

Discuss how far sociologists would agree that the curriculum that students follow is ethnocentric and that this explains why some ethnic minority groups perform academically.

Many people believe that living in a multicultural society results in all ethnic groups having an equal chance of succeeding in educational achievements. But children, based on what ethnic group they come from, have been proven to either achieve or under-achieve based on their home and school background, which all links back to their ethnicity.

Home background is the main environment where a child's ethnicity/culture is shown. Material deprivation separates classes of different ethnic groups majorly, by having the

Home background has many reasons to contribute to a child's education. Material deprivation is one of the reasons why home life affects a child's background. This is to do with lack of money resulting in a cold, overcrowded house, meaning that a child doesn't have the space to study. Lack of money also means lack of books, computers etc. Because of the conditions at home, it can lead to illness resulting in lack of attendance. Another 'deprivation' is cultural deprivation. This is when the norms and values of working class children are different from the norms and values of a middle class child. Sociologist Bourdieu believes that middle-class cultural capital (this is the desired skills they know, for example language in which middle-classes pass on to their children) plays a big part in educational terms linking to material wealth. If a child knows the knowledge of values, ways of interacting and communicating which is normally possessed by middle-class children, this is rewarded in the education system. On the other hand, working-class children may not have these skills/qualities and may lead to lack of chances to succeed. Speech patterns also develop at home. Middle-class children are more likely to have their writing and speaking skills start and develop at an early age, meaning that they are more likely to work at a higher standard when going through education. Whereas on the other side of classes, working-class children may not have developed from such an earlier age. The attitude of the child's parents also plays a big part. If the parent's of the child in question doesn't show a degree of interest and/or encouragement in their child's education, this can be a significant reason as to why the child's educational success may decrease. This is linked to school reasons, with parents not having the time to take interest in their child's education. It's more significant for working-class parents as to middle-class ones, seeing as, also stated in the reasons for school, it is shown that working-class parents can't attend parents as much as middle-

class ones as they don't have the time. Linking parents into another point, parents tend to buy girls different toys to which they would buy to boys. The toys girls receive are to encourage their languages skills. Research shows that girls spend their spare time talking to their friends, in which they are communicating. This puts them at an advantage and it is essentially in school in which is needed for good levels on comprehension and writing skills. Whereas boys see schoolwork as 'uncool' and 'unmasaculine' which results in them doing not as well as they could do, and work to their lowest of abilities.

From a sociologist's point of view, it is clear that home background holds the main reasons as to why some children's education can be effected. From all the points that are in both sides, it is clear that social class is the main reasons, and separates the ones that lack in education and the ones that do better. Middle-class children seem to achieve better in education based on their: material advantage, restricted code of speech, and having a positive attitude of their parents. Where as on the other hand, it is clear that working-class children may seem to struggle more as they have: material deprivation, negative parent's attitude and elaborated code of speech.

