision to relocate in the late 1990s, as much as children’s difficult experiences influenced parents’ decision to repatriate.

For the purpose of comparison, I wish to make mention of a similar situation - the consideration that families gave to out-migration in the wake of Hurricane Hugo, albeit under totally different circumstances. Hurricane Hugo struck Montserrat on 17 September 1989. It came, lingered, destroyed and left behind a trail of unprecedented destruction and laid bare the vulnerability of a Colony that had within that decade, experienced “a growth of 4.6% in the economy” (Fergus 1994:205). Although it was anticipated that it would take at the very least, ‘double-digit’ years to restore the island to pre-Hugo state, the healing hands of nature, heroic efforts, perseverance and determination of a resilient people brought about near normal restoration in less than half that time. The preceding sentence was mentioned to highlight that it was with similar struggles, exertion and resolution that persons deliberated before relocating to other lands. One resident had this to say after the September 17 (Hugo’s anniversary) 1996 eruption:

“If God helped us to survive Hugo, he will help us to survive the volcano. I won’t give up. I’m not leaving” (Jamesie – Resident).

Several persons voiced similar sentiments, but those same persons recanted because the situation got progressively worse (from phreatic to explosive eruptions and pyroclastic flows) and wisdom dictated that relocation was not only inevitable, but also necessary.

A notable difference with the Hugo situation was that there was no need for the Government to issue evacuation orders after the hurricane although the entire island was declared a disaster area. With regards to out-migration, parents decisions favoured allowing their children to continue their schooling in territories at the bidding of relatives, friends and regional governments who offered to help. This did not seem too difficult a decision since it seemed obvious that it was a matter of time before schooling on the island would resume and the children, particularly those in the Region, would return. By contrast, with

9 A steam-driven explosion that occur when water beneath the ground or on the surface is heated by magma, lava, hot rocks, or new volcanic deposits (for example, tephra and pyroclastic-flow deposits). The intense heat of such material (as high as 1,170°C for basaltic lava) may cause water to boil and flash to steam, thereby generating an explosion of steam, water, ash, blocks, and bombs.
regards to migration and the volcanic crisis, parents were faced with greater decision-making challenges since two thirds of the island were rendered uninhabitable. This suggested that any off-island rehabilitation would be of a longer, possibly indefinite duration, especially taking into consideration the unpredictable nature of the volcanic activities. Despite the life-threatening behaviour of the volcano, families deemed it useful to make reasoned decisions concerning who should relocate, who should not, where to relocate to, and how to manage (financially and otherwise) after relocation.

Although preference for continued schooling played a major role in families’ decisions to relocate, considerable attention was given to the aged, the infirm and the sick. As with Hugo, the island’s lone hospital was destroyed, thus families had to include these groups in their relocation plans - an added reason for careful planning. In 1989, the out-migration group consisted mainly of children (of school going age), the aged, the sick and the infirm. The post 1995 group consisted of persons from every stratum of the Montserrat society. This does not mean however that there was no selectivity for before the introduction of the passage grant, travel cost was an important selective factor. But for a people who have been noted for their resilience in the face of disaster, reasoned decisions are vital for ‘picking up the pieces’ as will be shown in the next section.

**Disasters and Resilience**

As part of the chain of volcanic Caribbean islands that sits in the hurricane belt, Montserrat is susceptible to environmental disasters. The island has had a history of disasters since the 1660s. By any measure, a trail of destruction and death does not bear good news. Montserrat’s disasters have however, managed to capture a measure of goodness from the ‘ill winds’ that have blown across its shores. This is evident in the tightening of family connections (home and abroad), the re-energising of community togetherness and the strengthening of regional bonds (Fergus 1994:220). Disasters have not only incited the benevolence of our Caribbean neighbours and the international community, but have also evoked the sympathy of ‘Motherland’ England. Ironically, it was the latent undercurrents that oozed from the ‘goodness’ rather than the ‘ill-winds’, that nurtured the current climate of dissatisfaction with regards to settlement, among some relocated migrants. Such
settlement issues (to be discussed in successive chapters) were identified to be some of the factors that retarded the educational progress of some relocated students.

In his 1994 publication, historian Sir Howard Fergus has presented a chronological record of the floods, earthquakes and hurricanes that have wreaked havoc on the Montserrat community for almost three and a half centuries. I will not however discuss islanders’ reactions to all these disasters. I have selected for discussion, two major disasters that relate to the issues of this study – Hurricane Hugo (1989) and the ongoing volcanic crisis. All the relocated informants in the sample have experienced both disasters and have been affected in one way or another.

Hurricane Hugo, dubbed the ‘angriest storm’ in Montserrat’s recorded history, commanded regional and international sympathy and media attention. This was perhaps because of its extended visit (over 10 hours bombardment of sustained winds of over 160 miles per hour) and its partial or total demolition of buildings and residences. Six years later, the awakening of the Soufriere Hills volcano on July 18, 1995 provoked an even more profound reaction from the world community. Undoubtedly, September 17, 1989 and July 18, 1995 will become two milestone dates in the history of contemporary Montserrat, albeit at varying levels of significance.

Six months after the Soufriere Hills Volcano sprang to life, His Excellency Mr Frank J. Savage, the then Governor of Montserrat penned the following sentiments to describe Montserratians’ reactions to the volcanic crisis:

Very few communities have been asked to endure as much as Montserrat has in the past six months; I doubt if any has responded with such resilience and good humour as the citizens of Montserrat (Savage 1996:12).

In 1989, several persons echoed similar sentiments to characterise the islanders’ response to the devastation (98% of houses affected) caused by category-5 Hurricane Hugo. Governor at that time, His Excellency Christopher Turner, had this to say:
Everywhere was devastation......I have never seen such destruction. Yet, there was an astonishing cheerfulness. Everyone one met in the streets grinned ruefully but with enormous relief.......We faced an enormous task but immediately everybody with any sense of responsibility and everybody with any role to play was at work coping with the tremendous problems of cleaning up the country (Markham & Fergus 1989:5).

From the foregoing citations it seems reasonable to conclude that “good humour” and “cheerfulness” not only dampened self-pity, but also helped to fuel the resilience of a people who were determined to fight the odds even in the face of disaster. It was against the background of such spirited determination and a strong desire to continue to progress that persons made decisions to relocate to England. With reference to progress, I deliberately inserted the phrase ‘to continue’ in order to emphasise that the volcanic crisis interrupted a notable progressive period (particularly educational) in Montserrat’s history.

The Education Factor
Montserratians have regarded education as important since the post emancipation period ushered in the elementary schooling era in the region, and like their Caribbean neighbours have remained firmly committed to education at all levels of the system (Steward 1999:65). Such commitment suggests that education and schooling are highly valued by Caribbean peoples. From repeated dialogues with parents, I would venture to propose that it is during critical times that the importance that is attached to education, is brought into sharper focus. But it seems that, as will be shown, it was in the aftermath of the two aforementioned disastrous events that parents’ desire to give their children “the education they did not have”, was openly demonstrated. No doubt it is Montserratians’ demonstrative desire to “pick up the pieces and move on”, that have earned them the title ‘a resilient people’. The following sections will describe how they picked up the ‘educational’ pieces in the wake of Hurricane Hugo and the first two years of the ongoing volcanic crisis.

Schooling and Hurricane Hugo
The widespread destruction caused by Hugo spared no schools. MoE too suffered a battering. It was well over 24 hours before households realised that their members were not the only survivors, and a few days for persons to make contact with relatives and friends. Assistance came from the regional and international community as soon as the elements allowed. Thus began the restoration to normalcy. Initially, persons were concerned about
food, clothing and shelter, but once provision for these were relatively secured, attention was turned to schooling and education.

In the variety pack of assistance that came from Montserrat’s Caribbean neighbours was an invitation from the Government of Antigua “to school Montserrat’s sixth formers” (Fergus 1994:236). Other open invitations for schooling came from relatives and friends in the region and the international community. This resulted in several students migrating to several Caribbean islands, USA and to a lesser extent Canada and England. Interestingly, the students in the sample for this study did not emigrate after Hugo. This means that in addition to being traumatised by the onslaught of sustained winds at 150 miles per hour, for more than 10 hours, they had to contend with all the discomforts that Hugo left in its wake.

Although schools were severely damaged, they still remained Hurricane Shelters. This meant that ‘shelterees’ had to find alternative means of shelter before classes could be resumed. From observation and personal experience, I noted that this situation did not dissuade the ‘education spirit’ for community groups, PTAs, and concerned persons worked incessantly to have persons rehoused and school buildings prepared for the resumption of classes in as quick a time as possible. Notably, this sterling effort was not prompted by education officials or the Minister of Education, but rather by a genuine desire to have the nation’s children schooled. Obviously, several weeks of contact time (teaching learning sessions) were lost, but many more would have been lost had it not been for the remarkable community spirit that prompted persons to action, and the concerted rebuilding efforts of persons who are concerned with the schooling and education of the nation’s children. It should be noted that schools reopened at different intervals, depending on how severely schools were damaged and or, how long schools had to remain hurricane shelters. By November 1989, most schools operated a near normal programme.

**Schooling during the First Two Years of the Volcanic Crisis**

Formal education has always been disrupted whenever disaster struck; and somehow Montserratians always managed to get on top of the ‘schooling situation’. But the volcanic crisis was a different situation. The disruptions caused by previous disasters paled in comparison to the volcanic crisis, hence the island community was faced with a wider range of challenges and difficulties. Yet, when off-island evacuation seemed inevitable, as
will be shown, education was a prominent decisive factor, if not the most influential, with regards to families’ decisions on when, where and who should relocate. This suggests that even in the face of danger, the importance of education has not been lost on ‘a resilient people’.

Within the first year of the crisis, there were three large-scale internal evacuations from the danger zone to the ‘safe’ zone. Every phase of internal displacement affected schooling, but it was the final evacuation called on April 3, 1996 that severely maimed the school system. All schools in the ‘safe’ zone that were initially declared temporary evacuation shelters, became permanent homes for evacuees from the danger zones and affected areas. Consequently, students had to attend classes in what MoE termed ‘centres’ – homes and private buildings were converted into classrooms and tents were erected in seemingly convenient locations.

Despite the pitiable conditions in the ‘centres’, teachers, parents and concerned persons did all within their power to create a semblance of normalcy within them. In fact, from its new location in an Olveston residence, it was “business as usual” for MoE. However, increased volcanic activities between June and September 1997 brought about a notable change in “usual business”. With volcanic activities in full gear and two thirds of the island rendered uninhabitable, approximately the same proportion of residents were forced to leave the island, thus severely decimating the school population. This was the school situation at the end of 1997:

- No Nursery (Pre-primary)
- 2 Primary (1 Government, 1 Denominational)
- 1 Secondary (No campuses, no sixth form)
- No Technical College
- No Special Education Unit

(Ministry of Education 1998)

In light of the foregoing, and still determined to make their children’s education a priority, families were forced to relocate. The majority of families relocated to England possibly
because it was a common notion among islanders that England has “the best education system in the world”.

Amidst all the fear and frustration of living with an active volcano in one’s backyard and the confusion that results from receiving mixed signals from officials, education and schooling seemed to be a major concern for parents. Internal displacement greatly affected schooling, particularly at Kinsale Primary, Kinsale Nursery, Plymouth Primary and Cloverdale Nursery. Volcanic activities were concentrated in the Kinsale and Plymouth areas for about five months before spreading to outer areas. On several occasions at Kinsale Primary School (KPS), a school week was shortened because of heavy ashfall. On one particular occasion, when the week was reduced to two days, those two days were devoted to cleaning up. Ashfalls were particularly worrying for staff and pupils of KPS because each time there was an eruption, school was disrupted since the ash came directly into the classes because of the school’s open ‘fancy’ blocks. Consequently, school days and weeks were often abbreviated thus greatly reducing teaching learning sessions. This situation continued until April 3, 1996 when increased volcanic activities forced the relocation of all schools to the Salem area where classes were held in ‘centres’. MoE 1995/96 report summarises the situation this way:

The accommodation was far from satisfactory, the tents were not only hot but also unusable when it rained. Toilet facilities for staff and students were inadequate and the atmosphere at most centres was not conducive to the teaching learning process (Ministry of Education 1996:p.7).

The June 25, 1997 disaster, the ‘burning’ of Plymouth (August 3, 1997), the evacuation of Salem and surrounding areas (September 1997), increased pyroclastic flows and dome growth and a drastic reduction in schooling facilities resulted in the exodus of islanders to England. Table 5.2, drawn from my own experiences and verified by MoE, shows how major volcanic activities affected schooling during the first year of the crisis (July 18, 1995 to July 31, 1996).
Table 5.2: The Effects of Major Volcanic Activities on Schooling: 18 July 1995 – 31 July 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Volcanic Activity</th>
<th>How Schooling was Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  | St. John’s Nursery used by Ministry of health as a casualty station.  
  | Kinsale and St. Patrick’s Nursery Schools relocated to Girl Guides Headquarters, Dagenham. |
| 30-11-1995 - Heavy ashfall on Plymouth and adjacent areas. | Disrupted schools in Plymouth and adjacent areas. |
| 04-11-95 - Very heavy ashfall as far south as Gingoes and as far north as Olveston and Salem. | Curtailed teaching learning sessions at the start of the next week. |
| 09-11-95 - Very heavy ash emission. | PPS, KPS, MSS, MTC and all nursery schools closed. |
| 11-95 - Increased volcanic activity. | Premature end to school term. |
| 01-04-96 - Significant pyroclastic flows. | Premature end to school term.  
  | All schools relocated to the Salem area.  
  | All Primary Schools in the ‘safe’ zone used as shelters – consequently, classes were held in ‘centres’, tents and private buildings. |
| 07-96 - Increased volcanic activities and threat of hurricane. | Premature end to the 1995/96 school year. |

A similar situation to that depicted in Table 5.2 existed during the second year of the volcanic crisis, albeit with more frequent interruptions to classes. Increased volcanic activities sustained this precarious position that ultimately led to the large-scale relocation to England between August and December 31, 1997 (GoM 1998). Despite a well-organised education system and strong community support, relocated students had suffered trauma and considerable disruption to their education.
Conclusion

The post-1995 phase of relocation to England is the largest out-migration from Montserrat since the 1950s. Because of its unpredictable and volatile nature, the volcano posed greater challenges than any previous crisis, but yet again, Montserratians’ resilience triumphed even when external displacement seemed inevitable. Despite the gravity of the situation, before responding to the ‘forced’ evacuation order, families found it necessary to make calculated decisions regarding their children’s education and the welfare of their infirm and elderly relatives.

As will be shown in future chapters, the lives of relocated migrants in London have been characterised by an interplay of resolution and resilience on one hand and discouragement and vulnerability on the other. Reminders of struggles and victories of the past seemed inadequate to effectively deal with the realities of life in a ‘friendless’ foreign zone. It is this complexity of constructions drawn from the past and present that have shaped and defined relocated migrants’ experiences in a land thought to be the ‘Holy Grail’ of educational opportunities.

The next chapter will highlight the issues that marred the relocated students’ educational experiences and ultimately affected their educational aspirations.
Chapter Six
The Educational Experiences of Relocated Students

*There is a silent catastrophe happening in our British schools in the way they continue to fail Black children* (Dianne Abbott, MP, 2002).

**Introduction**

This chapter discusses the experiences of relocated students in British schools as they struggled to realise their educational aspirations. The chapter compares these post 1995 migrant students’ experiences to those of African Caribbean students in British schools over the past 50 years. This comparison was necessary because in educational circles, the term ‘African Caribbean’ represents much more than an ethnic identity label. It carries with it a legacy of ‘underachievement’ that has serious implications for the educational progress of all students of Caribbean descent.

Relocated students are ‘hidden’ behind the African Caribbean banner, in that, their voices have not been heard above the clamour of the African Caribbean underachievement debate – a debate that has for some time now, monopolised the African Caribbean education agenda, particularly during the past two decades (Channer 1995:2). Discrimination, stereotyping, bureaucratic practices, and racism were among the several emotional issues that characterised the educational experiences of children of African Caribbean descent in British schools - experiences that sometimes rendered them invisible. This invisibility has been defined by an interplay of the aforementioned issues on the one hand, and negative self-perception on the other. Hence, they became highly visible in some ways virtually invisible in other ways.

It was evident from the interviews that the relocated students and their parents had similar experiences with reference to teacher-attitude, bureaucratic, language and racist issues. The similarities in some responses to the same issues were so striking that it was difficult to discuss them under separate ‘parent’ and ‘student’ headings. I have therefore discussed both sets of responses together.

\[10\] Despite the ethnic diversity among Caribbean peoples, “the term ‘African-Caribbean’ is used as a general signifier for people of Black African and/or Black Caribbean heritage” (Gillborn & Mirza 2000:6). Not only is the term widely used by researchers (Gillborn & Mirza 2000; Channer 1995; Mirza 1992; Mac an Ghaill 1988) but by and large, it is also acknowledged and endorsed by the people so labelled.
Stereotypes, Visibility and Invisibility

For the past three decades, official and unofficial research findings have revealed that black children (African Caribbean children included) were failing in schools. The 1981 Rampton Report was one of the first government-initiated inquiries that gave attention “to the needs of the West Indians” (Gundara 1986:14). Other researchers have investigated the educational progress of African Caribbean children. (Coard 1971; Taylor 1981; Bryan et al 1985; Fraser 1986; Gillborn 1990). More recent reports show that black children feature in disproportionate numbers in all of the negative statistics associated with education and schooling (Gillborn & Mirza 2000; Gillborn & Gipps 1996; Lyle et al 1996; Channer 1995). Based on these research findings, it is a common belief that the poor performance of African Caribbean students is due in part, to negative stereotyping, misconceptions, and misnomers attributed to them by teachers and fellow students.

An example of this is the work of Arthur Jensen, who in a 1969 article claimed that intelligence was genetically inherited and that white people were of a higher intelligence than blacks (Taylor 1981:48). Although Jensen’s views were rigorously challenged, severely criticised, and rejected by most psychologists (Giddens 1989:433), it seems that this very claim together with the numerous statistical reports about black children’s failure in British schools, have helped to cement a widely accepted negative stereotypes of black people. One would expect that education is a catalyst able to dispel any inaccuracies or mistaken impressions in any sphere, but research evidence suggests that it was within educational institutions that a climate of negative stereotyping was fostered. Valentino Jones, a founder member of Josina Machel Supplementary School (JMSS), wrote in 1986 that the majority of teachers in the UK had negative stereotypes of black pupils. He summarised how most schools dealt with the racial harassment of black students:

...most schools simply remain neutral or if they take a stand, it turns out quite often to be one against the black pupils. It is therefore very difficult for black children to have confidence and trust in an institution which they see as simply ignoring or dismissing what is, in fact, an ever present issue in their formative everyday lives (Jones 1986:xiv).

It is not unusual for nationals of a host society to view ‘strangers’ with a suspicion that may be accompanied by positive or negative reactions. But in an environment where difference
is synonymous to deficiency, where skin colour makes immigrants clearly visible, negative rather than positive stereotyping is prevalent.

African Caribbean migrants made an unsuccessful attempt to integrate into British society because they were not allowed “to submerge their ethnic status in British citizenship” (Husband 1982:71). Similarities in religion and language were recognised by some people, but for the majority of British society, skin-colour remained a great problem. Parekh explains:

They (the British) referred to them (the West Indians) by derogatory labels such as ‘niggers’, resented their presence, and generally avoided them (Parekh 1982:17).

African Caribbean migrants were then stigmatised and marginalised mainly because of their physical appearance (skin-colour). Almost two decades later, there remains an “extreme unwillingness of teachers and educationalists” to tackles this very issue (Abbott 2002). It is in this environment that relocated students have been battling to attain educational heights. However, individual students were judged by the properties attributed to the African Caribbean group as a whole rather than personal characteristics. Thus educational progress became an uphill struggle for them since they do not fit neatly into this classification. One student echoed this sentiment:

They (teachers) believe that all black people are the same... look the same, behave the same, operate the same. They treat us as if we never go school in Montserrat.... Teacher, tell them about us. Tell them that we different. Tell them what we did in Montserrat (Laverne – year 10).

Laverne’s lament points to two conclusions: (1) that teachers placed relocated students in the African Caribbean category, and (2) teachers were not aware of their educational capabilities. Admittedly, for the most part, most British schools have extended their knowledge of African Caribbean people beyond the “golliwog” and the “living in trees”, characterisations that were pinned on students in the 1950s and 1960s (Bryan et al 1985:62). However, relocated students entered the British school system when notions that African Caribbean students were “rebellious phallocentric underachievers” remained prevalent (Sewell 1998:125).
Some relocated parents share similar views to those of the students. A common view amongst parents was that the relocated students were "slighted", "taken for granted" and "given a bad deal". One parent concluded:

Some teachers believe that because our children have Jamaican friends, they are bad like them... you know what I mean.... You know dem Jamaicans got a bad name in England. Some of them bad yes, but not all bad. What they (teachers) expect? We all come from the Caribbean, so our children will talk to them (Harry – Parent).

I came to a similar conclusion during an interview when a teacher communicated to me that a certain relocated student would not do well because that student was "hanging out with Jamaicans" (RB - Teacher). This teacher's inference implied that however hard the student tried to succeed, that student was already a lost case as far as progress was concerned.

Such teacher attitudes have been identified as the root cause of African Caribbean students' poor performance (Miles 2000:17). Misconceptions such as African Caribbean students “cannot speak English”, they are “dull” and “disruptive” (Bryan et al 1985:65 & 66), and black people are inferior and are “less intelligent than white people” (Coard 1971:19), are still widespread in British schools (Community Empowerment Network 2002; Boyd 1999). These misconceptions filter through the entire society.

Teacher expectation is undoubtedly a delicate and complex issue and would therefore need rigorous research and analysis to justify specific claims. However, it cannot be denied that there is anecdotal and descriptive evidence to support some claims of poor teacher expectation of African Caribbean children (Mac an Ghaill 1988; Bryan et al 1986; Cropley 1983; Coard 1971). Right on into this new century, low teacher expectation as a result of misconceptions continues to affect African Caribbean students’ (relocated students included) performance and progress "as they work against teacher expectations that embody assumptions about criminality, lack of motivation and lesser ability" (Gillborn 2002:4).

Linked to teacher attitude and misconception is the lack of background concerning relocated students' circumstances. To explain, news of Princess Diana's death in August 1997 signalled the end of British media coverage of the volcanic crisis, for the British reporters left Montserrat to cover a much 'grander' story. A lengthy coverage of this sad
event was followed by the Kosovo crisis, and subsequently numerous other disasters – human-made and/or environmental. Thus, news of the ongoing volcanic crisis and of the thousands of Montserratians who had relocated to the UK, was pushed further into the shadows of media’s ‘attention-grabbing’ range and the minds of the general British public. Consequently, relocated Montserratian students, in an apathetic and yet interesting way, had become the ‘forgotten refugees’ even before their admission into British schools. Little wonder that in my earlier research work I found that some teachers were not even aware that there was an ongoing crisis in an island from where their students had relocated. (Shotte 1998b:79).

Almost three years later, the situation remains the same. Generally, there was a lack of awareness of relocated students’ geographical and cultural background. Levine (1997:95) dubs this situation “group invisibility”. I found it surprising how little most teachers knew about relocated students. The relocated students were equally amazed to learn that many of the students at their schools had little or no knowledge of Montserrat. One British student asked Laverne a year-10 relocated student, where in Africa Montserrat was.

Arlene (Year 7) had this emotional reaction when some students displayed ignorance of relocated students’ nationality: “But arwe com from sum whey” (but we are from some place). Such a reaction hinted that the students disliked the idea that their cultural and national identity was unknown. Moreover, some students confided that they wished for an opportunity to highlight their culture in poetry, dance and song “so people could see who we be and what we could do” (Laverne – Year 10).

Relocated students’ fears as regards ‘group invisibility’ were not unfounded. One teacher admitted:

My overall impression is that they were lively, vigorous, very at ease with their situation and I was barely aware that they were from Montserrat and was certainly not aware that they were recent arrivals to Britain.... (MD - Teacher).

Given that Ms Dance was not aware of the relocated students’ arrival, it follows that they were taken as the ‘old’ African Caribbean group and were treated accordingly. This is not an isolated case. In fact, some of the teachers interviewed did not even realise that they had relocated Montserratian students in their classes for all students of Caribbean origin are
registered as African Caribbean students. Because of this practice, I experienced some problems in identifying relocated students to be part of the sample, for they were 'hidden' among the numerous other Caribbean nationalities. For example, one headteacher reported that there were several relocated students at her school. A visit to the school revealed that there were several persons of Caribbean origin but not one from Montserrat. There was also the reverse situation where a report of “no Montserratian students” turned out to be not the case. At one particular school, a teacher referred to all students of African Caribbean origin as Jamaicans, for other Caribbean countries were perceived to be districts in Jamaica. At another school, a relocated student was considered to be just like his Jamaican friend who was “disrespectful, aggressive and ill-mannered”. In fact, the relocated student was perceived to be a threat to a school community who was “trying so hard to upgrade its image” (CP – Teacher).

Generally, relocated students resented such misnomers. Andora, a relocated student, had this reaction:

I am not an African Caribbean and I am not a Jamaican. I do not look like them, I do not speak like them and I do not behave like them. I am a Montserratian – from Montserrat (Andora – Year 10).

Another disliked the label African Caribbean because “people say that they not doing well in school and many of them end up in jail without an education… I came here to learn, not to go to jail” (Calli – Year 10). Yet another stated:

All over England Jamaicans have a bad name. Montserratian not like that, so why they call us Jamaicans? People say they bad and like to fight... and teachers don’t like bad children, they don’t take any interest in them. So they won’t pass their exams and I want to pass everything... to come somebody good (Kareem – Year 7).

Nevertheless, not wanting to be called Jamaicans does not mean that relocated students do not like Jamaicans for all students in the sample had Jamaican friends. Clearly, it is what the label represents that relocated students detest, for “the process of labelling can lead to a lowering of the expectations they (teachers) have of certain pupils” (Ainscow 1994:18).

Interestingly, relocated students have misconceptions too. They have repeatedly expressed disappointment with certain aspects of the British school system. Some are “shocked at the way teachers dress”, others could not understand “why teachers allow children to do as they
like”, yet others thought that “England schools were ‘better’ than Montserrat schools”. The issues of dress, discipline and to what dimension ‘better’ is raised, are not important at this point. What I wish to point out is, experiencing schooling in England has helped relocated students to adjust their thinking and/or, correct their previously held perceptions of schooling in England. Even more interesting is this comment made by a relocated student:

Most of my friends are Jamaicans. But I have other friends too. I even have a white friend. He is really nice. Not like the other white people. He’s nice. He’s cool (Jerry – Year 11).

Jerry’s comment implies that he was of the opinion that generally white people are not ‘cool’. It also shows that given the right circumstances, misconceptions can be corrected even in a school environment where they are grossly exaggerated, perhaps unintentionally. If generally, teachers’ attitude favour cosmetic reports (such as blacks as inherently less intelligent than whites) of black inferiority, it follows that they (the teachers) will continue to have low expectation of the African Caribbean students’ abilities. It is also possible that the widely held notions that African Caribbean students are underachievers will remain, despite the recent efforts of some researchers to emphasise the achievement rather than the underachievement of African Caribbean students (Ntemo 1998; Rhamie 1998; Gillborn & Gipps 1996; Channer 1995; Mirza 1992).

Teachers and parents too had misconceptions regarding some relocated students’ ability and progress. Consider these teacher responses about some relocated students:

- An able student
- A very good student
- Doing very well
- An ‘A’ student – a delight to have in my class

(Derived from teacher interviews)

The above responses suggest that teachers were pleased with the students’ progress. What teachers did not realise was that most of the students who were dubbed ‘A’ students were operating from a syllabus that they had already covered in Montserrat, and were therefore not exhibiting their true potential. Five of the labelled ‘A’ students were placed in year groups one year below their Montserrat level.
Some parents who took such comments in a favourable light were unaware of two facts: (1) ‘doing very well’ was below the standard that ‘very well’ represented in Montserrat; and (2) that their children were working in a tiered General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSE) system that had already placed “a ceiling and a floor” on their children’s attainment (Gillborn 2002:1). Thus, the students concerned were not making the educational strides that their parents were led to believe.

Relocated students and parents also reported being victims of racial discrimination. It was a common feeling among parents that because of some teachers’ discriminatory attitudes, they were “put off from attending parent meetings”. Admittedly, some parents were unaware of certain school policies and hence were totally oblivious of their rights to challenge unsatisfactory decisions made by teachers regarding their children’s progress. However, those who knew school policies and were cognisant of their ‘rights’ to challenge what they perceived to be unfair decisions, were ignored at parent meetings. One parent seethed:

No matter how much a put up me han, nobody notice me. De headteacher pretend she no see me. As far as she concern me no bin deh (Helena) - (The headteacher acted as if Helena was not present).

Hands were not always raised to challenge decisions. Sometimes parents sought clarification on certain matters. Even in settling issues, some claimed that their comments were disregarded. Such feelings of rejection created a communication barrier between parents and teachers, and the children became ‘invisible’ victims of this saga. Helena’s experience and feelings of worthlessness brings to mind this testimony:

I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distorting glass. When they approach me they see only my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination - indeed, everything and anything except me (Ellison 1980 cited in Books 1998:xx). Ellison’s statement portrays an ‘insider-outsider’ (us and them) scenario. It is in such settings that relocated migrants became victims of racism. They felt dehumanised and discriminated against, and thus become invisible among the flares of the ‘insiders.’ Yet,
relocated students were highly visible for their skin-colour identified them as belonging to a particular ethnic group. Tuvia related:

When I first came to school I had the most horrible feeling. Some of the students discriminated against me because I’m black. They asked me if I was from Africa. They said I cannot speak English, because of my accent. I felt so miserable that I wish I was still in Montserrat (Tuvia – Year 11).

Another student recounted:

Last year I almost had a fight with some boys who tease me about my colour. They keep calling me ‘darkie’..... I don’t call them ‘whitie’, so why they call me ‘darkie’? They just don’t like black people (Samuel - Year 9).

Yet, other students criticised some teachers’ attitude when such cases are brought to their attention. Karl echoes the sentiments of most students when he stated:

It makes absolutely no sense to complain if you get into anything with certain students. They (teachers) just won’t believe you. As far as they are concerned, black people always wrong. Sometimes they don’t even want to listen to you (Karl – Year 10).

Another case of racial discrimination is noted in this warning:

...... if you hang out with the White children, when anything happen you are the one who will get into trouble, not them. The teacher will never believe you, and when you go to the office the teacher is always right (Manson - Year 10).

Manson’s warning suggests that any efforts relocated students would make to defend themselves would be discounted. This scenario is a replica of the typical treatment for African Caribbean students in a similar predicament. This is not a biased conclusion for some white students have confirmed the many stories of racial discrimination that their African Caribbean counterparts have recounted (Gillborn 1990:31).

One of Jim Wights’s suggestions for tackling racism at school and classroom level concerns an understanding of how students experience and perceive racism (Jones 2001:58). It is tempting to view students’ claims of racial harassment as being exaggerated. But Wight’s proposal is reasonable, especially in the light of International Council on Human Rights Policy (ICHRP) who asserts that the victims of racism are the ones best suited to explain its effect. ICHRP maintains:
A victim of racism experiences the deepest feelings of offence, humiliation, shame and pain. It is a denial of his or her claim to be fully human. In this sense, those who suffer racism are in a privileged position to say when behaviour or language is racist or not. Standard and laws to address racial discrimination that failed to reflect the experience of those who are its victims would not be appropriate or effective (ICHRP 2000:3).

Feelings of ‘shame and pain’ were not limited to the students. This parent’s comment was even more telling:

I really thought that the system was the same like Montserrat because we are British. I now know that it is not the same but the headteacher treated me like I was an idiot, like I was dumb, like I didn’t know anything..... I used to hear about racism, now I know what it is. They not interested in we children because we black. From the children’s complaints I know that our children are suffering. This is so frustrating there must be something we can do (Clarice - Parent).

Trapped in the intersection of two groups (African Caribbean and refugees) that are victims of racial discrimination, relocated Montserratians are struggling with an internal conflict characterised by a mixture of fear, confusion and retaliation. While some interventions with teachers make them highly visible, it seems that parents’ efforts to resolve issues related to their children’s education were by and large, overlooked – a situation that made them “worry plenty bout de chilren dem education” (Clarice - Parent).

Relocated parents’ fears about the effect that racial prejudice is having on their children’s educational progress are not unfounded. Jones admits that racial discrimination and xenophobia are significant issues that impact upon education. And it does seem that schools are found wanting for Jones adds that in respect of these issues, “a great deal of work remains for schools to do” (Jones 1998:174). This view is endorsed by an increasing number of researchers who have investigated the educational experiences of forced migrants (Bennett de Marrais 1998; Coelho 1998; Kaprielien-Churchill & Churchill 1994; Davidson 1996).

Relocated students’ experiences are thus similar to those of migrant and British-born African Caribbean students who have been victims of racial harassment for the past five decades. They are deemed less equal and less intelligent than their British, white counterparts (Lyle et al 1996; Gillborn 1990; Mac & Ghaill 1988; Sutcliffe 1986; Stone 1981; Taylor 1981). In light of the foregoing, it seems reasonable to conclude that very
little has changed in terms of the racist attitudes towards African Caribbean students despite the mid-1980s policy and curriculum changes that were initiated "in schools that have attempted to deconstruct and oppose the racism that permeates so much of life in contemporary Britain" (Gillborn 1995:93).

The very institution that relocated students thought would shield them from the discriminatory remarks of the general public, undoubtedly fuelled by negative images portrayed by the media, has failed to offer any sanctuary. Thus, there seems to be no difference in racist attitudes between society in general and the school community. The racist attitudes within the school environment appeared to be encouraged, nurtured and supported by bureaucratic practices that perhaps inadvertently, assisted in promoting 'invisibility' among relocated students.

Certain of these practices (related to policy and bureaucracy) in some schools enable the "structuring of silence" (Davidson 1996:67). Davidson's reference was made against the backdrop of an inquiry he conducted to determine how inner-city migrant students conceptualise and assert their ethnic identities. Davidson points out that bureaucratic practices reinforce marginalisation and in so doing remove much of the force from migrant children's achievement and voice. The bureaucratic practices that hindered relocated students' progress were grounded in principles related to (1) being 'wrongly placed' and (2) the settling of disciplinary matters.

On the issue of 'wrongly placed', relocated students who were placed in classes one year below the level they had attained in Montserrat, spoke of their disappointments and frustrations to their parents, their peers and other Montserratians, but not to their teachers. I noted one exception when this was communicated to a teacher in a rather indirect manner (Chapter 8), but the matter was not pursued. One relocated parent who raised the issue with her child's head of year was told that the child was on trial, that is the child's academic performance was being monitored, and would be considered at the end of the trial period. Another parent reported:

It seems that they (the teachers) need a whole year to monitor Greg's progress. He will still be a year behind at the start of the next school year. They keep promising but do nothing about it. Greg's standard has dropped. I
don’t know what to do. I wish I could send him back to Montserrat (Alma - Parent).

The relocated parents concerned, resigned themselves to a troublesome matter that is controlled by school policy - pupils are placed according to their ages. But their protest and defences put forward to teachers for their children to “have a better deal” and “a fair chance to prove themselves” in the classroom, seemed to have gone unheard. This parent concluded:

It makes no sense to complain to anybody about anything. It’s a waste of time and energy. The school’s policy is written in concrete and we small island people can’t change anything. That’s how I see it (Val – Parent).

Another retorted:

So what we should do? Sit back and let them (schools) mess up we children? Ee much better if we go back a Montserrat... me karn let me children suffer.... not me (Martha – parent).

The foregoing examples suggest that parents felt a sense of powerlessness to even discuss their children’s levels of achievement because of rigid school policies. Some relocated students had similar views about work (subject topics) that they were forced to repeat. It was generally felt that raising the issue of “school work not challenging enough” was just “a waste of time”, although there were no ‘real’ discussions with teachers on this issue. Relocated students’ ‘silent’ reaction to this complexity is grounded in two positions - (1) their cultural orientation and (2) their perception of the teachers’ attitudes towards them as African Caribbean students.

To expand on the first position, in Montserrat, students were traditionally socialised into a respectful, distant, yet amicable relationship with their teachers. (The adjective ‘distant’ was used to contrast the ‘first-name’ relationship that students in England have with their teachers - a relationship that some relocated students find almost impossible to cultivate). In Montserrat, generally, there was an unspoken acceptance of teachers’ authority and this translated into accepting certain teacher decisions, particular those of a pedagogic nature. In the UK, to now challenge teachers’ decisions with regards to school policy, seemed an intimidating task for students and parents alike. It also seemed a puzzling undertaking. The way the education system in Montserrat was structured, did not allow for a student to be
placed in an ‘unsuitable’ class. By this I mean that students were streamed according to their ability and therefore were in classes that matched their academic needs. Even within a given class, as far as possible, individual academic needs were catered for.

To tackle a new and complex undertaking did not avert some relocated parents’ attention from the principle reason for relocating to England – the continuing of their children’s education. When the question of ‘unsuitability’ arose, some parents were determined to seek ways to settle this matter, despite their reticence of talking to teachers. They have recognised that to be heard above the din of bureaucratic procedures is an uphill struggle, but they were still willing to “take on the system” by arguing for recognition of their children’s academic ability, with a view to giving their children a positive, visible presence in their respective schools.

The second position, namely relocated students’ perception of teachers’ attitudes towards them as African Caribbean students, has reference to teacher stereotyping and low expectation of African Caribbean students.

Schools’ exclusion policies have turned disciplinary hearings into an arena of fear, frustration and disappointment for students and parents alike. I would venture to suggest that the ignoring of victims’ voices when dealing with contentious issues has crafted a fertile field for the growth of negative self-perception. Consider the following extract of a conversation I had with Calli who claimed to be a victim of verbal and physical abuse.

When asked why he did not report the matter to a teacher, he replied:

Not me. You tink dey would believe me? Not dem. I like the social worker. She know that I’m not like dem (some Jamaican boys). She believe what I say because she understand the situation. She know exactly what does happen with dem other students. She know that I only fight to defend myself and dem (the teachers) still give me wrong. If Miss (the social worker) was here the case would not go like that and dey would not send me home (suspended) Calli (Year - 10).

In the above and similar situations, the negative perception seemed to have begun with ‘unfair’ decisions that sometimes resulted in suspension and/or exclusion. And when other incidences occurred, the ‘victims’ have refused to make a report for fear that they would be unfairly treated again. In such instances, the teachers could not offer any support to the victims since the incidences were not reported.
Despite the many factors that have affected the educational aspirations of relocated students, many remain determined to fight to pursue their educational goals.

**Fighting to Pursue Educational Goals**

I use the expression ‘down but not out’ to describe the fighting, educational spirit of relocated parents and students. This expression has a two-fold connotation - a recognition of temporary restraint and a determination to progress. ‘Down but not out’ was a general fit for Montserratians before relocation to the UK. This expression also played a vital role in parents’ decision to relocate. But since relocation, it appears to have taken on a much more significant meaning in an unexpected way. Although there are different degrees of ‘significant meaning’ among relocated migrants, the basic tenet remains. I have identified two instances to demonstrate why ‘down but not out’ has gained weightier meaning among the relocated migrants.

A relocated parent insisted that the British school system is designed to “kip dung black people” (keep black students at the bottom of the academic ladder). The parent came to this conclusion when her child was sent to a Pupils’ Referral Unit (PRU) after his third exclusion from school. The parent challenged the school’s decision, since she was convinced that her child was “treated unfairly” and that the PRU was “the wrong place” for her child. This conviction seems all the more so when, after one week at the PRU, the child asked: “When will I go back to school?” The question suggests that the student did not view the PRU as school (a learning institution), and had a longing to return to such a place.

Another relocated parent, at the request of the headteacher, visited her child’s school on three different occasions to discuss the child’s “hyperactive” behaviour. During these visits, the parent was able to observe other students’ behaviour and noted the following:

(Montserrat Dialect)

Udder pickney direkly crazy an dem still in a main stream. But as soon as arwe children do a little ting, dey want to sen dem to de special unit (Millicent - Parent).

(Translation)

Other children are extremely disruptive but they remain in mainstream. When relocated students misbehave they are sent to PRUs.
After subsequent observations, the parent concluded:

It seems that this system really wants to keep down our children. We have to help our children. We just cannot let them go like that. This system wants to push us in a corner, and we are not accustomed to that. We have to fight our way out.

The above two examples represent the sentiments of relocated parents who were determined to ‘fight back’ when they were convinced that their children were treated “unfairly”. An extensive list is unnecessary, particularly in the light of the experiences of post-war migrants. Coard described a parallel situation for post-war students in opening chapter of his book *How the West Indian Child is made Educationally Sub-normal in the British School System:*

- There are very large numbers of our West Indian children in schools for the Educationally sub-normal - which is what ESN means.
- These children have been wrongly placed there.
- Once placed in these schools, the vast majority never get out and return to normal schools.
- They suffer academically and in their prospects for life because of being put in these schools.
- The authorities are doing very little to stop this practice (Coard 1971:5).

Comparatively, very large numbers of relocated students are not placed in PRUs, although 5 of the students in the sample (12.5%) were identified as having ‘special needs’, and were subsequently placed in related classes. But from the standpoint of a ‘tiny’, close-knit community, a minority of 12.5% is considered very significant. I take issue with the ‘special needs’ classification for more often than not, it constituted several meanings ranging from “shaky English” to “disruptive behaviour” to “severe academic shortfalls”. It is perhaps such flexible, implausible reasons for placing students in special needs classes that led parents to conclude ‘the system want to keep down their children’.

Neither relocated parents’ sincere interest in their children’s education, nor their refusal to accept ‘failure’, is a new phenomenon for African Caribbean parents. It is generally acknowledged that African Caribbean parents have always attached great importance to the
education of their children. It was perhaps this deep-rooted interest in education that inspired post-war parents to accuse the British education system of mentally destroying their children by not responding positively to their educational needs (Jones 1986:xii). Ironically, the schools have been noted to blame the students for their educational shortfall. Bryan et al put it this way:

The schools have kept our children at the very bottom of the ladder of employability and laid the blame on us. The schools’ ability to churn our cheap, unskilled factory fodder or ‘multi-skilled’ YTS trainees may have serve the economic needs of this society; but it has not met the aspirations of a community which has always equated education with liberation from poverty (Bryan et al 1986:58).

Coard (1971:5-7) made reference to the number of African Caribbean students who were placed in low streams. From a sociological perspective, Ball contends:

Inasmuch as the dominant official values in the school reinforce and reward academic achievement, allocation to a low stream is allocation to a position of inferior status. It is a label of failure (Ball 1986:62).

Some relocated students felt swamped by the system and trapped in an inferior position as noted by this comment: “what’s the point complaining? Nobody cares anyway” (Kester – Year 10). But others like Tuvia refused to resign themselves to failure. She commented:

We know that we can do it (succeed). We just have to show them (teachers). The same way we worked hard in Montserrat, the same way we can work hard here. We will show them (teachers) that we not stupid (Tuvia – Year 11).

Such determination is not new to African Caribbean students. Lewis (1986:39-41) recounts that with hard work, patience and strong determination some students “struggled to get out of low streams” and did manage to advance from ‘C’ to ‘A’. Such struggles were not halted at the end of compulsory school years. The following comments echoes the sentiments of first-wave migrants:

Many of us fought for credibility, adopting the same stubborn determination (as under the colonial rule in the Caribbean) to make it through the education system, despite the odds. When we found our ambitions frustrated, not through lack of money or too fierce competition this time, but by the teachers and the schools themselves, we signed up for evening classes and Further Education courses. Night cleaning,
auxiliary nursing and factory work often financed the education, which the schools had failed to give us (Bryan et al 1986:69).

The above accounts illustrate that a people who have placed a high value on education were prepared to go to great lengths to achieve their educational goals. It also implies that more then determination was needed - persons had to take positive action to effect successful results. What constituted and motivated success will be discussed in Chapter 8.

**Negative Experiences and Unmet Expectations**

It was with much eagerness and great expectation of ‘a better education’ that relocated parents registered their children in British schools. Eager expectation turned to frustration and disillusionment when parents and students alike came face to face with the realities of being African Caribbean in the British society – realities that made schooling a rather unhappy experience.

Discussions held with first-wave migrants revealed that their experiences in the classroom tell a tale of bitterness, disillusionment and pain. Relocated students related similar emotions sufferings. One student spoke of school in England as “a big headache”. Another of “being laughed at and teased by other students”, and yet another of not wanting to go to Maths class because “it is a waste of time – the work too easy”. Such reports suggest that parents too had an uphill battle as they helped their children to deal with the painful emotions that resulted from their unhappy experiences.

Admittedly, relocated students may not have as bizarre a confrontation with teachers as the following:

I remember my early schooldays as being a very unhappy time. People were watching you all the time, and if you did anything it wasn’t because you were you but because you were black. There was a time when this teacher pulled me up in front of the class and said I was dirty and that she was going to make sure that my neck was cleaned - and she proceeded to do it, with vim. My father is usually a quiet man, but he went up there with a machete (Bryan et al 1985:63).

However, generally African Caribbean students’ reports indicated that they too have had unhappy school days, have suffered disappointment and frustration and have experienced
similar feelings of inferiority. I will relate Kerry’s and Davida’s experiences as examples of similar emotional sufferings. Kerry reported:

It was very hard for me to find a school. Six schools rejected me before I found one. From the first day I set foot in that school, I was been bullied and I finally had to leave that school. Now I am here. The teachers here are friendly. They treat me like their own (Kerry – Year 9).

Kerry’s report implies that teachers at the other schools were not friendly. I have no explanation for the reported cases of rejection, although other students have reported similar experiences of bullying and rejection. Perhaps some teachers still view an increase of African Caribbean students “as leading to a decline in standards of discipline and achievement” (Gillborn 1995:101). Notably, the teachers at her present school are all of African Caribbean origin. Little wonder that Kerry was treated “like their own”. Kerry made a reasonable assessment for Gillborn & Youdell contend that year nine students are at school “long enough to build a strong sense of the Institution and their place within it” (Gillborn & Youdell 2000:166).

The following is an excerpt of a conversation I had with Davida:

R: You said that you felt strange and you had no one to talk to. Did you speak to anyone?
D: No. Because I can’t speak English.
R: What do you mean by that? Aren’t you speaking English now?
D: Yes. But I cannot speak like them.
R: So that made you feel strange?
D: Yeah. Everybody ah talk English.

The feelings of inferiority that Davida experienced, were present because she had a different accent. She felt like the odd one in the group – a perceived failure for not being able to speak like everyone else. It is in this context of self-assessment that inferiority is used. I draw on Hamachek’s rationalisation to explain:

Feeling of inferiority cannot be taken as an index of actual inferiority. A feeling of inferiority is a purely subjective affect related to the self, and is measured by the ratio between one’s success and aspirations in a given direction (Hamachek 1971:234).

Here’s another example of Hamachek’s ‘subjective affect’. A relocated parent was concerned when her child told her that he was unhappy at school, but became alarmed
when the child ask “why did God make me black?” Further discussion with the child made the parent more aware of the negative effects that discrimination and unfulfilled educational dreams were having on her child’s learning. An African Caribbean student asked her mother this same question about three decades ago, possibly for the very same reasons (Bryan et al 1985:64).

Self-Image: The ‘Individual’ Factor

Undeniably, feelings of inferiority and negative self-perception among relocated students have been fuelled by unhappy school experiences, which have affected their self-esteem.

Some British educators and officials have contended that the negative self-concept of African Caribbean students is largely responsible for their failure in schools, and that a change of attitude would help them to “achieve more in schools” (Stone 1981:26). This is an ongoing and old debate, but the trouble with this contention is that it does not recognise that it takes a change of circumstances to effect a change of attitudes. It leaves very little room for the positive influences of “significant others” and “educational ambition” (Kerckhoff 1986:98). Kerckhoff proposes that any evaluation of self (positive or negative), is formed as a result of social interaction. This prompts the question, which of the social interactions results in a students’ negative evaluation of self? Self-concept is a complex concept, probably because of its connection to the affective domain. I therefore refer to the following definition as my guide for this discussion:

The concept represented by the person’s picture of himself (sic) to himself has been variously called the self-image, self, or self-concept. Persons not only form pictures of themselves, they also develop feelings and attitudes about the content and quality of that image. They may like and admire the image they see in their mind’s eye or they may feel varying amounts of dislike and even hostility about the self they have formed. These positive or negative attitudes and feelings about the self are the evaluative sentiments known as self-esteem. Thus, the self-concept is the symbol or the image which the person has formed out of his personal experiences while self-esteem is the person’s self-evaluation of that image (Coopersmith 1975 in Taylor 1981:162).

Coopersmith insinuates that it is repeated levels of social interaction that help to shape self-images and the resulting attitudes. It follows then that the low self-esteem, which is associated with African Caribbean students, stem from the constant interactions with students and teachers in an environment where “racist stereotypes were translated into
social and material responses” (Mac an Ghaill 1988:42). The distinction between self-concept and self-esteem seems necessary since other writers have claimed that there is a
correlation between self-esteem and achievement among African Caribbean students
(Jones 1986; Cropley 1983:120; Stone 1981). It was perhaps being in an environment
where it was perpetuated that whiteness is synonymous to success (Bryan et al 1985:226)
that prompted students, who probably saw success as a distant dream, to ask their parents
why had God made them black.

Interestingly, the relocated student went a step further; he forcefully stated that he did not
want to be black. From his famous ‘black doll, white doll’ experiment, Milner (1975:135)
claimed that the black child confers a highly positive value on whiteness and renders his
blackness a highly negative attribute, hence the reason for black children to have a
tendency to deny their true identity. But this was not the case with the relocated student for
a discussion with the student revealed that the desire to be white was neither a rejection nor
a hatred of his ethnic identity, but rather a simple wish “to be treated like the white people”
(Dalton – Year 8). I concluded the same from Kester’s story:

R: Why do you say it is a curse to be black?
K: Because dem (teachers) no like you. Dem no care bout you. Dem no want you fu
learn at all.

R: What make you say that?
K: One time yeah? In a Science class a put up me han to ask de teacher something, I
wanted some help, yeah? Miss just watch me and went over by some white children .... She stay with them all the time... so I just close me book.

R: You should have raised your hand again.
K: Who me? Not me. Miss would do de same ting. Dey (teachers) do it all de time.

Dalton and Kester’s comments imply that they wanted to be part of the group that had the
teachers’ full support and encouragement. Ethnic identity was not the major issue.

The teachers might not have shared the student’s sentiments, but this is not unusual for
pupils are noted to be more sensitive than teachers on the question of equity. It is also noted
that “pupils are especially sensitive to any differences in treatment and will often seek
justifications for actions they perceive to be unfair” (Gillborn & Youdell 2000:183). And
although the issue of not wanting to be black is with reference to one relocated student, the issue of discrimination was not, for several students have voiced their opinions of being discriminated against. The fact that Milner’s claim did not hold true in this instance may be a reflection of these factors:

1. changes in socio-economic circumstances (in Montserrat) over three decades;
2. changes in perceptions of, and attitudes towards host country;
3. reasons for migration; and
4. the influence of ‘significant others’.

There is a tendency for one to think that there are very little changes in racist attitudes towards African Caribbean students. Yet, generally, a new and different awareness of self does exist among African Caribbean peoples – relocated students included. I would not venture to suggest what brought about the changes in England. But it seems safe to assume that in addition to the political, social and economic changes in Montserrat and the wider Caribbean over the past three decades, it was the ‘fresh’ way of thinking about self that has conditioned current thoughts on self-image among the relocated migrants.

Inevitably, thinking about self will evoke thinking about ‘significant others’. Moreover, an individual’s self-esteem erodes if he/she constantly receives a dismal image of self from the behaviour of others towards him/her. The converse is also true. But how do students view persons who influence their self-image?

Undeniably, African Caribbean parents have high academic aspirations for their children. But it is also noted, “parental ambitions are high and often unrealistic” (Stone 1981:219). These unrealistic ambitions sometimes clash with students’ own ambitions and teacher expectations. Thus, students often have a hard time balancing parents’ and teachers’ expectations. This balancing act is further compounded by the conflicts that result from peer interaction and peer pressure. Consider the following:
The West Indian adolescent seems to be caught between identifying with the world belonging to his parents and with one which he regards as his own. Most adolescents in their bid to assert their independence, experience a period of poor relationship with their parents, but with the West Indian in England this experience is made more crucial by the clash of two worlds of which he is part, particularly since he is aware that as a West Indian acceptance by the group with which he identifies is limited to a few rather than the wider more general adolescent world (Bushell 1973 in Taylor 1981:147).

By extension, when Bushell’s comment is applied to relocated students, an interesting situation results. The relocated adolescent’s experience might have been made even more crucial for coming to England as a forced migrant it was difficult, and in some cases impossible to identify with adolescents who had experienced similar traumatic experiences. Therefore, initially, it was a critical parent-child relationship that helped relocated students to adapt to their new environment. Thus, it was family influences, rather than peer influences that played a particularly vital role in relocated students’ adaptation, as they tried to negotiate the transition between dependence and independence. But in helping their children to adapt, relocated parents were themselves faced with conditions that were physically and psychologically stressful, as testified by some parents:

(Montserrat Dialect)
Me tiad wid dis moovin up an dung. Me evacuate so much times in a Montserrat, me tink when me come here de moovin stap. How dem expect de children dem fe settle dung an learn? (Alice - Parent)

(Translation)
I am tired having to move so many times. In Montserrat, I was evacuated several times. I thought that when I relocated to England, I would not have to move anymore. How do they (the government authorities) expect the students to progress?

No job, no house, still in temporary accommodation and I still have to sort out the children schooling. Montserrat did not have these kind of problems (Charles – Parent).

I give up my good job to come here. Now I cannot get a job. I cannot live so. I am accustomed to work for myself and my children (Beatrice – Parent)

The above comments demonstrate that relocated parents are experiencing various difficulties in helping their children to attain academic success. Yet, parents remain active influences in their children’s education. Like post-war African Caribbean migrants, relocated parents and children have created for themselves patterns of meaningful
relationships, which are served “to insulate and protect against the stressful and dehumanising environments” (Stone 1981:222), albeit under different circumstances. In recognition of the importance of such relationships, some relocated students have encouraged their children active participation in weekend study groups and church and sporting organisations (Chapter 10).

Generally, relocated students have high regards for their parents and are willing to be guided by them. However, there was an obvious clash between parents and peers’ influences. The general trend from research findings shows that African Caribbean children prefer friends of their own race, “with similar interest and background” (Moore 1998:53). The pattern seems to be the same for the relocated student as noted in Table 6.1. The responses are in reply to the question, “who is your best friend?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Choices</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (N = 40)</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montserratian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ironically, although relocated students resented the idea of being labelled a Jamaican, they did not seem to mind having a Jamaican as a best friend. Interesting too, was the ‘dropping’ of a Turkish friend when a Jamaican student became a member of one of that student’s classes. This occurrence aligns with researchers’ findings (previous paragraph) as well as Kerckhoff’s, who from research conducted on study peer processes, noted that most friendship choices were made within the same classroom (Kerckhoff 1986:100). Researchers who have studied patterns of friendship among secondary pupils from a number of ethnic groups found that African Caribbean children showed a greater own-
group preference than indigenous pupils (Moore 1998; Kelly 1988; Epstein & Karweit 1983). This trend that is noted in Table 6.1.

Pollak (1979) in Taylor (1981:161) found that West Indian children claimed to have ‘lots’ of friends although they were significantly less likely to have visited friends in their homes or have had these friends visit them at home. I have noted a similar occurrence among 8 of the 9 relocated students who had non-Montserratians as their best friends.

In cases where the ‘best friends’ were Montserratians, parents were informed. This is perhaps because generally, parents felt that their children were “safer” with other Montserratians. One parent had this to say:

I keep to myself. I don’t know who to trust. It is not safe to go certain places, not even in the daytime. The people here so bad and you don’t know who is who. Not like Montserrat where you know everybody (Sarah - Parent).

It seems a reasonable conclusion that relocated students were aware of their parents’ fears and therefore deemed it wise to keep certain friendships secret, perhaps to maintain stability in the family relationship. The lone student who took her non-Montserratian best friend to her home, did so because she wanted her parents to see that she was not “keeping bad company” (Andora – Year 10). Undoubtedly, parents’ influences are critical to children due to their considerable, intimate interactions with them. However, in a school environment where there are constant encounters with peers and teachers, influences are also quite significant.

Kerckhoff postulates that there is a correlation between friendship choice and academic performance or attitudes towards school. He also noted that at primary as well as secondary levels, friends tend to have similar attitudes towards school, educational ambition and academic performance (Kerckhoff 1986:100). Stone adds that attitudes to school are closely related to attitudes to teachers for she noted that students who had positive attitudes towards school were those who also had positive attitudes towards their teachers (Stone 1981:211). It was further noted that teachers’ attitude towards students determined students’ attitudes towards them. So in cases where students believed that teachers had negative stereotypes and low expectations of them, they (the students) had negative attitudes towards teachers. This no doubt affected their academic performance.
Traditionally, Montserratian students exhibited a respectful attitude towards their teachers. Relocated students brought this habit to England. In the group discussions, they openly expressed their shock and dismay at the poor discipline exhibited in schools, and the manner in which some students treated their teachers. The following comments represent relocated students’ perceptions of discipline in British schools:

They (students) are so disrespectful. They just don’t have any manners (Khali - Year 7).

The students are too rude. They tell the teachers anything they feel- even bad words (Jonelle - Year 7).

If they had Montserrat teachers to deal with, they would never behave so badly (Donald - Year 9).

The teachers cannot control the students. The students control them instead. They even take knives to school (Sanchez - Year 11).

It looks like the teachers are afraid of the students (Donna - Year 10).

What the teachers here accept from students, is totally unacceptable in Montserrat (Ellen - Year 11).

These relocated students made a clear distinction between student-teacher relationships in Montserrat and England. Compared to the Montserrat situation, there is an obvious lack of teacher-control in some British classrooms – a situation that relocated students found rather distasteful and one that provoked specific attitudes towards teachers as well as students.

Relocated students’ comments on behaviour in school referred to the entire student body. This suggests that African Caribbean students are also part of the “rude” group. Given that African Caribbean students are disruptive and aggressive, and given that friends have similar attitudes towards school (teachers included), it seems reasonable to conclude that relocated students’ respectful attitude towards teachers would eventually be eroded, particularly if they cultivate close friendships with persons who have negative attitudes towards their teachers. I make specific reference to the African Caribbean students for Table 5.1 shows that Jamaicans formed the largest non-Montserratian best friendship
group. Besides, all relocated students have African Caribbean friends. Consider this teacher’s comment about a student who had changed by the end of her first school year:

When Dulcie first started, she was keen and clearly academically able. At her intake interview, she presented as a shy girl, but one who was determined to do well. Her attitude during lessons was good, she completed all her work............. As time went on, Dulcie began to get into more confrontational situations with members of staff (KP - Teacher).

Dulcie’s example might have been as a result of factors such as peer pressure, teacher attitude or even frustration with the system. However, it does align with Kerckhoff’s claim (p.30) for it was noted that her best friend (an African Caribbean student) had a “very poor” record. Dulcie’s case is one of two major confrontational cases reported by teachers.

**The Language Issue**

The maintenance and development of the home language is crucial to a child’s cognitive development and promotion of positive identity (Refugee Council 1997:18). But the hope of home languages of minority groups featuring in the National Curriculum remains a distant dream (Gillborn 1990:197). Language is one of the two controversial aspects of the education of African Caribbean students; behaviour is the other (Taylor 1981:202). Relocated students have no qualms with the accepted linguistic standard. However, some would like to be able to use dialect more freely as noted by this comment:

Sometimes I want to say something in dialect but I say it in English. I do not want the teacher to think that my English is not good..... Dey tink if you tark dialect you tupit (If you speak dialect, teachers think that you are not intelligent). But we know English...... We like to talk dialect for it make us feel good. When we (relocated students) get together we tark (speak) we (our) Montserrat dialect (Davida - Year 10).

Relocated students were used to writing short stories and poems in Montserrat dialect as this allowed them to pen expressions that reflected genuine, heartfelt feelings. Living with an ongoing volcanic crisis has caused untold physical as well as emotional instability, and schools are perfectly positioned to provide numerous opportunities for students to talk and or, write about their experiences. I refer to Fergus’ assertion concerning the use of dialect in critical times, to explain the importance of providing opportunities that allow displaced students free self-expression:

We laugh to preserve our sanity and our lives, and creole (dialect) helps us to do that without trivialising the episodes (Fergus 1998:11).
Two relocated students had an opportunity to ‘preserve their sanity’ via a theatrical project for a Summer School Festival. The teacher who ran the project needed persons “who could speak with a West Indian accent or read Jamaican dialect”. Others students do not get similar opportunities because of some teachers’ attitudes towards Creole.

Teachers’ attitudes towards the language of students of African Caribbean descent have triggered off this chain reaction:

The stereotyping process leads features of Creole to be stigmatised and to develop connotations of, amongst other things, low academic ability. The teacher is then more likely to allow the stereotype to determine her behaviour towards the child and low teacher expectation will probably lead to low pupil performance (Edwards 1979:97).

Edwards’ observation is still evident two decades later. Relocated students have been found guilty of “having an English deficiency” presumably on two counts - the basis of their African Caribbean origin and their ‘refugee’ status. As Caribbean descents, their Montserrat dialect represents an inability to speak standard English; as ‘refugees’ relocated students are classified as students for EAL and ESL classes - supplementary English classes for ethnic minority students whose native tongue is not English. (I will pick up the refugee issue in the next chapter). Both assumptions are totally misguided, not simply because English is the official language of Montserrat, but more so because the speaking of one’s dialect is an identification of one’s cultural orientation, not an indication that the speaker does not know, or cannot speak Standard English. Richmond advances this position:

..... our language is a crucially important part of what we are, of our history and of our culture, and that schools’ ignorance of, or hostility to, languages and dialects other than Standard English is a form of oppression, which must be challenged and transformed. Black children, it declares, will overcome the condition of their oppression not by adopting the very language of the oppressor but by being strong and confident in their own voice (Richmond 1986:124).

Montserratian born, world renown calypsonian and Socca King, seems to align himself with the above position in the opening verse of his ‘Montserrat’s English’ calypso:
People tink dat is wrong, to talk real Montserratian
They say it ain’t right grammatically
They can’t find dem words in no dictionary
Calling it bad language, despising we heritage
Don’t care if they call we foolish
This is Montserrat English.
(Alphonsus Cassel, Arrow)

Yet, Arrow does not seem to support the view, “not adopting the language of the oppressor”, but suggests that strength and confidence in one’s own language is possible if one continues to use this language, while at the same time making appropriate use of standard English. In the last verse of the same calypso, Arrow appeals:

English grammar you cyan neglect, but hold on to we dialect
Is we ancestors give it to us, so accept it back and stop making fuss
I am making a strong appeal, regardless wha dem big shots feel
Use this language more and more, be proud of you own culture.
(Alphonsus Cassel, Arrow)

The first segment of Arrow’s appeal seems to take side with another position, which proposes that black children stick to Standard English, “at least for the purposes of education” (Richmond 1986:124).

Taking Arrow’s total appeal on board creates a difficult and complicated position for relocated students. It seems a rather difficult task for relocated students to be proud of their culture by using the Montserrat dialect “more and more”, in a school environment where that dialect is “despised”. Such a practice is likely to minimise rather than “maximise their chances of success in examinations, of access to post-compulsory education, of desirable and well-paid employment” (Richmond 1986:124). Yet, some students have managed to strike such a balance for teachers have noted that generally, standard English is written and spoken in classes, but dialect is used among peers in informal settings. Such successes seem an ample demonstration of the stability and flexibility of language. Sutcliffe (1986:3 & 4) notes that language stability results from “the social situation in which language is learned and developed”, whereas flexibility manifests itself in “vocabulary, idioms, pronunciation and even grammar”. The symbiotic relationship that clearly exists between these two facets of language, tends to suggest that ‘understanding’ language is crucial to an individual’s educational progress.
For relocated students, complexities arising out of language issue had little or nothing to do with acquiring the accepted form of language in the host country, as would be the case for non-English speaking migrants. However, feelings of inadequacy did surface. Cropley contends:

Language is important in individual’s people’s feelings of belonging and competence, in their understanding of what is going on around them, in their system of values, in their attitudes, in their ability to feel and express emotions, in their conscious and subconscious life and in their ability to form and express wishes (Cropley 1983:57).

I refer to the conversation between Davida and me (p.121). It was not Davida’s inability to express emotions that created feelings of inferiority but rather, the sense of not being able to identify with a group that spoke with a different accent. She claimed that she had no one to talk to. This seems to suggest that she had something to say and wanted to say it, but an ‘understanding’ audience was not available. After giving some background information on relocated students to a teacher who had “taken them for granted”, this comment was made:

It must be very difficult for them. I know that they have lots to say. But they have no one to talk to. Nobody who understands (RI - Teacher).

I noted two assumptions emerging from the above comment. The first is that relocated students do not have an ‘informal’ teacher audience, and the second is that teachers may be willing to listen but do not make any extra effort to do so since they do not understand what is said. Not understanding may be as a consequence of three factors: (1) lack of background information, (2) interpretation of the spoken language - dialect or standard English and (3) a combination of (1) and (2). These assumptions bring the question of intonation, articulation, and interpretation into focus.

With reference to classes, all the teachers noted that relocated students spoke Standard English. However, one teacher said this of one student, “he speaks Standard English but dialect comes through in his writing”. This general impression prompts the questions, if relocated students speak Standard English, why were some of them assigned to EAL classes? When dialect “comes through in writing”, are EAL classes the most appropriate setting to correct this? Different schools used different indicators to determine their relocated students’ language status.
At one school, assigning a relocated student to EAL or ESL classes meant that the student “is identified as someone whose reading age was below his/her chronological age” (Teacher GD). At another school, the same action meant “the student had a poor command of the English language” (Teacher MK). At yet another school such placements were necessary in order to help students “to develop their vocabulary and comprehension skills” (Teacher PR). But none of the explanations offered quelled the feelings of disgust and worthlessness that some relocated students experienced.

Admittedly, some relocated students were identified as having special needs, and therefore merited specialist teachers’ attention, as provided by some schools. However, the general impression is that they do not speak English fluently and therefore need the support of the EAL Department.

All the relocated students have acknowledged that they speak standard English in classes and to their teachers, but revert to dialect among their Montserratian and Jamaican peers. But communicating in Standard English did not guarantee that students always understood what teachers said, for intonation (accent) and articulation (distinctness) hindered understanding, as noted below:

I do not always understand what the teachers say. They speak different and sometimes they speak too fast. I have to strain to hear what they say (Alice - Year 8).

I have to listen carefully to pick up certain words. Sometimes I get mix up but sometimes I understand (Samuel – Year 9).

The foregoing experiences represented the rule rather than the exception. All relocated students confessed to having difficulty in understanding teachers because of the teachers’ accent. Relocated parents have experienced similar problems, particularly at Parent Evenings/ PTA meetings. When asked whether they had (students and parents) communicated to teachers that they did not understand, “no” and “sometimes” were popular responses for different, yet related reasons. Some students feared classmates’ adverse judgements of their academic ability, while some parents feared teachers’ negative perceptions of their intelligence. Consider these comments:

...even the students watch you funny when you ask them what the teacher say. Sometimes they laugh.....they think you dumb, you not smart (Kester – Year 10).
Me no a ask dem a ting. For dem to tink me a wan idiot? Dey dum tink we no come from no way.... Dat wha dey tink when you com a dem country (Teachers think that persons are not intelligent when they ask certain questions) (Hilda – Parent).

However, some parents who felt “lost” in large group settings, used one-to-one discussions to understand school policies and clear-up misunderstandings. Yet, with regards to settling disciplinary matters, misinterpretation of language remained a problem. Some teachers appeared not to have understood students’ or parents’ ‘testimonies’. Thus, written teachers’ reports were taken to be ‘final’ and parents tended to view such positions as “biased and one-sided”.

While on occasions the perceived biased positions of teachers might have been a result of negative stereotyping, at times it seemed a genuine case of misinterpretation of language. For example, at a ‘hearing’, a teacher reported that a relocated student pushed another student “a couple of times”. The relocated student denied this accusation and insisted that he had pushed the student “two times”. The teacher’s interpretation of ‘couple’ is two, but for the relocated student couple means more than two - several, as would be interpreted by the Montserrat community. This illustration demonstrates that in a teaching-learning situation messages may be distorted and possibly will have knock-on effects, for although persons hear the same thing, what is heard is not necessarily interpreted the same way.

Post-war African Caribbean students were told by teachers that they could not speak English and that they needed special classes where their “broken version of the language” could be drilled out of them (Bryan et al 1985:66). The evidence suggests that that perception of African Caribbean students still exists.

**Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the relocated students’ educational experiences in British schools. It paralleled these experiences to similar situations of the wider African Caribbean group. This juxtaposition of both migrant groups revealed that very little has changed with regards to teacher expectation of African Caribbean students’ ability to attain educational heights.
Two controversial aspects of the education of African Caribbean students are behaviour and language. Issues relating to stereotyping, lack of background information and misinterpretation of language created negative experiences for relocated students.

In demonstrating the great importance that they have attached to their children's education, relocated parents have faced as many up-hill struggles as the students themselves. While some students had fallen prey to the failures that often accompany stereotyping and low teacher expectation, others were determined to succeed despite the many negative experiences. Some parents were equally determined to encourage and support their children by avoiding the pitfalls of a “biased” system. These pitfalls also typify the school experiences of refugees in British schools as will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Seven
The ‘Refugee’ Experience of Relocated Montserratian Students

Label us asylum seekers if the words
Caress the cash, stereotypes can salve,
A tenement for exchange of stock or labour
Is just as sweet as is sea-island sugar;
The transaction tickles God. Good winds
Have blown us here (it was fire really
And the ulcers of Soufriere).
(Fergus 1998:83)

Introduction
This chapter examines the school experiences of relocated Montserratian students as refugees. Relocated Montserratians were like refugees even though they did not fit into the UN’s official definition. The chapter looks at the ambiguities of being and not being official refugees and explores whether as refugees relocated students’ educational needs have been met. Linked to the refugee experience is the issue of homelessness. Thus, the chapter also discusses the effect of homelessness on relocated students’ educational aspirations.

Uprootedness is a common thread that runs through the terminological network of meanings given for the term ‘refugee’. Related to this are the terms ‘forced migrants’ and ‘displaced persons’, which also connote mobility under adverse conditions. Forced migrants and displaced persons are described as:

... those whose lives have been so disrupted by war, famine and or, civil conflict that they have been forced to acculturate to new worlds, often radically different from those from which they came (World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) Interagency Commission 1990: 8).

This explanation does not explicitly account for all environmental disasters. However, the utilisation of the word “famine” does make allowance for the inclusion of other environmental disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, floods and volcanic eruptions. Moreover, Cernia (1993:379) includes environmental disasters in his list of causal agents for population displacements and refugee flows.
Given the context of this study, the terms ‘refugees’, ‘forced migrants’ and ‘displaced persons’ are used interchangeably with a view to capturing the entire range of the relocated students’ ‘refugee’ experience.

Definitions and Refugee Status

Individuals, international agencies and nation states continually construct definitions and notions of refugees to fit into and or, overlay contexts and ideological stances according to each group’s circumstances. The definitions and related expressions used to explain the term ‘refugees’ in this subheading, were the ones used in the UK in official and unofficial capacities during the mid 1990s to 2000, the period when the exodus from Montserrat to the UK occurred.

Immigrant status does not seem to be a major factor in determining who are refugees for World University Services (WUS) uses the term refugee to cover:

- persons granted refugee status by the UK Home Office;
- persons not granted status but allowed “Exceptional Leave to Remain” (ELR);
- persons who have applied for asylum and are awaiting the Home Office’s decision (WUS 1989: 10).

From the above classification, the Home Office officially accepts two particular groups of immigrants as refugees, although not granted refugee status – those with an ELR stamp in their passports and asylum seekers. Relocated Montserratians who came to England before May 31, 1998, fall into the former bracket. Those who came after May 31, 1998, were granted an ‘Indefinite Leave to Remain’ (ILR) status. Relocated Montserratians who still have ELR status may apply for ILR status when their ELR status terminates (MCST 2001). The prolonged volcanic crisis together with Montserrat’s BDTO status perhaps influenced the Home Office’s decision to effect the change from an ELR to an ILR status.

Addo identifies three categories of refugees in the UK law:

1. *Quota Refugees* – admitted as a result of intergovernmental negotiations, usually with the assistance of UNHCR;

3. **De facto Refugees** – are granted ELR in the UK at the discretion of the Home Secretary (Addo 1994:97).

Addo also explains that de facto refugees are persons unable to satisfy the strict requirements of the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol, but who nevertheless demonstrate reasons to fear persecution in their home country (Addo 1994:97). This means that relocatedMontserratians with ELR status are **de facto refugees** solely on the basis that they do not satisfy the strict requirements of the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol.

Article 1 of the Convention Relating to Status of Refugees 1951 (the “Geneva Convention”) and the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees 1967 stipulates in part, that persons become refugees “owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted” (World University Service (WUS) 1989: 10). It fails to take into account the plight of persons such as relocatedMontserratians who did not flee persecution. In light of the issues this reveals, it is not surprising that “several western democracies” questioned the validity of the 1951 Convention with regards to the status of refugees, and viewed it as “outdated and in need of reform” (Ogata 2000:17).

Given that Article I is a legal document, in a strict legal sense, relocatedMontserratians are not refugees. Moreover, in 1997, during a visit to England, Minister of Communication and Works, the Honourable Rupert Weekes, raised the issue of relocatedMontserratians’ status with “high level officials”. In the Minister’s report, he echoed the sentiments of Robert Archer, Senior Policy Advisor at Christian Aid:

Montserratians who went to England under the Voluntary Evacuation Scheme (VES) are technically not refugees. They therefore cannot receive the same treatment as refugees from Bosnia, Somalia or Rwanda (Montserrat Reporter 1997).

Evidently, the influx of evacuees from Montserrat under VES did not fit into the refugee domain that is guided by political policies and legislation. Yet, they suffered many of the same experiences of dislocation. This is how Mennear and Lancaster view the situation:
There is a sense in which people forced into migration by environmental catastrophe are arguably in a worse position than political asylum seekers. A refugee may have the possibility that the political environment in their home country will change and they can return home or facilitate their children visiting their country of origin or at least seeing images of it, perhaps on television. If the homeland is destroyed this can never be possible (Mennear & Lancaster 1999:25).

However, there are other ‘non-legal’ indicators that put relocated Montserratians in the refugee category. Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill (1994: 6) view refugees as “persons who fled from danger or opposition in one country or region and resettled in another”. Black (1998:17) refers to forced migrants and displaced persons cross-national borders because of environmental disasters as refugees. Wardak advances this psychological perspective:

Refugees are victims of systemic violence who undergo horrendous life events that undermine their physical and emotional well-being (Wardak 1995: 1).

Wardak’s position offers a more personal dimension in that it sites the physical and emotional effects of the refugee experience. This element brings the issue of resettlement into focus. Skinner (1999:1) lists housing, benefits, employment problems and residential status as some of the settlement issues that relocated Montserratians faced. A Home Office research finding identified these same issues as the major anxieties of refugee settlement (Carey-Wood, Duke, Karn & Marshall 1995: 97-110).

From the aforementioned viewpoints, reference to danger, displacement, horrendous life events, the weakening of physical and emotional stability and anxieties related to settlement are all trademarks of the relocated Montserratians’ forced migrant experience. Besides, headlines such as the following might have influenced popular thinking on the status of relocated Montserratians:

• ‘Britain Helps Montserrat Refugees in the Caribbean’ (NEWS, Department For International Development, October 31, 1997);

• ‘Montserrat Refugees Say It’s Hard To Celebrate’ (The Independent, December 24, 1997);

• ‘Montserratian Refugees Win Government Cash Help’ (Housing Today, November 6, 1997);

• ‘Britain’s ‘Betrayal’ of Volcano Island Refugees’ (Evening Standard, October 27, 1997).
With particular reference to refugee children, the Refugee Council has named among others, the following characteristics:

- An interrupted education in their country of origin;
- Suffered overwhelming trauma in their home countries;
- Suffered a drop in their standard of living;
- Experienced major changes in their lives;
- Living with families who do not know their educational and social rights;
- Living in temporary accommodation in Britain; and
- Suffer bullying or isolation in school (The Refugee Council 1997:2 & 3).

These features were selected because they all fit into the relocated students’ educational and social experiences. But some schools were unaware that these descriptions aptly related to the relocated students, hence their educational needs as refugees were not met, probably because they registered relocated students as African Caribbean, not as a nationality followed by the term refugee – for example Somali refugee. Yet, some teachers and students regarded them as refugees as related below:

They (other students) call us anything they feel. Some students call us Jamaicans, some call us Africans and some call us Montserrat refugees (Davida - Year 10).

When my friends call me refugee, I believe that they are teasing me because they know that I’m not a refugee. But some other students call me refugee too (Samuel – Year 9).

I identify with the above comments for on a few occasions I have been introduced to staff as the person who came “to see the Montserrat refugees”.

“Becoming an internally displaced person is often a first step in the process of becoming a refugee” (UNHCR 1997:108). The majority of Montserratians were internally displaced before relocating to England. Relocated Montserratians are therefore refugees, given the context in which UNHCR (1997:51) characterises refugees – “as people who are confronted with threats to their life and liberty” and their only means of safety is to flee to another country. The difference lies within the reason for fleeing – from a raging volcano as opposed to “a well-founded fear of being persecuted”.
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Ron Baker contends that loss is one of the elements that characterises the refugee experience:

Loss of what is obvious, tangible and external such as possessions, a home, work, role, status, life style, a language, loved members of the family or other close relationships; and loss that is less obvious, ‘internal’ and ‘subjective’ such as loss of trust in self and others, loss of self esteem, self respect and personal identity (Baker 1983 in Bolloten & Spafford 1998:109).

Relocated Montserratians are a neat fit into Baker’s description of loss – “obvious and less obvious”, and are therefore refugees in this context. Although their material losses were great, it seems that it was the “internal” and “subjective” losses that caused the greater stresses. A relocated parent echoed this communal sentiment:

I left the shelter, gave up my job and everything else because they told me I would get a house and social benefits when I come to England. I came. Big disappointment. No house, no benefits. They gave me so much trouble to get a house. I had to go time and time again from one office to the next. It’s rough. It’s hard. In this place you on you own (Thomas).

Thomas’ “on you own” comment also suggests that the close-knit “web” of connections that Montserratians had prior to relocation, had been broken. Baker argues that when this happens, it threatens and challenges an individual’s coping and adaptive capacities. Such a scenario is clearly illustrated by Figures 7.1 and 7.2.
Figures 7.1 and 7.2 aptly represent the Montserrat ‘refugee’ situation. The relocated Montserrat community is ‘scattered’ throughout the UK – from Durham in the north to Southampton in the south (MCST - 2000). This ‘scattering’ clearly shows “the extent of the loss occurring from a fracturing of relationship networks” (Bolloten & Spafford 1998:111).

And for a people who are still coming to terms with a new and ‘extended’ concept of distance and time, activities directed towards rebuilding the Montserrat “web”, are sometimes difficult to co-ordinate and execute.

Admittedly, refugee status is a contentious issue when “applied to proud Montserratians with historical and cultural links with the UK, though no right of abode” (Skinner 1999:1). However, contentions aside, some relocated Montserratians have resigned themselves to living with the inevitable, dire consequences of forced migration: One relocated parent lamented:

It’s no use to worry about whether we are refugee or not. I don’t have time for that. We here already so we just have to make the best of the situation we find ourselves in. Our children are depending on us so we have to do all we can to support them. Worrying about this refugee thing won’t help (Karmen).

While some relocated parents have been quite vocal about their feelings on their quasi refugee status, others “have been whispering their pain and discomfort in letters and telephone calls” to friends and relatives abroad (The Montserrat Reporter 1998)

Common Misconceptions
Relocated students have had negative and “frustrating” educational experiences because of widespread misconceptions of who are refugees. Rosenkranz (1996: 15) warns that accepting common notions such as the following can lead one to make wrong conclusions:

Refugees are illiterate, poverty-stricken peasants. (Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill 1994: 52)

The above generalisation is spurious and unreasonable although a significant proportion of refugees “speak little or no English on arrival in Britain” (Refugee Council 1997:3). It was perhaps on the basis of this particular characteristic that some relocated students were assigned to EAL and ESL classes. Given that mastery of English language skills was the
issue, it would then be a problem of language competency rather than illiteracy in its strictest sense, particularly in the light of the following comment:

Many people who came to Britain as refugees are highly educated. Even those who are not, are likely to speak two or more languages and given the opportunity will have an ability to English proficiently in a short space of time (Goldsmiths' College 1994:61).

Goldsmiths' College’s observation is plausible for a Home Office research on the settlement of refugees in Britain found that “a large proportion of the refugees were highly qualified and held professional occupations in their home territories” (Hudson 1996:25).

With regards to relocated Montserratians, a sizeable percentage of parents in the sample were engaged in professional occupations before relocating to England (Chapter 3). ‘Highly educated’, ‘highly qualified’ and ‘professional’ are hardly the kind of descriptive terms one would use to qualify illiteracy. It seems reasonable to conclude then that ‘illiterate’ is not an apt description for all refugees.

The issue of ‘poverty-stricken’ is synonymous to ‘destitute’. Shah identifies this next misconception:

A Refugee is someone who is destitute, has fled a country, and is most likely sponging on the state and should not be in this country. (Shah 1996: 9).

When ‘poverty-stricken’ and ‘destitute’ are taken to mean penniless, needy or homeless in a broad sense, this usually conveys a false impression of the true socio-economic status of some refugees. Sunderland & Rees (1996:59) found that many refugees in Britain have had a career for “several years”. This implies that those refugees had experienced some degree of social stability during the “several years” period. A change of circumstances might have brought about financial hardships that became more acute in a foreign land, but given the opportunity to continue their careers this hardship could be rectified.

The aforementioned misconceptions are patronising as well as dismissive. They suggest that the main purpose persons fleeing their country is to “sponge on the State”. No mention is made of why persons had to flee or what had made them “destitute”. The Montserratian refugee’s ‘change of circumstances’ was brought about by a literal loss of ‘home’. As BDTO citizens, they came to England in response to an invitation from the British Government, with the promise of assistance in accommodation, benefits, employment and
education (Sives 1999:36), not to ‘sponge on the State’. When misconceptions become ingrained, persons in the host country tend to dehumanise refugees and harbour a false sense of identity of them. One relocated parent sighed:

……refugee or not I don’t care what they call us. Just treat us like humans – we are decent people. We come from some place…. Much better than here… ask anybody they will tell you (Icilma – Parent).

The majority of relocated parents shared Icilma’s sentiments. The general view was that Montserratians wished to be treated humanely like “people who accustom to good life”. Prior to relocation to the UK, the average Montserratian perceived the acquisition of refugee status as something incongruous, alien and undesirable. ‘Refugee’ was not the term that Montserratians associated with a people who lived on “a quiet and relatively prosperous” island and had “good levels of employment and high standards of health care” (Skelton 2000:104). Nor was refugee status perceived fitted for citizens who benefited from “a comprehensive and good quality education system” (DFID 1999:36) and who enjoyed “a creditable standard of living in spite of the insubstantial base of its externally-oriented economy” (Fergus 1994:233). They did not think of themselves as fitting the ‘refugee’ category. However, as de facto refugees living among thousands of ‘legal’ refugees, some relocated migrants have acquired a realistic view of who refugees are, as well as what ‘the refugee status’ signifies. When one parent was made aware of schools’ support systems for refugee students, she stated: “our children would be better off….. and they would get more help if they were registered as refugees” (Martha). A similar sentiment was expressed in reference to social services:

After all this time we still not settled. They treat you so shabby. So much trouble to get a house... and this moving up and down not helping the children. They need to settle down at one school. If we were refugees we would get house quicker (Walter).

Interestingly, Martha’s and Walter’s expressions suggest a change in pre-relocation perceptions of refugees, albeit to a measured degree.

**Treatment of Montserrat ‘Refugees’**

Montserratians’ refugee status does not allow them to receive the same treatment as refugees from Bosnia, Somalia or Rwanda (p.137). It appears that it was the financial
aspect of “the same treatment” that first caught some relocated persons’ attention as noted by this parent’s comment:

Dey give de Kosovans who custom to de koal warm clothes allowance and we who come from hot Montserrat no get none. So dey no know dat we want allowance too? (Karmen)
Translation: Kosovans who live in the cool climatic zone received warm clothing allowance on arrival in England. By contrast, relocated Montserratians who lived in tropical climate did not receive any allowance on arrival in England.

This inequality as perceived by Karmen was also noted by an observer of the Kosovo crisis. Having noted the inequality that existed between the treatment of the “popular” Kosovan refugees and other refugees, Matthew Gibney points out:

It’s time to reconsider the way we respond to refugees as a whole. We can start this process by asking ourselves not why the suffering of Kosovans matters to us so much, but why the suffering of the vast majority of the world’s refugees matters to us so little (Gibney 1999).

Montserratians saw that they did not receive this “same treatment”. A parent made this observation:

Some Montserrat children are having a rough time. They (teachers) call them refugees but they do not give them refugee treatment. They give the refugees counselling…. and they have some kind of support service for them, but none for the Montserrat children... Montserrat children are suffering and some of them really need counselling (Clarice - Parent).

Clarice’s observation has some merit, for although the schools in the sample have a refugee support system in place, relocated Montserratian students were not given the same treatment as other refugees. This might have been so because it was generally believed that since relocated Montserratian students did not come from a war-torn country, their experiences (collective and individual) before relocation were neither horrendous nor traumatic. This teacher’s comment aptly sums up why relocated students were not treated as refugee:

They (relocated Montserratian students) are few in number, they had none of the apparent needs of “typical” refugees – mostly refugees into London have very little English, have had traumatic war and related ghastly experiences, have considerable social and psychological needs as a result, and are often very poor (M D - Teacher).

This teacher’s comment confirms that relocated students are perceived refugees, but not in a full sense. It also shows a lack of background information for if teachers were aware of
the students' pre-relocation 'ghastly experiences', they would undoubtedly cater for the students’ 'considerable social and psychological needs'. Undeniably, relocated students have had traumatic experiences that warranted the psychological support that schools offer to “typical” refugees, but their ambiguous status meant that this was rarely adequately provided.

**Trauma and Educational Experiences**

There is growing evidence that children’s mental and emotional health is severely affected when they experience horrendous, traumatic events (Coelho 1998; Wardak 1995; Sergestrom 1995; Kaprielen-Churchill & Churchill 1994; Rutter 1994; UNHCH1994; Boothby1992). Relocated students have had numerous unnerving, emotional ordeals between July 1995 and the time when they relocated to the UK. Some teachers have admitted that some relocated students have exhibited emotional behaviours similar to those displayed by traumatised children, but these behaviours were rarely perceived as consequences of the mental misery that relocated students undoubtedly experienced before relocation to the UK. One teacher reported:

Niko has had problems with his behaviour throughout his time here, particularly relating to other students in a physically and verbally aggressive manner and increasingly being verbally abusive towards staff (WP - Teacher).

When I questioned Niko about his poor behaviour, he responded: “Nobody listens to my side. Nobody understands. They blame me for everything”. One teacher admitted that the relocated students at her school had “absolutely no outlet for sharing any stressful experiences” (MD – Teacher). Refugee Council (1997:12) advises that teachers should not only listen to students, but should also take their communication seriously.

Another relocated student was accused of “acting in a childish manner” and “constantly seeking attention” as noted by Teacher OA:

R: Generally, how is Natasha doing at school?

AO: I can only speak for the time I had her – which is a short time.

R: How short is your short?

AO: One term.
R: Alright. Give me your general impression for that term.

AO: She constantly seeks attention. She is very childish – not in a negative way – she behaves and acts in a childish manner.

R: What do you mean? What does she do?

AO: She sucks her thumb?

R: All the time?

AO: Most times. And when she speaks she puts on this babyish voice just to get attention. Another thing, she wants to keep on her jacket all the time. I know it has nothing to do with the weather. She does this to get attention.

Natasha's behaviour might have been summed up solely on the basis of these traits. But traumatised children have a story to tell and they need to be listened to in a quiet relaxed atmosphere, not just be heard. This teacher appears not to have recognised this.

In a handbook prepared to assist teachers to respond to refugee needs, Kahin noted the following behaviours that traumatised children might manifest:

- Difficulty in settling in and concentrating
- Lethargy and lack of motivation
- Withdrawal and depression
- Phobia and anxiety
- Preoccupation with death and destruction
- Somatic problems: headache, stomach pain, etc.
- Reaction of intense anxiety
- Aggression or irritability (Kahin 1997:74 & 75).

In light of the foregoing indicators, it seems possible that Natasha's 'silly' dressing habit, her lack of initiative and motivation and Niko's aggressive behaviour may have been manifested as a result of being traumatised. In addition to identifying 'being silly' as an indicator of refugee trauma, Hyder (1998:95) also asserts that aggression is "one of the commonest manifestation of distress". Kahin further noted:

On the playground traumatised children can find it difficult to react in a balanced way. Their reaction can be extreme and unpredictable. Boys in particular, are likely to respond physically to taunts and racial abuse (Kahin 1997:75).
Undoubtedly, the new school environment, particularly physical size and large roll, augmented the relocated students’ pre and post migration stresses. This was evident from the responses they gave me when I asked them about their first-day school experiences. Description words such as “shy”, “scared”, “frightened”, “shocked”, “nervous”, “terrified” and “surprised” characterised all the responses.

Admittedly, not all relocated students experienced the same degree of personal trauma. Some students, especially those from Plymouth and its southern environs, were exposed to more volcanic hazards and longer periods of unsettlement. Some may have been internally displaced several times, while others may have lived in undesirable conditions in cramped shelters. Still others may have lost not just their homes, but their entire village community, or worse yet relatives and or, friends. Even those who lived in the considered ‘safe’ zone, suffered some sort of trauma – either when it rained ‘pebbles’ in the ‘safe’ zone, or having to cope with adverse conditions in the school ‘centres’ because of the severe disruption of the entire school system.

Noise has been another stressor for some relocated students. Hyder (1998:95) has identified fear of loud noises as a sign of trauma. Some relocated students confided that loud, rumbling noises often bring back vivid, unpleasant memories of the rumbling Soufriere Hills. These students who lived with this rumbling from the onset of the volcanic crisis confessed:

At first my heart always beat fast when I hear an overhead train. I think it’s the volcano (Terese – Year 9).

Whenever I hear a loud bang or a rumbling sound like thunder, I think that I’m back in Montserrat. Explosions too, you know what I mean – like fireworks... they make me think of the volcano (Andora – Year 10).

All relocated students have lived with the fear and emotional stress that comes from living (for up to two and a half years) with a rumbling, unpredictable volcano ‘in their backyards’. Boothby (1992:112) explains that exposure to prolonged danger may result in chronic (long term) rather than acute stress that generally last for a few days, and it is often marked by features of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) – a condition that “most effectively
embodies the global human response to overwhelming traumatic events” (Boyden 2000). PTSD is defined as:

A debilitating malady characterised by recurring and intrusive recollections of dreams of traumatic events (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society 1998:8).

Boothby further indicates that prolonged PTSD can result in “reduced responsiveness and involvement with the environment and diminished expectation for the future” (p.112). With regards to relocated students’ behaviour, it seems then that what teachers interpreted as undesirable behaviour might be also features of PTSD. It follows too, that if left unattended, PTSD can have immediate and far-reaching effects on the students’ educational progress. Consider this:

R: So, how would you describe Terry’s progress?

AR: She is progressing very well. Her standard of work is above average and she has a positive attitude. When she first came to the school she was doing exceptionally well, but because of her illness her average dropped a little.

R: Was she very ill?

AR: Yes. She was absent from school for some time.

R: How is she now? Is she much better? Back to normal?

AR: The problem has not reoccurred since her mother came to England. I think that the problem was more psychological than physical. She was really very ill but recovered soon after her mother got here. It seems that she was missing her mother very much but her father did an excellent job. He was very supportive.

R: How is her level of achievement since her illness?

AR: Still above average. But her presentation is very weak. She said that her handwriting has changed since she came to this country. Her handwriting is difficult to read. It is too small and she worries about it.

The above is part of an interview I conducted with Teacher RA. I noted the situation with puzzling interest because it seems an isolated case as far as this study is concerned. From my pre-migration classroom experiences, I knew that Terry was an above average student and that her handwriting was clear and legible. I am not attempting to explain what caused the complete change in Terry’s handwriting, but it seems reasonable to assume that the
A conversation with Terry confirmed that the change in her handwriting came about since she relocated to England and that she was extremely worried about the harm this could have on her educational progress. She reported:

I used to write so well when I was in Montserrat. The teachers always used to tell me what a beautiful handwriting I had…. (pause). Now I cannot write at all. I don’t know what happened since I came to England. I wish that my writing was the same like in Montserrat (Terry – Year 9).

Yule (1989:4) contends that separation from parents can create major stress for children who are traumatised. Refugee Council (1997:14) observes that loss of acquired skills is one of the characteristics of children who are traumatised and that they should be given the needed attention. Given that legible handwriting is an acquired skill, it seems reasonable to conclude that Terry’s situation might have warranted such attention. Furthermore, a graphologist, who is also a child psychologist has this to say about handwriting:

Your writing and your signature can change remarkably throughout your life, mirroring maturity, progress, health, ups and downs and major events (Patterson 1998:140).

The volcanic crisis is a “major event” that created “ups and downs” for all Montserrat residents since July 18, 1995. It has also affected many persons’ health. Fitting Patterson’s observation into this context, it seems probable that a major event as the volcanic crisis, followed by another major event as relocation to England, might be responsible for the remarkable change in Terry’s handwriting.

**Meeting Educational Needs**

Writings on refugee children in British schools often highlights how they are not given the full support they need in order to help them to successfully integrate into a new school system (Rutter 2001; Jones & Rutter 1998). Relocated students have however remarked that some schools had made laudable efforts to be sanctuaries to them:

The first day I went to school I felt scared. A teacher told me that I would feel more comfortable when I get to know children from different parts of the world…. After two weeks I began to feel better. Some of the students were kind, some teachers were kind too (Alice – Year 8).
When we first came to the school we were introduced to a lady from Montserrat. She teaches at the school. She was very supportive, understanding and helpful. We could go and see her at any time. She was like a mother to us (Kanta - Year 11).

Teacher TS took us to the office. He asked us about Montserrat and how we were getting on in England. He said that he was sorry about the volcano and the school would try to make us comfortable and happy. He told us to come and see him if we had any problems. Some of the other teachers are nice too (Levis – Year 8).

These reports show instances of good practice, but generally schools need to do much more. Jones (1999:36) observed that many refugee students survived within the education system because of their determination to achieve. Maintaining that needs solid educational support.

In the 1990s, the British education system changed rapidly, but towards the end of the decade, Jones & Rutter (1998:2) reported that the situation in respect of refugee children in schools remained unsatisfactory. Other researchers have made similar observations, noting:

- Lack of support and guidance to make maximum use of educational opportunities;
- Lack of understanding of the refugee experience;
- Insufficient support with regards to language acquisition and
- Stereotyping and negative attitudes of some staff members (Bolloten & Spafford 1998; Kahin 1997; Goldsmiths’ College 1994; Refugee council 1990).

Refugees view education as an important part of their overall development and more often than not it becomes the primary concern in the resettlement process (Lam & Martin 1996; Hudson 1995). But the importance of education also goes beyond the resettlement process; education is also perceived as the vehicle that will facilitate reintegration on return home (Flukier-Stockton 1996:3). A vast majority of the students in the sample expressed a strong desire to participate in the rebuilding of Montserrat on completion of higher and or further education, if the volcano “goes back to sleep”.

With regards to the education of refugees, many institutions are found deficient in that they have not honoured Article 28 the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) that says in part, “each child has a right to education” (UNHCR 1994:109). Admittedly, there was no outright denial of relocated students’ right to education. However, they faced varied
obstacles in getting a school places, possibly because schools are concerned with their image with regards to position and league tables. Jill Rutter, Education Officer at the Refugee Council admitted that some schools are unwilling to accept refugee children “because they’re worried about how it will impact on their exam results and how that will look in the league tables” (Klein 2000). Such an attitude is not safeguarding the rights of “the world’s most vulnerable people” (Ogata 2000:17).

Schools are well aware that refugee children have special needs (Jones & Rutter 1998; Refugee Council 1997; Kahin 1997). Yet, educators at all levels of the system have not adequately catered for the needs of refugees who are left at the margins of the education system. Molten explains that marginalised children “are too busy with life at the edges of survival to be able to acquire the skills or material support that would let get out of the trap they were born into, or have been pushed into” (Molteno 1998:4). I contend that schools are perfectly positioned to remedy this situation.

Relocated students ‘have been pushed into’ a disadvantaged position - one that their parents were convinced that the British education system could reverse (Chapter 5). Moreover, in addition to been stereotyped as refugees, relocated students’ progress have been retarded for the various reasons, outlined in Chapter 6.

The language issue is rather a contentious one. South (2001:2) explains that EMAG is intricately related to the issues surrounding the raising of standards of ethnic minority children. I have not ascertained whether relocated students were placed in EMAG groups on the basis of their African Caribbean status, their refugee status, or both. What seemed evident was students’ dissatisfaction with being stereotyped as speaking little or no English, hence their assignment to the EAL department - an area supported by EMAG.

Among the provisions schools make for refugee children are EAL or ESL classes, but with all the good intentions of schools to assist student whose first language is not English, these classes have been labelled “dumping grounds” (Kaprielian- Churchill & Churchill 1994:83). The assigning of such a definitive label to EAL classes is open to debate. The issue at hand is the perceived status of these classes. Some relocated students have not missed the fact that EAL classes do not carry the same ‘status’ as the other English classes
that are part of the mainstream programmes (Coelho 1998; Davidson 1996). One student said:

They (teachers) make us feel so dumb as if we not good enough for the real English classes. These classes are just keeping us back – a waste of time (Kanta – Year 11).

The resulting effects of the above situation were feelings of inadequacy and low self-worth. The assurance that EAL teachers work in collaboration with the mainstream classroom/subject teacher (Franson 2001:113) did not bring much consolation to relocated students. A common view was, “because we speak dialect they (teachers) think our English is bad” (Laverne – Year 10).

Leach & Mertz (1987) in DeVoe (1994:240) observe that the reactions of many classroom teachers to ESL students are ambivalent. Sometimes specified ethnic groups are perceived as achievers if they make reasonable progress, but at other times all ESL students are viewed as a single group - “foreigners”. It is the latter perception that seems to engender feelings of low self-worth. Some teachers are noted to have withdrawn and distanced themselves from the overwhelming, complex refugee situation that exists in schools (Bolloten & Spafford 1998: 109). This suggests that refugees’ needs are not adequately met. The general conclusion from relocated parents was: “teachers do not know the difference between ‘refugees’ andMontserratians and our children will lose out” (Walter).

Given that refugee children are “falling through the cracks in the planning and implementation educational programmes” (WCEFA Interagency Commission 1990: 8) of the British educational system, relocated students are indeed ‘losing out’ on realising their educational aspirations. Jones & Rutter (1998: 11) hope that new and more generous ideas in social policy, particularly education, will provide refugee children with better deals in British schools. This expectation implies that

1. there are indeed such policies,
2. these said policies need to be reviewed and
3. there is need for the formulation of ‘fresh’ policies with specific targets for refugee children.

Undoubtedly, the recognition of the need to formulate policies with specific targets for refugee children shows that currently, refugees' educational needs are not met. But
relocated students’ desires to make significant educational strides have been further compounded by their ‘homelessness’.

**Homelessness: The Montserrat ‘Refugee’ Experience**

Before I begin the discussion on the ‘homelessness’ of relocated students’ refugee experience, I wish to mention that I view homelessness as having two meanings for relocated Montserratians – (1) temporary accommodation, for in a Montserrat context, ‘having a roof over one’s head’ does not necessarily mean ‘home’, and (2) literal loss of home.

On arrival in England, relocated migrants were offered temporary accommodation. Four years later, many of them were unsettled because they were still housed in temporary accommodation. Thus, I contend that they were homeless for although they are in temporary accommodation, they still lived a ‘nomadic’ existence. Homelessness, in the words of a relocated parent, sometimes means “sleeping rough”. They were also homeless in a unique way, in that their point of reference for home is a particular village community in Montserrat. For the majority of them, this ‘home’ no longer exists because several villages lay buried under tonnes of volcanic deposits. It is within these two contexts of homelessness that I frame the educational experiences of relocated students.

Some relocated families had not yet accessed permanent accommodation and had moved house up to four times. One parent lamented:

... only God knows. Ee no eezy. Dis movin so farse a stress me out. An de poor children, dey karn get chance fu settle dung wid dem school wuk. Now dey ha foo tek to bus fe go a school..... sumtime dey reech a school leat....... de teacher dem jus no undastan, dey jus no doan kair (Helena).

(Translation: Life in England is very difficult and stressful especially for the children. They are finding it hard to settle down and make progress because of the many times they have to move. They now have to take two buses to school and sometimes they reach late. Teachers do not seem to understand the situation. They do not seem to care).

Helena’s was not an isolated case for further investigation revealed that parents were deeply concerned about the effect the various forms of temporary accommodation was
having on their children’s educational progress. One parent who was still in temporary accommodation bemoaned:

There’s hardly any space for Jim to study and do his homework. I am so worried about his progress for this will definitely slow him down. I wish things were different. I can’t wait to get a permanent place (Betty – Parent).

Temporary accommodation does disturb stability of children’s education, as an investigation into the impact on schooling of temporary accommodation for homeless families (not necessarily refugees) showed (Power, Whitty & Youdell 1995). Moving to many different schools has created particular difficulties in basic subjects:

The disruption to the continuity of their education leaves gaps in their learning and, no matter how intelligent, it is difficult for them to catch up (Power et al 1995:50).

While relocated parents were worried over the ‘gaps in their children’s learning’ that resulted from ‘moving house’ several times, generally teachers appeared totally oblivious to the students’ experiences. To return to the punctuality issue that Helena mentioned above, a teacher admitted that punctuality had become a problem for some relocated students who travelled long distances. The teacher noted that their lateness affected “their ability to concentrate fully on their morning lessons” (Teacher RD), but showed little understanding of the reasons for this.

It is tempting to argue that the relocated students’ homeless situation is ‘normal’ since refugee children are “likely to be living in various forms of temporary accommodation and are likely to be very mobile as a result” (Jones & Rutter 1998:4). This is indeed a usual phenomenon for refugees and asylum seekers whose presence in England is governed by the terms of the 1951 UN Convention and the 1967 Protocol. For relocated Montserratians however, accommodation was never envisaged to be a problem since they left Montserrat with the promise of receiving accommodation and other social services on arrival in England (Sives 1999:37&38). They were not expecting temporary accommodation and were totally unaware of bureaucratic procedures for accessing accommodation in Britain.

‘Homelessness’ turned out to be one of the greatest stressors for relocated parents and their children in the settlement process. It was a source of disgust and anxiety for most relocated students for moving from one place to the other represented an extension of the frustrating
internal evacuation exercises before relocation to England. There is a common echo in following sentiments:

I hate moving. Every time I begin to get used to a place we have to move again. Moving is very frustrating. I feel the same like in Montserrat, moving from Hill to North, from North to Hill and back to North (Kerry - Year 10).

...I know that we have to move again but I don’t want to go to a new school this time. I am just getting to like here... I want to stay here. I dread the day when we have to move again (Kobi - Year 7).

Power et al remarked, “each time a child enters a new school, new sets of procedures have to be learnt” (Power et al 1995:50). Laverne experienced this:

As soon as I get accustomed to what teachers accept at one school, I have to move to another. This is so frustrating... When will we settle down for good? (Laverne – Year 10).

Homelessness in London has exposed “vulnerable groups to relatively high levels of risks” (Horlick-Jones 1997:391). As a vulnerable group, relocated students has not escaped the emotional ‘risks’ that results from homelessness – risks that sometimes lead to a breakdown in family relations (Polakow 1998:5). But for many Montserratians, a breakdown in family relations began during pre-relocation periods of internal displacements. These were further compounded by the present temporary accommodation issue.

In a study that investigated the impact of homelessness on the health and education of children living in East Lothian, Hall, Powney & Davidson found that homelessness is associated with:

• loss of a parent
• no space to play
• losing contact with existing friends and having to make new ones
• lack of school support
• being trapped in trouble
• worried about parents (Hall, Powney & Davidson 2000:11)

With the exception of ‘being trapped in trouble’, all of the above factors relate directly to relocated students’ post-migration experiences. Five relocated students had behavioural problems that resulted in exclusion. These were students whose fathers remained in
Montserrat. I view their problem as partly due to absence of strong parental control rather than a result of homelessness.

**Conclusion**

The chapter discussed the ‘refugee’ experience of relocated students in London schools. It noted that the term ‘refugee’ bears a variety of interpretations ranging from the mundane to the ‘legal’; and although relocated Montserratians are not refugees in a legal sense, in many ways they fit into the refugee category.

There is a general agreement among researchers that the British Education system does not adequately provide for the educational needs of refugees. Thus, as refugees, relocated students’ educational needs have not been satisfied and this situation has been exacerbated by their ‘homelessness.

The relocated students’ overall ‘refugee’ experience has dampened the achievement motivation spirit that they had on arrival in Britain. The next chapter will discuss the nature of this spirit and how it was sustained during pre-relocation times. It will then look at how particular post-migration experiences have thwarted students’ efforts to maintain achievement motivation.
Chapter Eight

Achievement Motivation and Educational Success

If a child lives with encouragement, He learns confidence.
If a child lives with praise, He learns to appreciate.
If a child lives with fairness, He learns justice.
If a child lives with approval, He learns to like himself.
If a child lives with acceptance and friendship, 
He learns to find love in the world.
(Dorothy Law Nolte)

Introduction

This chapter discusses the concept of achievement motivation in relation to educational success. It examines the factors that influenced and sustained relocated students’ achievement motivation prior to relocation. I assert that these students’ pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation have been depleted because of several in-school and out-of-school factors (Table 3.1). The chapter will therefore consider the causes that brought about this decrease in achievement motivation.

Concepts of Achievement and Achievement Motivation

Relocated students’ measured educational success against the background of what constituted success in the Montserrat context. One student recalled:

When we were in Montserrat we had so many things to look forward to – choir, steelband, Arts Festival .... and even graduation. We get prizes for everything.... tidiness and all (Davida – Year 10).

In Montserrat, educational programmes were structured on a policy framework that was based on Montserrat’s cultural heritage. The policies emphasised and encouraged “self-reliance and self-determination” (Ministry of Education 1996:2), and reflected a Vygotskian principle that views education as an interactive activity that seeks to develop the cultural identity of the student (Vygotsky 1978:8-10). The programmes provided students with various opportunities to become successful in areas such as sports, music, creative arts and building craft (such as carpentry, masonry electrical installation) with a view to preparing them for “a meaningful, purposeful and rewarding life” (Ministry of Education 1996:29). This practice aligns with the precept that human development is essentially a cultural-historically determined process for which educators are responsible (van Oers 1999:218). It also parallels another principle – the development of “personal
qualities that every individual has the right to acquire” (Tomlinson 1994:7). The aims of education thus embraced concepts that related to personal development, respect for self and others and equipping learners with life skills (Ministry of Education 1996:1 & 2). Life skills are “the basic educational skills that human beings need for their survival and to develop their intellectual potential to improve the quality of their lives” (Chinapah 1997:11). Achievement was therefore measured on this broad scope.

Arguably, lessons via the ‘affective domain’ do not produce immediate outcomes; hence it was impossible to measure rigorously the extent to which one progressed in this area. Nonetheless, it was generally accepted that many of the ‘taught values’ were reflected in different aspects of students’ lives, thus highlighting the benefits gained from utilising an all-inclusive learning package that is concerned with more than intellectualising learners.

Curricular and non-curricular activities underscore the need to view education as “the sum total of the learning experiences which individuals acquire throughout a lifetime” (Halliday 1991:28). This was the all-encompassing curriculum to which relocated students were exposed – one that was expected to empower them to become active participants in Montserrat society. In this way, empowerment becomes an outgrowth of education for Lee (2001:75) contends that persons empowered by education can act in ways to reach their own goals. Trueba & Zou view such empowerment as: “the capacity to function effectively in a given social setting, with active participation in the cultural, political and economic institutions” (Trueba & Zou 1994:2). This all-inclusive curriculum also exposed students to ‘critical transitivity’. According to a Freirean view, “a critically transitive thinker, feels empowered to think and to act on the conditions around her or him, and relates those conditions to the larger contexts of power in society” (Shor 1993:32).

The Ministry’s policies also reflected this assertion:

Global education speaks to the integrated totality of all phenomena that have the human being as the subject of their concern, rather than simply the object of academic investigation (Nettleford 1991:22).

Operating a system whose major concern is human development ‘rather than academic investigation’ does not mean however that academic qualifications were understated for significant importance was attached to getting the highest qualifications possible. I refer to
an interesting Montserrat policy with regards to Caribbean Examination Council (CXC). While Grade I, II and III represented pass grades in most of the countries in the Region, Montserrat accepted only Grades I and II as passes (Ministry of Education 1996:30). Therefore, in 1994 an average % pass of 76.2 represented only Grade I and II passes. Whether MoE’s action was justified is debatable. What is evident, from all reports and discussions held with students and parents, the Ministry’s ‘unorthodox’ stance served as a motivator for students to strive for academic excellence, especially since it accentuated students’ chances of securing places in higher education institutions.

On arrival in Britain, as part of the African Caribbean student group, relocated students were moulded into a situation where they are forced to adopt a less expanded concept of achievement. Generally, levels of achievement and underachievement are described within the boundaries of tests and examinations as noted in research reports (Lyle et al 1996; World Bank 1993; Miller 1992; Miller 1991; Tomlinson 1986; Rampton Report 1981). Success is therefore measured by examination passes.

African Caribbean students who had obtained “at least five CSE Grade 1 or ‘O’ level Grades A-C awards”, were classified as successful (ACER 1982: 50). Mac an Ghaill (1988:5) in examining why black students were ‘failing’ in British schools, made reference to “Afro-Caribbean students who were achieving poor examination results”. I assume that these results were for CSE or ‘O’ Level examinations since Mac an Ghaill was focusing on students’ transition from school to work. Also, in her study that examined success factors of African Caribbean students, Rhamie’s successful students included those who had attained graduate and post-graduate qualifications (Rhamie 1998:8). If the passing of tests and examinations are the major standards used to measure educational achievement, then students themselves will measure success only within this framework. Seven of the eight African Caribbean student’s reflective accounts presented in Jones (1986:55-72) suggested this trend. Yet, this interpretation of success was practical as well as necessary since there seemed to be no place for unqualified persons in the British society. One post-war African Caribbean migrant who became qualified by attending night classes expressed these views:
I went back into education because I felt it was high time that I get some qualifications.... I resented the way society was treating me. Even before they realised that I couldn’t read, they were ready to walk all over me (Bryan et al 1985:82).

A Montserratian migrant from that period reported:

I had to go back to college. I realised that I was not qualified enough to do the job I wanted to do. I was fed up with working with the underground. I wanted something better (Sylvanie - Parent).

By contrast, some relocated Montserratians though not ‘fully certified’ had been able to secure senior and managerial positions in both government and private sectors in Montserrat, on the basis of on-the-job training and short-term courses. In this sense, success extended beyond the boundaries of passes in ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level examinations and graduate and post graduate degrees. Yet, over time, some persons gained these very qualifications via UWI School of Continuing Studies programmes.

Relocated students who were nurtured in this supportive and ‘easy-going’ environment, were encouraged to strive for success, not pressured into battling for it – a stark contrast to their current situation. Much encouragement was found in the various factors that influenced and sustained their achievement motivation. For this study, achievement motivation simply means the desire to succeed – academically and/or otherwise, the yearning to accomplish a pursued goal.

McClelland and his associates, who investigated achievement motivation among white middle-class Americans in 1953, defined achievement motivation as “competition with a standard of excellence” (Suarez-Orozco 1995:155). They contend that achievement motivation thrives in a an atmosphere where youngsters are encouraged to be independent from others and their research found that there was a strong correlation between achievement motivation and independence. Such a conclusion presupposes that independence training is always a prerequisite for achievement motivation. Besides, their conclusions about the relationship between achievement motivation and individualism are in conflict with “the subtle motivational dynamics encountered among other ethnic groups” including Japanese and Central American refugees (Suarez-Orozco 1995:156).
My own experience as a member of the Montserrat community departs from McClelland et al conclusions. I have identified a cultural climate that knits self and others into a tapestry of social integration and interdependency. In my view their theory does not apply across cultures, particularly in the Montserrat context, as will be shown.

Factors that Influenced Achievement Motivation – Pre-Relocation Times

It is against the background of expanded boundaries and ‘integrated totality’ that this study examines the factors that have influenced the achievement motivation of relocated students. I reason that achievement motivation largely determines educational attainment – the higher the level the higher the attainment. The converse is also true.

I have constructed a model (Figure 8.1) that depicts the combined motivational factors that influenced achievement motivation among Montserratian students. In contrast to McClelland’s and his associates’ conclusions, the model illustrates that it was largely interdependence rather than individualism that tended to inspire and sustain achievement motivation. The model was influenced by the foreshadowed problem that I identified for this study: diminished levels of achievement motivation are affecting the educational aspirations of relocated Montserratian students at varying degrees (Table 3.1). The model is based mainly on my experience as a teacher and member of the Montserrat community, and to a lesser extent on symbolic interactionism – society influences an individual’s action, that is, human beings act towards things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them (Lee 2001:48). Because the model is based on personal experience, I suggest that it should serve as a guide and/or springboard for further study, since this is simply an attempt to portray my observation of a particular social aspect of the Montserrat community.

Figure 8.1 illustrates how motivational influences rippled in from the immediate family via the wider island community, the regional and even the international community, to the centre of the model – achievement motivation. The introduction of Regionalism\(^\text{12}\) in the early 1990s, resulted in the endorsement and subsequent implementation of new educational policies and programmes across the entire region (CARICOM 1993:69). Thus,

\(^{12}\)Regionalism is a way of doing, thinking, feeling, which seeks to identify, give meaning to, acknowledge the integrity of common and unique Caribbean Communities, and also to pool these various experiences obtained from institutions and from persons in order to compel an action (CARICOM Secretariat 1993:5).
Figure 8.1: Model of Factors that influenced Pre-Forced Migration Achievement Motivation among Montserratian Students
Montserratian students benefited from the region’s educational programmes under the banner of “Caribbean Regionalism”. The annual Conde Naste Essay Competition, the Leeward Islands Debating Competition, Regional Science Fairs and the Caribbean Festival (CARIFESTA) were some of the education programmes in which primary as well as secondary students were involved. From observations and personal experiences, I noted that participation in these programmes greatly boosted, and sustained students’ achievement motivation. The volcano struck at a time when student’s involvement in these programmes represented much more than ‘attendance’ status. Participation was a symbol of educational attainment, academic success and national pride for it provided an opportunity to showcase Montserrat’s cultural heritage. It was with similar fervour that students participated in international events relating to sports, church and uniformed organisations’ (such as Girl Guides) activities.

Two relocated students who wanted to continue to be Girl Guides expressed disappointment at the fact that their school did not accommodate such organisations (as did the schools in Montserrat). This to them was a missed opportunity to be ‘representatives’ at school and community levels. I noted a similar feeling of discontentment among other relocated students who realised that they were not afforded opportunities to be ‘ambassadors’ for their schools in academic and sporting activities.

I wish to comment on the ‘religious’ as part of the educational package that influenced relocated students’ achievement motivation. Farrel, Kerry & Kerry (1995:70) made reference to Peters’ (1966) explanation of what education entails: it “implies that something worthwhile is being or has been intentionally transmitted in a morally acceptable manner”. ‘Morally’ implies a correlation between education and religious beliefs. With regards to influencing the social dimensions of development, ‘beliefs’ is mentioned alongside the quality of life, attitudes, values and the satisfaction of basic human needs (Saha & Fagerlind 1994:1650). Whether religious beliefs influence education or education influences religious beliefs is debatable. What is evident from a Caribbean perspective is that “the Caribbean has had a strong tradition of education to which churches made a great contribution, especially after the emancipation that took place in the 19th century” (Mottley 2000:9). It was on this foundation that Caribbean governments built and established their
current education systems, perhaps with a view to ensuring that ‘something worthwhile is being intentionally transmitted in a morally acceptable manner’. This intention suggests a continuous and life-long process for “education is intended to foster learning, to bring about changes in attitudes, achievement and values” (Willet 1994:671). Barrow & Woods (1982) in Farrel, Kerry & Kerry (1995:70) contend that these transformations also bring about changes in behaviour towards others and they are integrally related to the concepts of knowledge and understanding. MoE’s policies emphasised the development of “moral, spiritual and ethical values” (MoE 1996:2), hence the inclusion of a ‘religious’ element in its all-inclusive educational programmes.

The volcanic crisis put a damper on the entire education process, yet, generally achievement motivation remained high among students. Parents and concerned persons were determined to “keep the educational flame burning” by ensuring that students took advantage of the provisions that MoE made for the continuation of schooling. An evaluation team from the UK observed that the resilience of education in Montserrat is due to “the extraordinary efforts of educational professionals and the commitment of Montserratians to education as a critical aspect of their private and social aspirations” (DFID 1999:103).

Students were equally determined to benefit from these provisions. For example, the Montserrat community supported and assisted students in their preparations for the 1997 OECS Science Fair that was held in St. Vincent. The preparatory sessions were done under severe ‘ashy’ conditions. In another instance, Grade 5 and 6 students of KPS braved the ‘volcanic’ weather after a week of several phreatic eruptions and disruptions to regular classes, to attend a Saturday session to complete their essays for the up-coming Conde Naste Essay competition. Furthermore, in the absence of regular classrooms, parents and concerned persons willingly accommodated student groups (of various sizes) in their homes when there was a need for students to work on particular school projects. It was within this framework of a substantial level of educational euphoria that families made reasoned decisions to relocate to England.

The Montserrat family (community) played a significant role in motivating its children to attain academic success. I have therefore drawn on Kerckhoff’s Schematic Model of the
Educational Attainment Process (Figure 8.2) as a base for comparison and contrast, to my representation of the Montserrat situation (Figures 8.1). Although there is an extensive body of literature that discusses family and school relations, Kerckhoff’s model was chosen for comparison because of its reference to the links between family structure and education attainment. It represents family influences in three ways – socio-economic position, the composition of the family and educational orientations of parents. Relocation has impacted negatively on these influences, thus affecting students’ achievement motivation. The absence of the family, biological as well as the Montserrat ‘family’, has a direct bearing on the depleted levels of achievement motivation that are affecting the relocated Montserrat students’ educational aspirations.

Figure 8.2 is based on the socialisation theory that suggests, “potentially, all significant others have an influence on the individual’s development of characteristics relevant to effective social functioning” (Kerckhoff 1986:99). Kerckhoff did not explain ‘significant others’, but from the context of the model, I take this to mean the same as offered in the explanation that ‘significant others’ are real or imaginary persons who influence our beliefs about ourselves and our world (Lee 2001:66). Parents, friends and teachers are the ‘significant others’ who influence educational ambition and attainment in Kerckhoff’s model. The ‘others’ who influenced achievement motivation, and ultimately educational success of Montserratian students prior to relocation were the family, school and village groups within a close-knit Montserrat island community, as well as extended regional and international groups and organisations (Figure 8.1).

‘Others’ with whom relocated students now interact, hail from a much larger diverse, multi-ethnic, multicultural society - including the school environment. And the influences, particularly the negative, of these ‘new significant others’, have impacted on relocated students’ achievement motivation in diverse ways, as discussed in Chapters 6, 7 & 9.

**Post-Relocation and Achievement Motivation**

As noted earlier, generally, relocated students’ pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation have diminished due to several in-school and out-of-school factors. This has impacted on individual students’ educational aspirations in various ways and at varying degrees. Some students have managed to maintain some measure of their pre-relocation
Figure 8.2: Model of the Education Attainment Process
achievement motivation, albeit at lower levels. Others seemed to have lost their desire to attain educational success.

The literature has shown that a combination of home, school, and community influences has contributed to students’ educational aspirations (Rhamie 1998; Chinapah 1997; Kerckhoff 1986). Within each of these broad categories are various strands and subsets that have a direct link to students’ achievement motivation, and ultimately their educational success. Figure 8.3 identifies the subsets that have helped those relocated students who managed to maintain a measure of their pre-relocation achievement motivation.

Figure 8.3: Factors that Helped to Sustain Relocated Montserratian Students’ Achievement Motivation
In the previous paragraph, I posited that post-relocation levels of achievement motivation among relocated students were lower than in pre-relocation times. This is because the students no longer have the full support of the extended Montserrat family. Furthermore, the absence of the regional and international educational programmes noted in Figure 8.1, has created a notable 'gap' in the students' overall advancement.

Although their circumstances have changed considerably, some relocated students still had strong feelings on what achievement meant to them, but admitted that “it's just not the same like Montserrat”. The following are students’ perceptions of achievement:

- Respect from others - to be looked up to.
- Becoming a professional and be famous.
- Graduating from university.
- Power, money and success.
- A good education - people will think that you are smart.
- To get the best job and make my parents feel proud.
- Becoming a computer programmer
- To go overseas to represent my country
- To become a ‘high’ person in society
- A well-paying job
  (Derived from the student interviews)

All the responses given for the question “What does achievement mean to you?” are similar to, or fall into the same category as the above. There was one ‘isolated’ response where achievement was associated with “going back to Montserrat” (Levis – Year 9). Such a response may seem quite unusual, but in a follow-up discussion with the student, he explained that he felt useless because he was “left out of everything”. Prior to relocation, Levis represented his school in sporting activities, he participated in MoE’s Arts Festival, church and community activities. Levis acknowledged that the recognition gained from the
school and community for his successful participation in those activities, contributed greatly to his academic performance. Since relocation, the absence of similar activities in an ‘appreciative’ school-community environment lessened his chances of experiencing similar success and of becoming “somebody good”, hence the reason for associating achievement with returning to Montserrat.

Relocated parents’ perceptions of achievement were no different to those of their children. Generally, parents associated success with “a good education”, where a good education ranged from excellent college grades to post graduate studies. One parent lamented that it was more difficult for relocated students to perform very well here (in England) than in Montserrat because “the teachers do not take enough interest in the children”, but hastened to add that England offers more opportunities for tertiary education so “we (parents/guardians) have to support and encourage them and all they have to do is to try their best to succeed” (Amanda).

Amanda’s admonition is reasonable. But in a situation where the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) reported that there was “particular concern over the way Afro-Caribbean pupils slip behind their classmates” (Miles 2000:7), it seems a daunting task. The report further noted: “in one ‘large urban authority’ they entered school at five as the highest achieving group, but left as the group least likely to achieve five good GCSEs”. A general conclusion was that the achievement gap between African Caribbean students and other students had doubled over a period of ten years, despite the head-start that African Caribbean students had. Low teacher expectation was cited as one of the possible reasons for this wide margin.

If low teacher expectation is one of the factors that have contributed to the poor levels of achievement among African Caribbean students, it seems reasonable to conclude that relocated students were given ‘a bad deal’, since they came to England during the period when the achievement gap was widening. So what might appear to be a head-start to relocated students might very well be the extension of ‘the widening gap’. It follows too, that in such a situation, a relocated student’s ‘best’ might not have been good enough to effect a change in teacher expectation. And if because of negative stereotyping, relocated
students' ‘best’ was slighted or not recognised by teachers, this might well be another major reason for the decreased levels of achievement motivation among relocated students.

I have identified ‘work level’ as another reason for the decreased levels of achievement motivation among relocated students. A vast majority of the students (87.5%) in the sample claimed that most of the work they were doing had been done in Montserrat. One had this to say:

When I left Montserrat, I couldn’t wait to get into school. I was excited because I was going to secondary school. If was supposed to go to 1A1. When I came here I was put in Year 6. The work was so easy. Now I am in Year 7 but the work is still too easy. I am not learning anything new. There is no challenge. Sometimes I get very frustrated (Arlene - Year 7).

As if in support of Arlene’s claim, her Head of Year reported that she was an outstanding student who was “clearly academically able”. Based on Arlene’s past academic record and the Head of Year report, I contend that if Arlene was a Year 8 student she would still be an outstanding student, albeit with ‘fresh’ challenges. Larry had a similar experience. He reported:

At Salem campus I would be in 3A (Year 9), but they put me back in Year 7 when I came here. That’s why I am now in Year 8. Sometimes the work is like Grade IV work... although I feel good when I get ‘A’, I still get frustrated sometimes (Larry – Year 8).

At yet another school, a Year 10 student who had, according to her English teacher, “become a problem”, told her teacher in a “rude” manner: “the school work is beneath me” (Davida). I interpreted this action to be a sign of frustration, particularly because at other schools, some relocated students have complained of being “bored and “frustrated” for the very same reasons. Although the lessons in themselves were not the object of my observation visits to school, I could not help noticing that in some cases the topics for the lessons were indeed ‘beneath’ the relocated students’ level. To explain, in two Year 9 Mathematics classes, the topics taught were ‘Approximation’ (rounding off) and ‘Negative Numbers’. Both these topics appear in the Grade Six syllabus. Admittedly, there are different levels for these topics, but for “outstanding” (RE – Teacher) relocated students who have a sound grasp of these concepts, a repetition of ‘concept formation’ created no challenge and was therefore a frustrating and boring experience. A senior teacher voiced: “when they (relocated students) came to this school, their desire and willingness to learn
were extremely high and their motivation great, but it is different now – for some of them” (RI – Teacher).

In light of the forgoing, I have concluded that after two years of ‘boredom and frustration’, the high levels of achievement motivation that some students had at the start of their school life in England, had been severely depleted in schools that “should be places for acquiring skills and knowledge and developing abilities associated with these skills and knowledge” (Stone 1981:251). But there were other factors that caused some relocated students to lose their desire to achieve as shown in Figure 8.4.

Figure 8.4: Factors that Contributed to a Decrease in Relocated Montserratian Students’ Achievement Motivation

Decreased levels in achievement motivation did not come about as a result of a single category, but of a combination of factors. For example, role-change, accommodation problems and the absence of parents and Montserrat community were largely responsible for ‘poor academic skills’. Guardians were too busy “sorting out accommodation” and
“making ends meet” to give students the assistance they needed to improve their academic skills. In Montserrat, help would have come from different persons in the community, but the ‘scattering’ of the Montserrat community since relocation does not make this possible.

Here is another example. Lack of confidence and self-motivation as well as poor behaviour, in many cases, resulted from role-change, family separation, low teacher-expectation and school-status combined. Consider Terese’s concern with regards to school-status:

Can you get me in a better school? Mummy say that this school is not good. It has a bad name and it does not get good results. But it was the only one she could get for me...(sigh) I want to go to a good school (Terese – Year 9).

In a similar vein, this parent complained:

Everybody say that this school is not good. Teachers don’t care about the children because they too rude and disgusting... and they not learning anything. I am just waiting for the right time to move S from there. I know that he does not like it. Children feel good when they go to good school (Icilma).

School-status and a positive school environment do make a difference to students’ achievement motivation. Only one of the twelve schools in the study had a teaching learning atmosphere quite similar to the school environment in Montserrat - a relaxed but business-like atmosphere that incited positive student teacher interaction - even a pat on the back to show approval. This might be due to a number of factors, but one worthy of note is that the entire staff was of African Caribbean origin. In this light, and against the background of relocated students’ negative experiences, it is reasonable to conclude that in the absence of racist attitudes and negative stereotyping, relocated students in London can be highly motivated to perform well. On one of my observation visits to that particular school, I noted the following quotes boldly printed on decorated charts around the classroom:

- WE ARE WHAT WE REPEATEDLY DO. EXCELLENCE THEN IS NOT AN ACT BUT A HABIT.
- YOU ARE THE AUTHOR OF YOUR OWN LIFE STORY.
- ACHIEVING STARTS WITH BELIEVING.

I am not claiming that the above quotes had a profound effect on all the students who attended classes in that room. For some relocated students however, these were major
‘achievement boosters’. One student excitedly said, “the quotes remind me of Montserrat. We had lots of charts like those in our school” (Davida).

Before the volcanic crisis, it was customary to see similar quotes on the walls of classrooms in Montserrat schools. Based on my teaching experience and the student interviews, I contend that the bold display of similar quotes and school mottoes helped to motivate students to achieve. Students who were nominated for achievement awards at graduation and other achievement ceremonies, have intimated that they were greatly motivated and inspired by the many quotes that papered their classroom walls and those in the main hall. Others have confessed that the popular media slogans ‘Believe in Yourself. You can Achieve’ and ‘Simply the Best’, and the inspiring, competitive spirit among students have encouraged and spurred them on to success. Similarly, the slogans on the walls of the London classroom in question, served as motivating influences for the relocated students at that school. But it seems that the encouraging, competitive spirit is noticeably absent from the remaining schools in this study. Relocated students’ sentiments are echoed in these comments:

If I were to choose between the schools in Montserrat and the school I attend at present, it would definitely be Montserrat. In Montserrat, I actually feel like I have competition in my classes. I actually feel the urge to work hard but at present I am just going through the motion (Rachel - Year 11)

I don’t have anyone to compete with for first place. No challenging work like what we used to do. Everything here so different – the school different, the work different and the teachers different. I miss the competition, it make you want to work hard to come first (Curtis – Year 10).

Interestingly, relocated students have explained that on occasions, some students have teased, laughed at, or called them “nerdy” whenever they exhibited a conscientious and studious attitude. A youth counsellor and drug educator at one of the schools confirmed that students “are labelled nerds and are looked down on if they are good”. In commenting on the effect this action has had on one of the relocated students, she explained that the student expressed a strong desire to be part of ‘the group’. She did not want to be considered a ‘softie’ and began to behave just like them (members of the group). This is not an unusual phenomenon, for sociologists have noted that, in adjusting to “new status and experiences of failure”, students tend to assume anti-school attitudes and behaviours (Ball 1986:62).
Sociologists have also noted that students try to gain acceptance amongst their peers by conforming to the norms of that group. Browne asserts:

The fear of rejection and ridicule by peers may exert an enormous influence on an individual's behaviour (Browne 1992:178).

So in addition to being labelled 'nerdy', it is possible that fear of rejection to some degree has also caused relocated students' achievement motivation to wane. While most students suffered the effects of peer rejection, only a minority experienced direct 'institutional' rejection.

Ball asserts: “the education of overseas students pales into insignificance when people are considering their own institutional survival” (Ball 1987:53). Ball’s assertion, although made in reference to colleges and universities, finds a parallel in the school situation in respect of league-table rankings. Not only have some schools turned students away “because of the effects their results can have on rankings” (Henry 2000), but some teachers have also debarred some students from taking particular exams, as noted below:

They (the teachers) think that I can’t do the GCSE exams. They give me other work to do because they believe that I’m not good enough to do the real exams. I want to go to college and I want to do the exam but they won’t let me do it. When I leave this school I want to go to college (Karl - Year 11).

Neither Karl nor his guardian challenged the issue. A discussion with Karl’s teacher revealed that he had not completed some of his course work and he failed to attend the mock exams. The issue here is neither the reasons for omitting Karl from the exams nor what led to this delicate and complex situation, but rather Karl’s feeling of rejection and powerlessness to voice his concerns on such an important matter – one that has affected his desire to achieve. Karl’s omission from the exams created feelings of worthlessness that rendered him uncomfortable and uneasy among classmates who were selected to do the exams. He concluded: “if I even talk to them (teachers) about it (exams), they will not do anything about it anyway... what’s the use? Sometimes I don’t feel like going to school”.

Situations such as the above might have developed because generally, teachers viewed relocated students as “casual new arrivals from the West Indies” (Teacher MD). And given that teachers have stereotyped relocated students into the African Caribbean under-achievement matrix, relocated students are expected to operate from the same position – the
bottom of the achievement ladder. As a fall-out of such actions, Bennett de Marrais contends:

When educators hold negative perceptions about a particular group of people, their expectations for school success are clearly communicated to the children through their daily classroom interactions and practices (Bennett de Marrais 1998:98).

Discouragement from teachers via ‘daily classroom interactions and practices’ has raised some relocated students’ frustration levels to the point where it impacted negatively on their achievement motivation. Consider Shanelle’s experience:

Sometimes I don’t understand what the teachers say. They speak different to us and I feel too shame to tell them I don’t understand. One time a teacher got angry with a girl who said she didn’t understand. So when I don’t understand I don’t tell the teacher, I prefer to ask my friend for help (Shanelle - Year 7).

Shanelle’s fear of appealing to her teacher for help stemmed from the manner in which a teacher had responded to another student who solicited the teacher’s assistance. Another relocated student suffered similar frustration when a teacher referred to her as ‘Miss Smartie’ in a rather patronising manner. In Montserrat, it is usual for students to raise their hands repeatedly if they wish to respond to questions posed by the teacher. This was what Jonelle did when the teacher called her ‘Miss Smartie’. I compare this teacher’s reaction to similar situation where a teacher stated that relocated students have higher opinions of themselves than deserved (Shotte 1998:91).

The language issue too has helped to deflate relocated students’ zeal to become successful. Although their official language is English, some have been discouraged and frustrated because of their placements in EAL/ESL classes. The freedom to use their dialect without being judged as having ‘poor English language skills’, has also put a damper on their desire to achieve.

It is an uphill struggle for relocated students to maintain their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation in an educational environment where they are the intersection of two marginalised groups - African Caribbean and refugee students. Homogenisation and stereotyping are practices that are described as “deplorable” since they do not allow for an understanding of an individual student’s background, an understanding that is vital for students’ scholastic achievement (DeVoe 1994: 237). This positioning in expanded,
opposing, fractured structures, translates into a decrease in achievement motivation, which ultimately retards educational progress.

Conclusion
The chapter discussed concepts of achievement and achievement motivation against the background of relocated students' pre-relocation experiences. Home, school, village and island community, regional and international affiliations were identified as the major determinants of achievement motivation.

After relocation, a combination of several in-school and out-of-school factors has impacted negatively on the students' pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation. The absence of the Montserrat ‘family’, low teacher-expectation, accommodation problems and school-status were the major factors identified. Despite these negative influences, some parents have managed to utilise factors similar to those identified in pre-relocation times to encourage and maintain a reconstituted sense of achievement motivation among some relocated students. The maintenance of achievement motivation necessitated the construction of new identities while maintaining a Montserratian identity. This proved to be a challenging task, as will be discussed in the next chapter.
Introduction

Chapter nine explores the issues of identity and ethnicity that have confronted relocated Montserratian students in the British school system. In adapting to a new cultural setting, they have experienced a range of identity changes that often clashed with what they view as traditional Montserrat values. The chapter explains how they have negotiated their ethnic/racial identities in relation to school and home, and how they have crafted new identities, while at the same time trying to maintain their ‘Montserratness’.

As noted in Chapters 6 & 7, relocated students were stereotyped into two moulds – African Caribbean and refugee students. On the basis of descent and location, their Montserrat identity represents an African Caribbean identity that is defined by ethnicity. Nested in this ethnic boundary, is an island identity within which the relocated students’ educational experiences are interpreted. My concern with identity also focuses on their status as forced migrants/refugees, as they navigate their way through a multi-ethnic maze of identity clashes and dominant cultural influences.

Like a common origin and a shared culture, one’s ‘sense of place’ is an integral part of his/her ethnic identity (Rampton 1995:297). Relocated Montserratians’ ‘sense of place’ is caught between ‘old and new ethnic identities’13. Negotiating the space between identities has been dominated by passionate articulations of connection to homeland for attachment to

13 The ‘old’ ethnicity gains its denotation mainly from geographic location. It refers to relationships based on “the linkage of similar people whose social identity was formed by influences from outside the society in which they lived” (Rampton 1995:295). The ‘new’ ethnic identity depends less on geographic location and focuses more on “the highlighting of key differences separating one group from another” (p.295).
land and place, to a large extent, defines the impressions about a Montserrat cultural identity. And this cultural identity, although severely challenged, remains the “connective tissue” between the ‘old and the new’ (Bhabha 1996:54). This chapter will therefore explain how relocated Montserratians’ ‘sense of place’ has been affected by the loss of ‘home’.

The main argument of the chapter is, the inevitable merging of the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ forms of identity and ethnicity, has impacted on relocated students’ educational aspirations in various ways. It becomes necessary therefore, to give a brief explanation of the concepts under discussion, and relate the role that culture plays in their development.

Interrelatedness: Identity and Ethnicity Explained

Identity and ethnicity bear complex and varied definitions and by their very nature defy a strict definition. Both concepts have a common general core – culture (Kruelfeld & Camino 1994; Slonim 1991). Identity and ethnicity denote an individual’s sense of self-recognition and impart a sense of belonging to a reference group, whereas culture claims a set of symbolic generalities. Identity, ethnicity and culture mean different things to different people. The processes and practices within which they are defined and interpreted, are interconnected at various levels, as is acknowledged by various researchers.

Sheets acknowledges the link between identity, ethnicity and culture, but points out that the connection does not represent a “one-to-one relationship”. Sheets proffered this reason for the narrow distinction:

Ethnic identity formation and development is influenced by membership in an ethnic group identified as a distinctive social group living under the shaping influence of a common culture (Sheets 1999:92 & 93).

From Sheet’s explanation, it is culture that influences ethnic identity. Brah (1996:21) puts forward a similar view by stating that identity is simultaneously subjective and social and that it is constituted in and through culture. Herein lies the inextricable interconnection between culture and identity given that:
Culture is the symbolic construction of the vast array of a social group’s life experiences. Culture is the embodiment, the chronicle of a group’s history (Brah 1996:18).

Jones too, does not support the one-to-one relationship mentioned earlier, but has however identified the integrated links between the concepts under discussion. For Jones, ethnicity includes:

all of those social and psychological phenomena associated with a culturally defined group identity .... Ethnicity focuses on the ways in which social and cultural practices intersect with one another in the identification of, and interaction between groups (Jones 1997:1).

The fact that the concept of ethnicity is closely related to the concept of ‘group identity’, underlines a “sense and expression of ethnic difference” that gives members an opportunity to glorify their ethnicity without passing judgements on other ethnic groups (Gillborn 1990:7). It is perhaps within this sense that ethnic identity “has come to be conceptualised less in terms of culture per se and more in terms of process”, in that it has become “more fluid and flexible, created, manipulated, and negotiated” (Krulfield & Camino 1994:x). With regards to refugees, ethnic identity is influenced in ways other than a meeting of former identities and new influences from the host society. It is also influenced by a forced migrant’s “current relations with his/her country of origin as well as those with other exiles in their diaspora” (Krulfield & Camino 1994:xi).

Against this background, and within the boundaries of interwoven, complex interpretations of identity and ethnicity that I relate and illustrate the educational experiences of forced migrants. I begin by exploring the fluidity of the forced-migrant identity.

**Forced Migrants/Refugees and Identity**

Maintaining a national and cultural identity in a multicultural environment proved to be a challenging experience for relocated Montserratians, especially the students. Social and cultural theorists contend that identity construction is dynamic and fluid (Chapter 2). It follows then that an individual’s identity is not static, but is created and recreated to fit ongoing circumstances (Camino 1994; Eckermann 1994). For refugees therefore, the malleability of identity formation is extremely vital since it “allows the experience of suffering and hardship to assimilate into symbolic understandings of who the collective
ethnic group is and what it stands for” (Camino 1994:1). Consider these parents’ comments:

No matter what happen to here we still Montserratians. If people call us refugee we still Montserratians and we should do what ever it takes to hold on to the Montserrat culture. But it ain’t easy, for the way some of the children pick up the different habits from school if we don’t put down we foot, they will forget where they come from (Ellen – Parent)

It’s bad enough for us adults to carry the Montserrat banner and show them who we are and what we stand for, but it is worse for the children. They under plenty pressure at school.... we could do it but it is rough (Clarice – Parent).

Another parent spoke of renouncing his Montserratness, albeit temporarily, in order to get accommodation sorted out:

I just had to forget that me a one Montserratian. I had to behave like everybody else to get what me want.... if you did hear me you wouldn’t believe... anyway sometimes you have to be different to get what you want (Walter).

From the foregoing comments, I conclude that it is the shifting and bouncing back and forth between attempts at ‘fitting in’ and the struggles to maintain a Montserrat identity, rather than the recognition of what the collective Montserratian group stands for that presented the challenges for relocated students and their parents. Lam & Martin (1996:23) reported on a similar situation for Vietnamese refugees in London as they tried to “reconstitute themselves as a community”. African Caribbean refugees too faced comparable dilemmas in Canada. They were so concerned with settlement and survival issues (meeting basic needs) that maintaining their cultural identity proved to be rather difficult (Coelho (1998:20).

I have also noted another area of conflict that posed challenges in maintaining a Montserrat identity – ‘cultural equalising’. The placing of relocated Montserratians in a ‘refugee’ category to allow them to have basic social services has rendered differences of culture and socio-economic strata into one ‘refugeeness’. In this way, ‘Montserratness’ has not only become obscured on the ‘refugee’ playing field, but is also restricted to a Montserrat family/community setting. This continuous shifting between identities coupled with the fear of losing the Montserrat identity have caused much concern for relocated Montserratians with regards to past identity maintenance. Some parents have confided that they are worried
that their children would grow up more “English than Montserratian”, and therefore would be unable to pass on Montserrat traditions to successive generations.

The students expressed other concerns. This does not mean however that they were not concerned about maintaining their Montserrat culture for, generally, they spoke of wanting to continue doing traditional cultural arts at school (Chapter 6). Their concerns focused on what circumstances caused them to be ‘refugees’ – what they were before relocation and what they were forced to become. One student lamented: “if the volcano didn’t come, we would not be refugees.... We would be in Montserrat living good life” (Khalil – Year 7). Another spoke of not being a refugee if she was “still living in the safe zone, even it was scary” (Alice – Year 8). Yet another spoke of mixing with the many students “from every country” who made up his school population, as an unnerving and intimidating experiencing.

Before relocation, some students did not realise the scope of differences among others cultures that exist. They viewed ‘ethnic identity’ through a Montserratian lens for their lived experiences were defined by encouragement, support and ‘protection’ of the entire Montserrat community. This ‘sheltered’ existence did not prepare them for the upheaval and accompanying uprootedness that turned them into ‘refugees’, nor did it prepare them to deal with culture clashes and differences.

A first-wave migrant recognised the uphill struggle that relocated Montserratian students faced in retaining their cultural identity, as they tried to assimilate into British society. Aymer pointed out that not all of them would respond positively to efforts made by UK-based Montserrat organisations ‘to keep Montserratness alive’. She noted that while some will do extremely well, others would be seduced by “the destructive aspects of British society” and thus become “casualties of the system” (Aymer 1999:32). This Montserratian’s anxieties were voiced against the background of her own reflections about her identity and sense of belonging as a Montserratian living in London. Admittedly, as a voluntary migrant, Aymer’s reflections on her identity were not perceived through the ‘distorted’ lenses of ‘refugeeness’. But her welcome to England was “unbelievably traumatic”, she experienced a similar sense of alienation and disappointment, and faced comparable accommodation problems (Aymer 1999:29 & 30).
What has emerged from Aymer’s experience and observation is that “symbolic understandings” of identity do not only happen on a group level for there is the central task of analysing one’s own identity. This implies that while relocated students were battling to maintain a Montserrat identity and struggling to assimilate their ‘refugee status’, they were also juggling various levels of individual identity construction as each sought to craft a ‘new self-identity’.

Education is generally regarded as one of the principal means of helping refugee students to assimilate into the mainstream school culture (Refugee Council 1997; Rutter 1994). Kroger (1989:42) argues that it is the job of the school “to meet genuine needs, and allow opportunity for individual talent to be expressed and channelled into real social roles”. But this study shows that it was within the school environment that relocated students confronted the greatest challenges to maintain their cultural identity. It was also the school setting with its many and varied cultural influences that inspired relocated parents’ trepidation relating to identity maintenance and cultural conflicts.

Maintaining a Montserratian Identity in School

Relocated Montserratian parents were extremely concerned about their children’s reaction to the “corrupting influences that surround them in the schools they attend” (Martha). The major issues that angered the parents are subsumed under these themes:

A. disrespect for teachers
B. ‘undesirable dressing’
C. ‘bunking-off’
D. threatening to call Childline UK

In Montserrat, there were occasional incidences with respect to A and B, and perhaps C. But D was unheard of; Montserrat society did not accommodate a ‘Childline’ service, hence the parents’ extreme concern.

The relocated students in question have acknowledged their parents’ concerns, but felt compelled to ‘follow the crowd’. One student confessed: “If I don’t dress like them I would not have any friends” (Davida – Year 10). Another said: “They (the other students) would
call me ‘soft’ if I don’t go with them” (Kester – Year 11). These two students’ expressions represent the views of the majority of relocated students.

It is quite clear from the interviews that dealing with culture shock proved to be a threatening and depressing experience. Admittedly, this can be said of any migrant whose previous experiences clash with aspects of the new environment. However, it becomes more problematic for forced migrants who have added anxieties and stresses resulting from the traumatic experiences that caused the forced migration, as well as the frustration of resettlement (Coelho 1998; Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill 1994).

For relocated students, the ‘bonding function’ proved most effective in helping them to cope with the anxieties that resulted from culture clash. Cross, Jr., et al 1999:31 advance that ‘bonding’ allows persons to derive meaning and support from an affiliation with, or attachment to other members of their ethnic group. I observed that ‘bonding’ was evident among the relocated students whose friendship groups consisted primarily of persons from similar ethnic groups, that is other students of African and African Caribbean origin (Chapter 6). I also noted that they gained much emotional support from their Jamaican counterparts, possibly because of the ‘Caribbean connection’ and the common dialect that they speak. It was this affiliation that provided the support that relocated students craved as they tried to absorb the ‘shock’ experienced on entering a ‘foreign’ school environment. ‘Bonding’ seemed strongest in one particular school where all staff members were of African Caribbean origin. It was also at this school that relocated students felt most welcome.

In addition to providing students with a renewed sense of optimism and autonomy, giving a warm welcome to refugee children has been shown to aid the recovery from culture shock (Refugee Council 1997; Segestrom 1995; Rutter 1994). But this was not Silda’s experience, a Year 9 relocated student who reported that for her first few weeks at school she cried every day because she missed Montserrat, was very unhappy and had “nobody to turn to”.

Another student related:

It was very hard at first, I was on my own. Sometimes I felt like crying, but I am confident now and I am more independent. My English teacher was very nice to me. In Montserrat it was different all the teachers helped you but here you have to push yourself if you want to succeed (Kate - Year 11).
Silda and Kate’s experiences show the difficulty that some relocated students endured in merging past and present identities. Silda appeared more susceptible to the pressures of alienation, while Kate recognised the need to push herself, perhaps with some encouragement from her English teacher who was the school’s EMAG co-ordinator.

Curtis had a similar experience to Kate but viewed being in a multicultural school as an advantage to learn about other cultures:

I meet students from many places. They speak different languages and they even have different religions. I enjoy learning about their culture and I tell them about Montserrat. I miss Montserrat and the things I used to do but I am trying to get used to the way the schools operate (Curtis - Year 10).

Curtis’ experience fits with the ‘bridging function’ that Cross Jr. et al propose as an identity operation. Bridging allows a person to move “back and forth between black culture and the ways of knowing, acting, thinking, and feeling that constitute a non-black worldview” (Cross, Jr., et al 1999:32). This function allowed Curtis to gain a non-Montserratian worldview while at the same time holding on to his Montserratian cultural frame of reference.

Jonelle too was able to appreciate the difference she confronted as she immersed herself in the realities of her new school environment. She not only tried to get accustomed to her new school culture, but she also admitted that she missed it when she returned Montserrat for a short period:

When I went to visit Montserrat, I realised how much I missed home. But when I came back to England, it made me have second thoughts about going back. It’s not too bad here once you get used to it (Jonelle - Year 7).

The above experiences suggest that as students strove for successful integration, they were creating new cultural identities in the process, although this may be a transitory adaptation. Curtis as well as Jonelle can be categorised as low salience identity students for difference in culture did not prevent them from making reasoned decisions or making the best of being in a multicultural school setting. I equate Jonelle’s experience to what Cross Jr. et al dub ‘codeswitching’. This function “allows a person to temporarily accommodate to the norms and regulations of a group, organisation, school or workplace” (Cross et al 1999:32).
I noted too that there was also an element of ‘individualism’ in Jonelle’s case. The ‘individualism’ function, according to Cross et al, “is the expression of one’s unique personality” (Cross et al 1999:33). They further explained that when a person acts in a race-neutral manner in accord with his/her self-concept, it is the ‘individualism’ function that motivates him/her to utilise this identity strategy. Jonelle was able to identify herself with the norms of the school as well as express herself in accordance with her individual outlook and persona.

Obviously individuals do not move through the stages of adjustment and acculturation at the same rate, even if they are from the same cultural background. Coelho (1998:20) notes that students who are caught between a desire to succeed in order to overcome marginalisation, often adopt “an oppositional stance towards school” - a situation that may result in further marginalisation and exclusion from school and/or home, and ultimately a loss of the educational success that is desired. This seemed to be the case with Kester, a relocated student who was excluded from school three times in his first year of schooling in England. Kester has repeatedly expressed his disgust at school and with teachers whom he claimed acted unfairly towards him because he is black. But his exclusion, whether rightly or wrongly meted out, did not gain favourable acceptance from some relocated students at his school and some members of the relocated Montserrat community who share this view: “He (Kester) let us (relocated students) down. And he make his family shame” (Shanelle – Year 7). Extreme and/or poor behaviour is not the norm for the Montserrat school culture. Hence Shanelle’s and others’ aghast reactions to Kester’s dilemma imply that such behaviour threatens what ‘Montserratness’ represents.

Kester’s ethnic identity undoubtedly had a directing bearing on his exclusion case for research has shown that African Caribbean students were more likely than other groups, to be excluded from school (Lyle et al 1996; Channer 1995; Mirza 1992; Mac an Ghaill 1988). These students who were excluded from school claimed that they were victims of racial prejudice although some teachers tend to argue that they do not see skin colour among the children they teach (Hollins 1999:186). But in analysing similar cases to Kester’s, I conclude that teachers’ attitudes to racial identity, which is an integral part of social identity development, have implications for relocated students’ educational progress.
The issue of racial identity brings into focus Cross et al ‘buffering identity function’. They have described this function as “those ideas, attitudes, feelings and behaviours that accord psychological protection and self-defence against everyday encounters with racism” (Cross, Jr., et al 1999:31). In other words, buffering prepares one for racist encounters, leading to greater personal control. But I posit that the relocated students, unlike their British-born African Caribbean counterparts who have always lived with racism, lacked the psychological protection and self-defence to which Cross, Jr. et al alluded. Whether British-born African Caribbean students have mastered ‘buffering’ is open to question. The comparison was made for this reason: most teachers have put a blanket label on all students of African Caribbean descent; no distinction is made in handling contentious issues.

Experiencing face-to-face racism was ‘foreign’ to Montserratian students prior to their relocation to England, thus they did not anticipate such racist encounters, as is implied in this sentiment:

Before I came to England, I used to think that it was a nice place. I used to think that people would be nice to you and want to help you. Now I know it is different - not the same like Montserrat. Racism everywhere – in school, in church, everywhere (Arnold – Year 10).

Like Arnold, most relocated students were not prepared to confront racism and racist attitudes, at least to such a large extent. It was not evident from the group discussions and the one-to-one interviews, that the relocated students had employed the ‘buffering function’ to counteract racist experiences. Also, it was not readily apparent that they had developed the ‘buffering’ capacity that would have allowed them “to filter out racist information” (Cross et al 1999:31). It was perhaps the use of the ‘bridging function’ among low salience identity relocated students that helped them to blunt the pain that arose from unavoidable racist encounters.

It is probably a good practice for relocated students to begin to develop the ‘buffering identity function’ to a capacity that will allow them to filter ‘racist information’ and let positive non-racist experiences help them to regain and/or sustain their pre-relocation educational aspirations, as they rework their identities to accommodate the changes in their new school environment.
Adapting and Combining Identities

Instead of simply accepting what the ‘mixed bag’ that the host society offers, Camino observed that generally, refugee students often add new slants to their identities by using symbolic dimensions that are grounded in their own experiences (Camino 1994:2). I fit Nadia into this categorisation. I noted the following from an observation session at Nadia’s school: Having had an interesting debate - ‘Environmentalists versus Developmentalists’ - a class of Year 8 students was given the task to design posters in preparation for a demonstration to protest their side of the issue. I present two posters (Nadia’s and a British student’s), to show how Nadia utilised symbolic ‘dimensions from her past social experience as she struggled to identify with a new cultural experience:

Nadia’s Poster:

PREAD ON MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS
SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT - AMEN! AMEN!

British Student’s Poster:

MURDERERS! MURDERERS! MURDERERS!
MURDERERS OF THE PLANET!
IT MUST STOP! IT MUST STOP!
NOW!!!

In comparison to the other student’s, Nadia’s poster bore an extremely mild protest. Her verbal protests seemed even milder for while other students responded with frenzied chants.
Nadia placidly responded with an approving “yeah, yeah”. The general tone of her protest appeared to be one of peace and love, as indicated by the hearts on her poster. By contrast, the other student’s poster and demonstrative responses portrayed a strong sense of antipathy, abhorrence and antagonism.

On observing Nadia’s presentation, one may reasonably conclude that she did not feel a similar loathing for destroyers of the environment, as was demonstrated by the other students. But this is not the case, for in a follow-up discussion with Nadia, she confirmed that she was “all for preserving the environment”. Like Nadia, the average Montserratian student put a high value on preservation of the environment. This statement was made on the basis of my experience in Montserrat, working on several environmental projects with Nadia and other students. The focus here however, is not on students’ perceptions on environmental concerns, but rather on the clash of cultures; Nadia was caught between two cultural worlds – the ‘new’ and the ‘old’. It was evident that her attempts to shift, albeit temporarily, from spiritual values that she was socialised to cultivate, were unsuccessful.

Clearly, the new ‘attitudes’ that Nadia confronted in this particular lesson, clashed with values that were inconsistent with her pre-relocation experiences. Interestingly, although failing to shift fully, Nadia did not reject her new experiences because it conflicted with her values, but rather she re-organised her values to fit her new experiences. Her poster demonstrates that she was still ‘holding on’ to her ‘peaceable’ pre-relocation sense of self while participating, to a comfortable degree, in an episode that clashed with her beliefs. One school of thought suggests that such an action, that is, identifying with a new sense of self, is one way in which self-consistency can be maintained (Cooper 1999:61).

The creation of refugee student identities in a multicultural school environment can be very successful but also often painful (Minority Rights Group 1998:3). From the various experiences reported by relocated students, I take the ‘good’ experiences to be the successful ones and the ‘bad’ to be the painful. Constructed identities are related to aspects of culture, language and religion, and most of the personal accounts tell a story of success and/or, pain, that is, the students’ experiences were characterised by a range of conflicting emotions. For example, Kanta reported that she liked her school and was enjoying the learning experience, but lamented:
I hate to see the students smoking and I don’t like the attitude of some of the students at school. They do not respect the teachers at all. They never listen when the teachers talk to them for their good. In Montserrat we never behaved like that (Kanta – Year 11).

Kanta’s remark represents the views of most relocated students. It highlights two types of identity – individual and cultural. It also implies that identity clashes result in emotional pain. The students categorically expressed their disgust at the undesirable habits that some students practised. These include: swearing in class, smoking, being disrespectful (especially to teachers), and wearing “anything they want with their uniform” (Shanelle – Year 7). Yet, some have admitted engaging in these very undesirable practices because they were pressured by other students to conform – another example of ‘codeswitching’. Nevertheless, this is the school climate in which relocated students were striving for educational excellence, so they were forced to recognise and accept these realities as they struggle with various identity constructions.

Undoubtedly, this was a clash of two very different school cultures; and invariably, trying to adapt, mix and balance the cultures proved to be an emotional strain. The school dress code in Montserrat did not allow for ‘bizarre’ hairstyles, nose rings, earrings (for boys) and immodest dressing - a stark contrast to what is allowed in British schools. A relocated student explained that he wore an earring because “every body is doing it”, and if he did not follow the trend he would be harassed and ostracised from the boys’ clan. Another student explained:

I only wear it (an ear- ring) when I am at school and when I go out with my friends. I do not put it in at home. I can’t let my mother see it (Angus - Year 11).

A similar case was reported for another relocated female student who wore a nose ring. Yet another, took off her woollen socks when she got to school and donned a “nice” pair, because the woollen socks were “too old-fashioned” and they “don’t go well” with her shoes. Pieces of clothing were even hidden in school bags and later worn at after-school activities. I observed that many relocated students sported a distinct duplex identity - they behaved in one way at school and another at home and they continually shifted from one role to the other. At some times, when it suited them, they maintained their traditional norms; at other times, these very traditional norms are pushed aside for new identities that fitted the existing circumstances.
The ‘relational self’ described in Chapter 2, gains its strength from “the constant barrage of imagery and information” produced by communication technology (Rapoport, Baumgardner & Boone 1999:98). With reference to relocated students and this study, the ‘relational self’ is nurtured by an infiltration of influences of a more dominant culture. Inevitably, constant exposure to these influences in a school environment, will play a major role in relocated students’ development of new identities. It is this scenario that has raised “serious concerns” and invoked “real fears” among relocated parents. In general, parents’ anxieties were reflected in this parent’s comment:

The problems that our children are having is a serious matter. We cannot ignore it and hope that it will disappear. The influences from the British culture are very strong and some children do not have the strength to resist the bad ones. It is a different way of life and we have to help them to deal with it. Some of them have already lost their Montserrat values – what they know we stand for, and we can’t afford to let all of them go down the drain (Teresa – Parent).

Another parent hoped that “the damage” that had been done “is not beyond repair” (Melvin) and that the identity conflicts would be transitory. But it is problematic to attach a time-limit to transitory especially if the students realised that they can benefit from both worlds (home and school) by maintaining an assortment of alternative identities. Besides, some relocated students seemed to have mastered the art of ‘doubling’ by displaying a high degree of behavioural flexibility – a characteristic of a “pluralist individual” (Rapoport, Baumgardner & Boone 1999:99). The fact that some parents were unaware of “what is going on with de children dem” (relating to doubling), bears this out.

Generally, the parents felt that the solution to such “an awful situation” (Martha), was to “take every one of them back to Montserrat” (Harold). Another parent bemoaned:

Look what me come to. Who would believe that me would come a England to get dis kine a problem. Only God could help us (relocated parents) wid we children (Ellen – Parent).

Head (1997:23) posits that it is not unusual for adolescents to make attempts to demonstrate autonomy and an independence from parents. However, such adolescent behaviour is not demonstrated in a vacuum but rather within the confines of a culturally defined group identity, usually an ethnic identity. In an analysis of adolescent friendship networks, Rampton in a study of ‘language and adolescent ethnicity’ informs that ethnic descent was
an important organising principle in adolescents’ associative networks (Rampton 1995:28). It is reasonable to conclude therefore that the seeking of autonomy and independence from parents, together with constant identity reconstruction have put extraordinary emotional strain on relocated students’ psyche – a situation that has impacted negatively on their overall educational progress. This suggests that the adaptation to cultural changes entails more than assimilation into the mainstream; other interrelated phenomena like the dimensions of human development are also involved. As an integral part of ethnicity, one’s ‘sense of place’ is one of the phenomena that plays an important role in the adaptation process, as is noted in the next section.

A ‘Sense of Place’

When people flee from the threat of death and total dispossession, the things and stories they carry with them may be all that remains of their distinctive personhood to provide for future continuity (Parkin, cited in Couldrey & Morris 1999:).

Relocated Montserratians’ flight ‘from the threat of death and total dispossession’ has not obliterated their strong emotional attachment to their homeland. Their ‘sense of place’ remains central to what constitutes ‘Montserratness’. Some relocated students had the opportunity to express this cultural awareness. I refer to two examples:

I was commissioned to run a small theatrical project for the School Summer Festival... I planned a dramatisation of some poems..... For one particular aspect of my plan I needed speakers who could speak with a West Indian accent or read Jamaican dialect..... They (two relocated students) were wonderful, committed, hardworking, imaginative, responsive to ideas, full of initiative, brought their own props and music (Teacher CP).

In one of our English classes, I asked them (relocated students) to write about their country, what it is like, what it was like living there. They all were quite interesting. One of them was excellent - very well written - a very enthusiastic and informative description (Teacher KL).

I noted earlier that attachment to land and place was one way in which feelings about a Montserrat cultural identity can be interpreted (p.204). Language, that is the Montserrat dialect, is another. Thus, CP’s theatrical project played a vital role in allowing the two students concerned to reinforce their ‘sense of place’.
A similar sense of island identity was noted in the students’ writings (from Teacher KL’s task). An analysis of these accounts, revealed that the students’ thoughts were penned with a strong sense of individual and collective identity, and clear definition of the students’ ‘sense of place’. The writings were grounded within a set of traditional and cultural orientations that the students recalled with mixed emotions – ranging from pleasure to misery, from acceptance to inadequacy, from despair to cautious hope and optimism. All the stories were developed along a similar route and the ideas were connected by the same historical links. The stories did tell a tale of students’ ‘distinctive personhood and nationhood’. These include stories about pre-volcano Montserrat, descriptions of the volcanic activities and reasons for relocating. The accounts also showed an awareness of students’ perceptions of the differences in cultural orientation, as noted from this excerpt from one of the accounts:

I like the life in Montserrat. I wish at this very moment I was in my hometown, where there is no winter or fast-going life. You are able to walk freely in Montserrat without anyone stepping into you, unless they are not minding their business (Roselyn – Year 9).

An expression of cultural identity in any fashion, is noted by the editors of Forced Migration Review (FMR) to be “a powerful way to maintain a community’s mental and physical health” and restore their dignity after the trauma of exile. (Couldrey & Morris 1999:4).

It is a common practice for relocated Montserratians to chat about ‘what’s happening at home’ whenever and wherever they meet. From these informal discussions, I noted that the parents/guardians had followed a similar trend (as in the students’ writings) with regards to reflections on life in Montserrat. This suggested that attachment to land and place remains the backdrop against which relocated Montserratians interpret their feelings about their cultural identity. And given that ‘sense of place’ is central to ethnic identity (Rampton 1995:297), it is reasonable to conclude that relocated Montserratians’ sense of place is intricately linked to their attachment to land. This appears to be what is suggested in this excerpt from a conversation I had with a relocated parent:
P: You know me always say if dey sell Montserrat dey sell me with it.

R: I really didn’t expect to find you here.

P: A no a did say a wud be de larse wan to leave, but a had to leave (I used to say I would be the last person to relocate, but I had to leave).

R: What happened?

P: De chilren. Deh ejukashun kom fus an a warn to help dem, but Montserrat iz stil me hoam. Me karn dun wid Montserrat (The children’s education comes first and I want to help them, but Montserrat is still my home. I am not finished with Montserrat) (Raphael – Parent).

Similar expressions to Raphael’s were voiced by other relocated migrants. Panton & Archer (1996:7) assert that relocated Montserratians have suffered a double loss – loss of house and possession, and loss of the society itself. They have also acknowledged that Raphael’s sentiments are common among Montserratians:

People carry a potent image in their minds, of a island emptied of its people......... they feel real and sensible anxieties. One woman said: “We are grieving over our country”. The volcano threatens to destroy ‘home’ at almost every level (Panton & Archer 1996:7).

But there is much more to this deep-rooted emotional attachment to land than having material possession. In the ‘safe zone’ (the North) where most of the land is privately owned, many individuals have constructed items in particular places. These items (of which graves sites are among the most important), according to Panton & Archer (1996:23), bear “personal and cultural and spiritual attachments”.

The foregoing reinforces relocated Montserratians’ emotional bond to their native land. But forced migration has thrust upon them new concepts of place, space and time. Thus, they are forced to acknowledge the cultural shifts, no matter how small, that are developing with their new lifestyle. But even with this acknowledgement, expressions like these are common:

Montserrat is still there. Montserrat still nice... I live here but my heart is in Montserrat... Even though the volcano is there and things are not the same I will still hold on to Montserrat culture (Val – Parent).
In trying to hold on to Montserrat culture, the new identities that are being created are fitted into an existing perception of a sense of place, for representations nearly always tended to be framed within images of pre-volcano Montserrat. For example, during an interview session when asked whether her friends visited her at home, a relocated student replied: “Not yet – when we get a nice house like the one we had in Montserrat – with everything in it” (Alice – Year 8). In my field notes, I wrote: ‘like parent, like child’, for I received a similar summary from Alice’s parent, on the same issue of ‘hospitality’. Such an attitude may provoke a reaction of ‘stretching things too far’, but it was mentioned to emphasise that every aspect of relocated migrants’ ‘new’ life that was deemed worthwhile and desirable was examined and contrasted against a Montserrat background.

Clearly, a strong sense of an island identity has remained with relocated Montserratian migrants – an identity within which a sense of self and a sense of place are interpreted. Such an affiliation to land seems necessary since their national identity is defined by location rather than by citizenship. A BDT status neither makes allowance for British citizenship, nor the status that nations attain on gaining political independence. By strict definition then, persons who were born in Montserrat, along with those who were naturalised as BDT citizens, have no national identity. In this context therefore, relocated Montserrarians remain in a limbo, somewhere between self-identity and pan-ethnicity, a gap that even the acquisition of several identities would find difficult to bridge. The next section explains how a limbo position was achieved and how it affected identity formation among relocated migrants.

**Identity and ‘In-betweenness’**

I view this section as important since some relocated migrants’ choice to relocate to England was based on a perception of essential sameness – ‘we are British’. It was a false sense of identification with ‘Britishness’, perhaps influenced by being holders of ‘category-5 British passports’, that blinkered some parents into believing that the Montserrat and British education system operated in the same way.

Clearly, a BDTO status has positioned Montserratians in a political limbo. Prior to 1995, the ambiguous nature of this positioning seemed to have gone unnoticed. And although political status was given some consideration when persons began to relocate, it was the
mass relocation in 1997 that seemed to have brought this ‘in-betweenness’ into sharper focus - perhaps heightened by the harassment some received from immigration officials when they presented their ‘British’ passports. Consider this experience:

They (immigration officials) ‘treat us like dawg’. They take we passport and tun it inside out... and so they watch me up and down. Although the see de passport mark British, they still mek me and de children wait for along time before they let us go (Sammy – Parent).

Sammy’s is not an isolated case. ‘In-betweenness’ creates in those who experience it an awareness of inferior and superior ‘otherness’ that heightens the need of belonging, hence the constant yearning to sort one’s position. Bhabha has developed the concept of hybridity to describe a way that spaces in between might be negotiated. This, Bhabha contends, is possible if one constructs “cultural authority within conditions of political antagonism” (Bhabha, cited in Arber 2000:61). This entails more than an integration of culture as proposed by theories of multiculturalism. It involves an in depth examination of political, economic and social ideologies from which the aims and practices of naturalisation are derived. Arber offers this explanation of Bhabha’s suggestion:

Bhabha’s concern is to demonstrate ambivalence within colonial discourse, to find instabilities of power through which anti-colonialist resistance is no longer powerless, to define a place where hybrid strategies open new spaces for negotiation. Ambivalence works within discourses of the coloniser, so that the authority is undermined even as it is asserted (Arber 2000:61).

To express dissent within colonial discourse with a view to finding weakness within the power structure is a challenging but reasonable task under ‘normal’ circumstances. However, for Montserratians who were forced to relocate to England because of an ongoing volcanic crisis, and whose host is their coloniser, this seems a tall, if not impossible order. Besides, some relocated migrants may lack the gall to challenge a host whose education system “provided the foundation for their educational achievement” (Edwin), despite the noted biases such as textbooks that conveyed positive messages about England and negative messages about the indigenous population. Such an attitude lives on despite the fact that the then education system “served a vital function in sustaining the coloniser’s dominance” (Ryan 1999:122). Consider these parents’ expressions:
Yes we suffer injustice and yes they (the British government) treat us badly but they
not all bad. They used to help us in some little way…. (pause), (laugh) … I remember
those good old school days. Anyway, we are not a position to do anything about it…
at least not now. They are in control, they brought us here.. that mean ‘they have the
handle and we have the blade’, we cannot beat the system (Jamie – Parent).

You see this situation that we find ourselves in, it is the children who will suffer
most. But we can’t give up, they need an education and we have to sacrifice many
things to make sure that they get it. We here already so we have to take the sweet and
the sour and move on (Sarah – Parent).

These parents’ seeming apathy is not representative of a lack of concern about relocated
migrants’ status as ‘in-betweeners’, but rather a recognition that under present
circumstances it is futile to attempt to challenge an authority that is so strongly asserted.
Another parent spoke of “resisting the temptation to take on the system just for the sake of
the children’s education” (Walter). Although a sense of powerlessness and helplessness was
prevalent among most parents, preoccupation with the continuation of their children’s
education remained top of their agenda.

Battling with the ever-shifting, contradictory identities together with the fallout of forced
migration, have left relocated Montserratians with insufficient spatial and temporal reins to
create situations where they can negotiate their ‘in-between’ spaces with a view to
constructing a solid political/national identity. I surmise that only when particular concerns
are resolved, will they begin to examine whether hybrid strategies can indeed “open new
spaces of negotiation”. Arguably, filling in a political space may symbolise a sense of
“cultural authority within conditions of political antagonism”. It does not necessarily
represent however the acquisition of a fixed political identity since identities are always
shifting and reconstructing themselves “against the representation of others” (Arber
2000:61).

**Conclusion**

The chapter focused on the multifaceted interrelationship that exists between identity and
ethnicity and the role that culture plays in their development. This interrelationship was
noted to have manifested itself in the various school experiences of relocated Montserratian
students. My line of argument was sustained by presenting from a broad literature base,
scholarly theories and reasoning that paralleled the relocated students’ experiences.
The main point of reference for the discussion on identity was Montserratian-born black students now living in London. I located different school experiences of relocated students and fitted them into contexts that appeared to represent 'the black identity'. Buffering, bonding, bridging, codeswitching and individualism are the functions that Cross Jr. et al (1999) have noted to make up the Black identity profile. I noted that different situations necessitated the utilisation of different operations – singularly and/or as a mixed bag.

Ethnicity encompasses a shared culture and/or language as well as a 'sense of place'. An emotional attachment to land defines a 'sense of place' for relocated Montserratians whose identity is geographically rather than politically defined. Perhaps it is the 'inbetweenness' defined by an indeterminate state, and created by the deliberate political and racial manoeuvres of host country Britain, that have inspired relocated Montserratians to embrace a purposeful sense of survival in an 'unfriendly' society, for the sake of their children’s education. Social networking and recognising the importance of maintaining a solid home-school-community partnership were critical elements in this process. The next chapter discusses how such a task was undertaken.
Chapter Ten

Home, School and Community Partnership

None of us can be strong unless we have the support of the community. And unless the community is strong, it's impossible for us to be strong, no matter how big we become (Camille Cosby, Wisdom of the Elders).

Introduction

The preceding four chapters have demonstrated that generally, schools have failed to give relocated Montserratian students the necessary support that they needed to sustain their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation. This chapter discusses the strategies that UK-based Montserrat organisations and church groups have employed to support relocated students, and how they attempted to help the students to restore and sustain their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation. It focuses on the importance of home, school and community collaboration in motivating students to maintain a strong desire for learning, develop a sense of agency and realise their educational goals.

Figure 8.1 illustrates the unbroken ‘rings of security’ that helped to produce and sustain high levels of achievement motivation among Montserratian students before they relocated to England. It was noted from the fieldwork that relocated students’ pre-relocation levels of motivation were slowly and painfully depleted as they became victims of negative stereotyping, low teacher-expectation, racial discrimination and the family and community problems associated with resettlement. An unhealthy relationship existed between the parents and school because of the ‘language’ barrier, parents being “slighted” and/or “ignored” on occasions and teachers’ general lack of background information on physical and social Montserrat. It was noted too, that other factors such as the ‘absence’ of the entire Montserrat community in a given location, homelessness and the oscillating between multiple fragmented identities contributed to the deterioration of students’ motivation to achieve. I contend that pre-relocation ‘rings of security’ have been broken by the aforementioned in-school and out-of-school factors. For some persons it was a ‘sudden separation’, for others it was a gradual painful process as families succumbed to the pressures of resettlement in a ‘hostile and unfriendly environment. Figure 10.1 illustrates the consequences.
On the basis of the numerous discussions held with relocated students, their parents and some members of the relocated Montserrat community, I further assert that the situation illustrated in Figure 10.1 has ultimately affected the educational aspirations of relocated students. This claim mirrors the sentiments of all the persons with whom the discussions were held. It was this backdrop that prompted the communal response to make a conscious and deliberate effort to restore and sustain students’ pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation, via building a sense of ‘island’ community.
The rest of the chapter will first explain how concerned persons and relocated migrants employed various types of networking strategies to build this sense of 'island' community. It will then discuss the initiatives of the UK Montserrat organisations and church groups and relate some students', parents' and teachers' reactions to these programmes, which were mainly concerned with rekindling and sustaining relocated students' pre-relocation achievement motivation and educational aspirations. Lastly, the chapter will show how the groups' efforts are supported by the literature for it is widely accepted by researchers that home, school and community collaboration is crucial to the educational and overall development of children (Bastiani 1997; Henry 1996; Mansfield 1994).

Social Networks
Before I examine the deliberate actions that were taken by the UK Montserrat community to re-establish an 'island' community spirit, I wish to make mention of a particular type of networking that played a significant part in social networking. It is funeral gatherings. Unfortunately, since relocating to England several Montserratians have passed away. By any measure, funerals are not joyous occasions, however, the Montserrat UK community has used these gatherings to 'celebrate the life of the deceased', to socialise and recreate a sense of 'Montserratness' – a communal sharing of grief, encouragement and comfort. In Chapter 1, I explained that the relocated Montserrat community was scattered throughout England – from far north to extreme south. However, many persons have not allowed distance to be a barrier and have travelled from one region to another to share the Montserrat community experience. Although unplanned and unwelcome, funerals have provided an extraordinary opportunity to network, and have brought together very large gatherings from every echelon of the UK Montserrat community, that no planned event would have accomplished so readily.

Planned Events
One of the many scheduled events organised by the London Forum was a series of education workshops born out of the numerous queries and complaints forwarded by parents, guardians and concerned persons to MGUKO, and MCST who report:
After the initial reports of high academic standards and exceptional performance on the part of Montserratian evacuee children, there was now some indication of under-achievement, of difficulty in adjusting and of behavioural problems at school resulting in exclusions and delinquency – issues that led to decisions for repatriation (MCST 2000:5)

The principal aim of the London Forum workshops that were held in community and church halls during the summer of 1999 (June 26, July 20 and August 24) was:

To equip parents and guardians with the tools necessary to understand the British Education system and to establish a communicative, working relationship with teachers and education officials, with a view to improving their children’s levels of achievement motivation and productivity in London schools (Shotte 1999:2).

It was therefore no accident that the theme chosen for these workshops was ‘Knowledge, Unity and Endurance’, based on these tenets: (1) Knowledge is power; (2) Unity is strength and (3) Endurance reaps reward – don’t quit. It was the general consensus that these principles, singularly, but more so combined, were crucial ingredients for the effective and successful handling of the various problems (educational and otherwise) that were plaguing relocated students and their parents.

The presenters were a balanced representation of first-wave and relocated Montserratians - social workers, school governors, teachers and parents, a British teacher who taught in Montserrat for a few years and non-Montserratian personnel from organisations that deal with problems similar to those relocated students and parents were experiencing. This cross-section of presenters was deemed a necessary match for an effective and meaningful discussion of the issues highlighted. The issues were discussed under the following themes:

1. School and the School System
   - Some essentials – registration, attendance, streaming, Special Education Network (SEN - including PRUs) and school meetings
   - Complaints – how to lodge complaints, handling complaints and appeals
   - Discipline – exclusions, mentoring and mediation
2. How to Benefit from the School System

- The importance of communication
- The role of extra curricular activities
- The importance of parental involvement in school
- The role of school governors
- Participating in PTAs (MGUKO – Workshop I Programme Outline, June 26, 1999)

The distribution of information packs is not an unusual occurrence at workshops. However, it was an interesting phenomenon at this workshop for although relocated parents had accessed some of the material prior to the workshop, it was the first time that parents had the contents interpreted and explained. Participants were especially grateful for the interpretation of a glossary of school-related terms that was prepared by one of the panellists.

The three workshops were organised in different ways. For workshop II, relocated parents presented case studies of particular problems that students were experiencing. The main issues emerged were exclusion, admission and academic progress. An informative discussion of the issues and suggested solutions followed the presentations. Relocated students took the ‘chair’ for the third workshop. They spoke passionately about the issues that were affecting their schooling. The ‘standard’ of work, discipline and exclusion dominated the agenda. Members of the organisations who were ‘expert’ in specific areas offered practical suggestions to relocated parents and students, with the promise to follow-up with further assistance and advice. Appendix XI presents a summary of the review of the three workshops. Similar workshops were also organised by MCST in the summer of 1999 and the spring of 2000. A summary of the recommendations made at MCST workshops is presented in Appendix XII.

In addition to the aforementioned workshops, other planned events include homework clubs, one-day conferences, summer school, cultural events and debates. This network of support is expected to continue for as long as necessary. The Nottingham-Montserrat Education Link is the latest programme designed to improve teachers’ understanding of
relocated students. Five teachers from Nottingham teachers from the programme visited Montserrat earlier this year and five teachers from Montserrat did a return visit in May 2002 (MCST 2002:3). With regards to the debates, MCST reports:

The idea for this debating competition was conceived with the realisation that there was a vast number of issues that affect Montserratians, which needed to be discussed in a formal setting such as this. The debating competition presents a grand opportunity for Montserrat nationals and friends of Montserrat from all over the UK to gather in one place in the spirit of community and listen to various viewpoints, opinions and facts on issues that concern Montserrat and are of vital concern to all of us (MCST 1999:1).

A ‘spirit of community’ was evident at the gatherings (formal and informal), especially the cultural events that are generally deemed very important in maintaining a sense of ‘Montserratness’. One relocated parent had this to say after one of the cultural events that featured folk songs, dances, steelband, poetry and story-telling:

We can’t afford to let this go. Montserratians are proud of dey culture and we have to encourage de young people dem to hold on to it. We can’t let dem forget it (Henry – Parent).

Henry’s reaction resonates the mood of a large majority of the relocated community – a mood that is clearly reflected in these words about refugees:

On one hand they desperately want to build a new and stable life for themselves and their children in a land of peace, security, opportunity, and perhaps to leave the past behind. On the other hand, they are conscious of a lost homeland, of possible national extinction, and of their responsibility, as survivors, to preserve a culture in disarray and to pass on to their children their legacy before it disappears altogether (Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill 1994:62).

Within that legacy that relocated parents want to pass on to their children “before it disappears altogether”, are particular moral and religious principles. Since relocation to England, the churches have played a significant role in trying to sustain these principles, and to reintegrate a “spirit of community” among relocated Montserratians.

The Role of the Churches

It was within the communities of the ‘black’ churches (various branches of Baptist, Pentecostal, Seven Day Adventist and Wesleyan Holiness among others) rather than in the mainstream churches (Anglican and Catholic), that social networks were established. Leaders of the ‘black’ church set up group meetings for the relocated community and
organised several social gatherings such as parties, dinners, and games evenings. From the discussions and interviews, I noted that some relocated migrants, in an indirect way, were discouraged by some mainstream church leaders from attending church services. A relocated parent related the following:

The second time I went to church, he (the Priest) came up to me and said that he was glad to see me, but some church members were not too pleased about my attendance, so I must not come back (to that church) next Sunday (Muella – Parent).

Similar experiences to that of Muella’s resulted in several relocated migrants becoming members of evangelical churches where they felt “more comfortable”. These said members probably felt “welcome and at home” in their ‘new’ churches, principally because some of them were led by Montserratian pastors (relocated and first-wave) and they attracted a large Montserratian following (Patricia - Parent).

In addition to catering for relocated migrants’ spiritual needs, the churches have actively participated in the organising of education workshops and other social gatherings. Not only have some pastors willingly offered their churches as venues for some of the events, but they also were panellists and/or keynote speakers at many of the meetings. In addressing a group of relocated students on ‘Coping With Loss’, one Pastor encouraged:

Accept the reality, this is not a dream, this loss is real. Montserrat will never be the same again. Work through the pain of the loss - pain comes with loss. Be careful how you choose to deal with the pain. Do not use harmful substances like drugs and alcohol to numb the pain, let the pain take its course and try to adjust to the environment in which you find yourself. Remember that it is possible to be Montserratians in a British environment...... Move on with your life - it is worth living. Set realistic, achievable goals. Do not leave a vacuum, neither should you become detached from what you believe in. Continue to believe in yourself, you can still achieve. Strike a balance, widen out and seek positive action (Pastor Ruthlyn Bradshaw – Relocated Parent).

The encouragement offered in the foregoing excerpt is typical of the spirit that existed in most, if not all the meetings that the churches and the UK-based Montserrat organisations have planned with the hope of reinstating relocated students’ pre-migration levels of achievement motivation. Table 10.1 highlights the ongoing programmes that some churches have initiated in an effort to assist relocated students’ to be successful in their educational and overall development.
Table 10.1: Churches’ Ongoing Initiatives and Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Churches</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Programmes Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Reformed Church</td>
<td>Lauriston Road Victoria Park</td>
<td>• The Young People’s Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sunday schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evering Road Pentecostal Church</td>
<td>Tottenham</td>
<td>• Saturday school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Assembly</td>
<td>Beechwood Road, Dalston</td>
<td>• Forum for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshops for parents and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Pentecostal Church</td>
<td>Ashwin Street</td>
<td>• Sunday School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Saturday School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Shiloh Church</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>• Homework club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Saturday School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Compiled with information from the Montserrat Community Support Trust – MCST)

Some of the programmes (the Saturday and Sunday schools, the Young People’s Fellowship) listed in Table 10.1 were in operation prior to Montserratians’ relocation to England. Perhaps after considering the plight of the relocated Montserratians’, the churches introduced the additional programmes to accommodate them. These initiatives were organised by the churches mentioned only. Other church related projects (such as workshops and youth round-table discussions) were an integral part of the London Forum and MCST social networking schedules. Space does not permit me to present a detailed description of each event, but I wish to highlight some general reactions to the churches’ and the other planned initiatives.

Religious ceremonies have always been an integral part of African Caribbean people’s ‘survival kit’. Bryan et al assert that they serve as a creative and sustaining force, “a means of articulating our joy at our continuing survival and our hope that salvation would come” (Bryan et al 1985:189). For the post-war African Caribbean migrants to the UK, church-going in the ‘black’ communities was used as an opportunity to socialise, but Sutcliffe and Wong explain that the ‘black’ churches created more than a social space for African Caribbean people:
Many of the people have derived strength and solace from the black Churches, which have provided them with a social space in which they can make the rules, in which they can develop and succeed. The churches have afforded them spiritual strength derived in a typically black way – from collective, joyful worship in which the love of God is experienced – and continue to be a very important and underrated force (Sutcliffe 1986:7).

The foregoing explanation associates development and success with the black churches, possibly because “teachers from the church….fostered an atmosphere of learning, of certain goals and objectives to fulfil” (Bryan et al 1985:69). Approximately five decades later, the ‘black’ churches are still playing a major role in the socialising, development and general success of migrant communities.

Reactions to Initiatives
From all appearances, generally, there has been a positive response to the efforts that the UK-based Montserrat organisations and some churches have been making to help relocated students to remain focused in their quest for educational success. This section examines some of the reactions from some students, parents and teachers.

Students’ Reactions
Debates, modelling, ‘impromptu speaking’, singing, dancing, reading at church services, reciting poetry and leading group discussions were some of the church and community activities in which relocated students participated. These activities were not all of an academic nature, in a strict sense, but based on the reactions of some students who participated in these events, I have concluded that the students’ confidence and self-esteem were boosted by their experiences as participants.

I relate the students’ confidence to ‘student efficacy’, which is described by Coleman (1998:144) as an “inner belief” that students develop about their capability to be successful – to make a difference by ‘acting on (and ordering) their world’. Students develop self-confidence/efficacy when persons, particularly family members and teachers accord them commendation and/or approval whenever they are deserving. Such praise often provide the encouragement and support that students need to ‘feel good about themselves’, that is boost
their self-esteem and help them to attain educational success. It is in this light that I analyse the success of the community and church initiatives. One student related:

I really enjoy doing the poems. They are our poems. Remember? Those we did in Montserrat for National Geographic .... but we don’t do those kind of things here.... Everything so different I would just sit there (in class) and don’t speak, sometimes I feel scared to speak up..... But now I’ll try. Do you think Miss would let me say my poem for the class? (Alice – Year 9).

Another said:

I feel good when people come up to me and say ‘well done, that was very good, you did well’. I just want to do it again (Chanelle – Year 10).

The foregoing sentiments aptly represent the general feeling among relocated students. It was evident that they thrived in an atmosphere where there was, as a non-Montserratian observer put it, “the spirit of Montserrat” present. Some relocated students who confessed that the education workshops provided them with much encouragement and support, requested that the London Forum “host a seminar on their behalf” (MGUKO 2001:4). The seminar was held on October 28, 2000. The London Forum assisted in the selection of guest speakers but the themes were chosen by the students, and the compere for the programme was a Year-10 student. The following are some of the students’ comments about the event:

• “Sister Ruthlyn was really good. She encouraged us to always keep a positive attitude no matter what ”.

• “It was a big success. I enjoyed the group sessions. When I heard all the stories, I realised that we all have the same problems, so we have to work together and help one another”.

• “I feel good when I see so many Montserratians come together”.

• “It was nice to have Rose Willock. I like her talk. It was encouraging”.

• “We should have another evening like this. It was great experience. I think we all (the students) did very well”.

It is reasonable to conclude from the above comments that the students considered the seminar a success. Obviously, there is need for further research to determine to what extent this seminar has made a difference in relocated students’ lives. However, the initial conclusions based on the students’ comments well represent a positive way forward.
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Encouragement and a supportive community spirit were the elements that appear to have determined the evening's success. I noted a similar air of satisfaction in Mandy’s sentiments after she participated in a cultural programme:

I love to be on stage. It feels good. When you hear the crowd cheering and clapping, you feel so motivated - as if you get fresh inspiration. You just want to go out there and do your best. It is really encouraging. It reminds me of Arts Festival (Montserrat) ..... those days are gone..... I wish the schools had Arts Festival (Mandy – Year 11).

Underneath Mandy’s excitement about being on stage, there seems to be an unvoiced disappointment in the schools that do not provide students with similar opportunities to feel good about themselves - to display their creative talents, to recognise their self-worth and develop their self-confidence.

With regards to relocated students and the development of ‘student efficacy’, the churches seem to have succeeded where the schools have failed, for in addition to providing a sense of belonging among the church community, their programmes have helped to sharpen creative skills, develop public speaking abilities, instil a sense of self-pride and improve self-esteem. Consider the following:

Youth club (run by one of the Churches) really help me feel better. Here is so different... you don’t get the opportunity to do so many things that we used to do in Montserrat and you feel so useless. But at club we do all kinds of things like reading to the group, picking a topic from a bag and speaking about it, debating and other things like that. I wish more Montserrtians children could join... some of them like they lose interest in everything, but if they come to club they will see the difference. Club really nice. (Alice – Year 9).

What I like most about going to Youth Club is the opportunity to meet other Montserratians. That is when I see all my friends from the other schools..... when we have group discussion we share ideas, we talk about Montserrat and we plan how we can continue to do things that we used to do in Montserrat (Donna – Year 10).

Alice and Donna are convinced that the Youth Club can help relocated students to regain a sense of achievement motivation, given that “lose interest in everything” means lack of achievement motivation and “continue to do things that we used to do in Montserrat” means continue to engage in activities that promote achievement motivation.

Sunday and Saturday schools were run by the churches identified in Table 10.1. These too have had a similar effect on relocated students as the seminar and youth club meetings,
although relocated students had to “get used to going to school on a Saturday” (Kobi – Year 7). The ‘getting used to’ was perhaps related to the nature of ‘Saturday school’ rather than the actual attendance on a Saturday, for attending school on a Saturday for the purpose of learning “basic skills” and to improve attainment “in weekday school” (Stone 1981:190), is a new phenomenon for relocated students. To explain, there were times when teachers, particularly Grade Six teachers, would host Saturday classes (up to three hours) for the purpose of giving extra assistance to students who were preparing for entry into MSS. Unlike the current situation, these supplementary classes were not born out of parents’ dissatisfaction “with what is being offered by the school system” (Stone 1981:148), but rather by teachers’ desire to help students to make notable educational advancement. Any other ‘Saturday school’ attendance was to practise or prepare for school and/or PTA social events.

While participation in cultural activities is an integral part what constitutes ‘Montserratness’, and is therefore almost self-motivated, attending Saturday school was encouraged by others. From the fieldwork, I noted one main reason why relocated students attended Saturday school - parents/guardians encouraged them to attend. In addition to their regular Saturday school, the churches in Table 10.1 had organised some extra sessions for relocated students, so students were exposed to a familiar social environment where they were “glad to see all their Montserrat friends” (Kester – Year 10). I surmise that it was because of this social environment that parents only needed to encourage rather than pressure children into attending. And although initially some found it to be different, Saturday school turned out to be very useful and beneficial. A general reaction to Saturday school is reflected in the following:

I like going to the classes .... I feel more relaxed and comfortable. I am not afraid to put up my hand if I don’t understand for I know that the teacher will help me. Miss always encourage us to ask questions. Sometimes we work together in groups and discuss with one another. She is a good teacher. She is very helpful and I learn a lot (Urlene – Year 8).

Urlene’s comment echoes a collective sentiment despite the difficulty some students experienced in getting to and from the classes. One church is known to have transported children in the ‘church bus’ – a reflection of the Montserrat community spirit. There are no official records of the progress students have made from attending Saturday school, but the
students themselves have given positive reports from their self-assessments, and parents have reported an improvement in their children’s self confidence, emotional behaviour and attitudes to school. Relocated parents, like their children have welcome the assistance the children have received in the Saturday and ‘extra’ classes as is explained in the next section.

**Relocated Parents’ Reactions**

The unexpected assault on relocated parents’ sense of identity have put them under severe pressure, yet based on several discussions with parents, ‘a good education’ for their children remained a priority on their agenda. Even before some parents had heard of the ‘revival’ projects that the churches and the UK-based Montserrat organisations had initiated, they had already solicited assistance from successful first-wave migrants and some concerned persons, hence the organised additional programmes were welcome with open arms. Parents’ attendance and participation at the workshops signify the following assumptions:

1. They are concerned about their children’s educational progress;
2. Their children are not progressing at the rate that they had anticipated;
3. They have concluded that the education system is not catering for their children’s educational needs;
4. They believed that the community projects can offer the advice and assistance that they and their children need; and
5. Their children are not beyond redemption – they can still attain educational success at the highest levels possible.

Follow-up discussions held with parents supported the foregoing suppositions. Parents were particularly thankful for the knowledge they had acquired about the school system as a whole. One parent echoed this communal sentiment:

> It is so good to learn how the British education system works. I thought at first that it was the same like Montserrat. They do things different here, especially when it comes to getting children into school, so many schools to choose from and sometimes you still don’t get what you want. If I knew how the system works, things would be different. If we want our children to succeed we have to learn the system – all the ‘ins’ and out and which school to choose (Jenny – Parent).
Within the general framework of how the system works was one particular frustrating issue – exclusion. It was some relocated parents’ self-perceived inadequacy to handle exclusion-related problems that prompted them to make impulsive decisions about repatriation – that is sending back their children to Montserrat (MCST 2000:5). Anxieties relating to exclusion had become so serious among the relocated Montserrat community that a significant proportion of the London Forum second workshop was dedicated to ‘exclusion and exclusion matters’. The following are some parents’ reactions to Workshop II:

- “I did not know that I had the right to appeal”.
- “The many letters from the headteacher were getting to me. This long list of bad things, I didn’t know what to do. I feel much better now to know that somebody who understand the system will go with me to see the headteacher”.
- “Because we did not know better they took advantage of us. Now we know how to deal with them”.
- “I was too quick to blame the children. Now I know that I should listen to them more”.
- “I learn so much. Meetings like these are very useful”.

The general tone from the above remarks indicate that parents viewed the workshops as being very helpful since from them, they had gained knowledge and understanding that will equip them to deal with specific problems that their children faced at school.

It was not only the education workshops that the parents applauded. Church initiatives and cultural events were lauded with similar fervour. The collective sentiments concerning the importance of maintaining ‘traditional morals and values’ and ‘holding on to Montserrat culture’ were recurrent. It was generally accepted that “a returning to the Montserrat way of life, being Montserratians in an English society”, was the way forward for relocated students if they were to realise their educational dreams (Ruth – Parent). But it was also generally agreed that teachers too had a very critical role to play.

*Teachers’ Reactions to Community Initiatives*

I wish to make clear that not all the teachers interviewed were aware of the programmes that were organised by some churches and the UK-based Montserrat organisations. I presume that the teachers at the schools where students had behavioural problems were the
ones who knew of the programmes for on several occasions, ‘qualified’ persons from the church or organisations were present at hearings as representatives of relocated students. The remarks made concerning teachers’ reactions to the programmes are therefore not representative of the entire sample.

As conduits of the curriculum material, teachers are a crucial link in the teaching and learning process. And no matter how successful the community initiatives are, without an effective home-school-community partnership, the efforts made to reinstate relocated students’ pre-migration sense of achievement would be futile. It is therefore imperative to involve the school in such projects since “schools do make a difference” (Bastiani 1997:9). Participants in the community initiatives who volunteered to assist relocated students with school issues have been visiting the schools when necessary. Some teachers have welcomed and praised the efforts of the community scheme. Regarding one such visit, one teacher remarked:

It’s truly a commendable effort. I am thankful for the information that was provided. I was totally unaware that such a situation existed. No one told me about it. I now see the Montserratian students in a different light (DR – Teacher).

Another confided:

James seems more confident now. His attendance has improved. There is even a change in his attitude towards me (IO – Teacher).

This satisfying comment comes from yet another teacher:

Dialogue between us has improved. She is opening-up little by little. She seems more willing to listen… (pause) and reason (RI – Teacher).

The foregoing comments seem very encouraging. I am not here attempting to generalise these comments, but rather to demonstrate that home-community projects can help to improve parent-teacher relationships, which can in turn improve students’ progress.

**Extent of the Community Programmes’ Success**

I assess the success of the community projects organised by some churches and the UK-based Montserrat organisations within this broad framework: success denotes something that gives enjoyment or satisfaction as a result of the attainment of something desired (Wordsmyth Educational Dictionary, www.wordsmyth.net).
In light of the students, parents and teachers' comments regarding their reactions to the community initiatives, it is plausible to conclude that the community projects were successful. But if relocated Montserratians and others were to measure the relocated students' educational progress merely from the perspective of these community projects, this would be to underestimate the realities the students have encountered in a multicultural school environment. Admittedly, the community projects and workshops have played, and are still playing a significant role in helping relocated students to regain and maintain their motivation to attain educational success. However, these projects should be viewed as supplementary, and/or as motivating extensions to the regular learning institutions. Since the projects were born out of concern for relocated students' educational progress, the extent of their success should therefore be evaluated in a wider social context with reference to particular indicators within “the sum total of the learning experiences” that the students have acquired (Halliday 1991:28).

**Indicators of the Projects' Success**

Given that education is compartmentalised into the “formal” (within an educational institution), the “non-formal” (education that may not lead to certification) and the “informal” (incidental learning) (Robert 1994:1), indicators of success should be identified and measured within these three workspaces. It is therefore within this broad educational definition that I evaluate the success of the home-community projects.

Crooks (1997:59) observes that although black parents are deeply committed to their children’s education, they do not always feel welcome by teachers to come into the school. Crooks further notes that their reluctance to enter classrooms to discuss issues relating to their children stems from being “intimidated by the hostile environment of school”. From the fieldwork conducted for this study, I noted that some relocated parents have expressed a similar fear and have been wary of willingly visiting their children’s school. From follow-up discussions made after the workshops, it seems that some degree of that fear has been lessened, albeit to a small extent. A parent who took this “big step”, did so with “fear and trembling”, but for her child’s sake “will do it again”, if the child will benefit. I deem this parent’s experience as one of the successes of the workshops and from other parents’ experiences have identified the following as other areas of success:
• Confidence to relate to teachers
• Knowledge and information that promote a better understanding of the school system
• Improved teacher-parent relationships
• Improved home-school relationships
• Lessened ‘fear’ of written material relating exclusion
• Better equipped to deal with admissions, complaints, transfers, records

Effective communication is the foundation on which the above noted areas of success were laid, as well as the thread that links one area to the other. The success that I claim to have resulted from effective communication, relate to the conscientious attempts that parents have made to create better home-school relationships rather the disappearance of barriers. The psychological barriers that have arisen from cultural differences and racism, between relocated Montserratian parents and teachers cannot be ‘magically’ erased after a few community initiatives. However, when dealing with problematic situations, parents’ inability to communicate effectively because they are paralysed by fears and doubts can be corrected by reinforcing particular measures. Hence it is the genuine efforts made by workshop presenters and the practical ways in which some parents have responded, that I label success stories. Students too have shared the conquest since parent-teacher dialogue inevitably involves them.

The cultural events and church programmes too were deemed successful since they have managed to bring relocated Montserratians together from across regions, thus creating a sense of ‘island’ community. The cultural events have also helped students to maintain traditional values and lessen the conflict between the traditional and the mainstream. One of the presenters at a seminar admitted:

When the students are constantly exposed to traditional values, it helps them to evaluate what they were taught, what they are now exposed to and what they believe in. There may be changes in their thinking and shifts in their values, but the traditional cultural values should remain the core view point (Dorothy – Parent/Presenter).

The consensus remains that the maintenance of traditional values via a re-established ‘island’ community will help to ‘mend’ the ‘broken rings of security’ and ultimately restore relocated students pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation. Admittedly, these
events in themselves cannot physically restore the ‘lost’ Montserrat community. Besides, it will take many more of these events to bring about a desired outcome. However, they have been successful in that they have laid the foundation for the continuation of the rebuilding of an ‘island’ community, and have provided relocated migrants with the inspiration to ‘fight the odds’ in order to succeed.

Importance of Home, School and Community Collaboration

Research has shown that home, school and community collaboration is critical to the teaching learning process. This partnership appears on the agenda of politicians, education officials, teachers, other professionals and parents, albeit in diverse and varying ways (Bastiani 1989:6). Home, school and community relations are no longer options but rather legitimate concerns, particularly for displaced students who have special needs (Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill 1994:99). In their comprehensive and probing study of unaccompanied children, Boothby, Ressler & Steinbeck in Kaprielian-Churchill & Churchill in (1994:101), refer to the home, community and school as the first, second and third rings of security, respectively. They contend that for traumatised youths whose families are dispersed and whose community is in a state of instability, the school a vital force for rehabilitation. While admitting that the school cannot compensate for all the ills of society, they have identified this third ring of security as the institution that can alleviate some of the pain and suffering of vulnerable displaced children.

Obviously, each ‘ring of security’ has different and particular roles to play, but it is the structuring and maintaining of interactive links among the three rings that is of paramount importance to students’ wellbeing, educational progress and overall development (Sergestrom 1995:19). I have observed a striking parallel in Coleman’s depiction of the collaboration within his ‘classroom triad’ where the teacher, the student and the parent(s) are ever-present actors. He contends:

The interactions amongst these three actors largely determine the student’s willingness and readiness to learn; predict student satisfaction and commitment to school and schooling; and hence largely shape both the attitudes towards school and learning, and the level of achievement of the child (Coleman 1998:1).

Coleman sees the maintenance of interactive links as involving teachers’ commitment to parental involvement and recognition of student capabilities, parents’ appreciation and
valuing of school and open communication between students, parents and teachers (Coleman 1998:141-143). Ken Livingstone, Mayor of London, reiterated this viewpoint when he stated that there is a need “to build a constructive dialogue between black pupils, their parents and their teachers” in order to identify long-lasting solutions to the many problems that black pupils are experiencing, which in turn are preventing them from succeeding in British school system (Livingstone 2002).

**Home-School Links**

Research into school effectiveness in Britain has shown that effective home-school links result in higher achieving students and better behaviour (Mansfield 1994:6). In ‘School Matters: The Junior Years’, Professor Peter Mortimore reported the following from research work on home-school partnership:

> Our findings show parental involvement in the life of the school to be a positive influence on pupils’ progress and development (Mortimore et al 1988:10).

The success of the 1981 Haringey Reading Project backs up the above comment. Twelve junior schools participated in this project. Wolfendale (1983:37) observed that the children who participated in the project and who had received assistance from their parents were superior in reading attainment to the children who had no parental support and follow-up after a year confirmed continuing leads and sustained gains. Berger notes similar results from a study of parent involvement in four school programmes:

> Children whose parents help them at home do better in school. Those whose parents participate in school activities are better behaved and more diligent in their efforts to learn (Berger 1987:3).

Home-school collaboration has had similar success as noted above, in secondary schools. I mention three different programme in three British schools – (1) Woodvale Comprehensive operated a Home-School Liaison Committee that met termly to allow parents and staff “to discuss general school matters and policy”; (2) Banthorpe Comprehensive ran a transition programme for first-year pupils that proposes “to demonstrate to children that parents and teachers work together with pupils interests in mind”; and (3) Marksbury Community School “devised a series of meetings and related booklets on GCSE options, designed to inform parents of, and involve them in, the decisions which face their children” (Jowett, Baginsky & MacNeil 1991:14&15).
Rhamie (1998:90) noted similar outcomes from an investigation of the factors that have contributed to the academic success of African Caribbean professionals (British-born) in Britain. In one of the two models that Rhamie used to represent her findings, it is noted that it was the home-school-child link that played the major role in students' academic success. Participation of the community is perceived as extra-curricular activity rather than as an integral component of the teaching-learning environment. Thus, the community has remained on the periphery, as illustrated in Figure 10.2.

**Figure 10.2: A Home-School Based Model of Success**
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Continuity of belonging, security, acceptance, achievement and success.

Source: Rhamie (1998:91)

Rhamie found Figure 10.2 to be a model for academic success. However, generally, relocated students do not fit into this model for, in their case the community is central to success rather than peripheral (Figure 8.1). Interestingly, Rhamie explained that the three of the fourteen participants who fitted neatly into this model were of "middle class" upbringing, and they attended schools that had "a proven record of high achievement" (Rhamie 1998:92). Space does not allow me to discuss here the 'class' upbringing of the relocated students, but I wish to point out that the schools they now attend do not have "a proven record of high achievement", perhaps because as 'refugees' they are more likely to
attend “unpopular schools in the local authority, because of their mobility” (Jones & Rutter 1998:4). And mobility has been a problem particularly for relocated students who are still in temporary accommodation, hence the need for strong community support. Undoubtedly, home-school links are vital for children’s educational progress and development. But home-community connections are just as important.

**Home-Community Links**

“Close links with parents and the local community are crucial in maintaining acceptable behaviour within a school” (Mansfield 1994:18). But according to Rhamie the benefits of home-community interaction extend beyond the maintenance of acceptable behaviour. The benefits encompass a positive continuity in language and culture, and a working relationship that creates “a sense of belonging, ownership, security, acceptance, achievement and success” (Rhamie 1998:93). In her second model of success, Rhamie illustrates that it was the community rather than the school that mainly influenced respondents’ educational successes, possibly because the community provided various situations where respondents experienced achievement and success, hence supplying the motivation for respondents to succeed at school. This model of success is illustrated in Figure 10.3.

**Figure 10.3: A Home-Community Based Model of Success**
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The scenario depicted in Figure 10.3 matches the current general situation of relocated Montserratians students. The home and the UK-based Montserrat organisations/community are largely responsible for giving students the necessary support that they need to make educational advancement. Some relocated parents have even set up study groups in their homes with a view to helping the children to become successful students. In acknowledging the support of MCST, had this to say:

Thank God for The Montserrat Project (renamed MCST). If it wasn’t for them, what would become of Montserrat children? What kind of education they would get? Dey (the children) better mek use of all they could get now .......... when dey go back a Montserrat, dey got to go wid something (certification) (Martha – Parent)

By and large, the schools were not very supportive, especially in cases where relocated students were placed in classes below an attained standard. Also, the GCSE tier system has not encouraged them to realise their full potential (Chapter 5). It should be noted however that as shown in Figure 10.3, the apparent alienation of the home and the community from the school does not represent total estrangement of school from home and community. In fact, parental and community involvement in school affairs was strongly encouraged and supported by UK-based Montserrat organisations and churches.

**School-Community Links**

Figure 10.3 shows the home and the community as playing a more significant role in children’s learning than the school. But, in writing about school and community collaboration, Berger (1987:111) asserts that if children are to benefit more fully, there is need for the two-way traffic between the school and the community. Puri (1997:42) contends that it is sometimes necessary for teachers to extend their territory “beyond the classroom door” to the community since school-community collaboration will provide vital information of students’ background, as well as increase students’ chances of success.

The principle behind community education supports Puri’s argument and extends it to the sharing of resources. In her discussion of ‘community education and parent involvement’, Watt defines community education as:
a process of commitment to the education and leisure of all ages through local participation in setting priorities, sharing resources and the study of circumstances. Thus, the community and its educational provision qualify and enhance each other (Watt 1989:185).

The above definition covers a wide range of principles that leads into community schooling. However, against the background of the issues presented in this chapter, I wish to focus one particular principle: “the mutually supportive relationships between school and community” (Watt 1989:186), since it was this principle that featured significantly in the educational progress of Montserratian students in pre-relocation times. Furthermore, the London Forum 1999 Summer Workshops highlighted the need to establish ‘mutually supportive relationships between schools and the relocated Montserrat community’ if relocated students are to attain educational success.

From personal experiences as a teacher in the Montserrat education system, I have experienced the benefits of two-way traffic between school and community - the community has enriched the standard school activities, while the school has contributed to community life. Varied talents and abilities within the community, were brought into the school and children were given opportunities to observe the adults in action in their work environment. The Social Studies programme in particular, which has the fostering of social participation as one of its major goals, made special provisions for school-community participation.

Henry (1996:170) who examined parent-school collaboration in relation to feminist organisational structures and school leadership, affirmed: ‘bringing the community into the school’ adds a crucial element to the schools’ programmes and promotes “the school’s reputation in the community”. She further emphasised that prominent persons in the community can do much to strengthen school-community relations since they can be sounding boards for new ideas. But these ideas have several reference points including the family, which is “the most stable component” in any community (Berger 1987:77).
Structuring school community links in schools that work with refugees poses some difficulty. This is the view of Caroline Lodge who was headteacher at a secondary school in North London, from 1989-1995. She noted: “schools working with refugees are often isolated, because the children are spread unevenly among the schools”, but that some LEAs have set up networks to support these schools (Lodge 1998:146). Lodge further stated that schools can play a significant role in helping refugee children to become effective learners and to this end made reference to what some young refugees in Sweden cited, among others, as being valuable aspects of schooling:

- Teachers who ask them about themselves;
- Schools which invited members of the refugee community into the school; and
- Teachers who came to special cultural occasions in the refugee community (Lodge 1998:146).

Given that schools, the ‘third ring of security’, can help all children to become effective learners, teachers should make purposeful and calculated efforts to increase parents’ confidence to approach them and become willing participants in school affairs. Hence, it is vital to build bridges between the ‘rings of security’ in order to maximise children’s chances of making great educational gains.

**Bridging the ‘Rings of Security’**

In addition to the rapidly increasing academic literature on home-school-community partnership, Education Acts (1980, 1981,1986 and 1988) have all mentioned some aspects (such as parents’ involvement in school choice, assessment procedures and representation on governing bodies) of this partnership (Jowett, Baginsky & MacNeil 1991:1). Such widespread attention confirms the importance of such collaboration to children’s educational progress.

Evidently, students benefit more when the home, school and community operate as partners in a relaxed atmosphere, rather than as splinter groups in an issue-ridden society. A comfortable, relaxed atmosphere creates an environment in which children’s education can flourish. I refer again to Figure 8.1 for it represents a similar environment - one in which relocated students’ educational aspirations were nurtured. In the Montserrat context, the school and community are virtual extensions of the family, thus the entire island becomes
one close-knit ‘family’ community. It was this ‘family’ environment that nurtured and sustained students’ achievement motivation. Unfortunately, absence of a similar home, school and community collaboration since relocation to England, due to several in-school and out-of-school factors, has resulted in a decrease in relocated students’ achievement motivation (Chapters 6-9). Relocated parents still view home-school-community partnerships as vital to their children’s educational success and were therefore determined to restore the ‘broken links’ by using various types of networking strategies.

Conclusion
This chapter has demonstrated that home-school-community partnerships have played a significant role in helping relocated Montserratian students to restore their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation that had been depleted due to several in-school and out-of-school factors. It explained that in response to parents’ complaints and concerns regarding their children’s educational progress, MUKGO, MCST and some evangelical churches planned a number of projects to deal with the issues. It was generally accepted that since students’ pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation were sustained by the spirit of a close-knit ‘island’ community, the recreation of the same can help to restore and maintain students’ these levels.

Education workshops, seminars, one-day conferences, Sunday and Saturday school, youth clubs, debates and cultural events were some of the programme planned. The chapter noted that these programmes have netted some degree of success, in that positive home-school and community-school dialogues have resulted in improved relationships. But it was the unplanned events – funerals – that seemed to have captured an ‘instant’ community spirit. Funeral gatherings, although unplanned and unwelcome, have captured the ‘Montserrat’ spirit in a way that the planned events have not.

Undoubtedly, effective home-school-community partnerships can disentangle, if not eliminate, the crisis of confidence between homes and school. The issues at stake are the offering of equal opportunities and respect for cultural and racial differences. The attainment of these should rivet home-school-community partnerships, improve relationships and purge cynical and/or dismissive attitudes towards homes and parents. The UK-based Montserrat organisations and church groups have unwaveringly asserted that
their community initiatives would act as conduits between home and school, help to foster an environment in which the aforementioned issues can be resolved, and re-establish an ‘island’ community in which relocated students can regain their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation. Their resolute assertion is fortified by this principle: ‘It takes a village to bring up a child’.
Chapter Eleven

Conclusion: Reflections, Evaluation and Implications

Just as there is no need to rewrite the Bible or Koran, there is no need to adjust the Declaration. What needs to be adjusted is, not the text of the Universal Declaration (of Human Rights), but the behaviour of its disciples (UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan).

Introduction

This concluding chapter presents some reflections on the major findings of the research, evaluates the thesis and the data-collection methods, discusses the implications of this research for the education of refugees in general and makes some specific suggestions for future policy and practice. All the proposals are directly related to relocated Montserratian students. This study has thrown up several pertinent issues with regards to the continuing education of relocated students, so in addition to the aforementioned main intentions, the chapter will suggest areas for further research.

Reflections on Main Findings

The main findings have supported the assertion that the ‘absence’ of a Montserrat community as it existed before the volcano, plus problems associated with ‘refugee’ settlement are mainly responsible for the decreased levels of achievement motivation among relocated students (Table 3.1).

In-school Factors

The literature has shown that it is not unusual for in-school and out-of-school factors to influence school experiences. But when these factors are attached to forced migration under the ‘unusual’ circumstances of the Montserrat case, they do merit some attention. The uniqueness of the Montserrat forced migrant situation has three features – the ambiguity of British status, the ongoing nature of the volcanic crisis and their ‘homelessness’ (Chapters 4, 5 & 7). Among the in-school factors that impacted on relocated students’ educational aspirations are stereotyping, low teacher-expectation, racial discrimination and lack of background information by schools, relating to relocated social and cultural orientation. Temporary accommodation, the ‘scattering’ of the Montserrat community and
dysfunctional families were identified as the major out-of-school factors that affected relocated students’ educational aspirations and aims.

Relocated Montserratian students’ arrival in England was untimely in two ways – (1) legislation governing the reception and resettlement of refugees (Chapter 7) and (2) the educational circumstances of African Caribbean students (Chapter 6). With regards to (1), they came to England at a time when there were few direct services provided to give refugees the support they needed to resettle (Rutter 1998:24). Fitting relocated Montserratians into this category may seem a paradox since by a strict UN definition they are not ‘legal’ refugees. But since Montserratians are holders of British passports (although they were not British citizens), it was generally thought among the UK and relocated Montserratian community that they deserved better treatment, that is, more general support to facilitate resettlement. Thus, after complaints and interventions from the then Montserrat Project and some Montserrat organisations it was debated among immigration officials whether Montserratians should be accorded a strict refugee category. They were eventually offered ILR. However, status aside, as is explained in Chapter 7, in many ways they are like refugees and were so treated within and outside of the school environment. Yet, schools did not put in place the same support system for relocated students, as they did for ‘legal’ refugees, thus increasing the number of factors that encumbered relocated students’ educational aspirations.

Teachers’ stereotyping of relocated students further inhibited their achievement motivation. African Caribbean students are noted to be at the bottom of the achievement ladder in the British education system and low teacher-expectation was identified as a major determinant (Miles 2000:17). Debates on the poor performance of African Caribbean students were rife during the period that Monserratians relocated to England en masse. It seems a reasonable conclusion therefore that the combination of the students’ untimely arrival and their registration in schools as African Caribbean students, was the catalyst teachers used for casting relocated students into an African Caribbean educational mould. Thus, relocated students’ educational journey in British schools began on a negative footing.
Out-of-school Factors

Homelessness has been a major factor negatively affecting relocated students educational progress. Living in temporary accommodation in England has caused untold stress to parents and students alike. Students found themselves in 'home' situations that were not conducive to a learning environment, thus limiting their opportunities to complete homework, do revision exercises and practice study skills.

The effects of dysfunctional families also contributed greatly to relocated students' decreased levels of achievement motivation. The nature of the volcanic crisis demanded the services of organisations (such as the Royal Montserrat Police Force (RMPF), the Royal Montserrat Defence Force (RMDF) and Port Authority workers) that had a strong male presence, hence many families were forced to relocate without the fathers. So, many relocated students who formerly lived in 'complete' family units, are now living in female-headed households. I am not here suggesting that female-headed households are dysfunctional, but simply pointing out that the male or father presence in Montserratian family units, had a notable influence on children's overall development and progress. On the basis of the data collected for this study, I have observed that the students who had 'severe' behavioural problems, and those who had very low levels of achievement motivation were mostly those whose fathers had remained in Montserrat.

Other Factors

Relocated students faced a constant struggle as they patterned and repatterned multiple identities to fit ongoing contingencies. Crafting new identities while at the same time trying to maintain a Montserrat identity, proved to be a challenging exercise for relocated students. Some were able to merge the 'old' and the 'new' to fit particular situations, while others sported a dual identity that fitted the home and school environment.

Issues relating to national identity, cultural identity and ethnicity have also helped to shape and influence relocated students' educational experiences. Parents and students were forced to recognised that Montserratian 'Britishness' did not translate into preferential and/or 'equal' treatment, nor did a British-based Montserrat education system operate in the same way as the British education system. This recognition was tied to accepting and adjusting to the cultural differences for 'Regionalism' (culturally different to the National Curriculum),
was central to the Montserrat education programmes and these very programmes influenced students’ achievement motivation in a large way. Accepting that relocation had brought with it a new and different lifestyle appeared relatively easy for most relocated migrants although each situation was interpreted within a ‘sense of place’ framework. It was the adjusting to all the differences that was noted to have created numerous problems.

The transition from a living in a ‘secure’, close-knit, ‘family’ community to living in an environment where one’s ethnicity identified one as being inferior has also taken its toll on relocated students’ educational aspirations. In Montserrat, racism was just another abstraction, thus coming face to face with racial discrimination has dealt a severe blow to the Montserratian migrants’ identity, in that it has denied them claim to be fully individualistic, fully Montserratian.

Inevitably, the clash of cultural and ethnic differences has resulted in conflicts among teachers, relocated students and other students. These conflicts have dampened relocated students’ spirits as well as stifled initiative, creativity and educational progress. In Chapter 6 I posited that sometimes relocated students are highly ‘visible’ and sometimes they are not. I have identified their ethnicity (skin colour) along with the occasions when tensions resulted in verbal and/or physical abuse, or even exclusion, as the factors that promote their ‘visibility’. Paradoxically, when resolving these very issues in classroom situations, some have claimed that their voices were not heard and they were often slighted. It is in this sense, when they are unheard and unrecognised that they are termed ‘invisible’.

Despite the initial fervour to achieve their full potential in the land of educational opportunities, the findings from this study have revealed that relocated students have lost the initial burning desire they had to achieve, hence their educational aspirations have not been realised. The London-based Montserrat organisations and some evangelical churches were therefore moved to put in motion educational programmes that should assist the students’ educational progress and restore a similar sense of achievement motivation to that they had in pre-relocation times. To date, the workshops have been successful – an innovation that has given hope to some parents, with regards to their children’s educational future, and optimism to some relocated students, pertaining to their desire to achieve.
Evaluation of the Thesis

The findings of this study cannot be generalised to every school where relocated Montserratian students are found, since the inner-city circumstances may not fit neatly into the suburban scenario or other UK school situations. I am of the opinion however, that a sizeable majority of relocated students may well be experiencing similar problems to those experienced by students in inner city London schools, as many similar features like low teacher-expectation and institutional racism have been noted in the literature.

It is also my view that displacement – internal and external – has put considerable strain on relocated students’ general psyche. The Refugee Council (1997:10-12) reports that displaced children usually experience specific emotional and psychological needs as a result of the loss, trauma and cultural changes they have undergone.

Evaluation of the Methods

The nature of the research demanded an investigation of a personal and emotive nature and one in which I was viewed as both insider and outsider, hence the choice of a qualitative design. The purpose of the research was not to seek ultimate truths but rather to try to interpret how respondents make sense of the situation in which they found themselves. I therefore added a phenomenological as well as an ethnographical slant to the basic case study approach. Subjective though this representation may seem, it is an integral part of the ‘objective’ truth and bears a legitimacy founded in Bourdieu’s concept of habitus that suggests that one’s experiences is shaped by his/her capital (Bourdieu 1993:86), that is, reality comes from a particular experience. This suggests that an ‘outsider’ (not from the relocated Montserrat community) researcher would not have accessed the crucial and confidential information necessary for the interpretation of informants’ lived experiences. The same can be said of even a post-war Montserratian migrant or a relocated migrant who holds another position, or who is of another profession or field. The multi-faceted personality of a Montserratian teacher does hold an advantage. This does not mean however that research conducted by such a person is problem-free, for I had many issues to contend with – power relationships, students and parents’ perception of me, and the obligation I felt to fulfil the expected roles of whichever cap I was made to wear. Nevertheless, my awareness of the existence of these concerns, in a strange way, empowered me to use my
‘insider’ status to access information in a manner that perhaps another researcher could not have done.

I recognise that subjectivity does not signal finality, but rather is part of an ongoing discourse (Bourdieu 1993; Atkinson 1992; Nagel 1986). I am also aware that a researcher must work in the knowledge of his/her resources since he/she does not possess “perfect theoretical and epistemological foundations…. perfect methods for data collection…. perfect or transparent modes of representation” (Atkinson 1992:52). Based on the foregoing, it is tempting for one to avoid being caught up in what appears to be futile, but Atkinson encourages that because of these shortcomings,

We do not have to abandon the attempt to produced disciplined accounts of the world that are coherent, methodical and sensible (Atkinson 1992:52).

The theoretical base and the manner in which this research was approached (Chapter 3) contributed to its validity and reliability. Admittedly, scholarly theories should be interpreted with caution, within particular contexts, under transferable circumstances. Thus, I have not depended entirely on theoretical underpinnings and citations from the literature, but have employed the principle of ‘member checking’ with persons who are ‘experts’ in the area of study, and who possess practical and ‘researched’ knowledge of the issues discussed in this thesis.

With reference to the presentation of a case study report, a researcher is allowed a mixture of description and analysis, with description being the weightier (Creswell 1998; Stake 1994). I found it difficult to accord proportional representation to related chapters, perhaps because of several cross-case comparisons, hence some readings may appear more analytical than descriptive. However, within the flexibility permitted, I have tried to use the overall purpose of the research to shape the written narrative (Creswell 1998:186).

**Implications, Proposals and Suggestions**

Central to this thesis’ task of creating legitimate portrayals of displaced students, is the thorough clarification of the flawed and dysfunctional notions commonly made about refugees. One exaggerated assumption is that refugees are ‘unlearned and unskilled’, a notion no doubt fuelled by their inability to readily and fully express (verbally and written)
their thoughts and opinions. Another is that they are generally viewed as “centres of, or creators of problems” (Shah 1996:91). A third erroneous perception is embodied in the belief that refugees are helpless and poverty-stricken. If teachers continue to view forced migrants merely as helpless victims, they may never acknowledge their true abilities and potentials, or even encourage and help them to realise their educational aspirations.

To obtain a rational, clear picture of the plight of relocated Montserratians students, one must first understand their context and the educational milieu in which they were nurtured. In British educational circles, it is widely accepted that African Caribbean people rate education as highly important, but it is also a common belief that African Caribbean students (first and successive generations) are underachievers. Given that the British education system is resourceful and efficient, this belief seems to question the students’ ability to achieve. But research, as discussed in Chapter 6, has shown that they can achieve, albeit under ‘extraordinary’ circumstances. This raises an important issue: how can relocated Montserratian students who were raised under totally different circumstances, in a friendly, rather than ‘hostile’ environment, suffer the same educational eventuality? To address this issue, it is imperative for policy makers, education officials and teachers to rethink many of the older and currently held concepts of African Caribbean students. This can be done by starting from a position of understanding, that is, building partnerships with relocated students and their parents on respect rather than grudging tolerance and making a determined effort to access educational and cultural background information of relocated students, instead of casting them in a particular mould.

‘Qui non proficit deficit’

‘He who does not progress, retrogresses’. So translates the motto of MSS – the motto for Year 8-11 relocated students. The Year 7s too have a similar propensity towards progress for they were nurtured in a primary school climate that had similar aphorisms for their mottoes. Arguably, these mottoes may have had little or no effect on students’ aspirations, but based on the principle ‘if you hear something often enough you believe it’, I would venture to debate that in an accumulative way, they were indicative influential motivators, especially when creative persons put music to these mottoes via school songs, calypsos, reggae and other forms of music.
Caribbean music is a powerful creative cultural work that “has derived its power from an involvement with the realities of the poor” (Lamming 1996:9). It is via this powerful calypso medium that many important messages concerning education are transmitted as noted in the words of world renowned Mighty Sparrow:

Children go to school and learn well
Otherwise later on in life you would catch real hell
Without an education in your head
Your whole life would be misery, you better off dead
There is simply no room in this whole wide world
For an uneducated little boy or girl
Don’t allow idle companions to lead you astray
To earn tomorrow you got to learn today
(Slinger Francisco – the Mighty Sparrow)

Even after four decades the powerful message in this calypso has not lost its meaning as it passes from generation to generation. To evaluate the import of Sparrow’s lesson in song, it is necessary to analyse the entire song (See Appendix XIII). More recently, 1997, this message was reiterated by another calypsonian – Gypsy:

Little black boy, go to school and learn
Little black boy, show some concern
Little black boy, education is the key
To get you off de street and off poverty
(Gypsy)

There is a profound message in Gypsy’s calypso for not only does it states the importance of education, but it has also outlined the resulting conditions of ‘the little black boys’ who have not heeded this admonition. (See Appendix XIV for full song). The song was created with a particular context in mind. However, the message is equally important to both sexes. So powerful was this message perceived to be, that Camilla Watts, the then principal of MSS distributed a copy of the song to every student, and teachers were commissioned to set aside a specific time to have students listen, analyse and discuss its content. Reggae, another type of popular Caribbean music, has also been an effective medium for instructing powerful lessons. Lieutenant Stitchy, a notable Reggae singer, via his song ‘English Class’, taught the functions of the parts of speech, sentence construction and elements of good essay writing.
The forgoing musical examples were not mentioned to showcase an integral part of Caribbean culture, but rather to underline an effective channel through which the importance of education was highlighted and children were encouraged and motivated to achieve, and also to reinforce that relocated students came from a society where the importance of education was constantly promoted. The message was clear - he who does not progress, retrogresses. It was in such a ‘progressive’, educational climate that motivated relocated students were encouraged to strive for excellence. At the 1997 Heads of Government Conference, it was generally accepted that a culture of excellence does exist in the Region and it should continue to be the cornerstone of ongoing efforts to develop the Region’s human resources (Hall 1998:61). Sustaining a culture of excellence is one of the fruits of Regionalism. The findings of this study have shown that the absence of this ‘culture of excellence’ in the British school’s curriculum, has contributed to the decrease in relocated students’ pre-relocation achievement motivation levels.

Montserratian teachers have successfully used appropriate calypsos and other types of songs as resources in many lessons. In light of the success that musical resources have had with relocated students, I wish to propose that teachers in British schools use cultural music/songs as resources when appropriate.

In many ways, relocated students were achievers and they flourished in an island community that encouraged and assisted them to develop their potential to the fullest. And it was with the same impetus that they relocated to England, with the perception that they would have expanded opportunities to realise their educational aspirations, in a superior educational system. It was on the basis of this conviction that many families decided to relocate to England instead of another territory and it was the same persuasion that is generally noted among Montserratians to have fortified their resilience and sense of survival.

**Resilience and Survival**

Frank Savage, former Governor of Montserrat, has dubbed Montserratians a resilient people (Savage 1996:12). Governor Savage’s description was influenced by residents’ positive and forward-looking reactions to the first year of the volcanic crisis. However, the island is no stranger to disasters for over the past three decades it had been plagued by
floods, earthquakes and hurricanes. But it was the restoration to ‘normality’ after the cataclysmic destruction of category-5 Hurricane Hugo that seemed to have earned Montserratians the title of ‘a resilient people’ (Fergus 1994:238). In fact, ‘if we survived Hugo, we can survive anything’ was a common sentiment that was expressed in the parent interviews conducted for this study. Yet, an analysis of the data has shown that some relocated parents are deeply concerned about their children’s survival in the British education system. Nevertheless, a sense of resilience and survival is discernible in parents and students’ response to the ongoing education workshops that are organised by the London-based Montserrat organisations and some evangelical churches.

I propose therefore that teachers in mainstream schools should establish a two-way communication system between themselves and relocated students in an effort to identify the sense of resilience that relocated students are noted to possess and use it to their educational advantage, instead of viewing them as mere victims of circumstances. To attempt this task however, teachers need to have a knowledge of the relocated students’ pre-relocation experiences. Additionally, teachers should acquire information via parents, UK-based Montserrat organisations and the Internet (www.montserratreporter.org/) about successful projects and methods used by Montserratian teachers with a view to adapting practical aspects for use in their dealings with relocated students. The Nottingham-Montserrat Education Link is a practical example to imitate.

**Suggestions for Future Research, Policy and Practice**

*Future Research*

This study has documented the educational experiences of relocated Montserratian students of the secondary schools in a single, inner-city London Borough. The nature of this research, together with the interesting issues that have emerged from it, have opened up a number of potential areas for further research. I suggest further investigation into the issues mentioned in this study, detailing and analysing school experiences with a view to understanding in greater depth the interaction between agency and migration, and aspirations and location. This study can also lead into research that informs the total experiences of persons who have undergone unexpected, rapid socio-economic and cultural transformations, and how these persons have adjusted to these changes. Adaptation brings identity into focus. Researching identity formation in forced migratory experiences may
inform the many hypotheses on identity processes, thus contributing to a better understanding of a much-debated issue. Forced migration inevitably produces dramatic and drastic changes that induce a battle between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ self within the context of background experiences, including traditional values and beliefs. It is within these conflicting situations that research should address the creation and recreation of identities.

I wish to make reference to a particular claim that has provided a springboard for an interesting, comparative study – the educational experiences of relocated Montserratian students in the USA, Canada and other Caribbean territories compared to the educational experiences of those in the UK. According to local newspaper reports (The Montserrat Reporter), news bulletins from MGUKO and MCST, information from friends, family members and the students themselves, the relocated Montserratian students in other countries are doing considerably better than those in the UK. The many progress reports from the schools, relocated students and their parents confirm that relocated students in the UK are doing less well than some of their counterparts in other countries who were noted by their Montserratian teachers to be average students. Based on my ‘insider’ knowledge of the Montserrat education system, I posit that the cream of the Montserratian student crop came to the UK. Considering this, the resulting situation is indeed a cause for concern that needs to be investigated. In the light of this situation, I propose that future research examine the educational experiences of those students who remain in Montserrat along with those who were repatriated because of the exclusion issues in the UK. It is also practical to compare pre and post volcano educational experiences.

Another specific area that I wish to note relates to exclusion and PRUs, issues that are extraordinary bones of contention among the relocated Montserratian community. Further research may address what exclusion and PRUs represent to the relocated Montserratian community and how they affect the overall development of the students concerned, particularly those who were repatriated. Tied to these two, is the gender issue. According to the findings of this study, not only were more boys excluded than girls, which indicated that the boys had more behavioural problems, but also pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation among the boys had dropped to a much lower level than the girls’. Furthermore, no girls were noted to be transferred to PRUs. An investigation into these issues may benefit the fertile field of gender research.
This third issue – health - should neither be overlooked nor underestimated since health is akin to education. "A natural disaster will have a number of adverse health effects which will be more than those that are immediately apparent. In case of a volcano there will be the immediate effects on respiratory health but, as these wear off, other more serious problems emerge" (Avery 2001:2). This admission suggests that relocated students may be experiencing health problems of one kind or another since, following the crisis, a survey carried out by two medical students in a cross section of the Montserrat population found that "many people experienced symptoms of anxiety and depression" (Avery 2000:14). The extent to which the emotional health of relocated students has affected their educational attainment is therefore a viable area to research.

Society is constantly changing under the inevitable influence of globalisation and the rapid increase in international population movements. A school’s curriculum should therefore as far as possible, mirror these changes with a view to assisting migrant students to achieve their educational goals. Further research into how schools have accommodated these changes is another area that should unearth pertinent information for teachers and curriculum developers.

Inevitably, any research regarding education, migration and identities will take the researcher into different theoretical camps in different fields (anthropology, sociology and psychology). Each field has provided a scope that has allowed researchers to make significant contribution to the aforementioned areas. It seems therefore, that in charting new directions for research, the researcher will not only need to cut across these theoretical boundaries, but he/she will also need to merge them (when necessary), in order to comprehend the interaction between them, thus providing a deeper understanding of all the dimensions of forced migrant students’ lives.

**Future Policy and Practice**

At the London School and the Black Child Conference held on March 16, 2002, Dianne Abbott MP described the educational situation of black children in this way:

There is a silent catastrophe happening in British schools in the way they continue to fail black children (Abbott 2002).
The above comment was made after successive generations of black children remain at the bottom of the achievement ladder. During the past four decades, despite recommendations from research projects (Coard 1971; Rampton Report 1981; Swann Report 1985) there has been little positive change in the educational circumstances of African Caribbean students possibly because there was no "government minister willing to champion these issues at the highest level" (Livingstone 2002:4). Another reason suggested for such failure of the British education system is that policies do not explicitly address race and social issues, which are at the heart of the conflicts (Gillborn 2002:3).

Relocated students are the 'new kids on the block', but they have fallen into the cracks of the British education system. If they are to attain educational success there is a dire need for policy makers to include them in the proposals for education reform that Baroness Ashton, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for School Standards, intends to enact (Ashton 2002). This research has shown that relocated students were aggregated as African Caribbean students and refugees. I therefore suggest that the British government should re-evaluate its policy in this light, with the view of helping to disaggregate relocated students from stereotyped labels that hinder their educational progress and those of all others so grouped together.

Speaking at the conference London Schools and the Black Child, Baroness Ashton disclosed that the government intends to increase the number of black teachers by 9% by the year 2005. Given the shortage of teachers, and in line with the aforementioned black-teacher recruitment policy, I propose too that better use should be made of Montserratian teachers (first-wave) who are already in the system, by having them supply vital background information and involving them in related curriculum decision-making exercises. Also, a sizeable percentage of the pre-relocation teacher community has relocated to the UK. Relocated teachers should be encouraged to become part of the British teaching cadre, working in a position where they can help British teachers to help relocated students to learn. These two groups of Montserratian teachers (first-wave and relocated) in the education system should help to make a significant and positive difference in the relocated students' overall educational performance.
Admittedly, well-meaning policies cannot resolve cultural values that are utterly conflicting opposed to those upheld in British schools - for example, issues relating to dress and grooming and first-name student-teacher relationships. These are contentious issues with no unequivocal solution. However, policy that address issues that can provide substantial background information of the students concerned will go a long way in effecting successful integration and ultimately educational achievement.

Policy makers, furthermore, need to re-examine the efficacy of existing placement practices and assessment procedures in the light of the academic characteristics of relocated students. I refer specifically to placing new students in lower classes because of their age, and the ‘tiering’ system that operates at the GCSE level. This is a problematic system that debar some students from attaining academic success even before they write an exam paper. Some relocated parents have become so frustrated at these processes and practices that they have taken their children back to the Caribbean where these conditions do not exist.

The 1999 government inclusion policy has been described as “dead” because it did not meet its objective to “reduce the risk of disaffection, social exclusion and crime” (Boyd 2002:1). This policy did not benefit black boys who are disproportionately excluded from schools (Communities Empowerment Network 2002:1). Government should therefore revisit this policy with the hope of ‘resurrecting’ it so that it yields educational gains for relocated boys who have experienced alienation from school as well as their very own Montserrat community.

It may be useful for policy makers to revisit the inclusion policy against the tenets of Gay’s proposal with a view to helping teachers to address any distorted perception they may have of students’ ethnicity. Gay proposes these pedagogical techniques:

1. Case studies – permit students to conduct in-depth analysis of traits, events, individuals, and experiences that have contributed to the cultivation and dissemination of their own groups’ ethnic identity.

2. Ethnobibliotheraphy – helps students to gain feelings of affiliation and learn some techniques for dealing with their own identity issues from the situations and characters portrayed in the literature.
3. Modelling and Mentoring – is appropriate for students who are approaching ethnic clarification. Students in this phase may study the personal profiles of people from a variety of ethnic groups and participate in relationships with them (Gay 1999:206-207).

Evidently, the inequalities in the British education system are largely responsible for the failure of black children in British schools. In developing new policies to address these inconsistencies, policy makers should stay clear of the procedures and practices that crafted the very injustices that they are trying to remedy.

Concluding Comments

Undoubtedly, the schooling conditions that the relocated Montserratians desired, do exist in England, but for whatever reasons, the schools where such conditions exist are not accessible to refugees. Hence, relocated students had to make best of the circumstances in which they found themselves. These circumstances often undermined their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation and shattered their educational aspirations.

A ‘scattered’, relocated Montserrat community who, despite their diet of hegemonic colonial discourses, have tried to redefine ‘Montserratness’ in terms determined by their current circumstances, and restore students’ levels of pre-relocation achievement motivation by responding positively to the education workshop initiatives of the London-based Montserrat organisations and some evangelical churches. It is readily apparent that these initiatives are not the ultimate panacea for the educational ills of the relocated students since there are other causal agents that this particular solution cannot eliminate. However, these programmes can go a long way in helping students to continue to embrace the familiar while at the same time appreciating and respecting differences. They can also help students to develop the state of mind that would allow them to transfer their pre-relocation values and attitudes to their current circumstances, thus enabling them to reinstate their pre-relocation levels of achievement motivation via a renewed sense of agency.

From personal experiences, I am convinced that no disaster, man-made or otherwise, will pulverise the resilience of Montserratians to the extent where they no longer esteem the value of a good education. It was in the heart of the volcanic crisis that Cupid, a local calypsonian, echoed this communal reminder to education officials:
School we children, school we children,
School we children, school we children,
We producing a generation of fools
If we don’t get children in school
(Herman ‘Cupid’ Francis)

Although this message was directly related to the volcanic situation in Montserrat, it is applicable to any situation where children are found. A look beyond the artist’s imagination will reveal the determined spirit of a resilient people who, because of past and present experiences will never underestimate the importance of a sound education, and will therefore seize every opportunity to make meaningful educational advancement. With such strong determination, relocated students in British schools may still realise their educational aspirations, much later rather than sooner. Only time will tell.
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Appendix I
The Students’ Interview Schedule

The interview schedule is a mixture of closed and open-ended questions. The closed questions are used to establish personal details and background information and the open-ended questions to investigate respondents’ perceptions of their experiences.

Personal Details and Background Information

1. Name
2. Date of birth
3. School
4. Year group
5. Year relocated to the UK
6. Parents’ occupation (M/rat)
7. Parents’ occupation (UK)
8. Montserrat address (before and during the volcanic crisis)
9. UK address (on arrival and presently)
10. Number of persons in household

School Experiences

1. What was your first day at school like?
2. How would you describe your school?
3. Do you look forward to attending school?
4. Who are your friends? Where are they from?
5. Do your parents know who your friends are?
6. Do you visit them at their homes?
7. Do they visit you at your home?
8. Do you have friends in other schools?
9. Are there any high points in your school experiences that you wish to mention?
10. Have you had any unpleasant experiences at school?
11. Are you involved in any extra-curricular activities?
Language

1. Do you find it difficult to understand your teachers when they speak?
2. How do you deal with this?
3. Have you told your parents that you sometimes experience difficulty in understanding your teachers when they speak?
4. Are there any occasions when you speak the Montserrat dialect at school?

Parental Support

1. Do you talk to your parents about school?
2. What are some of the things you discuss?
3. How about homework? Do you get help from your parents?
4. Did they help you with your homework when you were in Montserrat?
5. Do your parents control your TV time?
6. Do your parents attend PTA meetings? Parent evenings? Other school functions?
7. Did they attend these meetings in Montserrat?
8. Do they visit school regularly to check on your progress?
9. How would you describe their attitude to school? To the teachers?
10. Generally, how would you compare the support you get from your parents here in the UK, with the support you received from them in Montserrat?

Community Activities

1. Are you a member of any youth group or organisation?
2. Were you a member of any youth group or organisation in Montserrat?
4. Which of these did you play in Montserrat?
5. Which church do you attend?
6. Is it the same church that you attended in Montserrat?
Achievement Motivation

1. Who or what motivates you to want to achieve?
2. What does achievement mean to you?
3. How has this sense of achievement influence your educational performance?
4. Do you have a role model?
5. Did you have a role model in Montserrat?
6. What advice would you give to other Montserratian students?
7. What are some challenges you had to face as a relocated student?
8. Is there anything else about your educational experiences that you wish to mention?
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The Parents’ Interview Schedule

Personal Details and Background Information

1. Name
2. Year of arrival in the UK
3. Number of children
4. Number of children travelled with you to the UK
5. Occupation (M/rat)
6. Occupation (UK)
7. Montserrat address (before and during the volcanic crisis)
8. UK address (on arrival and presently)

General Education Details of Children

1. Which school do you child/children attend?
2. How did you learn about this school?
3. How did you find out what is expected of you? What is expected of your child?
4. Did you have any problems in getting your child/children admitted to school?
5. When you took your child to school, what was the first day like for you?
6. Who is your child’s tutor? Tutor group? Head of year?
7. Do you discuss your child’s progress with them?
8. How does your child get to school?
9. Are you acquainted with your child’s school policy?
10. How would you describe your child’s progress?

Involvement in School Affairs

1. Do you attend PTA meetings? Parent evenings?
2. Do you participate in discussions at these meetings?
3. Do you attend other functions organised by the school?
4. How do you compare your participation in school affairs in the UK to your participation of school affairs in Montserrat?
5. Do you talk about school with your child?
6. What are some of the things discussed?
7. When does your child do homework?
8. Do you help with the homework?
9. Do you have a limit on his/her TV time?
10. Was this the trend in Montserrat? (Discussing school business, helping with homework and monitoring TV time?)

**Discipline**

1. Has your child ever had any serious disciplinary charges?
2. Has he/she ever been detained after school as a form of punishment?
3. How do you feel about punishment?
4. Would you say that your child is well-behaved at home?
5. Have you noticed any changes in your child’s behaviour since relocating to the UK?
6. Generally, how do you feel about the discipline at your child’s school?

**Language**

1. How comfortable are you with communicating with your child’s teacher?
2. Has your child ever told you that he/she sometimes find it difficult to understand what is taught?
3. Which is widely spoken at home, Standard English or Montserrat dialect?
4. (Pick up ‘language’ in other areas)

**General Details**

1. What challenges do you face in ensuring that your child/children maintain the standard that you expect of them?
2. Do you think that it is more difficult to monitor your children’s educational progress here in the UK, than before relocation?
3. Generally, what are some challenges you face as a relocated parent?
4. What are some challenges you face trying to help your children to continue their education?
5. Is there anything else about your children’s education that you wish to mention?
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The Teachers’ Interview Schedule

Personal Details
1. Name
2. Male/Female
3. Name of School
4. Position
5. Subject Area(s)
6. Years of teaching experience

General Education Details
1. How many Montserrat students do you teach?
2. For how long had you been teaching Montserrat students?
3. Is their level of achievement average, above or below the expected standard?
4. Generally, how would you describe their attitude to school?
5. Are there marked differences in attitude between the boys and girls?
6. Are there marked differences in expected levels of achievement between the boys and the girls?

Discipline
1. Generally, how would you describe the behaviour of the Montserrat students?
2. Have you noticed any severe behavioural problems among the Montserrat students?
3. Are the students told what standard of behaviour is expected of them?
Language

1. Do you have problems in understanding the Montserrat students when they speak?
2. Do students communicate to you verbally or otherwise that they do not understand you when you speak?
3. When such situations arise, how do you deal with them?
4. Is there an open-communication agreement between you and the Montserrat students?

General Details

1. Is there any notable occurrence regarding the Montserratian students’ experiences at this school that you wish to share?
Appendix IV

‘Location’ Information : Forms Used to Collect Details from Potential Research Participants

I am researching the educational experiences of relocated Montserrat students to the UK. Haringey has been chosen as the area from which to launch this research. I am therefore inviting relocated Montserratian parents and students who reside in the Borough of Haringey to participate in the research project. If you wish to make a contribution to this research, kindly complete the following:

Name of Parent(s): __________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Postcode: __________________________________________________

Telephone: _________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Child/Children</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name of School Child/Children Attend</th>
<th>Year Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V
Observation Schedule Used in Schools

This instrument was designed to help me to record some general occurrences in the typical day of relocated Montserrat students. Duration and frequency of events/occurrences are of minimal importance – the focus is on the events/occurrences themselves rather than on how long they last or how often they occur.

Name of School: ____________________________________________________________

Name of Student: ______________________ Male (M) or Female (F): ______

Date: ________________________________

Number of Relocated Students Registered at the School: ________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer Topic 1</th>
<th>Negotiation within the Social Framework of the Class/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-topics</td>
<td>Comfort levels with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1. Other African Caribbean Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Other superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments – Sub-topic 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments – Sub-topic 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments – Sub-topic 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments – Sub-topic 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Topic 2</td>
<td>Response to Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Favourable / Correct Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unfavourable / Incorrect Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Sub-topic 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Sub-topic 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments - Sub-topic 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other general comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Volcanic Risk Map October 1996 – Zoning System Introduced (A-G)

MAP REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES
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Volcanic Risk Map December 1996 – Rezoning of Southern and South Eastern Areas

MAP REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES
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Volcanic Risk Map June 1997 – W. H. Bramble Airport Designated to Zone C

MAP REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES
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Volcanic Risk Map July 1997 – Zoning System Discarded, Island Divided Into Three Zones

MAP REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES
Appendix X

Volcanic Risk Map September 1997 – Salem Now In Exclusion Zone

*MAP REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES*
Appendix XI

Summary of the London Forum Education Workshops I, II and III – 26 June, 20 July and 24 August 1999

The June, July and August workshops were hosted by the Montserrat London Forum in collaboration with the Haringey Parental Outreach Team. The theme of the workshops was: 'Knowledge, Unity and Endurance'. The following is a summary of the key issues that were discussed by the participants:

- Secondary and primary school students are experiencing problems of various kinds at school. The issue of ‘poor communication’ and lack of knowledge of how the British education system functions seem to be affecting the way parents are dealing with the situation. It is generally felt that the British school system is not ‘refugee friendly’. There is an air of helplessness about handling problems that arise at school and parents feel powerless to even try to tackle the problems.

- Most of the issues tend to go unresolved because parents do not know their rights.

- Drastic and dramatic changes brought about as a result of forced migration are major factors affecting parents’ effective handling of matters.

- Parents and students seem to be still struggling with accepting some cultural differences, which inevitably affects children’s approach to schooling in a ‘foreign’ land.

- Admission and exclusion are two major problems.

- Language (interpretation and comprehension) is another serious problem.

- The number of cases presented by parents underscore the seriousness of the issues that are affecting their children, especially the boys who are said to be experiencing more pressures than the girls, to conform to the particular cultural practices of the British society. From all reports, it seems that the boys’ levels of achievement are generally lower than the achievement levels of the girls.

- It is believed (by some students and parents) that students who have relocated to other territories, are producing and achieving more than students who have relocated to the UK. This impression was influenced by the ‘high achievement’ reports that the migrants received via private and MCST sources.

- While it may be true that the relocated migrants are experiencing similar problems in all the London Boroughs, the Borough of Haringey stands out like a sore thumb. This seemingly biased conclusion is influenced no doubt, by the content of the cases that were presented by the senior parental outreach worker at Workshop I.
Appendix XII

Summary of Recommendations from MCST Workshop –

26 February 2000

The theme of the workshop was: ‘Relocated Montserratian Children: School and Schooling’. Relocated parents, teachers (first-wave migrants), social workers, representatives from church groups and UK-based Montserrat organisations attended the workshop. The workshop was held at the Evangelical Reformed Church, Lauriston Road, Victoria Park, London, E9. The following is a summary of recommendations made by participants at the workshop:

- A summary of education and sensitisation to make newly arrive parents aware of the duties of the schools and school officials.

- Enhancement of parenting skills appropriate for the new social and cultural context to enable parents to be more supportive of children in this environment, as well as to increase an appreciation of alternative approaches to discipline.

- Equipping parents to become more involved in the life of the school as school governors, and to participate in school activities.

- Enabling parents to challenge and question decisions and to be more assertive without whinging and without displaying aggressive behaviour.

- Promoting participation in mentoring and role model schemes such as the Caribbean Volunteer Readers Project.

- Support for, and collaboration with existing new homework clubs, Saturday schools etc.

- Support for the formation and use of a pool of advocates willing to attend hearings, support parents and children, and advise the Trust on appropriate policies and programmes.

- Acquisition of information about schools, play centres, and clubs, for distribution to parents.

- A task group to deal with and handle social issues. Compilation of a register of professional persons willing to work and share their skills with the community.

- Encouragement for parents to seek the assistance of their representative organisations if they are having problems with the schools.
Appendix XIII

Education
by The Mighty Sparrow

Education, education, this is the foundation
Our rising population needs sound education
To be recognised anywhere you go
You must have your certificate to show
To enjoy any kind of happiness
Knowledge is the key to success.

Chorus: Children go to school and learn well
Otherwise later on in life you catch real hell
Without an education in your head
Your whole life would be pure misery you better off dead
There is simply no room in this whole wide world
For an uneducated little boy or girl
Don't allow idle companions to lead you astray
To earn tomorrow you got to learn today.

For employment, yes employment, you must be intelligent
It's essential, very essential to have your credentials
But if you're block-headed like a mule
No one will employ a fool
You'll be the last one to be hired
And the first one to be fired

Chorus: Don't follow idle companions, or you will get burn
To earn, to earn, you got to learn (two last lines)

Illiteracy, illiteracy, is man's greatest enemy
It's your duty, yes your duty, stamp it out completely
Ignorance always impedes progress
Education saves you much distress
So learn, learn, learn, as much as you can
For the nation's future is in your hand

Chorus: Children stay in school and learn well (etc.)

It's a treasure, yes a treasure, beyond any measure
Just secure it, just secure it, don't ever ignore it
To fight life's battles come what may
Education lights up your way
Without it you won't get through
Success or failure now is up to you.
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Little Black Boy
by Gypsy

There was a little black boy, a black boy was he
De boy went to school and he comes out duncey
He never learn how to read, he never learn about Maths
He never learn how to write, he never study bout dat
All he study was his sneakers, his sneakers and clothes
He learn how to dress and he learn how to pose
He can’t get no work, he can’t get no job
He decided to steel and he decided to rob
But little black boy couldn’t last long at all
De police put a bullet through his duncey head skull.

Chorus – 1: Little black boy, go to school and learn
Little black boy, show some concern
Little black boy, education is de key
To get you off de street and off poverty
Whoa yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh

There was a little black boy, a rude boy was he
All de boy ambition was to conduct a Maxi
With a ring in he nose, a gold teeth in he mouth
He feel very proud and they call him a tout
So proud was de boy dat he never learn
He could ‘ave work hard and buy a maxi of his own
So he hustle for a dollar, he hustle for a smoke
He hustle so that he could buy a little coke
Now he hook on de coke and off de maxi
And one more little black boy vagrant in de country.

Chorus – 2: Little black boy, go to school and learn
Little black boy, show some concern
Little black boy, education is de key
To get you off de street and off poverty

Little black boy, think ‘bout you race
Little black boy, when will you find you place
Little black boy, go to school and learn
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When you black you just black, you can't help but be black
But because you are black, you don't stay in the back
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Look in de front, see who’s de doctor
Look in de back, see who’s de lawyer
Look in de bank, see who’s de banker
Look at de business, see who’s de owner
Look at de staff, see who’s de worker
Look at de drug, see who is de Don Juan
Look who eating out dem garbage can
Look in de jail, see ho you see who
A lot of little black boy just like you

Chorus – 3:  Little black boy, go to school and learn
Little black boy, show some concern
Little black boy, education is de key
To get you off de street and off poverty
Little black boy, go to school and learn
Little black boy, you have to show some concern
Little black boy, think 'bout you race
Little black boy, when would you find you place
Whoa yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh

Little black boy, take a look at yourself
Little black boy, take a look at yourself
Little black boy, watch what you do
Little black boy, take a good look at you
Little black boy, look at other people too
Little black boy, is that the way you should be
Little black boy, don't put drugs in you vein
Little black boy, it could drive you insane
Little black boy, addle you brain
Little black boy, don't you be a fool
Little black boy, keep yourself in school

When you black you just black, you can't help but be black
But because you are black, you don't stay in the back
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Be black, be black, but be conscious
Whoa yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh yoh