Managerial impact on programmes for second language learners in international schools.

Maurice Carder *November 2013-March 2014*

www.mauricecarder.net

'I say that the just is nothing else than the advantage of the stronger . . . Each government makes laws to its own advantage: democracy makes democratic laws, a despotism makes despotic laws, and so with the others, and when they have made these laws they declare this to be just for their subjects, that is, their own advantage . . . This is what I say justice is, the advantage of the established government . . . and the just is the same everywhere, the advantage of the stronger.' Thrasymachus, Plato's Republic, 338e.

Abstract

School leaders in international schools frequently bring with them the pedagogical culture of their national system which is based on different premises from those of international schools. This has particular significance for second language learners and their teachers. Examples will be given of the power of 'managerial professionalism', interconnected with the International Baccalaureate and the Council of International Schools, and how Second Language Learners' teachers' only recourse is 'democratic professionalism', which however cannot on its own ensure that these students are given equitable treatment. The criticisms levelled in this paper are not written lightly: they come from a lifetime of study and practice of 'all things second language', and above all from 28 years of teaching SLLs in a thriving international school, being involved with second language issues in the global network of international schools, and seeing the huge potential of SLLs when given the chance to learn in a well-developed pedagogical model.

Key words

International Schools, L1/mother tongue, L2/second language, second language learners – SLLs, culturally and linguistically diverse students – CLDs, managerial professionalism, democratic professionalism, post-modern professionalism.

Introduction

This paper will address the question of the provision of instruction for second language learners – SLLs – in international schools, particularly in the middle years. It will show that there is a need for strong, informed leadership in ensuring such provision, with institutional back-up, but will give evidence for the paucity of knowledge that many school leaders bring with them from their national systems about second language acquisition and the benefits of bilingualism, especially from England, where the issue has been politicised over many years; many school leaders are simply unaware of the extent to which SLLs are ill-served by current models in national systems. The result is frequently *ad hoc* ESL and mother tongue (MT) provision which casts both SLLs and their teachers in a peripheral role. This results in the only recourse for the teachers in being to seek their own strategies for providing sound second language (SL) programmes described here as 'democratic, or post-modern professionalism'. However, given that international schools have a management structure that is hierarchical, where policies are determined 'from above', and teachers' views are not necessarily given credence; and given also that two principal educational agencies, the IB – International Baccalaureate – and the CIS – Council of International Schools, give SLLs peripheral status ('support'), SL teachers' input can easily be ignored. This is shown to be paradoxical for the children of the international

community, who live in a sociological 'bubble', an 'international space', where the social context that a student's individual personality is shaped by, and that supplies the raw materials for their personality, will be linguistic (Carder, 2013a). For these students there is no national entity to which they have to assimilate, and they would benefit from a structured second language programme with a mother tongue programme parallel to it, so that their social, cognitive and intellectual potential can be fully developed. Examples will be given of the neglect of SLLs in national systems, and then in international schools. The aim is to link two areas: the provision and status of programmes for second language learners, and the effect this has on the teachers responsible for these programmes, who are powerless against school leaders, who, in turn, by making certain decisions can prejudice the academic potential of SLLs. It will be argued that only by equity of programme provision for SLLs can their situation be remedied. This can be achieved by ensuring that ESL and Mother Tongue departments are seen as 'centres of expertise' in international schools and are securely established throughout the global network, with appropriately defined curricular objectives, assessment and accreditation. In an age of establishing equal rights for women; for all races; and for the gay community; it is time to establish equity for languages. Many schools have in their mission statements clauses proclaiming their intention to have no prejudice on the grounds of race, gender, or sexual preference, but do not mention equal access to languages, or the means to successfully achieving such equality. It seems to be 'a bridge too far' even for international schools. This article aims to redeem that lack.

International school students

International schools vary widely in their structures and size but one issue links them: the large number of students who do not know English, the language of instruction. Schools have responded to this issue in various ways over the years, borrowing ideas from the many national educational systems of English-speaking countries, especially the UK, where educational provision is relegated to the constituent parts of the Kingdom, resulting in the provision in England being the most commonly known; from the USA, where policy is mandated at federal level, but provision often varies from state to state; and from Australia, where a similar plan is followed (Carder, 2008). All of these countries have at times made concerted efforts to ensure that there have been dedicated instructional programmes for SLLs, but given that such programmes have been for immigrants, political and economic factors have arisen and programmes have deteriorated or even been emasculated (Crawford, 2000, Crawford and Krashen, 2007, Mehmedbegović, 2011, Mohan *et al*, 2001, Moore, 2002). The majority of international school leaders come from these English-speaking countries and often bring with them their familiarity with the treatment of SLLs in their home country. This is generally not a model that is relevant or suitable for international schools: in the latter, which are largely private and fee-paying, all students can be considered as being on a level socio-economic playing field. Therefore the political machinations which have gone into decades of the evolution of programmes (or the lack of them) for SLLs in national systems do not apply, and instead we need to look at research, and also examples of good practice, to see how good models can be instituted. In national systems ESL students are varied across four dimensions: proficiency in English; race and ethnicity; national heritage and culture; and socio-economic status. All four of these will affect how the students are treated in school. In international schools the principal

factor that needs to be taken into account is language proficiency: the other three dimensions will be naturally subsumed into the accepted mix of international school students. Therefore international schools can serve as models of how an increasingly globalised world will educate multilingual students.

Examples of the negative effect of policy for SLLs from national systems will be given, with a focus on England as many school leaders in international schools hail from there. Following that there will be similar examples from international schools around the world, all reported recently. This will highlight the tensions between school leaders and the staff with specialist knowledge of the needs of SLLs. Every attempt has been made to disguise their origin, but in fact the stories are so commonplace that each incident could probably be attested to by ESL teachers in many international schools. The only recourse that professional ESL teachers have in the face of institutional poor practice is their own professionalism.

There will also be a review of how the IB and the CIS, frequently adopted curriculum and accreditation bodies in international schools, approach the second language issue, and how it can be improved.

Terminology

It is necessary to clarify some aspects of the extensive terminology used in the field of second language acquisition. Developments in the field of linguistics, education, and various national education systems – in their turn influenced by politics and politicians who are invariably unskilled in the area – have resulted in a broad range of terms being generated to refer to the

students who are involved in the large undertaking of absorbing a new language, English, into their cognitive base so that they can proceed through their schooling, and thus their entire lives, with as much success as possible. ESL, EFL, EAL, LEP, SLL, ELL, L2, TESOL, are perhaps the best known; there is also the IB's lengthy 'learners who are learning in a language other than their mother tongue (LLLOTMT)'. Each one of these terms carries its own 'baggage' (Carder, 2009). My preferred term is ESL – English as a Second Language – to refer to the curriculum area as this is the term that is used for the academic study of the field under discussion: Second Language Acquisition (Block, 2003). Critics of this term might find it useful to dwell on the expressions 'second nature' or 'getting your second wind' in order to give a parallel to the idea of learning a language so well that it comes naturally, or brings a benefit. Then there is 'second-ary education', which describes a more advanced level of study. Metaphor as a way of expressing our true needs has been extensively documented by, for example, McGilchrist, 2009. A useful all-embracing term to describe the students involved that has found currency is Culturally and Linguistically Diverse students (CLD) (Scanlan and Lopéz, 2012:584). This includes a cultural reference, is relatively neutral, and does not show affiliation to any national system.

There will be a clear distinction between Second Language and Foreign Language: the former refers to the learning of a language for use in the whole curriculum, in our case largely English; the latter to learning a new language as one subject in the curriculum, often French or Spanish. In the vast subject areas of sociolinguistics and language learning there has been a merging of these two terms for ideological reasons that is not helpful for those engaged with providing instructional models. There is also a conflict between usage in North America and the UK; in the

former, Second and Foreign are used interchangeably, which confuses issues even more. The IB now uses ‘second language’ to refer to any language learnt after the first language, which is unhelpful in an educational and curricular context.

LEP, Limited English Proficiency, a term predominant in the USA, has an obviously negative inference (‘limited’). Unfortunately it is a term which must be used in the USA when applying for government financial assistance.

The other side of the bilingual coin, for it is ‘emerging bilinguals’ we are discussing, is the Mother Tongue of the students. Terminology again presents a challenge, with terms such as heritage language, native language, first language, best language, L1 and many more. In international schools students have a multitude of language repertoires, and depending on their age they may be fluent and literate in their Mother Tongue, or only fluent orally, or perhaps be in a state of having lapsed but willing to improve their literacy skills. Therefore the term Mother Tongue (not mother tongue language, which is a tautology) will be used. Those who wish to see a more nuanced view of the issue can refer to Carder (2013a).

EAL provision in England

‘EAL’, English as an Additional Language, is a term which originated in England (in the UK education is devolved to the various constituent parts of the Kingdom; Wales, for example, has chosen to follow a separate path on school examinations (Left Foot Forward, 2013)). However, in England there is no professional recognition of EAL teachers or of EAL as a subject; there is no obligation for schools to run professional EAL programmes; EAL teachers have to report to

Special Needs departments; in post-graduate training courses for teachers, only half a day out of a whole year's training is devoted to EAL students' needs; and as reported to me by a university professor, of those teachers who commence on an MA university course to teach EAL students, the majority do not complete the course.

Mehmedbegović (2011) investigates the situation concerning SLLs in England. First, those relating to management in England are given here:
There is 'A lack of understanding of EAL specialism among school leaders and increasing financial pressures result in specialist teachers increasingly being replaced by teaching assistants (TAs)' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:2). For practitioners at the senior level and headteachers 'There is no compulsory EAL module in the National Professional Qualification for Headship training' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:6). One interviewee in the study stated 'I have not met any headteachers with specialist knowledge in EAL. I even met an Asian head who was advocating against home languages' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:9). The interviewed Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) representative expressed the following concern: 'OfSTED inspectors are no longer trained to inspect EAL. In OfSTED teams there are no longer specialists in EAL' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:10). Teachers in charge of EAL in schools 'Often lack knowledge and qualifications and have no experience in that area' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:11). 'At the school leadership level there is a lack of understanding of what good EAL practice looks like' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:12). All interviewees agreed that 'EAL can only have a high status at the school level if it permeates from the school leadership' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:14), a key observation of vital importance to international schools. 'All interviewees agreed that EAL needs "To be pushed through standards, ITT, CPD and MAs"', also a factor which could be followed

up by, for example, the CIS. 'An interviewee said that "Training and Development Agency for Schools standards need to address EAL learners more explicitly"' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:15). In sum, the main priorities were given as the following: 'Training should be developed for non-specialists starting from the top, with school leaders and inspectors; This needs to become a compulsory component of the National Professional Qualification for Headship' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:17). This is a need which is increasingly appearing in the work of other researchers (see, for example, Scanlan and Lopez, 2012).

Next, areas relating to teacher qualifications in EAL are addressed in the interviews carried out by Mehmedbegović: 'An interviewee said that "Over 70 percent of new teachers do not consider themselves prepared for working with EAL learners; specialist EAL teachers are increasingly being replaced by TAs; the EAL community of teachers is increasingly becoming an ageing professional community, because younger colleagues view this field as unstable employment with an uncertain future and with limited career opportunities" (NALDIC, 2007)' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:2), which is interesting, as colleagues in international schools have reported a similar scenario. 'The decrease of specialist staff in schools, replacing qualified with unqualified staff, is because the focus of additional language teaching has been about remedying deficiency' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:4). 'Newly Qualified Teachers in England mostly arrive in schools having often had only one lecture on working with EAL learners (IOE, 2008)' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:5); this seems to be a widespread factor in the present educational climate in England. One interviewee 'Has never encountered an EAL specialist teacher in the schools she visits. EAL children in these schools mainly work with a TA in a low ability group' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:9). The absence of EAL curricula and programmes was seen by one

interviewee as ‘Having led the practice into the kind of *ad hocery* that we have had for so long’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:10). ‘Providing in-class support once a week to a new arrival is a prime example of mainstreaming EAL when the number of staff is insufficient to make that model efficient’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:11). It was recognised that ‘EAL teachers were perceived to have *second tier status’ (my emphasis)*; all interviewees agreed that ‘An EAL module needs to be compulsory for all PGCE students’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:14). ‘The main gaps are knowledge of bilingualism and applied linguistics, missing from the standards for QTS (Qualified Teacher Status); currently no national standards and qualifications are required for EAL teachers’. And ‘Currently there is an inappropriate use of relevant grants in schools’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:17).

Areas concerning CLD students in England from the Mehmedbegović study are now given: ‘Secondary bilingual pupils often self-identify as monolingual due to deficit models attached to bilingualism in mainstream schools’, a disturbingly ‘self-harming’ reaction. ‘Many bilingual children often experience their home languages as of little value in the education system’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:1*)*. The focus of additional language teaching has been about ‘Remedying deficiency: descriptions such as “children with problems or difficulties in English”, “children with no language”, “severe EAL”, and “children with bilingual problems” are not uncommon. Often the fact that a school lists 40 languages spoken by 30 per cent of its pupils will not be visible in the classrooms, notebooks or schemes of work’ (Mehmedbegović, 2011:4*)*, a familiar scenario as colleagues who work in international schools have reported similar incidents to me. Frequently ‘EAL learners are mentioned in the same sentence with SEN pupils’ (DFES, 2004). An interviewee said that ‘referring to bilingualism as “a barrier to learning”

undermines a natural process of new language acquisition and can perpetuate attitudes to bilingualism as a problem rather than a resource' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:6*)*. The interviewee was especially worried about 'Advanced bilingual learners not given suitably challenging tasks. The failure of schools to identify gifted and talented EAL learners and include them in suitable programmes could be linked with a deficit model of EAL learners and inappropriate links of EAL with SEN' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:13*)*. An interviewee believed that 'Big messages are missing at the policy level in terms of the value of first languages: "As a child I was told not to use my first language – Punjabi. Now I feel disinherited in many different ways. I would be very disturbed if anybody in education - teachers, leaders, or academics - said that losing your home language is a natural process".' Therefore 'Home languages need to be flagged up within Every Child Matters. The linguistic identity of every child needs to be valued' (Mehmedbegović, 2011:15*)*.

It has been considered necessary to give this extensive review of the situation in England as many, if not most, situations can be seen in some international schools. Many international schools are now using the term 'EAL' to replace ESL. It is clear that in the country of origin of this term practice and qualifications for the discipline are lacking, from EAL teachers to school leaders to policy makers. CLD students are not encouraged to develop their bilingual skills in a positive learning environment and their potential is not realised. Those in international schools employing school leaders and teachers from England need to know this, and parents need to become involved in the recruitment process. 'EAL' has become 'trendy' as 'it sounds better' for students; the reality is that 'EAL' is used as a smokescreen for poor educational provision for SLLs. Being inappropriately classified, and treated as peripheral, are no longer options given

what is known about the benefits of bilingualism and, conversely, about the negative effects of relegating potential bilinguals to uninformed teaching practices. The quotes given from the above study reveal almost an ostracism of any student without a knowledge of English. This is the background from which international school heads and teachers from England come.

ESL in other English-speaking countries

Moore, in Tollefson (2002) provides a detailed historical analysis of how ESL was deliberately targeted in Australia by management over a twenty-year period. A prominent politician described pluralism as 'a dog's breakfast' and a government official described ESL as 'the soft, wet, dimension' (in Tollefson, 2002:123). It was determined that ESL was part of the subject English, 'despite representations from ESL educators that it replaced distinctive ESL concerns for bilingualism and across-the-curriculum content'. ESL then became increasingly deprofessionalised, and ESL courses were frequently taught by teachers with minimal or no ESL qualifications (in Tollefson, 2002:125). Canada has followed a similar path. Parallels with the situation in international schools may be identified (see Mohan *et al*, 2001, for more detail on ESL in Australia).

An analysis of the situation of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the USA is the focus of an article by Harper and de Jong (2009). They demonstrate that recent educational policy in Florida intended to 'infuse' ESL teacher competencies throughout the general curriculum is in fact simply 'progressive pedagogy and inclusive rhetoric' that has led to the diffusion and devaluation of ESL expertise with the result that ELLs continue to be marginalised in mainstream contexts. Once again, decisions by managers and curriculum providers have led to

an undermining of the position of ESL teachers and the marginalisation of ELLs (see Crawford, 2000, for more detail on ESL in the USA).

ESL in international schools

In the ESL Gazette (2005) it was announced that: 'The majority of students in international schools are non-native speakers of English. In the 2004 ECIS annual statistical survey, 297 schools with a total enrolment of 161,863 indicated that over half the student population (56%) spoke 'English as an additional language'. Of these, 198 schools (67%) had 50% or more such students while only 21 schools had fewer than 10 per cent EAL speakers. In 18 schools none of the students spoke English as a first language'. Since that time the numbers of SLLs have undoubtedly risen further.

In many international schools there are typically about 25% native speakers of English; 25% speakers of the host country language; the remaining 50% comprising various percentages of other languages, with some students being single speakers of their language. Forward-looking international schools are beginning to recognise that for SLLs to gain maximum benefit from the curriculum it is important to have:

- An English as a second language *programme* (L2 literacy);
- A *continuing* professional development programme of linguistic and cultural awareness strategies for *all* staff and management;
- A mother tongue programme (L1 literacy) (Carder, 2007).

The first element aims to provide students not fluent in English with the skills necessary to follow the entire curriculum with increasing success. It has been shown that this process can take from five to seven years in a good programme (Crawford and Krashen, 2007; Thomas and Collier, 1997). The second element can be provided in the form of a professionally designed course such as *ESL in the Mainstream* (DECS, 1999) or *TESMC – Teaching ESL students in mainstream classrooms (www.unlockingtheworld.com)*, whereby school staff receive regular training. The third element comes in the form of arranging for every child to receive instruction in their mother tongue: research has given a clear message that maintaining and developing fluency in the mother tongue enhances fluency in English (August and Shanahan, 2008; Rolstad et al, 2005; Thomas and Collier, 2002). An overview of the most appropriate programmes is given in Carder (2007), and strategies for content teachers can be found in Mertin (2013) and Chadwick (2012). Scanlan and López (2012: 615-616) state that 'the goal of crafting effective and inclusive service delivery for CLD students is widely espoused yet infrequently attained. Though work always will remain to strengthen the knowledge base for reaching this goal, school leaders cannot claim that empirical research is ambiguous about the means toward this end. The way is clear: Cultivate language proficiency, provide access to high-quality teaching and learning, and promote the sociocultural integration of all students'. Unfortunately some researchers can paint a confusing picture by stating at conferences and presentations that 'there is no one size fits all programme for ESL students', a scenario that can be misinterpreted and misused by school leaders.

Incidents relating to the treatment of ELLs in various international schools around the world, as reported to me in recent years, will now be related. The aim is to show how the knowledge of

school leaders about the needs and potential of ELLs has not kept pace with latest research and good practice, and is too often based on practice in national systems, which is focused on immigrants and has become a politicized rather than an educational issue (Carder, 2013b; Crawford and Krashen, 2007:10). Since 'racism and linguistic intolerance have often been closely linked' (Wiley and Wright, 2004:145), school leaders need to ponder deeply on their provision of language programmes for SLLs – racism is strongly rebutted and seen as shameful; linguistic intolerance or lack of equality of provision – linguicism – should be seen in the same light. In addition, the detrimental effects of rulings that impede bilingualism and biliteracy have been comprehensively documented (Bilingual Research Journal, 2000; Educational Policy, 2005). The aim is definitely not to disparage the hard work of dedicated school heads but rather to show that they are often unknowing, because of the national backgrounds that they come from, of the harm that can come to SLLs by misguided practices. (Ideally, of course, models of good practice for SLLs should be instituted in all national systems as well). Through such a realization, and subsequent implementation of good models, the remarkable potential of SLLs can be truly developed and schools can only benefit.

ESL staff and programme structure affected by management

The following events may appear as 'routine' to seasoned international school leaders, but this only highlights the complacency concerning pedagogical programmes for SLLs which can arise from an uninformed approach. Training and qualifications in second language issues should be seen as essential for all those involved with international education, and *continuing* professional development should be the aim: a one-off six-week course will not suffice.

Here are some examples of what, unfortunately, has become accepted practice:

A book was published for international school leaders which had a section on ‘the particular problems of those of your students who are being educated in a language other than their mother tongue’. The nature of this wording immediately falls into the trap of defining certain students as a ‘problem’ and subscribes to a deficit model for these students. As long as SLLs are seen as a ‘problem’ and not as potential successes they will be demotivated.

In one large international school a new director from England was greatly surprised to discover that all the members of the ESL department had MAs in Applied Linguistics, TESOL, or other ESL related fields, as he was used to a scenario where ESL teachers were mostly unqualified. In the same school a retiring head of the ESL department reported that she had really enjoyed the pedagogical aspects of her job, but ‘simply could not face having to educate another director about the ESL issue’. Both these examples show the opposed poles of those involved with SLLs, and those who have the ultimate power to shape the provision for them.

An ESL teacher at an ECIS recruiting fair was informed by a school leader that ‘a qualified ESL teacher is not very high on the lists of many directors’ priorities’. Many ESL department heads face a situation where ESL is seen as a safe area for teachers who cannot cope, and also as a suitable position for the unqualified wives of directors and teachers; in one school an ESL department was made to change its name to EAL as it was considered more ‘modern’ although all the ESL teachers were against it.

International school leaders may bring in ‘consultants’ who recommend abolishing ESL departments. This appears on the surface to be educationally progressive and aims for the second language aspect of SLLs’ education to be undertaken by mainstream staff. However, staff frequently do not have the training to do this. Such training is not often done (Crawford and Krashen, 2007:45); and ESL departments are essential to provide the knowledge required for teaching beginning and intermediate ESL students, ***and spreading their expertise throughout the teaching staff and management.*** An experienced ESL teacher’s response to these factors was that ‘It seems that in international schools anyone can become a manager and then make decisions which may have wide-ranging negative effects on second language programmes and staffing, and there is no recourse’. One recourse is for teachers to become more empowered by following the precepts for building their own teacher professionalism as shown by Goodson and Hargreaves (1996) – see Appendix below.

An apparently recurring event is this: An experienced and qualified ESL teacher was placed ‘under’ the school’s English department. In spite of lengthy discussions of how he could develop a better programme for ELLs by heading a separate department, the Head of English, who was English (British), would not allow this and the school director deferred to her. The ESL teacher persevered for a year but then left the school, finding the conditions unworkable. Comment: this is not a unique example. English departments often appear to presume that they have the ‘right’ to take care of all things to do with ‘English’. Unknowing school principals may go along with this. In fact English teachers are rarely, if ever, trained in linguistics or bilingualism, and ESL teachers are the experts who should be deferred to.

The following series of events took place at a large international school which was keen to support curriculum development in the IB. Well-respected academics had done research at a leading British educational university on the language A/language B dichotomy in the IB Diploma programme, and the IB set up a working party to develop a new paradigm for bilingual students. This would introduce language A2. The head of the ESL department at a school was asked to join the working party, and after some years of meetings and development he was asked to pilot the new course and examination at his school. This he did. However, after the first year of the pilot the head of the English department protested to the school head that the English department should be the only department that taught any language 'A', be it language A1 or language A2. After several weeks of discussions the school head went along with the head of the English department and the second year of the pilot language A2 course was taught by an English department teacher. This person had no knowledge of the pilot, had had no contact with the IB pilot scheme, and had no training (or probably interest) in bilingual matters. The head of the ESL department continued to be a part of the IB working party and pilot project, but had no subsequent involvement with the teaching of language A2 in the school. Indeed, he was obliged to sign a declaration that from that time the ESL department would teach only language B.

This series of events highlights several issues surrounding the matter of 'power' in schools, and who controls it. The English department clearly believed it had the power to control a curricular area even though none of the teachers in the department had previously shown any interest in the new development, and none had any training or qualifications in second language acquisition or bilingualism. In fact at that time all the members of the ESL department did have MAs in these areas, and were keen to be involved in the project. It also shows how an ESL department is

perceived in a school: it has low status, certainly lower than the ‘English’ department, and its teachers should not be allowed to teach an IB Diploma language A course, be it A1 or A2, even though they were all eminently qualified to do so, more so in fact than the English department teachers. The school head who agreed to the decision was basing the judgment to transfer the course on the same basis. In following years the language A2 course was only taught by English department teachers, but they came regularly to the ESL department for advice and materials. The whole incident reveals the deep conservatism in international schools about ‘well-tried structures’. Until this is fundamentally changed and bilingualism is seen as a fact of daily life for the majority in international schools, with the accompanying need to have structures to develop it pedagogically throughout the school with an ESL department as a ‘centre of expertise’, bilingual students will be prevented from developing their true potential.

In a large international school with a well-established ESL programme the new, British director downgraded the status of the department to that of ‘language support’, thus undoing years of consistent effort to create a model which would demonstrate to ESL students that their teachers were responsible for a professional programme of instruction which would also provide a sense of equity for the students themselves, thereby ‘empowering them’. Previously with the status of a full secondary department they are now in a ‘support’ programme, as if their needs are not academic but emotional. This follows the model in England where ESL students and teachers have low status and academic provision. The influence from the English system is clear as the word ‘additional’ has been added. The website now reads ‘the programmes for students who have English as a second *or additional* language’, a tautology of course as both ‘second’ and ‘additional’ are terms to describe the same learning process: the learning processes required to

learn a language for the entire curriculum. It is possible that the new status has been given in order to fit in with the IB's use of 'language support' on its website. The director commented that the IB was 'moving forward' in its treatment of SLL issues, showing his ignorance of the matters at stake and also the almost obsessive need of some school principals to be 'positive' and uncritical about any initiative undertaken by a higher body.

In one school a well-established ESL department was attempting to develop more content-focused classes in Humanities subjects. This initiative was strongly supported by the Humanities department, and is strongly supported by research on good practice (Chadwick, 2012; Schecter and Cummins, 2003; Wolff, 2003). However, it was rejected by the school management, who decided that 'the Humanities teachers were trying to have smaller classes'. This reveals both the cynicism of management and their lack of knowledge of 'sheltered instruction' (Echevarria and Graves, 2008).

Many school leaders reject the model of SLLs in the middle school having separate classes as this offends their basic educational principle of not allowing 'tracking' or 'streaming', that is to say providing separate classes for students of different ability. However, students with no knowledge of English learn very little in a class taught in English, especially when the teacher has little or no understanding of second language pedagogy; and models of good instruction for middle school ELLs have been published by various experts in the field (for example, Crawford and Krashen, 2007; Schecter and Cummins, 2003).

Here a dedicated ESL teacher, with a well-developed and conceptualized middle school ESL programme expresses his frustration, after many years of trying: ‘The only thing missing is for the admin to have the gumption to tell new recruits that they must attend mandatory sessions in ESL matters. I gave up that fight as hopeless a while ago – but it still distresses me how some teachers can be unsympathetic to or unknowledgeable about the needs of ESL students.’

The next event shows a lack of awareness for the needs of students who are developing their language-learning skills: a new director reduced the number of staff for ESL without any consultation with the head of the ESL department. His decision was entirely arbitrary, based on a cursory look at group sizes. ESL classes are necessarily smaller than content classes as individual students benefit from more individual focus (Carder, 2007). The director saw ESL as coming under the heading of ‘support services’, the CIS (and British) term, and so was a valid area to cut in order to balance the budget. No ‘mainstream’ subjects received any cuts. As a result of his decision middle school ESL beginners were sent to mainstream content classes where they understood next to nothing, and were frequently in tears.

A similar example is this, from the head of an ESL department in an international school: ‘I hope your book might give us some ammunition to set up a proper ESL department again next year, with its own base and specialist ESL teachers. We have had this in the past, but each director has his own priorities and our present incumbent sees ESL as something which gets cut when you are short of teaching units’.

ESL students affected by uninformed policies concerning pedagogical programmes for SLLs.

Two ESL teachers in an international school reported that there was a large sign at the school entrance stating 'You are now entering an English-only zone'. Speaking any other language was discouraged, thus discriminating against all speakers of other languages, making students feel a sense of shame towards their own language, and detracting from any efforts made by ESL staff to encourage development in students' mother tongues: 'In the vacuum created by the absence of any proactive validation of their linguistic talents and accomplishments, bilingual students' identities become infested with shame (Cummins, 2000:13)'. If there was a sign saying 'White children only may proceed beyond this point' there would be outrage as racism is rightly condemned: 'linguicism', however, is allowed, as can be seen in this example: in one international school a teacher gave two students detention for speaking in their mother tongue, the national language of the country, as it was not allowed.

In an international school ESL teachers who themselves were speakers of English as a second language were intimidated by other staff, suggestions being made that they could not perform their job properly. In fact ESL teachers who have learned English as a second language often have greater insights and empathy for teaching CLD students than mother tongue English teachers.

In one international school the management wanted to charge families for ESL support, thereby stigmatizing them (see Carder, 2007, Appendix 4, for nineteen reasons why such a policy may be counter-productive). In another international school new parents of early childhood children had

to sign a form stating that they would speak English at home (where the family all spoke Spanish, their mother tongue) and if their children had not made sufficient progress in English within a year they would have to take their children out of the school.

In one international school an ESL teacher was doing reading records to pre-assess a group of grade 6 ESL students. A Korean boy was reading one of the *Lord of the Rings* books. He read fluently and with full comprehension and with no accent so he was asked how he could read so well in English. He said Korean wasn't his first language and that neither he nor his parents spoke Korean. He had been put in ESL simply because of his nationality. This may be seen as a simple 'mistake', but reveals that thorough language and literacy screening for *all* new students, vital in an international school, was not being carried out.

An Israeli girl with only conversational English was given a 35-page Humanities hand-out to read and answer questions at the end. When the ESL teacher first found out about it she had already begun to try to read three pages on her own. Over the top of every other word was a translation written by her in Hebrew. When asked how long it had taken her to get that far she replied 'about six hours'. The teacher then went to the Humanities Head and pointed out what the student was having to cope with. However, that person ignored the issue. This girl, a top student in Israel, was trying out the very good learning strategies that she had honed in an Israeli school and was failing and completely confused as to why. This scenario encapsulates the handing out of 'one-size-fits-all documents' which should no longer be acceptable but still takes place in many 'accredited' international schools, and is similar to another incident, where in one

school a grade 6 teacher gave an ESL student a document about God being 'incorporeal'. When another teacher was shown the hand-out he said 'Even I can't understand it'.

In a well-established international school the entire ESL department of ten teachers were told by their new director, a monolingual north American, that in future they would be seen as 'language support', and not as an academic department. They were relegated to a lower status, with a 'coordinator' instead of a Head of department, with correspondingly lower pay. Their teaching rooms were also downgraded. When they attempted to have a discussion with the director he told them 'my decision is made, there will be no discussion'. The position and status of the ESL teachers will reflect on the status of the students, allowing a perception throughout the school that 'ESL students are not so important', this in turn affecting their learning potential.

In an international school an ESL teacher , along with her entire class of ESL students, was physically pushed by the director into the mainstream classroom, and told 'this is what you will do: you will not teach separately; you will support the mainstream teacher'.

Finally, it has become clear to me personally that many ESL teachers in international schools leave ESL and move to other disciplines, as they feel unvalued in ESL.

SLLs and the MYP – Middle Years Programme

The middle years of schooling are crucial for SLLs, but the IB-MYP does not provide any dedicated curriculum or assessment for SLLs, instead requiring them to submit to language B

rules, aimed at Foreign Language learners, who have a progressive curriculum of five years with no sense of urgency to master the academic language *for the entire curriculum.*

The separate definition of Foreign and Second Language has become not only blurred, but merged by the IB as it declares that any language learned in the MYP subsequent to a first language (mother tongue) will be defined as a 'second language'. This provides the justification for not providing separate curriculum or assessment for ESL students in the MYP.

At a conference for ESL teachers an IB spokesperson said that the IB could not differentiate between foreign and second language as 'the IB was a global organization and such differentiation was not appropriate'. However, the IB finds it appropriate to distinguish between language A and language B, so the argument is flawed. The IB seems to be confused about the difference between the repertoires of students and the types of pedagogy they are best served by. Of course, seen as a whole, a cohort of students in any international school will have a range of language competencies from almost no knowledge of English to a highly literate level. But this does not detract from the need to provide appropriate programmes of instruction for the various types of learners. The most important factor in any school is the structure of the programme they teach in. This needs to be clearly identified. The IB has failed in the MYP to provide any programme structure at all for second language learners, who need it more urgently than any other students.

SLLs are best assessed by multiple measures, including classroom grades, projects, and portfolios of student work. It should by now be common knowledge that 'Teachers must provide

CLD students with content-specific academic language instruction to support their performance on content area assessments' (Kieffer et al, 2009, in Scanlan and López, 2012:597). However, the MYP proffers the model noted by Cummins (2000:145): 'The typical picture is that assessment regimens are initially mandated by the central authority with vague directions regarding the criteria for exemption of certain students or for accommodations of various kinds for students who might be unable to participate in the assessment without support, for example some ELL students'.

In the MYP all students have to reflect on all tasks and in all subject areas, and even for maths assignments grades are given for their depth of reflection. Thus SLLs with good maths skills but as yet undeveloped English language skills get dragged down by the 'reflection' grade. SLLs have difficulties even understanding the language of the criteria descriptions.

Teachers commented:

'The problem with MYP for ESL students really is the fact that they need to write reflections in every single subject, even PE, IT, and cooking. With all the different criteria the amount of assessments has increased a lot, and SLLs are adversely affected. They also have to write a reflection for everything'. Also: 'My 10th grade Japanese ESL students are seriously good at math but get lower grades because they can't write a reflection. I tried to modify the criteria for the math reflection, then sat down with the head of math to talk it through. It soon became clear that I had not understood what was required; my simplification had lost the original meaning, (which it took quite a while for the head of math to get me to understand). I went off to re-write

the simplified criteria and now cannot remember what the thing really means. I did A level math, I am a native speaker - and *I* don't get it'.

'The language of MYP "ideas" is a major source of difficulty for SLLs. One quick look at the language makes it clear that for a SLL the IT Design Cycle presents a linguistic challenge. The cycle revolves around the four key ideas: "Investigate – plan – create – evaluate". The command words alone are a challenge: "identify, develop, formulate, design, create and evaluate" are all words which need careful, simplified explanations, together with the corresponding mother tongue translations'.

'A good example of how only supplying a dictionary definition can confuse SLLs is this: the definition of access is "being able to get into something". The MYP visual supplied for the SLLs was a key to open a door, but the topic being studied was "Access to Water", so that not only the definition but also the visual was misleading'.

'A great number of subject teachers, for instance maths teachers, don't realize that students are being bombarded with lots of new words every day, not just in their subject. The solution is for ESL Beginners not to get grades in their mainstream subjects. They should not be punished by getting lower grades for not knowing vocabulary or for not being able to deal with the reflections'.

An MYP ESL teacher commented that 'I saw all the IT jargon in my students' booklets and even I had problems understanding what the design brief and the specifications were. How do you

explain this to a beginner?' She also saw that 'In PE students have to write hockey tests, so if a student doesn't have good language skills, especially beginners, they get low grades in PE, a subject where ESL beginners could easily get good grades and feel proud of themselves'. Her conclusion was that 'I think that *more schools should give the MYP critical feedback*. Our school is trying to deal with the problems but not with the source of them. We're expected to incorporate into our teaching whatever the MYP expects from us *but this is not in the best interests of the ESL students'*.

Within the MYP students should also have an equal right to certification. At present if SLLs leave the SL programme before Year 5 for the mainstream they will not gain certification in the language, English, and may score at a lower level in the medium of instruction, language A (usually English). In addition, to qualify for full certification at the end of Year 5, students must have completed study in a language A. For ESL students this means their Mother Tongue. Most International Schools do not, regrettably, offer such courses. This means that ESL students would not qualify for full certification – after working diligently at their English language skills. This peripheralises and stigmatizes ESL students.

It is justifiable to coin the phrase 'second language washing' to describe the way that SLLs have been 'accommodated' by the language B curriculum in the MYP, comparable to the 'green-washing' activities of corporations who make apparently environmentally friendly acts but in fact have a greater, underlying purpose of profit increase.

A teacher in a developing part of the world wrote that 'he hoped to see some aspects for the benefit of ESL students, but the IB seem to have made it more complicated as students now have to complete a Personal Project and E-portfolios in order to get an MYP Certificate. Also, in this part of the world it is very difficult to find teachers to teach mother tongues following MYP requirements. Our students continue education (Language, Maths, History and Science) in their first language online and both parents and students clearly understand the benefits. However, it doesn't work with the MYP. So what happens is that EAL students keep learning their mother tongue but the MYP can't assess it because it's not taught by MYP regulations. I am sure that the IB team, who creates all these PYP, MYP and DP programmes doesn't have active members who clearly know the issues of ESL students and can advocate them'. This last point sums up a widespread criticism of the MYP: that the reality of schools, students and teachers simply does not enter into the equation of those who design IB programmes and assessment.

The lack of a second language programme in the MYP was pointed out in the early 2000s and a working party was set up to address the needs of SLLs, with the understanding that there were clear differences between those learning a Foreign Language as just one subject and those learning a Second Language for access to the entire curriculum. A guide was compiled (IBO, 2004) titled '*Second Language Acquisition and Mother Tongue Development Guide'* (SLA & MTD). However, the guide is little known, does not appear prominently on IB websites alongside the language A and language B guides, and has not been revised since 2004. (It can be seen under 'materials to purchase'). Furthermore, at workshops for language B, to which teachers of ESL students are now directed, workshop leaders are consistently reported to have little knowledge of the needs of SLLs and ESL teachers leave wondering where they should turn

for appropriate IB training. In fact those developing the *SLA and MTD Guide* produced a whole package of materials and power-points for training but these have now disappeared from the IB's records, though this author still has copies.

SLLs and the CIS

The CIS has apparently taken its terminology and recommended practice for second language students from England, using terms such as 'learning support'. Until about 2005 the ESL and Mother Tongue committee of the ECIS had regular input to the ESL section of the CIS Accreditation Guide. This policy was reversed, with no consultation, in spite of protestations form the ECIS ESL & MT Committee. Thus a comprehensive listing of best possible practice for ESL students was no longer written by ESL educators, and the section for ESL was described as 'learning support', appeared under 'student support services' and was relegated to the back section of the Accreditation document: twenty years of consistent professional input on ESL matters was swept away by managerial edict, reflecting the situation in Australia already described.

The CIS has rewritten the relevant wording in the 8th edition of the guide to: 'Effective language support programmes shall assist learners to access the school's formal curriculum and other activities', which is now in Section E: Access to teaching and learning. This shows the continued use of the term 'support' which puts such programmes in the peripheral box. Another factor in using the term 'support' is that the term endangers the very existence of the ESL programme as management sees 'support programmes' as first in the line of fire to cut spending on.

An accrediting teacher commented that 'the accreditation process is simply too bland. Schools can have minimum ESL programmes, taught peripherally, and such schools can be re-accredited,

accreditation team members saying “they can only make suggestions”. CIS accreditation has no teeth, and schools can do what they like’. In fact probably only a small percentage of international schools are accredited in any case, leaving owners to free to ignore professional ESL provision.

Managerialism

Managerial professionalism has had a significant impact on the work of teachers following such factors as restructuring and the emphasis on economic efficiency. In a review of ‘Education management in managerialist times’ (Thrupp and Willmott, 2003), Cambridge (2006) writes about the increasing dominance of various practices relating to control that have ‘precluded debates about the purposes of education beyond preparation for the economy’ (Tomlinson, 2001:2). The practices include ‘a language and practice of managerialism, of accountability, inspection, testing and targets’ (Tomlinson, 2001: 2). These are coupled with a focus on outputs and performance rather than inputs, and crucially views organisations as low-trust relationships. He concludes ‘International schools and other institutions offering education in an international context have not been insulated from such developments’ (Cambridge, 2006). These insights neatly tie together the impact of managerialism on education, on international schools and on valid programmes for SLLs.

In the book under review, Thrupp and Willmott (2003:182) write that current school change literature ‘is fundamentally about extending and legitimating the neo-liberal managerialisation of education, and not about change (for example, curricular) that promotes real learning and engenders creativity in pupils and students’. They trace the sources of this trend to the marketising reforms of the Thatcher and Reagan era, and see texts on education management

arising from this mindset as legitimising the marketization of education. Unfortunately, even researchers are not free from blame, as Block (2003:11) reports that researchers and academics have 'a sneaking tendency to disengage from practical teaching matters'. If such people have not engaged with the realities of teaching in schools on a daily basis, then great swathes of information are missing from their research results.

Clarke (1995) defines two terms which are the basis of the new managerialism: universalism and isomorphism. The former is defined as 'all organisations being basically the same and needing to pursue efficiency, irrespective of their specific functions'; the latter is defined as 'the assumption that commercial organisations are the most naturally occurring form of coordination, compared with which public sector organisations are deviant' (Whitty et al, 1998:52). Furthermore, Rees (1995) states that managerial discourses make two claims: 'that efficient management can solve any problem; and that practices which are appropriate for the conduct of private sector enterprises can also be applied to the public sector'.

Taking this argument to what might be seen as an extreme, Pollitt (1990) describes how the values of managerialism have been promoted as being universal; therefore management is inherently good; managers are heroes; managers should be given the autonomy to manage and others should accept their authority. Moving on from this position, Clarke and Newman (1997:92-93) believe that 'the new discourses of managerialism offer new subject positions and patterns of identification – those of management as opposed to professionalism'. This suggests, alarmingly, that managers are outside and above the professional sphere.

As Cohen writes (The Observer, 2013) ‘The nearest you are likely to come to experiencing life in a dictatorship is at work. Unless you are fortunate, you will discover that the management is the source of all ideas and all power. Above all, whether you are in the public or the private sector, you will learn that if you challenge authority you will lose the chance of promotion and if you challenge it in public, you will lose your job. To prosper in the workplace, as in the dictatorship, you must tell leaders what they want to hear.’

Teachers and democratic professionalism.

It seems that the managerial discourse has won out over the democratic aspirations of teachers when it comes to appropriate curriculum, assessment and instruction for SLLs in international schools. The power wielded by school leaders, frequently unknowing and biased by their national education backgrounds when it comes to ensuring professional programmes for SLLs, is backed up institutionally by the curriculum bodies and accreditation agencies that set standards. Against such apparent authority there is a limit to what teachers can do (though see the appendix below). To paraphrase Wolin (1992:2) ‘Teachers of today have been subsumed by the managerial revolution: they have become jobholders, salaried employees, hirelings with tenure . . .The real problem lies in the fact that for genuine second language pedagogy it has become a labour of Sisyphus to emancipate itself from the limitation of teaching as a job’. ESL teachers are stuck in an endless groundhog day of fighting for the language rights of their students, but there are fewer qualified ESL teachers, directors are not looking for such teachers in any case, and the students have been ‘second language washed’ into an amorphous programme of language-learning that does not meet their needs. It is worth noting that research shows that

> Teachers who are given more support are shielded from teaching-related stress; they experience less burnout and are more likely to remain in the teaching field. The support the teachers receive also influences their performance; those with greater support are more motivated, display superior teaching efficacy and are more willing to adopt new teaching methods. Teachers who believed they were giving feedback to [ethnic minority students] supplied more positive feedback than teachers who believed they were giving feedback to a white student (Harber et al, 2012: 1156).

Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to show that second language learning in international schools could ideally be in a 'politically free' environment, wholly separate from that encountered in national systems. SLLs can be offered professionally modelled second language and mother tongue programmes, taught by trained and qualified professionals. Given such a model SLLs can show remarkable skills and progress. For this to happen, however, curriculum providers, accreditation agencies, and school leaders would need to leave their national prejudices behind at the international school gate and focus pro-actively on the needs of the actual students they are responsible for: *international* school students. ESL has to be given the status of a mainstream subject: only thus will ESL teachers be treated equitably, and ESL students receive the professional pedagogy they require. School leaders should be familiar with the core knowledge base regarding: trajectories of school language acquisition among new students, including the time taken to learn a second language – 4-7 years – and the need to employ well-qualified SL teachers; the positive role of students' L1 in facilitating L2 development; instructional strategies (*e.g.*, scaffolding) required to teach academic content effectively to students who are in the

process of developing academic English proficiency, and therefore the need for content teachers to be trained in these techniques.

Second language and mother tongue programmes are developed according to a specialised body of knowledge – about bilingualism, second language acquisition, and teacher training. Decisions affecting such programmes need to be carefully considered in the light of 'the new paradigm' in international schools where ESL students are frequently in a majority. Soto has suggested that 'The search for an emancipatory theory leading to egalitarian treatment of bilingual/biliterate subjects includes the notion of not only the postmodern, but also a post-monolingual society' (Soto, 2003:608), a concept wholly relevant for the international school context.

International schools are independent and scattered throughout the world, so only through the requirement of robust accreditation, with consistent follow-up, and programmes of instruction specifically geared to SLLs, will relevant and appropriate standards of suitable pedagogical programmes for SLLs be achieved. The key lesson for educators working in this area is the need to mobilise support from the parent group directly affected by policies and programmes imposed by the CIS, the IB, and individual schools. Through relevant committees, the use of the internet, and writing articles, ESL and mother tongue teachers' professional expertise can be harnessed for the purpose of instituting appropriate programmes for L2 learners in international schools. However, such an ambitious undertaking would require a high level of commitment and tenacity, and would not come to fruition in schools without approval and support from directors and heads, and, ultimately, boards of governors.

Benson concludes his article on the turnover rate of directors in international schools saying: 'The current arrangements that exist in international schools are not robust enough to set consistently applied recognizable standards for the fragmented international school sector' (Benson, 2011:101). Given such fragility there is all the more urgency for umbrella bodies of accreditation and curricula to re-assess the language needs and repertoires of the student body and establish meaningful pedagogical programmes and certification specifically for SLLs. Those appointed to leadership positions need to be educated in second language issues, and be aware of the vast differences between the models applied in most national systems, especially England, and those that view bilingualism positively in international schools. The 'problem' of what types of programme to provide for L2 students has been solved (Crawford and Krashen, 2007; Echevarria and Graves, 2008; Scanlan, and López, 2012), but correct decisions have not been made: school leaders and curriculum providers are simply not trained and aware enough, or do not have enough political will to deliver appropriate models. For the sake of the many L2 students in international schools who have little or no say in how their language repertoires are nurtured this needs to be robustly addressed. The world views of many school heads run so deep that they can rarely be transformed by rational argumentation, and many school leaders still oversee a regime which limits the potential of SLLs.

Shaw (in Schecter & Cummins, 2003, pp 97-112), himself a school principal, writes that 'Principals are often tempted to view themselves as experts, people who have all the answers. Principals who succumb to this temptation tend to play the role of program implementers, where curriculum lies within policy documents and can be addressed through programs that exist in texts '(op.cit. p 105). 'Rather than being the program implementer, the successful principal

practices pedagogical leadership by investing in the capability development of colleagues and by bringing focus and adherence to the work of the school (op.cit. p 106)'. 'He also emphasizes the need for turning top-down mandates into bottom-up commitment in order to benefit all students (op.cit. p 99)'.

The benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy - improved metalinguistic awareness, and considerable cognitive advantages – have been attested (Adesope et al, 2010; Bialystok, 2010), as has the building of a 'cognitive reserve' (Craik et al, 2010). It is disturbingly paradoxical that the international community which international schools serve is being harmed by educational models and personnel that come from national systems built on political agendas and political machinations which are unsuited for international students. The international community is influential in the world in many ways; if it cannot succeed in arranging appropriate, equitable educational provision for its own children one might be forgiven for asking what other world-shaping issues it is failing in. Equity on the basis of gender, race and sexual preference was only achieved after massive movements by those adversely affected by prejudice. For second language learners there is no possibility of fighting for their rights as they do not have the language to articulate them; their parents are usually in the same position, unknowing and not articulate in English. The entire responsibility of establishing equal language rights therefore falls on educators: **we** must ensure that there are comprehensive, successful, non-peripheral ESL programmes for SLLs. Not to do this is the educational equivalent of breaking a doctor's Hippocratic oath.

Appendix

Teachers' professional lives.

Goodson and Hargreaves (1996) point out (p 4) that

> The aspiration for teachers to have professional lives is not a given phenomenon but a contested one. It marks a struggle to redefine the work of teaching by governments, administrators, business and teachers themselves. Achieving the actuality of professional lives in teaching is not easy. Nor is it totally clear what this aspiration for professional lives might mean, or entail, even if it could be realised.

They then give descriptions of various types of professionalism:

- **Classical professionalism** defines the practices of law and medicine as the traditional professions which fulfilled basic criteria for having specialised knowledge, professional ethics, and internal regulation.
- **Flexible professionalism** describes our present world, characterised by manufactured uncertainty where postmodern chaos, complexity and uncertainty are not merely contingent or unintended, but also to some extent the result of wilful acts by governmental, corporate and financial powers which seek to maximise their own interests by keeping everything flexible, interest groups fragmented and everyone off-balance.
- **Practical professionalism** is an attempt to give dignity and status to teachers' lives and work. It shows how teachers' personal practical knowledge allows us to talk about teachers as knowledgeable and knowing people. It gives them status as practitioners but not the power to influence the system of values that education is based on.

- In **Extended professionalism** teachers look beyond the classroom to visualise the wider social context of education. All pedagogical practices – work in the classroom; methodology – are seen as rational rather than intuitive. This may lead to **distended professionalism** where teachers overstretch themselves as they attempt to manage other workers, write new curricula, plan staff-development and thus short-change their students.
- **Complex professionalism** describes the situation in a world of accelerating changes in global economics, where teachers have more administration and are often overloaded. Schoolwork is highly complex and becoming more so and teachers are expected to be knowledgeable, experienced, thoughtful, committed and energetic. Goodson and Hargreaves (1996, p 19) suggest this may lead to long-term damage to their health, lives and staying power.

They go on (pp 20-21) to recommend that in the current atmosphere of increasing demands for technical competency and subject knowledge, professionalism should be defined under a new heading, **postmodern professionalism**, with seven areas:

1. Increased opportunity and responsibility to exercise discretionary judgement over the issues of teaching, curriculum and care that affect one's students.

2. Opportunities and expectations to engage with the moral and social purposes and value of what teachers teach, along with major curriculum and assessment matters in which these purposes are embedded.

3. Commitment to working with colleagues in collaborative cultures of help and support as a way of using shared expertise to solve the ongoing problems of professional practice, rather than engaging in joint work as a motivational device to implement the external mandates of others.

4. Occupational heteronomy rather than self-protective autonomy, where teachers work authoritatively yet openly and collaboratively with other partners in the wider community (especially parents and students themselves), who have a significant stake in the students' learning.

5. A commitment to active care and not just anodyne service for students. Professionalism must in this sense acknowledge and embrace the emotional as well as the cognitive dimensions of teaching, and also recognise the skills and dispositions that are essential to committed and effective caring.

6. A self-directed search and struggle for continuous learning related to one's own expertise and standards of practice, rather than compliance with the enervating obligations of endless change demanded by others (often under the guise of continuous learning or improvement).

7. The creation and recognition of high task complexity, with levels of status and reward appropriate to such complexity.

The consequences for teachers of decisions taken by school leaders or educational agencies without consultation may be severe, as recounted by Stringer (1999:33):

> People sometimes tell lies deliberately to misinform others. The issue of "truth" is much broader than this, however. Truth is brought to question when information is distorted or misrepresented in attempts to persuade or deceive. Inflated estimates of costs and unwarranted promises of the benefits of particular projects are but two ways in which practitioners can distort truth and damage communicative action. . . . Manipulation through the use of distorted information or failure to make covert agendas explicit is so common that it is often accepted as an unfortunate but necessary part of social, organisational, and political life. Damage to communicative action through untruthfulness, however, often leads to more general problems. When people have been tricked or duped, they are frequently unable to continue to work harmoniously with those they feel have cheated them, and the chances of productive and effective work taking place are diminished accordingly.

Also (Stringer, 1999:39-40):

> A feature of modern life is the concentration of power in the hands of small groups of people. . . . Managers are given decision-making power over large groups to enable them to control and organise activities. . . . Management is greatly affected by the needs to play off the agendas of the various client groups and to deal with political machinations that often arise. . . . All too often, superficial solutions provide the semblance of immediate action but in effect can actually exacerbate the situation.

Barnett (2001) discusses the complexities of managing universities in a “super-complex age”. He notes the advantage of forming a distinction between *leadership* and *management*(p 31):

> It would take the general form of the following: the *task* of leadership is that of bringing into view new frameworks; the *challenge* of management is that of producing an environment in which such frameworks can be given a fair hearing; and the *achievement* of leadership/management lies in developing institutional processes such that new frameworks are spontaneously sought. In other words, the concepts of leadership and management *both* do worthwhile work (Middlehurst, 1993) but, in an age of super-complexity, they overlap each other. Effective leadership requires effective management (we might speak of *leadership-in-action*) and effective management requires effective leadership (having the intellectual generosity to envisage new frameworks of understanding).

This framework provides definitions of management that involve more responsibility towards the teacher as professional. The message from the world’s political leaders is constantly ‘We live in the 21st century – wake up’. International school providers need to wake up to the need for a re-professionalization of ESL programmes and skilled and qualified ESL teachers in international schools, where ESL teachers are seen as the key to success for the second language learners who are now a majority in international schools. In middle schools ESL departments will be seen as ‘centres of expertise’, serving to spread awareness of second language issues throughout the school for content teachers and management.

References

Adesope, OO, Lavin T, Thompson T and Ungerleider C (2010) A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research, 80* (2), 207-245.

August D and Shanahan T (eds) (2008) *Developing reading and writing in second language learners: Lessons from the report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth.* New York: Routledge.

Barnett, R. (2001) Managing Universities in a Supercomplex Age. Chapter 2 in M. Cutright (ed.) *Chaos Theory and Higher Education: Leadership, Planning and Policy.* New York: Peter Lang Publications. Pp 13-32.

Benson J (2011) An investigation of chief administrator turnover in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education* Vol.10 (1) Pages 87-103. SAGE Publications Ltd, 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London EC1Y 1SP.

Bialystok E (2010) Global-local and trail-making tasks by monolingual and bilingual children: Beyond Inhibition. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(1), 93-105.

Bilingual Research Journal, Vol.24, Nos. 1 and 2 (2000).

Block D (2003) *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cambridge J (2006) Review of Thrupp M and Willmott R (2003) Education Management in Managerialist Times: Beyond the Textual Apologists. In *Journal of Research in International Education* 2006; 5; 369. London: Sage publications.

Carder M (2007) *Bilingualism in International Schools: a Model for Enriching Language Education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Carder M (2008) The development of English as a second language (ESL) provision in Australia, Canada, the USA and England, with conclusions for second language models in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, Vol 7 (2), September. London: SAGE Publications

Carder M (2009) ESL or 'EAL'?: Programme or 'support'? The baggage that comes with names. *International Schools Journal,* Vol. XXIX No.1. November 2009. Pp.18-25. Saxmundham: Peridot Press, a division of John Catt Educational Ltd.

Carder M (2013a) International School Students: Developing their Bilingual Potential. In Abello-Contesse, C, Chandler PM, López-Jiménez MD, & Chacón-Beltrán R (eds). (2013). *Bilingual and multilingual education. New initiatives anchored in experience*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Carder M (2013b). English language teaching in International Schools: the change in students' language from "English only" to "linguistically diverse" and how school leaders can meet this challenge. In Pearce, R. (ed) *International Education and Schools: Moving Beyond the First 40 Years.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Chadwick T (2012) *Language Awareness in Teaching: A Toolkit for Content and Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clarke J (1995) Doing the right thing: managerialism and social welfare, Paper presented to ESRC Seminar, Professionals in Late Modernity, Imperial College, London, 26 June.

Clarke J and Newman J (1997) *The Managerial State.* London: Sage Publications.

Cohen, N. (2013, November 30) *'The real cultists are not Maoists, they're CEOs'.* The Observer, http://observer.theguardian.com/

Council of International Schools: www.cois.org

Craik F, Bialystok E and Freedman M (2010) Delaying the onset of Alzheimer disease: Bilingualism as a form of cognitive reserve. *Neurology, 75* (19), 1726-2729.

Crawford J (2000) *At War with Diversity.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Crawford J and Krashen S (2007) *English Learners in American Classrooms.* New York: Scholastic.

Cummins J (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

DECS (1999) *ESL in the Mainstream.* Hindmarsh, South Australia: Department of Education and Children's Services. www.unlockingtheworld.com

Echevarria J and Graves A (2008) *Sheltered Content Instruction*. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Educational Policy, Vol.19, Nos.4 and 5, (2005)

ESL Gazette, August 2005 (publication details could not be traced).

European Council of International Schools: www.ecis.org

Goodson, I. and A. Hargreaves (Eds.) (1996) *Teachers' Professional Lives.* London: Falmer Press.

Harber, K. D., Gorman, J. L., Gengaro, F. P., Butisingh, S., Tsang, W., & Ouellette, R. (2012). Students' race and teachers' social support affect the positive feedback bias in public schools. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(4), 1149-1161. doi:10.1037/a0028110.

Harper CA and de Jong EJ (2009) English language teacher expertise: the elephant in the room, *Language and Education*, 23: 2, 137-151. London: Routledge.

International Baccalaureate Organisation: www.ibo.org

International Baccalaureate Organization [IBO]. (2004). Second Language Acquisition and Mother Tongue Development: a guide for schools. Cardiff, UK: International Baccalaureate Organization.

Kieffer M, Lesaux N, Rivera M and Francis D (2009). Accommodations for English language learners taking large-scale assessments: A meta-analysis on effectiveness and validity. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*, 1168-1201.

Left Foot Forward (2013): http://www.leftfootforward.org/2013/01/while-gove-tinkers-wales-retains-the-gcse

McGilchrist, I. (2009) *The Master and his Emissary.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Mehmedbegović D (2011) *Reflecting on the Provision for Equipping the School Workforce in England for a Multilingual School Population: Research Conducted with Experts.* Paper presented at the The European Conference on Educational Research at the annual meeting of the European Educational Research Association, held in the Freie Universität Berlin between September 12 and 16, 2011.
A summary can be seen at the Institute of Education, University of London site at http://www.ioe.ac.uk/newsEvents/56528.html

Mertin P (2013) *Breaking through the language barrier: Effective strategies for teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) students in mainstream classes.* Woodbridge: John Catt Educational.

Middlehurst, R. (1993) *Leading Academics.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mohan B, Leung C and Davison C (eds) (2001) *English as a second language in the mainstream: Teaching, learning and identity*. Harlow: Longman Pearson.

Moore H 'Who will guard the guardians themselves?' pp111-136 in Tollefson J W (2002) *Language Policies in Education*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

NALDIC National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (2007) www.naldic.org.uk/docs/news/archive/news

Pollitt C (1990) *Managerialism and Public Services: the Anglo-American Experience.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rees S (1995) The Fraud and the Fiction, in S Rees and G Rodley (eds), *The Human Costs of Managerialism.* Sydney: Pluto Press.

Rolstad K, Mahoney K and Glass G V (2005) The big picture: A meta-analysis of programme effectiveness research on English language learners. *Educational Policy, 19*(4), 572-594.

Scanlan M and López F (2012) ¡Vamos! How School Leaders Promote Equity and Excellence for Bilingual Students. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 2012 48: 583.
The online version of this article can be found at: http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/48/4/583

Schecter R S and Cummins J (eds) (2003) *Multilingual education in practice.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Soto LD (2002) Young bilingual children's perceptions of bilingualism and biliteracy: altruistic possibilities. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26: 3 Fall 2002.

Stringer, E.T. (1999) *Action Research.* Second edition. London: Sage.

Thomas WP and Collier VP (1997) *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/index.html

Thomas WP and Collier VP (2002) *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA: center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz.

Thrupp M and Willmott R (2003) *Education Management in Managerialist Times: Beyond the Textual Apologists*. Maidenhead and Philadelphia: Open University Press

Tollefson JW (2002) *Language Policies in Education*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tomlinson S (2001) *Education in a Post-welfare Society.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Whitty G, Power S and Halpin D (1998) *Devolution and Choice in Education.* Buckingham: Open University.

Wiley T and Wright W (2004) Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the 'Age of Accountability'. *Educational Policy, 18* (1), 142-168.

Wolff D (2003) Content and language integrated learning: a framework for the development of learner autonomy. In D Little, J Ridley and E Ushioda (eds) *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 211-222). Dublin: Authentik.

Wolin, R. (1992) The Terms of Cultural Criticism. New York: Columbia University Press.