

Negotiating the diversity of ‘everyday’ multiculturalism: teachers’ enactments in an inner city secondary school

Veena Meetoo*

Thomas Coram Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education, 27-28 Woburn Square,
London, WC1H 0AL, UK

Telephone +44 20 7612 6971

Email veena.meetoo@ucl.ac.uk

Research was conducted at UCL Institute of Education.

*Corresponding author

Veena Meetoo is a Research Officer at the Thomas Coram Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education. Her research interests focus on the intersections of ‘race’, gender, migration and minority ethnic young people, in particular South Asian and Muslim girls, looked after children and separated child migrants.

Abstract

This paper explores the presence of multiculturalism in teachers' professional practice in a British inner city co-educational secondary school, which featured in two predominant ways: first, as a form of 'diversity management' through interventions including a formalised staffing structure to 'respond' to the school's ethnically mixed student body, representation of difference, and same 'race' role models; and second, through its sedimentation into everyday practices, whereby teachers enacted multicultural approaches in varied ways. The multiple meanings teachers attached to multiculturalism and its subsequent translations into 'everyday' professional practice suggests that the term 'everyday multiculturalism' should be used beyond its 'convivial' meaning of living in/with ethnic diversity to also reflect the diverse professional enactments of multiculturalism through everyday practice in institutional settings. Further, an analytical focus on professionals in 'everyday' multiculturalism elucidates how teachers' diverse enactments of multiculturalism perpetuates micro-processes of racialisation in schools.

Key words: teachers, diversity 'management', policy enactment, 'everyday' multiculturalism

The shifting landscape of multiculturalism in British education: from blurred presence to backlash

There have been a number of shifts in ways of viewing and dealing with cultural pluralism in British education (Race 2011; Vincent et al. 2013; Meer and Modood 2014). Multiculturalism has formed part of this shifting landscape, at times embraced and at other times, a site of tension. The 1980s was characterised by both multicultural and anti-racist policies but also a number of contradictory positions and discursive shifts. For instance, the Rampton Report (1981) highlighted teacher racism as a cause of the differential performance of 'West Indian', (now 'African Caribbean') children, whilst The Swann report's (1985) emphasis on Asian pupils achieving similar results to white pupils signalled a shift from overt anti-racist strategies towards an inclusive multiculturalism (Modood and May 2001). Ethnic and cultural diversity were constructed as assets to learning experiences in schools (Harris 2001; Bhavnani et al. 2005). However, the early 1990s under the Conservative government saw the starving of multicultural education resources and the removal of multicultural education from the national curriculum (Meer and Modood 2014). This shifted again in the move towards multiculturalism in education once more following the MacPherson Report (1999)¹, which led to schools being expected to teach cultural diversity in the curriculum in addition to merely 'accommodating' difference (Race 2011).

Since the mid 1990s a widespread political backlash against multiculturalism has blamed minority ethnic groups for 'holding on to their own cultures' in ways that amount to separatism and self-segregation (Ousley 2001; Phillips 2005; Rattansi 2011). Multiculturalism has been blamed for perpetuating a lack of integration, for ethnic minority people living parallel, rather than shared lives (Kundnani 2012; Kymlicka 2012) and for fostering diversity that is out of control (Lentin and Titley 2012). Further, multiculturalism in the twenty-first century has been criticized for destroying liberal ideas of open society such as secularism, individualism, gender equality, sexual freedom and freedom of expression and promoting extremism

¹ The MacPherson report (1999) investigated the failings of the police in the handling of the murder of the black teenager Stephen Lawrence, and concluded that the police force was institutionally racist.

(Kundnani 2012). The lack of commitment that radical Muslims have to the British national identity was posited by David Cameron, then British Prime Minister, as one of the main reasons for the rise of extremism, making them “*more susceptible to radicalisation and even violence against other British people to whom they feel no real allegiance*” (Grierson, 2015), concerns which have been reiterated in the Conservative government’s most review into social cohesion (Casey 2016). ‘Diversity management’ has become the concept used in official state policies and in institutions.

The state backlash against multiculturalism has involved a reassertion of nation building based on common values, identity, unitary citizenship, and a return of the ideology of assimilation (Kymlicka 2010; Casey 2016). This new era, which Vertovec (2010) terms ‘post-multiculturalism’ defines the competing set of interventions to tackle separatism and de-emphasises respect for diversity in favour of shared values, resonating strongly with discourses on integration and assimilation (McGhee 2008)². Since 2002, schools have been tasked with incorporating citizenship studies and teaching British values into the curriculum as a means to promote community cohesion (Crick Report 1998; Maylor 2010).

Within scholarly circles, multiculturalism in education has also come under significant attack. For instance, Alibhai-Brown (2000) cautions that when cultural pluralism is merely a ‘feel-good’ celebration of ethno-cultural differences promoting traditions, music and cuisine (Rattansi 2011), representations of culture:

“...are treated as authentic cultural practices to be preserved by their members and safely consumed as cultural spectacles by others. So they are taught in multicultural school curricula, performed in multicultural festivals, displayed in multicultural museums and so on” (Alibhai-Brown 2000: 98).

Practices of multiculturalism, then, have been blamed for encouraging constructions of groups as static and undifferentiated (Dhaliwal and Patel 2006; Mirza 2009; Youdell 2012).

² The recognition of institutional racism as significant has also diminished in the wake of the 2001 riots (Pilkington 2008).

In schools, representation and celebration of different cultures and customs in the curriculum, counselling, pastoral support, and mentoring in schools have been identified to be based on the cultural deficit model, where minority ethnic groups are represented in tokenistic ways, and based on simplistic versions of ethnic minority cultures with unchanging characteristics (Rattansi 2011). Youdell (2012) argues that a plural multicultural model that schools draw on to inform practice has been shown to perpetuate reductionist categorisations of some ethnic groups. This is particularly the case for South Asians and Muslims, where the over-emphasis on cultural differences suggests that they have been subjected to the culturalisation of 'race' (Goldberg 1993; Modood and May 2001; Hoque 2015). For instance, Patel's (2007) study of three London schools suggests that existing stereotypes were entrenched in teachers' positioning of minority ethnic students. Whilst black identities were commonly referred to through histories of political struggles against racism and for civil and political rights, South Asian identities were constructed in relation to their religious affiliations.

Similarly, Gillborn (1990) found that teachers positioned South Asian pupils as victims of over-strict culture and destructive traditions, but as high achievers and well behaved, in contrast to the African Caribbean boys who were labelled as troublemakers and low achievers. Through a gendered and raced analysis, Archer et al. (2007) found that teachers described black girls' disengagement from education in 'explicitly racialized terms' (p. 557). They were positioned as louder than Asian girls who were in contrast, homogenised as passive. In addition, the 'ideal' student was positioned as neither 'too sexualised' as black girls are, nor desexualised as South Asian girls are, because of heightened oppression at home (Archer 2008). Such research highlights a failure through institutions and professionals to engage with the complexity in identities beyond the culturally reductionist stereotypes that continue to plague multicultural constructions of ethnic Others.

Building on previous work addressing the troubles with British multiculturalism, this paper reports on findings from a three-year case study on how multiculturalism featured in an inner city co-educational secondary school in England. The study set out to explore how South Asian girls were positioned by teachers, and positioned

themselves within the context of an ethnically diverse school (Meetoo 2016). This article focuses on data from the teachers and more specifically, and how multiculturalism was understood and 'enacted' in their daily professional practice (further details can be found in the section 'The study: teachers' enactments of diversity management').

A response to backlash: developing the concept of 'everyday' multiculturalism'

The backlash against multiculturalism has been criticised by a number of scholars who argue that the term is blurred, contested and multifaceted (McGhee 2008; Harries 2014; Harris 2007). Gilroy (2012) contends that multiculturalism is:

"...is repeatedly declared counterproductive and then pronounced dead, often as part of anxiety inducing arguments about security, national identity and the menace of Islamic extremism. How much those noisy announcements refer to an ideological formation and how much they are aimed wishfully, at the fact of cultural plurality itself, has always been unclear" (384).

In light of its ambiguity, Howarth and Andreouli (2013) suggest that distinctions should be made between state or ideological forms of multiculturalism that includes top down policies and political spin, and as Gilroy (2012) suggests, everyday cultural plurality. As such, the move towards multiculturalism as 'everyday' is being increasingly advocated by some scholars as a response in challenging the backlash and reductionist versions of culture that have been produced as a result of state multicultural approaches. Recent studies of multiculturalism have been partly characterised by a growing interest in conceptualising multiculturalism as the 'fact' of diversity itself, along with a focus on the everyday meanings of living together (Gilroy 2004; 2012; Ho 2010; Harris 2013).

Current approaches to 'everyday' multiculturalism refer to understanding the everyday dimensions of multiculturalism as it is lived (Wise 2014), whereby different ethnic groups exist alongside one another. Gilroy (2004) refers to multiculturalism as 'convivial' to denote the ethnic diversity that enriches our cities and our cultural

industries. It is organically born out of the '*ordinary multiculturalism of the postcolonial metropolis*' (p136) and its conviviality is characterised by:

“process[es] of cohabitation and interaction that have made multiculturalism an ordinary feature of social life in Britain’s urban areas and in postcolonial cities elsewhere” (Gilroy 2004: xi)

Everyday multiculturalism therefore sits in contrast to top down state multiculturalism, as it focuses on how ethnic mix is experienced and negotiated in everyday situations such as diverse neighbourhoods, schools and organisations (Wise 2014). ‘Everyday’ multiculturalism is in ordinary social spaces in which people of different backgrounds encounter one another, and consists of the mundane practices they construct and draw on to manage these encounters (Harris 2013). This implies that everyday multiculturalism is dynamic and a lived field of action in which social actors construct and deconstruct ideas of cultural difference, national belonging and place making.

Approaches to ‘everyday’ multiculturalism are relatively new and under developed. ‘Everyday’ multiculturalism has largely been used as a descriptor of cultural pluralism and conviviality, and as an analytical frame to shift the focus from fixed notions of ethnic groups and their culture, towards places and practices that produce and rework ethnic and cultural identifications through mixed encounters, conflict and negotiation (Harris 2013: 7). However, the concept has received little attention in ‘everyday’ institutional contexts such as schools where students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds may rub shoulders and ‘get along’ (or not). There is currently minimal understanding about the interaction between the policy landscape and ‘top down’ discourses of multiculturalism, and how they play out on an everyday level in schools, which sits alongside a more general paucity of research about how professionals put policy into action (Ball et al. 2012). In sum, meanings of multiculturalism in contemporary British society and in relation to everyday practices in organizational contexts such as schools is currently underexplored (Meetoo 2016).

This article attempts to develop an understanding of ‘everyday’ multiculturalism in an institutional schooling context. It explores how the convivial aspects of living with/ in

diversity are coupled with 'everyday' multiculturalism through teachers' understandings and enactments of multicultural policies and approaches. 'Everyday' multiculturalism is therefore both a descriptive term but also a lens to explore how multiculturalism is 'enacted' in everyday interaction and negotiated by teachers. Such teacher enactments offer further potential insights into how schools are sites for the reproduction of 'race', with teachers as key to the perpetuation of marginal positioning of minority ethnic pupils (e.g. Gillborn 1995; Youdell 2012; Basit 1997; Crozier and Davies 2008; Shain 2003; 2010). The development of 'everyday' multiculturalism in educational settings can further understanding of how and why teachers may display essentialising or racist attitudes *within the context* of policy discourse – and how teachers' interpretations of diversity policy discourses like multiculturalism may be conducive towards or perpetuate racialized stereotypes and expectations.

In this article, the work of Ball et al. (2012) on teachers and policy enactment is drawn on. The authors suggest that multiculturalism and other school based diversity policies and discourses are not merely straightforward implementations of policies devised from 'above', but are 'enacted' by teachers. By 'enactment', Ball et al. refer to the ways in which policies are interpreted, translated, reconstructed and remade in complex and sometimes incoherent or contradictory social assemblages within schools. Policies may be formulated from 'above', whereas others may be produced in schools or by local authorities, or just simply become fashionable approaches with no clear end or beginning (Ball et al. 2012: 7). Therefore, putting policies into practice is a creative, sophisticated and complex process, bound by discourse and power, and part of the day to day life of schools through the bodies of, and relationships between, teachers and students (Foucault 1980; Ball et al. 2012).

The study: teachers' enactments of diversity management

This paper reports on findings from a three-year case study of an inner city co-educational secondary school in England. The data is drawn from the teacher participants, and reports on how they understood multiculturalism and implemented multicultural interventions. It explores how the enactment of school based multicultural policies and interventions, and teachers' action, agency, and contestation that accompanies this, can further understanding of micro processes of

racialisation in schools. Fieldwork took place between 2008 to 2011 at 'Hillside', a mixed sex inner city comprehensive school in England with approximately 850 secondary students, and 100 sixth formers. According to the school's Ofsted³ report in 2008 a high proportion of its students were eligible for free school meals. Three quarters of students were from minority ethnic groups, with a third from Black African or Black Caribbean backgrounds. South Asian students were in the minority and classified under 'other ethnic groups' which made up a third of the school's ethnic minority student body.

Nine teachers from the school's Inclusion and Ethnic Minority Achievement departments took part in repeat semi structured interviews, as well as teachers involved in pastoral roles (table 1). All interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Participants' names have been pseudonymised. This paper draws on the data from the teachers to present how they 'enacted' multiculturalism in their everyday teaching and pastoral duties. The data analysed from the girls is reported elsewhere (Meetoo 2016).

The analysis presented in the remainder of this paper is informed by Ball et al's (2012) notion that teachers 'enact' multiculturalism and other school based diversity policies and discourses. It is, thus, underpinned by an understanding of diversity management policies as taken up, negotiated and critiqued by teaching staff, within their situated understandings of multiculturalism. The findings presented indicate how multiculturalism enacted by teachers on an 'everyday' level was bitty and disjointed, reaffirming Ball et al's claim that doing policy is indeed messy, and carries specific implications for students' positioning within schools.

Multiculturalism in education as 'top down' diversity management

While teachers may 'do' or enact policy, the context in which they do so is also one in which policy is 'done to them' (Ball et al. 2012). Policies come together through the different roles of teachers, such as the policy entrepreneurs and interpreters who drive the ways in which policies are understood and taken forward, middle level

³ Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills) is a non-ministerial department of the UK government, reporting to Parliament. The department inspects and regulates services that care for children and young people, and services providing education and skills for learners of all ages.

implementers who render actions into outcomes, the critics and refusers who bring their own perspectives to the table, and the copers who are at the receiving end of policy (Ball et al. 2012).

At the time of data collection, the teachers' positions were reflective of the wider context of national approaches to addressing the inclusion and educational attainment of minority ethnic groups. A number of teachers had professionally ascribed roles to manage pupil diversity, and were located in the Ethnic Minority Achievement (EMA)⁴ and Inclusion departments. They were specifically employed to enact the school's diversity policies as the school's 'diversity managers'. Their roles arose from the responsibilities on schools to attend to diversity according to duties including 'race' and community cohesion at the time of data collection. However, their roles and policies were formulated at 'school level'. The diversity managers were the *policy entrepreneurs and interpreters*, but were also middle level implementers of diversity policies, responsible for monitoring and improving outcomes (Ball et al. 2012). For instance, the Head of Inclusion post, was created in 2008 to ensure that the school had a "*cohesive, inclusion support service that fulfils the needs of all the students in the school*" (Patricia, Interview 1). Lizzie, head of EMA, was responsible for '*every child from a minority ethnic background*' and for '*assess[ing] the progress of all those students through various data mechanisms*' (Lizzie, Interview 1). Her role involved address attainment issues for groups of students by ethnic group, refugee status and English language levels in order to understand patterns of attainment and identify needs.

In line with traditional multicultural approaches, Hillside also had systems in place to attend to the linguistic and pastoral needs of newly arrived migrant pupils. These teachers were *middle level interpreters* but were *also copers* at the receiving end of policy (Ball et al. 2012). For instance, the role of the school's EAL teacher (Barbara) was to work with pupils who had limited English in withdrawal groups. Annie, the Casual Admissions Mentor, was employed to assist them and their parents to

⁴ Whilst EMAG (Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant) was ring-fenced funding, this money to support minority ethnic and EAL (English as an Additional Language) pupils has now been devolved to schools with no obligation on how this money should be spent (see NALDIC www.naldic.org). At Hillside, the EMA and Inclusion departments disintegrated shortly after 2011.

navigate the school system. Her role involved explaining requirements and expectations of the British education system, such as the structure of the school day, forms of discipline, and ‘buddying’ up new children.

Other teachers who participated in the study were diversity policy *copers* (Ball et al. 2012). Although their jobs were not predominantly concerned with diversity, they were given roles by the EMA department and Inclusion staff and expected to attend to the school’s diverse student body. Fazia, Health and Social Care teacher and a ‘second generation’ South Asian woman, was assigned to act as a role model/mentor for South Asian girls. Esther, a Geography and Citizenship teacher, was given the role of International Coordinator to increase multicultural and intercultural school activities. The participating teachers were women, nearly all of whom were white, with the exception of Fazia who self-identified as South Asian Muslim, and Heather who self-identified as African Caribbean. Table 1 draws on the Ball et al.’s typification to detail the roles of the participating teachers and highlights where their work supported the school’s diversity agenda:

Table 1: Diversity roles of staff participating in the study

Staff member	Job Title	Type of diversity enactor	Role in enacting diversity
Lizzie	Head of EMA	Entrepreneur/ implementer	Raising ethnic minority achievement; identifying needs and allocating appropriate support; timetabling support and running withdrawal groups for reading
Patricia	Head of Inclusion	Entrepreneur/ implementer	Overseeing inclusion support services for all students including Special Education Needs (SEN), English as an Additional Language (EAL), the learning support centre, the learning mentoring service and

			alternative provision, via an equal opportunity approach
Fazia	Health and Social Care teacher	Coper	Role model; providing pastoral care and mentoring via discussion groups
Heather	English and Media teacher	Coper	Role model; Responsible for making the texts less 'Anglo-centric'
Josie	Educational Welfare Officer	N/A	
Annie	Casual Admissions Mentor	Implementer/ Coper	Supporting new arrivals to navigate the school, particularly first generation migrants
Barbara	EAL teacher	Implementer/ Coper	Teaching English as a second language; providing in and out of class language support
Isabelle	Head of Sixth Form	N/A	
Esther	Geography and Citizenship teacher	Coper	International coordinator as an add on role; closely aligned to the EMA department

'Everyday' Multiculturalism as ethnic mix and informal segregation

The teachers described the school as multicultural in the 'everyday' sense because of the school's 'ethnic mix'. The 'fact' of diversity itself also led some teachers to the conclusion that racism was no longer a problem, and reflects the assumption that ethnic diversity is a synonym for racial harmony (Ahmed 2012; Harries 2014):

Bullying goes on, but ...there are so many nationalities in the school that you won't be bullied because you are Polish or Albanian or small, or foreign

looking...You can get bullied for just about anything. I would have thought that in areas like London, well inner London, that racism, that battle has been won...There is racism now, but I think it is just fear of the unknown, fear of strangeness. But I don't think racism is an issue in London (Barbara, white EAL teacher).

Barbara suggests that the school's multicultural student body and living in London's multicultural automatically acts as a buffer against racism, and promotes tolerance. The 'warmth' of living convivially with ethnic diversity (Gilroy 2004) appeared to be central to these teachers' interpretations of 'everyday' multiculturalism (Ahmed 2012). This was evident in Esther and Fazia's responses who suggested that the school's cultural mix led to a decrease in racism. Their accounts lend support to Harries' (2014) notion that, in 'everyday' talk, racism appears no longer to be a significant issue.

However, some teachers perceived there to be visible segregation between ethnic groups in the school:

I am sometimes struck by how much they fractionalise and they do divide into groups. You have the middle class Goths, and then working class white kids, and the Jamaican or African Caribbean kids might be in a group, Somali boys and girls in a group, South Asian girls in a group, or Asian Muslim girls might hang together. But the Asian girls tend to not worry so much, so like they seem less, so they might be Asian girls together...but maybe that is multiculturalism and they function together but they still have strong identities (Josie, white Educational Welfare Officer, Interview 1).

I'd say for the majority they stay like with like. I don't know whether that's because they are familiar to begin with, or whether, ultimately, they do just have more in common, as they weed out other friends...it does tend to be black and black and then the Polish hang out (Esther, white Geography and Citizenship teacher).

Previous research by Crozier and Davies (2008) on teachers' perceptions of South Asian families found that South Asian families were positioned as separatist, and segregation as the 'fault' of parents not mixing with other families, lacking involvement in the school, and preventing their daughters from participating in school trips and extra curricula activities. However, for the students and their families, structural racism and 'everyday' experiences of racism played a significant role in how they experienced school. Racist abuse, bullying and the lack of intervention by the school as deterring them from going on school trips were cited as examples of how 'separatism' may have been generated by the schools' response to the South Asia families. The school was instead 'hard to reach' for Pakistani and Bangladeshi parents due to language barriers that hindered parental involvement, their knowledge of the education system, and factors such as long working hours that prevented fathers' involvement in school activities. Their study provided a counter narrative during a period when Asian groups were increasingly seen as 'self-segregating' (Cantle 2001; Phillips 2005) in the wake of the riots in UK Northern towns, and problematizes the dominant political discourse of Muslim families as separatist (Casey 2016).

This study's findings suggest that on an everyday level, the issue of segregation may be more complex. Josie and Esther both considered informal ethnicised segregation to be the norm amongst young people and an 'everyday' reality rather than a problem (Harris 2013). Separation between groups was seen as part and parcel of living convivially alongside one another (Gilroy 2004; Harris 2013), and the 'lack' of mixing due to 'strong (ethnic) identities'. Whilst Harries' (2014) study of how young people talk about race has effectively highlighted that there is little opportunity for young people to talk about and articulate racism, and a general wider acceptance that racism is a given and accepted norm, this study's findings indicate that this extends to professionals working with young people in segregated everyday settings. Similarly, the acceptance by some teachers of the separatism between groups of students can be seen as reflective of an acceptance of racism, and the lack of political consciousness to address divisions in a post-race (Nayak 2006), yet ethnically diverse school context.

Staff tension over 'diversity management'

The school's approach to diversity was a site for contestation and negotiation amongst staff, rather than a straightforward implementation of a set of policies. One area of contestation was about identifying racism. The absence of racism highlighted in the findings above suggests that some teachers' perspectives contained elements of 'post-race' discourses in which the impact of racism is ignored (Harries 2014; Pearce 2014). However, not all teachers were of the view that racism was no longer a problem in the school. Instead the recognition of racism was a site of tension between the managers of the school's Inclusion and EMA departments and the school's senior leadership team. These tensions and contradictions over the existence of racism are interesting and important and reflect the complexity of the discourse and the context of the school.

Lizzie and Patricia suggested that colleagues were resistant to labelling incidents as racist, and gave examples of fights between groups of Afghan and Pakistani boys, and African Caribbean and Somali girls:

People do not want to view something as racist. My boss and I had a huge battle last year over a couple of things where we (Patricia and Lizzie) felt the incident was racist and it was not being labelled as such. They don't want to label it as racism because then you have to do more ... But the school refuses to label incidents as racist because he (the deputy head) doesn't want the school to be seen as a racist place (Lizzie, white Head of EMA, Interview 3).

Lizzie gives two reasons: avoidance of effort and impression management. Patricia voiced similar concerns and attributed the silence over racism to the fear of '*opening up something that you then can't shut down, that actually you just can't cope with, and that it could take you over*' (Interview 1). Identifying racism appeared to be mediated by the Head and Deputy Head's desire to perform 'happy diversity' (Ahmed 2012) for Ofsted reports on the one hand, and the need to recognise forms of disadvantage and exclusion by the Heads of EMA and Inclusion on the other. The multicultural discourse of ethnic groups 'happily getting along' took precedence over an anti-racist approach for reasons both of effort and school presentation. In addition, these findings can be situated in the current legislative context whereby

under the Equality Act, 'race' is subsumed with other aspects of identity, leading to decreasing vigilance on 'racism' also in our schools (Pearce 2014).

The teachers also reported experiencing conflict and marginalisation, due to the tension they perceived there to be between the EMA/Inclusion departments and 'unsupportive' senior management staff over how 'multiculturalism' should be enacted as a 'whole school approach', rather than as piecemeal activities. Lizzie explained the limits to what she and her team could achieve in light of what she saw as the low priority and importance the headteacher placed on the activities of the EMA department:

I don't think the Head actually wants it to be a multicultural school.... There are a lot of tensions around how...we are given space to do development work. It is about me being given time by the school leadership to do that sort of training, and it always gets left till last. I have been asking for two years to do a whole school training on Somalia. It is not on the head's priority list. (Lizzie, white Head of EMA, Interview 1).

The sentiment that the work of EMA was a 'tag on', last on the list of the school's priorities, was similarly perceived by Esther (Geography and Citizenship teacher) who commented, *'there isn't really a huge whole school ethos'*. Esther credited Lizzie with the achievements in *'the bits that Lizzie has been doing, like the quizzes in form time about different places and different cultures'*.

Religious dress was perceived as another area of potential contestation in the school's multicultural approach. As Fazia explained:

I've heard that the Head has said that if she could do away with the scarf she would. She doesn't want the kids to wear a headscarf...And she was advised by the NUT rep that that was a very sort of inappropriate line to take in this kind of school, especially considering the school is supposed to be inclusive to everybody (Fazia, South Asian Muslim Health and Social Care teacher, Interview 2).

EMA and Inclusion staff viewed inclusiveness as a key feature of successful multiculturalism, and issues such as expression of difference through religious dress as important markers of this. Debates over religious dress demonstrate conflicting teacher views over what a multicultural school should look like, but also reflect current hostility towards Muslim groups (Housee 2004; Kundnani 2012; Lentin and Titley 2012). Muslim girls were seen as ‘outsiders within’, a view that is deeply embedded within wider discourses (Housee 2004) that appeared to be played out in the school context and were a site for tension amongst teachers (Mirza and Meetoo 2013).

In addition to there being tension between the EMA and Inclusion departments and senior management over diversity policies, the staff within and aligned to the EMA and Inclusion departments displayed heterogeneous views of diversity and their take up of plural multiculturalism. They had different understandings and perspectives on how difference should be dealt with. These variations complicated the enactment of diversity policies, and further denote the complex ‘everyday’ enactment of multiculturalism amongst diversity professionals.

Steinberg and Kincheloe’s (2001) typology of multiculturalisms provides a useful framework to understand the different ways in which multiculturalism appeared in the narratives of the teachers, and informs the analysis presented. Types of multiculturalism drawn on include:

- conservative multiculturalism: the superiority of Western patriarchal culture;
- critical multiculturalism: an understanding that inequality results from a lack of opportunity, and
- pluralist multiculturalism: whereby the curriculum consists of studies of various groups and promotes pride in group heritage.

The following section addresses how plural multiculturalism was the dominant form at Hillside. However, the data presented also indicates how within the group of teacher participants, conservative and critical multicultural perspectives were evident within the plural approach.

Diverse teacher enactments of ‘everyday’ multiculturalism

Most of the staff interviewed cited numerous examples to demonstrate how they actively sought to make the curriculum more multicultural through the representation of different groups in learning materials, promoting pride in group heritage and the study of various groups (Race 2011). For instance, Lizzie was responsible for ensuring that teaching material was representative of pupils’ backgrounds:

It’s about the fact that if a child is sitting in a class and they are discussing ‘Of Mice and Men’, and you are talking about a farm, if you have a picture of a Somali or Afghan farm on your Powerpoint they will sit up and take notice, and actually link it with their own experience (Lizzie, white Head of EMA, Interview 2).

As Patricia commented, the school’s approach was one that attempted to move beyond the three S’s of multiculturalism (i.e. saris, samosas and steel bands) (Rattansi 2011; Kymlicka 2012), by incorporating students’ ‘home lives’ and the ‘day to day’ aspects of difference:

I think a lot of work has been done in this school about trying to make the curriculum culturally relevant to students... it’s about the home lives, and the practical day to day lives of students being reflected in lessons (Patricia, white Head of Inclusion, Interview 1).

The school’s approach to fostering inclusiveness, challenging negative representations and capturing the stories of different groups trickled into other areas of daily school life where diversity was celebrated in a number of forms. This included celebrating religious festivals and black history month, and displays in the corridors on the school’s multilingual and diverse student body through languages and flags of different nations of the pupils (Noble and Watkins 2014; Dhaliwal and Patel 2006). Other interventions included focused learning about continents through the exploration of dance, food and culture, and the canteen eating ‘experiences’ whereby food from a specific country would be served alongside a display of pictures and voiceovers in the specific language (Lizzie, white Head of EMA).

Teachers drew on the discourse of pluralist multiculturalism but did so in different ways, signalling how they were in effect, 'making it up' as they navigated dealing with difference on a daily basis. Lizzie, categorised as a diversity policy *interpreter*, was the driving force for the organisation of multicultural displays. Rather than advocating a top down approach, she saw the importance of involving the pupils in the content of the displays to produce a more 'authentic' version of culture. This can be seen as a progressive approach that attempted to engage with meanings of culture from pupils themselves rather than imposing a version of what is expected of them. However, Lizzie arguably also imposed a pluralist model of multiculturalism for the pupils to slot into by only giving them an option to contribute on culture and heritage. Although she advocated an approach to inclusivity that started from the pupils' perspectives, pupils were still expected to define their difference from the white majority through culture and ethnic identifications rather than their multifaceted identities of gender, sexuality, social class and so on.

The pluralist multicultural model to which the school subscribed was evident in their assignment of specific roles to teachers who were made responsible for maintaining the promotion of diversity and were the diversity policy *copers*. Esther, a Geography and Citizenship teacher had recently been given the role of International Co-ordinator which involved developing the school's links with other countries and increasing 'international awareness' by teaching pupils about others' diversity. She was also tasked with bringing a more 'authentic' version of multiculturalism back into the school:

... it was in that interview that they said why do you need an International Coordinator in school, why do the kids need an international thing, when they are already multicultural? And they are not that multicultural. They all come, like Polish kids saying "allow it man" and the girls with their headscarves on covering up with hoodies, so they all just become south London kids at the end of the day. So that was my reasoning, partly, for doing the job, to try and get them to embrace where they came from (Esther, white Geography teacher and International Co-ordinator)

Whilst Esther acknowledges that migrant pupils 'become' South London kids through the identities they share, when for instance girls in 'headscarves cover up with hoodies' and Polish pupils use black American influenced language, she also yearns to position minority ethnic pupils in static ethnic categories based on her vision of 'where they come from'. This is evident in her view of shifts in displays of ethnic identity as problematic and as representing slippage towards loss of understanding of one's origins and cultures. Therefore, whilst she observes that there is fluidity in the pupils' identities, she does not accept their complexity and attempts to push them back towards the 'authentic' self. Esther's insistence that the pupils should 'embrace where they come from' can be located in a more 'conservative' multicultural approach (Dahwalhia and Patel 2006, Kymlicka 2010; Race 2011) that gives recognition to difference by positing Western knowledge about 'others' as the way forward. Although she was predominantly a policy *coper* (i.e. a teacher at the receiving end of policy rather than a diversity policy entrepreneur), the way in which she received and 'enacted' her role was informed by her conservative multiculturalist stance (Youdell 2012).

As the school's dominant discourse, plural multiculturalism based on essentialised notions of ethnicity and culture was readily available for teachers to take up. Although some had views that could be located in a critical multicultural perspective, teachers were provided with little room for alternative thinking outside of the dominant management discourse which was predominantly about 'race' and culture.

The case of same 'race' role modelling and 'race' matching

As with representing and celebrating ethnic differences, same 'race' role modelling and race matching interventions are based on essentialised understandings of 'race' and cultural difference. Role modelling is an intervention based on perceived biological sameness and difference (i.e. skin colour) rather than social relations (Martino and Rezai-Rasthi 2012). It is noteworthy that a number of benefits of this intervention have been evidenced, including the better understanding minority ethnic teachers have of local communities and pupils with similar socio cultural backgrounds, and the potentially educative role they serve for white pupils to help potentially counteract negative racial stereotypes. In addition, minority ethnic parents may be more willing to communicate with the school through these teachers and as

a result are more likely to have their views represented (Sewell 1997; Lightfoot 2000; Bush et al. 2006; Mirza and Meeto 2012). Role modelling alludes to the idea that if pupils are better able to identify with the education system because it includes teachers who are 'like them' this will lead to better educational performance and relations between minority ethnic families and schools.

At Hillside, role modelling was enacted in different ways that were rooted in the teachers' perspectives on 'managing diversity'. The teachers were largely in consensus that role models based on 'race' were a positive intervention, although their understandings of the benefits and enactments of the intervention were varied. Some of the white British teachers spoke about feeling anxious when dealing with pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds, and as a result supported the case for role models and 'race matching'. Josie explained:

I have had meetings with families before when it is just me and another white British officer when the kid is like Asian or African Caribbean and I have said I am not happy with this. Sometimes I want someone there that they can relate to better, that they will respond to better. I have heard them say to me, like they often hold prejudices, you know they think, two white women telling us this and you don't understand our culture. I have tried to say well, we do, but they know we are not one of them. It is a very difficult area (Josie, white Educational Welfare Officer, Interview 2)

Josie's anxiety to deal with minority ethnic families led her to place a high value on interventions like 'race' matching when liaising over welfare issues because, in her view, families respond and relate better to someone of the same ethnic background. Her narrative also illuminates how her position on diversity can be aligned to a conservative multicultural approach because first, she perceives herself not as 'one of them', as different to the minority ethnic families, and second, she essentialises their differences by claiming to know their 'culture', as if there is something concrete to 'know'. This reinforces the idea of culture as essentialised and static, echoing Martino and Rezai-Rashti's (2012) argument that role modelling is based on perceived biological difference and sameness (i.e. skin colour), but also perpetuates racialised categories and reinforces the social construction of 'race'. Last, by

positioning the families as the ones who are 'prejudiced' against her and her white colleague, she attributes the need for having same 'race' interventions to the families' deficits, rather than as a lack in her own knowledge base about their needs or 'culture'. Josie's enactment of role modelling is therefore based on intervening in cultural deficit rather than structural disadvantage (Martino and Rezai-Rashti 2012).

Although still based on racialised (religious) differences, Isabelle, Head of Sixth Form, understood 'race' matching and role modelling to have a different effect:

... I think there's too much of white teachers telling non-white children what they should do and feel and think. And I don't really agree with that...I think we should have more...in a way I am really reluctant to say mentoring by successful Muslim men for Muslim boys. I don't want to be too ghettoising with what I do. But I think that can be helpful - their long-term progress in life will be hampered slightly, because they don't understand the way social norms and systems work, all those kind of things, and I think some work with those students to kind of proactively help them just negotiate those things would be really, really, helpful for them (Isabelle, white, Head of Sixth Form)

Isabelle points to a different function of having role models and race matching from Josie to compensate the lack of knowledge that Muslim boys have to navigate social norms. In her account, the knowledge deficit for some minority ethnic groups is not seen as a product of cultural difference and their positioning of white teachers as outsiders, but because of socioeconomic positions that limit their access to certain types of knowledge and capitals needed to succeed in schools (Abbas 2003; Shah et al. 2010).

Isabelle and Josie's views present different positions on dealing with difference. Josie's comments can be aligned to an approach that reinforces the hierarchical discourse on racialised Others that minority ethnic families are different and that these differences are 'cultural'. Her conservative multicultural views underpin her constructions of role modelling as based on biological difference and sameness, rather than structure through unequal social relations. In contrast, Isabelle viewed the function of role models as empowering migrant pupils and their families. She saw

the intervention as a vehicle for families to accrue cultural capital as a buffer against material and social inequalities. Isabelle's views are more aligned to a critical multiculturalism approach that seeks to attend to inequalities rather than problematizing the essentialised cultural practices of certain groups, denoting her position as a critic and potential refiner (Ball et al. 2012) of diversity policies.

The differences demonstrated through these two examples of attempts to put in place race matching and role modelling suggest that further understanding is needed of teachers' heterogeneous positions, how these interventions take place, and to what effects. Teachers do not merely implement policy interventions. Instead, policy and its interventions are best seen as a process subject to different interpretations, and enacted in different ways (Ball et al. 2012).

Conclusion

The presence of multiculturalism at Hillside in the form of plural multicultural interventions (the celebration, welcoming and representation of ethnic, linguistic and cultural differences), and as 'everyday' (the interpreted, contested and negotiated meanings and practices of multiculturalism), brings to light a number of implications for understanding how diversity is 'managed' in our schools, how 'race' is reproduced, and formulating appropriate responses.

Multiculturalism at Hillside was a site for significant tension among staff, and teachers spoke and acted from different positions on diversity, which suggests that putting policy into practice is complex. The diverse positions of teachers give rise to different enactments of multiculturalism. Given that such enactments are not always accompanied with an anti-racist ethos, being representative and inclusive is not enough to disrupt culturally racialized hierarchies of difference and inequality in our schools (Martino and Rezai-Rashti 2013; Youdell 2012). Findings from this study demonstrate that racialized hierarchies can be a product of the policy approach itself (e.g. plural multicultural policies that perpetuate and reify difference), but also by who takes this up and how, bringing the micro processes of racialisation to life in the school.

However, the complexity between teachers' enactments of diversity policies

potentially offers hope that ruptures to racist discourses can be applied in professional practice. To do so, 'safe' spaces are needed for teachers to explore and reflect (Mirza and Meeto 2012). Teacher training needs to go much further in its work on diversity by addressing the tensions of multiculturalism in policy and practice (Race 2011; 2014). Lander (2014) suggests that there should be dedicated lectures and seminars in spaces such as Initial Teacher Education and Continuing Professional Development where stereotypes, the constructions of Others and teacher perceptions that privilege whiteness can be challenged. Such spaces could allow professionals to explore ways to engage with and enact a more 'complex' multicultural approach, where culturally racialized hierarchies can be challenged and worked through (Dahwahlia and Patel 2006; Martino and Rezai-Rashti 2012).

Despite leadership being raised several times in the paper in relation to the management of diversity by EMA staff and conflict between EMA staff and senior management, a limitation of the study is the lack of detailed interrogation of leadership in the school. Given that leadership is fundamental to developing and implementing change, a further recommendation is for future studies on diversity 'management' in schools to focus more explicitly on the role of leaders and their potential part in developing a more complex multicultural approach. However, in a climate where there is less time dedicated to addressing 'race' in Initial Teacher Education than in the 1980s (Lander 2014), finding spaces to address 'race' and racism remains a challenge.

As an 'everyday' discourse, multiculturalism in ethnically and culturally diverse schools like Hillside still clearly matters and is very much alive in day to day negotiations as teachers navigate the increasingly complex terrain of 'diversity management'. In light of increasing anti-Muslim and anti-immigration post Brexit sentiments (Burnett 2017; Hoque 2015), the role that schools have in addressing issues of 'race' and racism is ever more crucial. However, teachers are now tasked with managing and policing 'dangerous' diversity through preventing potential extremism and teaching students 'British' values (Vincent et al. (2016)). They are responsible for educating students, but also 'managing' diversity that is out of control through the surveillance of certain ethnic and religious groups. Within this current hostile climate, there is an urgent need to understand more about how diversity

management is done or 'enacted' to better understand the processes of racialization in our educational spaces.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank all the teachers in the study who gave their time, thoughts and reflections, and to Professors Gill Crozier, Heidi Mirza and Ann Phoenix who kindly provided feedback on first drafts.

References

Abbas, T. 2003. The impact of religio-cultural norms and values on the education of young South Asian women. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 24, no. 4: 411-428.

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin. 2000. *After Multiculturalism*. London: Foreign Policy Centre.

Archer, L. 2008. The impossibility of minority ethnic educational 'success'? an examination of the discourses of teachers and pupils in British secondary schools. *European Educational Research Journal* 7, no. 1.: 89-107.

Archer, L., A. Halsall, and S. Hollingworth. 2007. Inner-city femininities and education: 'race', class, gender, and schooling in young women's lives. *Gender and Education* 19, no. 5: 549-568.

Ball, Stephen., Meg Maguire, and Annette Braun. 2012. *How Schools Do Policy: policy enactments in secondary schools*. Oxon: Routledge.

Basit, T. 1997. 'I want more freedom, but not too much': British Muslim girls and the dynamism of family values. *Gender and Education* 9, no. 4: 425-439.

Bhavnani, Reena, Heidi Safia Mirza, and Veena Meeto. 2005. *Tackling the Roots of Racism: Lessons for Success*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Burnett, J. 2017. Racial violence and the Brexit state. *Race & Class* 58, no. 4: 85-97.

Bush, T., D. Glover, and K. Sood. 2006. Black and minority ethnic leaders in England: a portrait. *School Leadership and Management* 26, no. 3: 289-305.

- Cantle, Ted. 2001. *The Cantle Report - Community Cohesion: a report of the Independent Review Team*. London: Home Office.
- Casey, Louise. 2016. *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.
- Crozier, G, and J. Davies. 2007. Hard to reach parents or hard to reach schools? A discussion of home- school relations, with particular reference to Bangladeshi and Pakistani parents. *British Educational Research Journal* 33, no. 3: 295-313.
- Dhaliwal, S, and P. Patel. 2006. *Multiculturalism in Secondary Schools: Managing conflicting demands*. Report on a Pilot Project. December. London: Working Lives Institute.
- Foucault, Michele. 1980. Truth and power. In *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books. P77-108.
- Gillborn, David. 1995. *Racism and Anti-racism in real schools*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2004. *After Empire: melancholia or convivial culture?* London: Routledge.
- Gilroy, P. 2012. 'My Britain is fuck all': zombie multiculturalism and the race politics of citizenship. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 19, no. 4: 380-397.
- Goldberg, David. 1993. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grierson, Jamie. 2015. The four pillars of David Cameron's counter-extremism strategy. *The Guardian*, July 20th.
- Harries, B. 2014. We need to talk about Race. *Sociology* 48, no. 6: 1107-1122.

Harris, Anita. 2013. *Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism*. New York and London: Routledge.

Harris, C. 2001. Beyond Multiculturalism? Difference, recognition and social justice. *Patterns of Prejudice* 35, no 1: 13-34.

Harris, Roxy. 2007. *New Ethnicities and Language Use*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Ho, C. 2011. Respecting the presence of Others: School Micropublics and Everyday Multiculturalism. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 32, no. 6: 603-619.

Hoque, Aminul. 2015. *British-Islamic Identity: third generation Bangladeshis from East London*. London: Trentham IOE Press.

Housee, Shirin. 2004. Unveiling South Asian Female Identities. In *Institutional Racism in Higher Education*, eds. I. Law, D. Phillips and L. Turney., 59-70. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Howarth, C, and Andreouli, E. 2013. Has multiculturalism failed? The importance of lay knowledge and everyday practice. Research Paper. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Kundhani, A. 2012. Multiculturalism and its discontents: left, right and liberal. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15, no. 2: 155-166.

Kymlicka, W. 2010. The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies. *International Social Science Journal* 61, no. 199: 97-112.

Kymlicka, Will. 2012. *Multiculturalism: success, failure and the future*. Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Lander, Vini. 2014. Initial Teacher Education: the practice of whiteness. In *Advancing Race and Ethnicity in Education*, eds R. Race and V. Lander, 93-110. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lentin, A., and G. Titley. 2012. The crisis of 'multiculturalism in Europe: mediated minarets, intolerable subjects. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15, no. 2: 123-138.

Lightfoot, Liz. 2000. Black culture 'holding back' boys. *The Telegraph*, August 21.

MacPherson, William. 1999. *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*. London: The Stationary Office.

Martino, Wayne, and Goli Rezai-Rashti. 2012. *Gender, Race, and the Politics of Role Modelling: the influence of male teachers*. London: Routledge.

Maylor, U. 2010. Notions of diversity, British identities and citizenship belonging. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 13, no. 2: 233-252.

McGhee, Derek. 2008. *The End of Multiculturalism?: terrorism, integration and human rights*. Berkshire: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.

Meer, N. and T. Modood. 2014. Cosmopolitanism and integrationalism: is British multiculturalism a 'Zombie category? *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 2, no. 6: 658-674.

Meetoo, V. 2016. The identities of South Asian girls in a multicultural school context: constructions, negotiations and constraints. PhD diss., University College London.

Mirza, Heidi Safia, and Veena Meetoo. 2012. *Respecting Difference: good practice in issues of race, faith and culture*. London: Institute of Education.

Mirza, Heidi Safia. 2009. *Race, Gender and Educational Desire: Why Black women succeed and fail*. London: Routledge.

Mirza, Heidi Safia, and Veena Meeto. 2013. Gendered surveillance and the social construction young Muslim women in schools. In *(In) equalities: 'Race', class and gender*, eds. K. Bhopal and U. Maylor. London: Routledge.

Modood, T. and S. May. 2001. Multiculturalism and education in Britain: an internally contested debate. *International Journal of Educational Research* 35: 305-317.

Nayak, A. 2006. After race: ethnography, race and post-race theory. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 20, no. 3: 411-430.

Noble, Greg, and Megan Watkins. 2014. The 'Schooled Identities' of Australian Multiculturalism: professional vision, reflexive civility and education for a culturally complex world. In *Advancing Race and Ethnicity in Education*, eds. R. Race and V. Lander. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ousley, Herman. 2001. *Community Pride not prejudice: making diversity work in Bradford*. Bradford: Bradford Vision.

Patel, P. 2007. Every Child Matters: the challenge of gender, religion and multiculturalism. *Forum* 49, no. 3: 261-275.

Pearce, S. 2014. Dealing with racist incidents: what do beginning teachers learn from schools? *Race Ethnicity and Education* 17, no. 3: 388-406.

Phillips, T. 2005. After 7/7: sleepwalking to segregation. Speech given by Commission for Racial Equality Chair Trevor Phillips at the Manchester Council for Community Relations, 22 September.

Pilkington, A. 2008. From Institutional Racism to Community Cohesion: the changing nature of racial discourse in Britain. *Sociological Research Online* 13, no. 3. www.socresonline.org.uk/13/3/6.html

Race, Richard. 2011. *Multiculturalism and Education*. London: Continuum.

Race, Richard. 2014. The Multicultural Dilemma, the integrationalist consensus and the consequences for advancing race and ethnicity within education. In *Advancing Race and Ethnicity in Education*, eds. Richard Race and Vini Lander, 210-229. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rampton Report. 1981. *West Indian Children in our Schools: Interim Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. London: HMSO.

Rattansi, Ali. 2011. *Multiculturalism: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Open University Press.

Sewell, Tony. 1997. *Black Masculinities and Schooling: how black boys survive modern schooling*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Shah, B., C. Dwyer, and T. Modood. 2010. Explaining Educational Achievement and Career Aspirations among Young British Pakistanis: Mobilizing 'Ethnic Capital'? *Sociology* 44, no. 6: 1109-1127.

Shain, Farzana. 2003. *The Schooling and identity of Asian girls*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Shain, Farzana. 2010. *The New Folk Devils: Muslim boys and education in England*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Steinberg, Shirley. R, and Joe L. Kinchloe. 2001. Setting the context for Critical Multi/Interculturalism. The Power Blocs of Class Elitism, White Supremacy, and Patriarchy'. In *Multi/Intercultural Conversations: A reader*, ed Shirley. R. Steinberg 3-30. New York: Peter Lang.

Swann Report. 1985. *Education for All: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

The Crick Report. 1998. *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Vertovec, S. 2010. Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal* 199, no. 61: 83-95.

Vincent, C., S. Ball., N. Rollock, and D. Gillborn. 2013. Three generations of racism: black middle-class children and schooling. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34, no. 5-6: 929-946.

Vincent, C., S. Neal, and H. Iqbal. 2016. Children's friendships in diverse primary schools: teachers and the processes of policy enactment. *Journal of Education Policy* 31, no. 4: 482-494.

Wise, Amanda. 2014. Everyday multiculturalism. In *Migration: A COMPAS Anthology*, eds. B. Anderson and M. Keith. Oxford: COMPAS.

Youdell, D. 2012. Fabricating Pacific Islander: pedagogies of expropriation, return and resistance and other lessons from a 'Multicultural Day'. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15, no. 2: 141-155.