

Day 1. EAL in the rear-view mirror

**Keynote speeches given at the COBIS British School of Bucharest, Romania,
16th and 17th February, 2017, by Dr Maurice Carder**

Introduction	2
Terminology	3
England	4
Australia	8
London	9
Support	10
Contrived collegiality	11
Snapshots: Status, care, individualization	12
International School clientele	14
Motivation	17
Theories for good practice	17
Collier and Thomas	17
Moving target	19
Cummins	19
Models of practice	25
Day 2: Solution: the professionalization of ESL	28
Continuing professional development – CPD	28
Assessment	30
L2 English teachers for ESL: The myth of the native speaker	32
Cognitive psychology – why we go along with things	35
Tame and wicked problems	35
Different types of bias	37
Issues relating to the misplacement of ESL students in SEN	39
Research evidence	44
Solution: the professionalization of ESL	48
Examples of linguistic input	50
Characteristics of a good ESL & MT department	52
Conclusion	53
References	55

Introduction

I shall be talking today and tomorrow about the pedagogical provision for second language students in international schools, with the focus on secondary, and especially middle schools.

This sounds straightforward, but it is a massive area, encompassing aspects of linguistic theory, applied linguistics, sociological issues, teacher relationships, cognitive psychology, economic realities, and much more.

For those who enjoy teaching, it is fascinating and can be rewarding – given the right circumstances. For monolingual English content teachers, with a demanding curriculum to be got through, it may be viewed differently.

SLIDE: No other area of education has been more politicized in recent years.

Crawford and Krashen (2007: 10) have summarised the situation of ESL teachers well:

Educators must learn to cope with external pressures and become strong advocates for the programs that best serve ELLs (English language learners). Perhaps no other area of education has been more politicized in recent years. Immigration has become a stormy controversy, and language a frequent lightning rod.

They went on to add (op.cit: 14):

What are the worst mistakes schools make in serving ELL students? Three common responses can be summed up as denial, delegating, and remediation. None of them is beneficial to ELLs.

SLIDE: Denial, delegating, and remediation. None of them is beneficial to ELLs.

SLIDE: The relevance of research for policy is mediated through theory. Research-theory-policy → practice.

We shall be addressing all of the issues they mention over the next two days, and I hope to make clear how on the one hand there is a clear picture of what programme best serves second language students, and on the other what the obstacles are, in the way of politics and ignorance.

I spent my almost 30 years at the VIS fighting for a department structure for second language and mother tongue students and their teachers, and getting these structures into curriculum and accreditation frameworks – entirely successful until the early 2000s, when globalized neo-liberal forces insinuated their way in.

Terminology

This has been politicized, and the background to that politicization will be investigated later. Abbreviations that have been used for second language students are:

SLIDE: ESL, EAL, ELL, SLL, L2, LEP, EFL, ESOL, CLD and the IB's cumbersome 'learners who are learning in a language other than their mother tongue - LWALLOTTMT'.

Another ancillary term that has exploded into use is 'support'.

I shall be using ESL throughout - English as a Second Language, for two good reasons:

First, this refers to students who are learning language according to a theory of second language acquisition – SLA. This is the theory that underpins the entire structure of all that is involved in learning a second language: there is no theory of additional language acquisition.

Second, for researchers the term 'second language' may mean the third, fourth, tenth and so on language learned later in life, but it is important to realize that in SLA the term 'second' is often used to mean 'either a second or a foreign language' and often 'both'. However, distinguishing among specific contexts for L2 learning is, in fact, important. In such cases SLA researchers make three (rather than only two) key contextual distinctions: foreign, second and heritage language learning contexts [mother tongue], (Ortega, 2013:6).

This is important. In International Schools native speakers of English will have the opportunity to learn a Foreign Language, often French or Spanish. They will study this for 3-5 lessons a week. They will usually not use it after they leave the class. On the other hand, second language students will be studying the language academically in every class, using the language socially outside the class, and crucially may not even have a dedicated class of instruction in that language.

So: we have decided on what to call the students: ESL.

Now some history: how has the present situation come about? There have been different developments in the various countries of the Anglosphere: a term which refers to those English-speaking nations with a similar cultural heritage, based on people originating from the nations of the British Isles and which today maintain close political and military cooperation. The United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which, post-British Empire, maintain a close affinity of cultural, familial and political links with one another.

England

Please note, for ESL purposes we'll be talking about England as it (and Wales) has different educational provision from other parts of the UK.

SLIDE: 'Debates which on the surface focus on language are actually about culture, identity, power and control' Edwards, V., (2004:216).

The aim in England has always been assimilation, greatly influenced by politicians' fears of accusations of racial discrimination if separate classes were allocated for ESL instruction. There is a strong overlap between the issues of assimilation and the history of politicisation in matters relating to provision for second language students in the Anglosphere. I shall be quoting various researchers throughout, not always by name. Leung and Franson, for instance (2001a: 155), quote a MoEd document that 'the arrival of non-English-speaking background students represented a threat to the maintenance of academic standards and scholarly attainments of the indigenous students'.

And ‘As far as the school is concerned, whenever it is desired to treat immigrant children in a rather different way from our own children, for example by putting them in a special class for intensive English teaching, the parents should be briefed as fully as possible about the school’s purposes; otherwise it may be cited as an example of racial discrimination.’ Ministry of Education (1963: 9, cited by Leung and Franson, 2001a: 158).

In 1985, the Swann Report (DES, 1985, cited by Leung and Franson, 2001a: 159) emphasized its ‘fundamental opposition’ to separate provision for ethnic minority children and preferred a vision of ESL specialists working beside colleagues in mainstream classrooms.

The 1986 Calderdale Report (CRE, 1986; cited by Leung and Franson, 2001a: 159), stated that ESL provision given separately was against the promotion of equality of access to mainstream subjects and was therefore racially discriminatory.

So, issues concerned with ESL teaching had become political and ideological, focusing on race, not language learning needs.

The Swann Report (DES, 1985: 426, cited by Leung and Franson, 2001a: 160) believed that ‘the needs of English as a second language learners should be met by provision within the mainstream school as part of a comprehensive programme of language education for all children.’

‘Mainstreaming’ can have positive effects for second language students when it is well-planned, well-funded, and teachers are all suitably aware and trained, as has been the case in some Australian schools. Often, however, language ‘support’ teachers may end up (Leung and Franson, 2001b: 170): ‘mediating between the class teacher and the pupils often in hushed voices at the back of the classroom.’ Even in well-managed classes the ESL ‘support’ teacher role, under such circumstances, is reduced to a teaching assistant. In lessons where the teaching and learning activities and the work materials are disorganised, the contribution of the ESL ‘support’ teacher may be reduced further. An annual OFSTED report (1994: 4) on all schools states this point explicitly: ‘The efficacy of the work of the [ESL] staff depended largely upon the effectiveness of the mainstream teachers with whom they were working. Poor classroom management and organisation by the class teacher ... inhibited progress.’

Let's have a closer look at this. Leung investigated this area in depth, and produced several points that need to be fulfilled by content teachers. Note: mainstream is often used to refer to classes where ESL students have to fit in. I prefer the term 'parallel classes', as ESL students will have their own 'mainstream' ESL class. Each of the following 11 points can be discussed at great length!

Questions for content teachers:

- 1) What is the variety of backgrounds of pupils in the school and are teaching approaches, teacher expectation and task organisation responsive to this variety?

- 2) Is the distinction between language development and cognitive/*academic* ability clearly understood at school policy level and translated into practice accordingly?

- 3) Does a school acknowledge and publicly display second language pupils' achievement in culturally and linguistically sensitive ways?

- 4) Do teachers in the mainstream (ie content) classroom provide
 - (a) content-based comprehensible input?
 - (b) opportunity to use language appropriately for the full range of naturally occurring purposes such as recounting an experience, justifying a decision, describing a process and giving instructions?
 - (c) opportunities for the pupils to receive feedback on appropriate language use and to *act* on such feedback?

- 5) What proportion of class time is devoted to group work?
Is group work organised with explicit reference to participant role, responsibility and task outcome in a way that is sensitive to pupil needs?

- 6) Is the language requirement of the mainstream (ie content) task clearly understood by the content teachers?

- 7) Does the content teacher consider ways of organising tasks for both language and content goals, according to some common agenda?

8) Is there any evidence of a common (language-content) agenda in teachers' experiences of teacher training and professional development?

9) Is there any evidence of systematic task-based assessment being conducted in the mainstream context?

10) Is there a conscious recognition of what tasks are being used?

11) When establishing the suitability of a task

(a) Do the pupils have the necessary background content and language knowledge and skills to understand and engage with the task?

(b) Are the learning activities involved familiar to the pupils? (Do they know what to do?)

(c) Are the learning activities appropriately presented and organised to promote the desired understanding and sharing of thinking (in the case of a collaborative task)?

(d) Does the language use required to perform the task contribute to the pupils' further language development?

(from Leung, 2001: 177-198).

At my former school a secondary history teacher once calculated that 35 extra ESL teachers would be needed in order to fulfil the demands of an in-class ESL teacher for each content class in grades 6-10.

Another issue with burdening the content teacher with the task of educating ESL students is the insight of Krashen on the importance of lowering the affective domain, of creating such an atmosphere of openness and trust that no student need fear that their less than adequate mastery of English will be greeted with annoyance or derision. Secondary content teachers have a curriculum to get through, a class of young people to handle, and to slow down enough to encourage ESL students all the time becomes frustrating for both fluent students and harassed teacher.

Australia

A brief snapshot of the history of ESL in Australia shows what governments thought of Krashen's insight:

A researcher, Moore (2002), wrote 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' (Moore, 2002:123). Could this comment have been made because of the need for ESL teachers to 'lower the affective domain', as recommended by Krashen?

It was determined that ESL was part of the subject English, 'despite representations from ESL educators that this would replace distinctive ESL concerns for bilingualism and across-the-curriculum content (Moore, 2002:125).' ESL then became increasingly deprofessionalised, and ESL courses were frequently taught by teachers with minimal or no ESL qualifications – a parallel to the England experience, which can be seen through the following examples which led directly to new terminology.

In England, Rampton (1997) proposed the term 'EAL – English as an additional language' as various government edicts, produced as the result of fears of allegations of racism over separate ESL classes, had tainted the use of the term 'ESL'. In the USA, at a time when more attention was being paid to politically correct language and litigation was in the air in some states about the denial of access to language programmes, various terms evolved. 'Limited English Proficiency - LEP', somewhat patronizing, became the term required in order for schools to obtain government funding for SL students.

These 'terminology wars' do more to show up divisive politics and academic in-fighting than help the students who need effective programmes. 'Second language' has been attacked as showing it as not necessarily true, as it may be a student's third etc language; or as being second-class, while additional sounds more positive. These are weak arguments. No-one attacks secondary education for being second class. And we could think of second nature, or getting your second wind, as ways of showing how a second language could be a positive asset. Equally 'additional' might have negative connotations as it is frequently seen in such contexts as 'there will be an additional charge for . . .' when checking out of a hotel.

So: I stay firmly with ‘second language’ to refer to an academic discipline, with an impeccable lineage, which represents ESL students and confers on them a distinct and respectable status.

London

A researcher, Mehmedbegović, who is responsible for a large London borough spent much time collating facts about the situation of second language students there. She wrote, in 2011:

Chronically, ‘EAL’ students in many schools in England are now in the situation where bilingual pupils self-identify as monolingual because deficit models are attached to bilingualism; where the focus of additional language teaching has been about remedying deficiency for children with no language, or ‘severe EAL’ (sounding rather like a disease); and EAL learners are often mentioned in the same sentence with SEN pupils. One 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), and schools could be seen to have a deficit model of EAL learners and inappropriate links of EAL with SEN. Thus in the home country of ‘EAL’, ESL students are not provided with appropriate programmes, which makes even more questionable why so many international schools have been subjected to attempts, many successful, to change the name of ESL programmes to ‘EAL’, and EAL being proclaimed, usually with ‘support’, willy-nilly, as a better model.

Furthermore, Mehmedbegović (2011) reports that a majority of new content teachers do not consider themselves prepared for working with EAL learners, and in any case specialist EAL teachers are increasingly being replaced by Teaching Assistants. Younger teachers view the field of EAL as unstable employment with an uncertain future and with limited career opportunities, which reflects the views of colleagues in international schools. EAL teachers were seen as having second tier status, and all those interviewed agreed that there should be a compulsory module for all PGCE students. Since the present UK government abandoned many of the requirements for teachers of all subjects to be trained or qualified, the situation is even more exacerbated. To gain QTS (Qualified Teacher Status) a knowledge of bilingualism and applied linguistics are totally missing from the standards, and no national standards and qualifications are required for EAL teachers. This last statement stands out for its acknowledgement of what can only be described as a national failure.

The latest information about the situation in England is that the government will not specify EAL support as a statutory requirement (unlike SEN for example) and does not require schools to have EAL specialists. Rather, more and more schools are using Teaching Assistants whose understanding of EAL learning may be limited, and of course, TAs are cheaper than teachers. An insight to the dire situation of TAs in one part of England can be gleaned from a recent report in the Guardian (<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/06/teaching-assistants>

[-durham-pay-slashed-women-lions-of-durham-grunwick](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/06/teaching-assistants-durham-pay-slashed-women-lions-of-durham-grunwick)). This article relates how TAs in the north of England will no longer be paid a yearly salary; they will have to re-apply for their jobs and in future they will not be paid during holiday times. They are already paid well below the national average. They have had no support from either the local Labour party councilors or their union. A further article, written by the former government mental health champion for schools, goes into more detail about the valuable work that TAs do, and how little they are recognised for their contribution (<https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-views/teachingassistants-provide-essential-individual-attention-pupils>). There is also ‘an epic problem with retaining EAL teachers because of poor working conditions and pay – as well as a general lack of social and political respect’. These are the people who teach ESL students in England, and public perceptions will equate the status of their students with The teachers. Such perceptions are at the other end of the scale from Cummins’ recommendations that ESL students perform better when empowered rather than disabled (Cummins, 2000), an integral part of that being that their ESL teachers are also empowered.

Support

Here is another example of how the students see the EAL ‘support’ teacher, from Creese (2002:605, in Monaghan, 2010:20). It exemplifies the lower status of the ESL teacher in relation to the subject teacher in the lived reality of the classroom:

S1 (student): Miss, what have you got that for (the tape recorder)?

T (subject teacher): because she (the researcher) wants to record what I am saying and what Miss Smith (the language specialist) is saying and then she can play it back and she can see if there is a difference between the two of us.

S1: There is.

T: Why?

S1: Miss, you're the better teacher, aren't you? ...

S1: - you're the proper teacher, aren't you?

T: Well, no. We are both proper teachers.

S1: She's like a help. (Creese, 2002:605, in Monaghan, 2010:20).

We know from Cummins' work (2000) that ESL students' perceptions of their teachers' status reflects on their own status, then on their self-esteem, and ultimately on their potential.

SLIDE: Contrived collegiality

Arkoudis and Creese (2006) write about 'Teacher-teacher talk' exposing the potential pitfalls of ESL teacher/subject-teacher collaboration. They note (op.cit: 411) that

Central to teacher collaboration is the relationship between the ESL and content teacher. Within policy documents this has been represented as a simple relationship, where ideas are shared in planning for the ESL students within mainstream classes (Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2002; Leung, 2004). Yet within the same policy documents we have a framing of ESL curriculum as adjunct to the mainstream curriculum. The ESL curriculum is offered as a strategy-based methodology. It is used to supplement the mainstream curriculum, but is not considered to have a content area of its own (Arkoudis, 2003). The subjects do not have equal status and ESL is in effect an adjunct to the mainstream curriculum.

Another researcher, Davison, writes that

Teacher collaboration is promoted as a panacea for many ills, from breaking down the professional isolation of the classroom, to compensating for inadequate professional development, to salving the wounds wrought by overly ambitious curriculum reform (Corrie, 1995; Hargreaves, 1994; Hargreaves and McMillan, 1994; Little, 1990). To some critics, teacher collaboration is yet another poorly conceived but increasingly popular imposition on teachers from above, a contrived collegiality (Hargreaves, 1994: 208).

In contrived collegiality, collaboration amongst teachers was compulsory, not voluntary; bounded and fixed in space and time; implementation rather than development-orientated; and meant to be predictable rather than unpredictable in its

outcomes. The literature suggests, however, that effective collaboration between teachers is not only rare, but extremely difficult to sustain. As Little (1990:180) comments: The closer one gets to the classroom and to the central questions of curriculum and instruction, the fewer are the recorded instances of meaningful, rigorous collaboration (Davison, 2006: 458).

Then we have Shaw, himself a school principal, who notes (2003: 104-105):

Almost every study on successful schools acknowledges the important role of collegiality among teachers. Notwithstanding the rhetoric, in my own research I have found little evidence of teachers working collegially. Indeed, I have found that the traditions of professional privacy and teacher isolation are alive and well.

This robustly stated description of the reality in schools is a pre-eminent justification for having experts in their field to be responsible for 'all things ESL' in international schools.

Arkoudis writes (2006:417), 'Educational policy on collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers has assumed that the professional relationship is unproblematic and uncomplicated'. She continues

ESL as a pedagogy has claims to content such as knowledge about the English language, knowledge about first- and second-language development, and knowledge of relevant language-teaching methodologies. These are substantial areas of expertise, yet within the institutional context of secondary school education, ESL is positioned as strategy-driven and does not have the same authority as subjects such as mathematics and science within the secondary curriculum. Therefore, ESL is perceived as being lower in the subject hierarchy of the school. This institutionalized positioning of the subject has an impact on developing collaborative practices between ESL and mainstream teachers (Arkoudis, 2006: 417).

This sums up precisely the status of ESL in schools and the effect it has on ESL staff, and is why it has to be completely turned on its head in international schools with the same type of positive discrimination that has been seen in the fight for race, gender and sexual equality. As Davison (2006:472) sums up: 'Among the many conclusions that can be drawn from this study is that partnership between ESL and classroom teachers is neither easy nor unproblematic'.

Arkoudis (2006) documents the relationship between an ESL teacher and a science teacher. ‘The ESL teacher does not have the epistemological authority in the school to force the science teacher to reposition the science curriculum in ways more appropriate for ESL students, whereas the science teacher has a high status subject’ (op.cit:428). Arkoudis then writes that after many conversations the ESL teacher makes some headway. However, in international schools there is a constant flux of staff, and for every ESL teacher to devote great amounts of time and energy to individual content teachers would possibly be beyond their powers, and in any case wasted as the science teacher might soon leave the school.

Snapshots: Status, care, individualization

Reminder: The situation in England is that the government will not specify EAL support as a statutory requirement and does not require schools to have EAL specialists. SEN, however – special educational needs – is acknowledged to be a professional matter, and EAL TAs report to that department.

Researchers have found that standardised testing for learning difficulties alone is inadequate and inappropriate to use with students who have EAL (Brown, 2004; Gunderson and Siegel, 2001; Limbos and Geva, 2001). As successful completion of such tests requires sufficient English language proficiency, it stands to reason that students who lack such proficiency will score poorly. In spite of the difficulties involved with testing, Vaughn, Bos and Schumm (2006) reported that there continues to be a disproportionately higher classification of learning difficulties/disabilities and emotional/behavioural problems for students who have EAL than for those of the majority population group.

There is a paradox in the current climate of education in the Anglosphere: as globalisation becomes more pervasive there is increasing diversity of languages in the ‘global mix’; but at the same time there is an increase in the demand for standardisation of testing. There is a sense of a runaway train, where the size, speed and complexity of so many issues requires a firm hand to bring everything under control. What is needed is a sensitive and understanding approach to the needs of each individual, and this can be enabled by the professional ESL teachers overseeing the testing of ESL students: upon arrival in the school for appropriate placement, and thereafter by setting up school policies throughout grades 6-12 for assessing each ESL student’s progression from class to class, or placement in suitable classes for best

achievement. The focus will not be on what suits the framework of a politically and economically savvy curriculum provider, but on what is best for each ESL student's learning needs, and also consideration for content teachers so that they can best provide for fluent English speakers.

We know that children learn at different rates, and we must use differentiation to reach a wide range of students and treat them as individuals, catering to their particular needs and bringing them along. So why then do we judge them all on standards that require that they all get the same skills at the same (relatively) pace? The irony seems to escape people.

IS clientele

SLIDE: In general teachers have performed international education according to the national models in which they have been trained (Pearce, 2013:61, 62).

The majority of students in international schools are second-language speakers of English, so the common term used for such students, 'minority students,' is not appropriate in this context. International school students are, in fact, living in an 'international space' having arrived with or without a knowledge of English, and much of their life will be lived in an 'international' arena: their parents may work in an international organization where English is likely to be the medium. Their friends will be international school students.

The model most applicable for such students is that of pluralism and multiculturalism; in international schools an assimilationist model is not appropriate as there are no political pressures for assimilation; there is no nation-state to assimilate to, nor political measures to treat immigrants circumspectly: international school students are not immigrants. Therefore, a model can and should be provided that promotes enrichment in each student's mother-tongue while encouraging students to gain biliteracy in English.

As Coetzee-Van Rooy records about English (2006:442):

English is an international auxiliary language. It is yours (no matter who you are) as much as it is mine (no matter who I am) ... No one needs to become more like Americans ... or any other English speaker to lay claim on the language. ... it isn't even necessary to appreciate the culture of a country whose principal language is English in

order for one to use it effectively. This argument assumes a much more complex view of the identities of second-language learners in world English contexts.

Coetzee-Van Rooy (2006:442) quotes Lamb (2004:3) who comments that:

As English loses its association with particular Anglophone cultures and is instead identified with the powerful forces of globalization, the desire to ‘integrate’ loses its explanatory power in many EFL contexts. Individuals may aspire towards a ‘bicultural’ identity which incorporates an English-speaking globally-involved version of themselves in addition to their local L1-speaking self.

These findings relate directly to international school students: they remove the previously held focus on learning about the culture of the target language; and at the same time emphasise that students will maintain their own language and culture. It is fair to say that ‘Western-Based-TESOL’ is still the model employed in many schools, with textbooks still containing British or American cultural models.

SLIDE: ‘Language and socio-economic backgrounds are the two factors that determine school achievement most of all’ – PISA - the OECD Programme for International School Assessment (Conteh and Meier, 2014b:2).

Azadi tells of her brother leaving Iran to live in the USA:

The shock of changing cultures so drastically ... caused him terrible psychological problems later. The hardest part was that he went to live with a family where no Persian was spoken. ... One morning, about six months after moving there, he woke up to find that he could neither speak nor understand Persian any longer. To this day, when Cyrus is at a family gathering, one of us has to translate for him when the conversation turns to Persian (Azadi, 1987:43-44).

MacKenzie (2001) undertook a small research project in an international school which substantiates that parents overwhelmingly wanted their children to learn English at any cost – apparently including the loss of their mother-tongue. This reflects the observation by Edwards (2009:44) in the context of South Africa, though applicable to our case, that

There is palpable tension between the perception of parents, on the one hand, that the surest route to upward mobility is through English-medium education and the firm belief of policymakers, on the other hand, that a strong foundation in the children's mother-tongue will lead to more equitable outcomes.

Parents are, of course, all different, but in my experience it is a minority who focus on maintaining the mother tongue. This underlines the huge importance of having a good ESL programme.

A further reason for getting beyond the 'English-only' approach of the majority of international schools is that of students' identities. Although Crystal (1997) estimates that two-thirds of the world's children grow up in a bilingual environment, the 'West' is largely monolingual in outlook. Even 'bilingual' countries like Belgium, Finland and Switzerland have populations that exist in a state of 'territorial unilingualism' (Romaine, 2004:398). English speakers, especially, are prone to entrenched attitudes in the climate of the current dominance of English. Ireland (and the UK – past tense?) are now the only countries in the EU where there is no requirement to study a foreign language. English and American monolinguals are often characterized as having no aptitude for foreign-language learning, such a failing often being accompanied by expressions of envy for multilingual Europeans, and also:

Sometimes (more subtly) by a linguistic smugness reflecting a deeply held conviction that, after all, those clever 'others' who don't already know English will have to accommodate in a world made increasingly safe for Anglophones. All such attitudes, of course, reveal more about social dominance and convention than they do about aptitude (present author's emphasis) (Edwards, J. 2004:11).

Fishman uses the same word, 'smug', to describe the situation in the USA:

Unfortunately, a country as rich and as powerful as our own, smugly speaking 'the language that rules the world,' can long afford to continue to disregard the problem (present author's emphasis) (Fishman, 2004:418).

Motivation

The methodology currently accepted as most relevant for motivation is that of ‘the L2 Motivational Self System,’ with its concepts of the ‘ideal self’ and the ‘ought-to self’ (Dörnyei and Ushioda, eds., 2009:3-4).

Theories for good practice

An understanding of how best to provide for second language learners (SLLs) in schools changed massively following research in the 1960s. Up until that time SLLs were mostly given classes in grammar and spelling in separate classes with no attention given to their mother tongues – often they were totally discouraged from using their mother tongues. However, in the early 1960s Peal and Lambert (1962/72) carried out studies which verified a positive relationship between intelligence and bilingualism. They carefully controlled the relevant variables in an examination of ten-year-old bilingual and monolingual children and the bilinguals were found to ‘outperform their monolingual counterparts on both verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests.’ The authors concluded that the bilingual child had ‘mental flexibility, a superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities,’ while noting that ‘it is not possible to state from the present study whether the more intelligent child became bilingual or whether bilingualism aided his intellectual development’ (Peal and Lambert, 1962:277, in Edwards, J. 2004:16-17).

Collier and Thomas

Thomas and Collier devised a model for ensuring that second language learners could be treated equitably and developed their holistic ‘Prism model’ for the successful education of second-language learners. It has four components that drive language acquisition: sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive processes. The four components are equally important, and the prism should be imagined as a complex, multidimensional prism, viewed from above like a pyramid, with the student in the centre.

SLIDE 10: Prism model (reproduced in Carder, 2007, chapter 2.)

The socio-cultural component is the central area of the prism. Collier and Thomas state:

Central to the student's acquisition of language are all of the surrounding social and cultural processes occurring in everyday life... home, school, community, and the broader society. For example, sociocultural processes at work in SLA may include individual students' emotional responses to school, such as self-esteem or anxiety or other affective factors (Collier and Thomas, 2007:335).

This central area might be compared with 'inclusion', a concept which has tended to dominate current educational practice, to the exclusion of the other features on the prism.

Emphasised under the heading of 'L1 & L2 Language Development' is:

To assure cognitive and academic success in the L2, a student's L1 system, oral and written, must be developed to a high cognitive level at least throughout the elementary school years (Collier and Thomas, 2007:335).

The 'L1 & L2 Academic Development' component of the Collier and Thomas prism includes all school work in all subjects, for each grade level. Since academic work transfers from the first to the second-language, Collier and Thomas argue that it is best if academic work is developed in the first language, while the second language is taught through meaningful academic content. The authors state that: 'Research has shown that postponing or interrupting academic development while students work on acquiring the L2 is likely to lead to academic failure in the long-term' (Collier and Thomas, 2007:335-336).

Collier and Thomas also did a massive project collecting data on L2 students and the best models.

SLIDE 11: Chart – best model (reproduced in Carder, 2007, chapter 1).

SLIDE 12: Explanation of chart (reproduced in Carder, 2007, chapter 1).

What this makes clear is that a bilingual model is best; and that long-term programmes are necessary. Since bilingual programmes are usually not possible in the IS context, as so many languages are present, Collier, who was familiar with the IS network, wrote the following text specifically for the international schools' context:

When the demographics of a school population include a multilingual student group with small numbers of each language represented, then mother-tongue literacy development for each language group, combined with ESL taught through academic content, may be the best choice for support of non-English-speakers' needs (Collier, 2003:8).

And this is the model recommended, and put into practice, by Patricia Mertin and me.

Moving target

Enabling the ESL students to be successful by clarifying the demands of academic language has to be the responsibility of the whole faculty. While the ESL students are struggling to catch up with the level of language required to access the curriculum successfully, native speaker students are themselves continuing to develop their academic knowledge and language which enables them to communicate effectively. The ESL students are chasing a moving target. As Collier and Thomas and others point out, the ESL student has to do eighteen months work a year just to keep up with a native speaker, and they have to do this for seven years to achieve academic competence.

Cummins

Cummins has been a major figure in how we perceive L2 students.

I'll run through some of his ground-breaking perceptions:

In 1976 Cummins first postulated the hypothesis that 'there may be a threshold level of L2 competence which pupils must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence their cognitive functioning' (Cummins, 1976:41).

He elaborated on this (1979a) with his 'developmental interdependence hypothesis', in which he suggested that a child's second language competence is partly dependent on the level of competence already achieved in the first language, implying that the more developed the first language, the easier it could be to develop the second-language:

To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly' (Cummins, 1988:245, in Baker and Hornberger, 2001).

Thus if the first language is at a lower stage of development it will be more difficult to achieve proficiency in the second language, actually first postulated by two Finnish researchers:

Subjects such as biology, chemistry and physics also require conceptual thinking, and in these subjects migrant children with a good mastery of their mother-tongue succeeded significantly better than those who knew their mother-tongue poorly (Toukoma and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1977:69)

Cummins comments on studies by Hébert (1976) and Ramírez and Politzer (1976) that:

The major educational implication of these hypotheses [on time spent learning L1 and L2] is that if optimal development of a minority language child's cognitive and academic potential is a goal, then the school program must aim to promote an *additive* form of bilingualism involving literacy in both L1 and L2 (Cummins, 1976:91).

So, two more terms that should be in regular use in our daily lives are *additive* and *subtractive* bilingualism, subtractive being when a child's L2 competence is adversely impacted by a failure to maintain their L1.

Two concepts that have become well-known to professional teachers involved with bilingual children are BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive and Academic Language Proficiency).

SLIDE 13: BICS & CALP length of time.

Cummins further elaborated on the differences between the language proficiency required in face-to-face communication (BICS) and that involved in most academic tasks (CALP) by showing schematically (in Cummins, 1980:144) the relationship between them as two continua, consisting of two types of proficiency: context-embedded and context-reduced.

SLIDE 14: Embedded vs reduced context

Embedded refers to language embedded in meaningful contexts, and supported by situational props, for example by using experiments in a science class; whereas the latter is when a student has few or no such props, of which an example would be when a teacher is simply talking, with no overheads or other aid, or when a student is reading a text or writing, again with no supporting illustrations or other material. ESL students rapidly develop some context-embedded skills, 'BICS', whereas gaining proficiency in context-reduced aspects of English takes much longer.

Cummins (1980) refers to his own studies of immigrant students' learning of English in successful bilingual programmes, which substantiate that it takes 'from five to seven years, on the average, for minority language students to approach grade norms in academic (context-reduced) aspects of English proficiency' (Cummins, 1980:145). This finding was confirmed by the work of Thomas and Collier, already discussed. Cummins then makes a further point, also reinforced by Thomas and Collier, i.e. the 'moving target' analogy:

a major reason for this is that native English-speaking students are not standing still waiting for minority language students to catch up with them (Cummins, 1980:145).

Thus ESL students are aiming at a moving target: as native-English speakers make academic gains routinely every year, ESL students have not only to learn the academic content of the curriculum, but also to learn the language needed to understand and use each subject (Cummins, 1979b).

These are facts which *need to be continually reiterated to colleagues, parents and school management*. Such communications also reinforce the fact that second language learners simply need time and appropriate programmes and *should not be compared to learners with special educational needs*.

In his 1986 paper (Cummins, 1986) he states that:

Implementation of change is dependent upon the extent to which educators, both collectively and individually, *redefine their roles* with respect to minority students and communities (Cummins, 1986:175). - written 30 years ago . . .

He lays out three sets of *power relations*, which include

1. the daily interactions between teachers and students,

2. the overall relationship between the school, *the international community (inserted by me)*, and the local community,
3. and finally the power relations between groups within society as a whole.

SLIDE 15: Coercive relations of power have constituted the predominant mode of inter-group contact since the beginnings of human history.

Power can be generated in interpersonal and inter-group relations, thereby becoming additive rather than subtractive = root cause of academic failure in minority groups.

There is no reason for these power relations to be any different in the international school context as the same groups exist, though there is the added complexity of having an ‘extra’ community: the international community. Cummins reports that sociological and anthropological research suggests that status and power relations between groups make up an important part of the account of minority students’ failure in school, based on research by Fishman (1976) and Paulston (1980). The main tenet of his theory, is that minority students are either ‘empowered’ or ‘disabled’ as a direct result of how the interactions result with teachers in school, and based on **four** characteristics of the institution of the school:

1. how much the minority language and student is integrated into the school;
2. how much each minority community is encouraged to join in the affairs of the school;
3. how much the pedagogy encourages intrinsic motivation in students to use language to generate their own knowledge;
4. and how much educators involved in assessment use it to encourage students rather than put them in a ‘failing box.’

For the international school context I would add ‘and how much genuine information is given to parents about the challenge awaiting L2 students’.

The ‘empowered’ and ‘disabled’ dichotomy is fundamental to all aspects of educating L2 students, as regards students, teachers, management, and the community.

Research evidence for the effect that ‘disablement’ can have on students is shown by two World Bank economists, Hoff and Pandey, (2004), who reported the results of a remarkable experiment (in Wilkinson and Pickett, 2010:94).

They took 321 high-caste and 321 low-caste 11 to 12-year-old boys from scattered rural villages in India, and set them the task of solving mazes. First, the boys did the puzzles without being aware of each other's caste. Under this condition the low-caste boys did just as well with the mazes as the high-caste boys, indeed slightly better. Then, the experiment was repeated, but this time each boy was asked to confirm an announcement of his name, and caste. After this public announcement of caste, the boys did more mazes, and this time there was a large caste gap in how well they did – the performance of the low-caste boys dropped significantly. This is striking evidence that performance and behaviour in an educational task can be profoundly affected by the way we feel we are seen and judged by others. When we expect to be viewed as inferior, our abilities seem to be diminished.

It will be necessary for each individual language community to recognise that it is a part of the 'international community' and as such is an equal to, not above or below any other one. Another example of how much the attitude to a language and culture can affect a student is given by Troike (1978) when discussing the academic failure of Finnish students in Sweden, where such students are 'low status'; this is compared to their academic success in Australia where they are seen as a 'high status' group.

SLIDE 16: Majority vs minority groups – chart.

Cummins devised a framework to show how schools can provide a model which aims to provide equity across the curriculum. In this framework, there is a cultural and linguistic pedagogical model in which ESL students will be nurtured in an additive rather than subtractive approach; community participation will be collaborative rather than exclusionary; pedagogy will be 'reciprocal/interaction-oriented' rather than transmission-oriented; and assessment will be advocacy-oriented rather than legitimisation-oriented.

The more second language students' parents are involved in their children's education, the more the parents will feel that they understand and can contribute, for example by encouraging reading in the mother-tongue at home and providing a 'book rich' environment, with positive academic results. Krashen's 'Read read read' is a must for second language students, even more so today when so much energy is deflected to the screen.

The pedagogical model is vital, and this is where appropriate training for all staff plays a key role.

Informing and involving parents are important factors in the process of ensuring that children can benefit appropriately from their two or more languages. All new parents can be engaged in discussion of what is at stake, be given information booklets about the importance of literacy in the mother tongue, referred to websites, and told about the possibility of having mother-tongue lessons. The crucial time of arrival at an international school can be seized on by those responsible for the mother tongue programme in order to establish a firm foundation for each child in their mother tongue which can be maintained and built on.

Cummins (2000) points to the model which is most unhelpful to ESL students, and terms it a 'banking' model, in which students are the passive receivers of knowledge which is 'banked' in their brains by a transmission model of pedagogy. Alternatively, a 'reciprocal/interaction' model will encourage students to enter into discussion, dialogue, and continual exchange with teacher and students, which will encourage feedback in both content and form (Wong Fillmore, 1983). Haynes (2002:2) comments that:

Critical thinking in schools is limited by the boundaries of a system where teachers not only teach but also control the behaviour of pupils through regimes of discipline.

It is therefore important for educators to select curricular topics that relate to societal power relations, and then give students the opportunity to analyse such topics from multiple perspectives. In international schools this is crucial, as students come from so many different parts of the world which may have different outlooks on any number of topics.

Another area of concern is attitudes towards bilingualism. Baetens-Beardsmore (in Dewaele et al, eds., 2003) for example, quotes comments on the politico-ideological fears of many people concerning bilingualism: 'Unease about language is almost always symptomatic of a larger unease... The issues in question, I would suggest, are much more likely to be such things as dominance, elitism, ethnicity, economic control, social status and group security' (McArthur, 1986:87-88).

In fact McArthur wrote 'While it is no longer politically acceptable to express deep-seated fear and mistrust of minorities in direct terms, the same restrictions do not apply to opinions about language (op.cit:216).' Recent political events have reversed the 'no longer politically acceptable', so we have an even steeper hill to roll the rock up (Camus, 1942/2005).

Models of practice

Studies of second-language students in state schools in English-speaking countries (e.g. Mohan, Leung, and Davison, 2001; Crawford, 2000) demonstrate that the model most often followed is one of assimilation to the host-country language, with varying amounts of ‘support’ for English-language competence, and frequently no programme or recommendations for keeping up the students’ mother-tongue. A summary of the positions of assimilation and multiculturalism is given by Baker and Prys Jones (1998:299):

At the heart of the assimilationist ideology is the belief that an effective, harmonious, society can only be achieved if minority groups are absorbed into mainstream society. Harmony and equal opportunity depend on a shared language and culture. A multicultural viewpoint is partly based on the idea that an individual can successfully hold two or more identities.

Models of providing education for second language learners which will allow them to reach their full potential, linguistically as well as regards their social identity, come under the heading of pluralism, in a model of multiculturalism. These two positions are at the heart of the matter as far as international schools are concerned, though largely, I suspect, unacknowledged by those who design the programmes and administer the schools.

Harper and de Jong (2009:137) write that in the USA the amount of specialist time devoted to ESL students by ESL teachers has shrunk from 32% to near zero in a mere ten years, due to a ‘history of legislation to ensure equal educational access for ELLs, and a policy of full-time placement of ELLs in mainstream classrooms’, largely due to the consequences of the ‘assumption that ELLs’ language and learning “problems” are best addressed through (monolingual) mainstream approaches, and when ESL specialist teachers are considered redundant and are replaced by mainstream teachers who are minimally prepared to teach ESL’. This echoes the present author’s perceptions of the situation in international schools. This needs to be reversed, and ESL needs to become a mainstream component of the international school curriculum.

All evidence points to the need for ESL students to have content-related instruction in a paradigm of separate classes for ESL beginners, gradually segueing into a programme of partial separation and some integration: parallel classes of selected and adapted content, in the model

described in full in Carder (2007). Crawford and Krashen (2007:44) state: ‘For diverse schools, a program of communication-based ESL and sheltered subject-matter instruction, combined with native-language support by paraprofessionals, is often the best solution’ echoing Collier and Janzen (2008:1030) in Scanlan and López, (2012:601-602), writes ‘The academic uses of language as well as the meaning of individual words need to be explicitly taught for students to fulfil the genre or discourse requirements privileged in academic settings and to understand the material they encounter’.

Sheltered subject-matter teaching is a form of communication-based ESL instruction in which the focus is on academic content – science, math, history, and so forth – taught in a way that is comprehensible for students with limited English. The goal in the minds of both the students and the teacher is mastering subject-matter, not particular rules of grammar or vocabulary. In this way, students absorb academic English naturally and incidentally, while they are learning useful knowledge. If students are tested, they are tested on subject matter, not language (Crawford and Krashen, 2007: 24).

It is included as part of the training for content teachers of ESL students in the USA in the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) teacher training courses.

As Crawford and Krashen relate (2007: 25):

At first, subjects such as science or math are chosen because they can be more easily contextualized, and thereby made comprehensible through the use of realia and pictures. Beginners in the second language are not included in sheltered classes, because the input will not be comprehensible for them. Fluent English speakers are not included either, because their interactions with the teacher and with each other may be incomprehensible to the other students. Studies with intermediate, literate second-language students have consistently demonstrated the effectiveness of sheltered subject-matter teaching. Students in these classes acquire as much or more language as those in regular intermediate classes, and they learn impressive amounts of subject matter at the same time. Moreover, the kind of language they acquire is academic language, the cognitively challenging competencies needed for school success.

A similar model is CLIL - Content and Language Integrated Learning (Wolff, 2003; Nikula et al, eds., 2016), in which the focus is on academic content – science, maths, social sciences –

taught in ways adapted to the linguistic abilities of ESL students. Above all, different modes of assessment are required for ESL students.

For Beginners, over the year students may exit in controlled stages to sheltered instruction classes in maths and possibly science. Intermediate students will require sheltered instruction in maths, science, social studies/humanities and English (literature) for a longer period.

How long students remain in the sheltered ESL class is an important issue: many schools 'rush' the exit process in order to respond to parental demands, or those of administration. The weakness of many ESL programmes is that students are transferred to the mainstream before they have acquired enough 'second language instructional competence' – SLIC - to do well in content classes.

A further description is given by Collier and Crawford (1998:56):

Sheltered instruction refers to a content subject (science, math, or social studies) taught to ESL students by a teacher who has certification in the content area being taught.

The following strategies are identified for use in sheltered classes:

- Promoting collaboration between teachers and among students
- Modifying language
- Increasing the relevancy of [content] lessons to students' everyday lives
- Adapting [content] materials
- Using language teaching techniques in presenting [content] concepts (Fathman, Quinn, and Kessler, 1992:4, in Ovando, 1998:185).

The above models show a need to provide specific programmes of instruction for ESL students, ranging from direct instruction of language to ESL beginners, to programmes of academic language which are tailor-made for the content vocabulary and sentence patterns of the various academic subjects that ESL students encounter in the middle and upper school.

Friday, 17th February, 2017

Day 2. Solution: the professionalization of ESL

CPD – continuing professional development

There is a clear need for mainstream content teachers, who are all experts in their own special areas, to be given additional ongoing training in strategies to make their teaching accessible to the second language students' learning.

Many teachers struggle with the idea of legitimising multilingualism in their classrooms. Often this is because they have had little opportunity to reflect on this during their teacher education, and to develop appropriate teaching strategies.

(Conteh and Meier, 2014a:296).

Practices in schools are always led from the top and the climate of a school as a multilingual, multicultural welcoming institution can only be truly determined through the ongoing demonstration of effective practices by the leadership team.

August and Hakuta write:

The principal of the school is seen as a key player in ELL students' academic achievement in most of the studies reviewed. She or he makes the achievement of ELL students a priority, monitors curricular and instructional improvement, recruits and keeps talented and dedicated staff, involves the entire staff in improvement efforts and maintains a good social and physical environment.

August and Hakuta also note:

Staff development for all, not just language specialists, is a significant component of many of the effective schools. All teachers are expected to know how to teach ELL students and are given the support to do so (August and Hakuta, 1997, in Cummins, 2000:264,265).

Most newly appointed international teachers, leaving their home countries to enter the world of international schooling, are likely to have had little preparation for, and little induction into, their new life (Holderness, 2002:86).

Many teachers hired to teach in international schools know they are going to teach in a new country, but in many ways they are unprepared for the challenges they will face. These are many of the same challenges which the new students at an international school face; living in a country where they may not speak the language, growing accustomed to everyday life in an unfamiliar environment, finding their place in a new school, finding friends, dealing with a new curriculum, and so on. In addition, new teachers have to work with new bosses and colleagues in a different school system, but lack a network of family and friends to support them. The familiar phases of culture shock and assimilation are experienced by new teachers and students alike. The question Cummins poses is absolutely relevant for international schools and teachers:

To what extent is it child abuse to send new teachers into classrooms with minimal or no preparation on how to teach academic content to students who are in the process of learning English and whose cultural background differs significantly from that assumed by all of the structures of schooling (e.g. curriculum, assessment and teacher preparation)? (Cummins, 2000:14).

Valid in-service for ESL must be:

consistent, long-term training in ESL pedagogy and methodology ... Quick and dirty 1-day, or 1-hour, in-service sessions simply cannot provide enough preparation and training for teachers expected to help ELLs succeed in their mainstream content classes in a new language (Hansen-Thomas and Cavagnetto (2010:263).

All-school professional development may be led by an outside expert who may come in for one or two days and present to the full faculty. The danger with this form of PD is that one size does not necessarily fit all and not everyone will see the value of the sessions. He or she will leave the school and life returns to normal, unless a concerted effort is made by the administration to develop the skills and strategies the external expert has introduced.

‘ESL in the Mainstream’ (DECS, 1999), was launched in 1987 in Australia. This course was one of the few available which provides content teachers with structured in-service (60 hours) to address the challenges that SL students face. It aims to raise awareness and give skills to content teachers so that they can better teach second-language learners, with the entire staff of some schools in Australia having completed it (a full description is given in Carder, 2007).

A development from this is offered by the course ‘TESMC’ - Teaching ESL students in mainstream classrooms: language in learning across the curriculum:

SLIDE 17:

<http://www.unlockingtheworld.com/programs/teaching-esl-students-in-mainstream-classrooms>

This is offered as a tutor training course for ESL teachers. A five day, train-the-tutor, professional development course is given to teachers who can then go back to their schools and deliver professional training to the content teachers. The course for the teachers consists of 25 hours of instruction delivered in 9 modules, plus readings and activities. This results in a total of 50 hours of professional development which can be given by the teacher trained as a tutor to all colleagues over a period of months. The course focuses on the language related needs of ESL students, develops teacher awareness of cultural and linguistic awareness, helps teachers try out strategies and reflect on their own practice, and supports the development of collaborative working partnerships across subject areas and with the ESL department.

Research has confirmed that bilingual students’ perceptions of their teacher’s appreciation of their mother tongue are indeed of influence on their bilingual cognitive advantages. Goriot et al (2016) examined whether Dutch bilingual primary school students who spoke either German or Turkish at home differed in their perceptions of their teacher’s appreciation of their home language, and also whether these differences could explain any differences between the two groups in their performance in various skills. Their findings were that ‘German-Dutch pupils perceived there to be more appreciation of their home language from their teacher than Turkish-Dutch pupils’ (Goriot et al, 2016: Abstract).

This is more proof of the need for culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

In order to be credible, professional development must be continuing, ongoing and effective.

Assessment

SLIDE 18:

‘L2 users and L2 learners need to be assessed against successful L2 users, not against native speakers, as reflected in many contemporary examination systems’ (Cook, (c), 2014:138).

SLIDE 19: ‘A key problem of assessment ... stems from ... benchmarking performances in relation to inadequate or inappropriate descriptors. In the mainstream education context, the problems arise from using first language descriptors for assessing second language performance’ (Leung and Lewkowicz, 2008:314)’.

To summarise:

ESL students require specific modes of assessment: ‘The most suitable assessment models for ESL students are those which make use of multiple measures, including classroom grades, projects, and portfolios of student work’.

Portfolio work can be documented; there can be regular liaison between ESL and content teachers to decide on progress or the need for intervention.

In no case should important decisions be made based on one or more scores on standardized tests of language ability or academic achievement.

As successful completion of standardised tests requires sufficient English language proficiency, it stands to reason that students who lack such proficiency will score poorly. There continues to be a disproportionately higher classification of learning difficulties for students who have EAL than for those of the majority population group (Mahoney and MacSwan, 2005: 38).

As Garcia and Flores point out (Garcia and Flores, 2014:161-162): ‘For bilingual students it would be important to create language-proficiency assessments that assess their ability to perform academically in English; in their mother tongue; or a combination of both. In addition, it would be most important to develop valid and reliable assessments that separate language proficiency from content knowledge’.

Formative assessment is the ideal solution for ESL students. A definition given by Popham states that ‘formative assessment is not a test but a process that produces not so much a score but a qualitative insight into student understanding’ (Popham, 2008: 6). In a comprehensive review of the subject, useful for both researchers and practitioners, Boyle and Charles write, of the situation in England, that:

Formative assessment was legitimised and became part of the education policy makers' and teaching fraternity's lexicon through the seminal Task Group on Assessment and Testing report (DES 1988) which developed the assessment system for the National Curriculum encompassed by the 1988 Education Reform Act (DES 1988). However, with the commencement of paper and pencil testing of the National Curriculum (the 'sats') in 1991, soon the only form of 'assessment' which mattered was summative and this was embodied in the end of key stage tests. These quickly became a 'high stakes' priority for schools who felt pressured by both Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) and the government who used the test results as the principal (often, it appeared to teachers, the sole) measure of national standards and each school's success or failure (Boyle and Charles, 2014:3).

Second language English teachers for ESL?

The myth of the native speaker

There are many myths about the desirability of having native English speakers as teachers in international schools in order to ensure the best quality. Latest research is clear that such views have no basis as 'there is a monolingual bias in research and practice on language learning and teaching which have deeply negative consequences' (Ortega, 2014:32). Researchers believe that it is a fallacy to take L1 speakers as benchmarks to evaluate the learning success of L2 learners, and damaging deficit approaches become unwittingly entrenched in many practices found in classrooms and schools. Non-native speakers (NNS) are portrayed as having an 'approximative' kind of linguistic competence and native speakers (NS) are taken as the norm, the default. 'NNS are seen as subordinate, seen as having a less natural way of doing and knowing and learning a language than monolinguals; this is harmful from an ethical standpoint as it casts a deficit light on L2 users, who are seen as less legitimate and less pure' (Ortega, 2014:35). This state of affairs has arisen because all second language acquisition (SLA) research is by monolinguals trying to add on another monolingual command of the L2. This confirms the hypothesis that 'monolingualism is taken as the norm; the reality of bilingualism is thus made invisible; and linguistic ownership by birth and monolingualism are elevated to an inalienable right and advantage' (Ortega, 2014:36). The result of this is that 'a subtractive bilingualism approach is uncritically embraced' (Ortega, 2014:36). A reminder: subtractive

bilingualism is when the mother tongue is ignored, impacting negatively on the student's potential in the L2.

It would be more helpful if schools could recognise that 'There are now more L2 speakers of English in the world than native speakers, and L2 speakers interact mostly with other L2 speakers. Therefore they do not want to be 'native-like' but intelligible' (Hu and McKay, in Conteh and Meier, 2014b:48-72). There would then no longer be such demands as those seen recently for all new staff being recruited for the newly founded TH School in Hanoi (<http://www.ticrecruitment.com/th-school/>) which states that 'the first language of all applicants should be English'. This will automatically ensure a huge loss of potentially expert teachers and will also be a negative influence on the many second language students, who will not see any second language English, bilingual teachers to serve as role models for them.

Native English speakers can actually be worse communicators than second language speakers of English, as shown by Morrison (2016), who writes that 'often you have a boardroom full of people from different countries communicating in English and all understanding each other and then suddenly the American or Brit walks into the room and nobody can understand them' (op.cit.). The reason for this is that: 'The non-native speakers, it turns out, speak more purposefully and carefully, typical of someone speaking a second or third language' (op.cit.), whereas 'Anglophones, on the other hand, often talk *too fast* for others to follow, and use jokes, slang and references specific to their own culture' (op.cit). Morrison concludes that: "'Native speakers are at a disadvantage when you are in a lingua franca situation," where English is being used as a common denominator, says Jennifer Jenkins, professor of global Englishes at the UK's University of Southampton. "It's the native English speakers that are having difficulty understanding and making themselves understood"' (op.cit). Examples come to mind of native English speaking teachers in international school content classes . . .

Cherng and Halpin carried out research on students' perceptions of minority versus white teachers in the USA. They found that students perceived minority teachers more favourably than white teachers, and concluded that their findings underscored the importance of minority teacher recruitment and retention. They pointed out that 'An overwhelmingly White teaching force is working with a majority non-White student population' (Cherng and Halpin, 2016: 407), that 'minority teachers are more multiculturally aware than their White peers, and that

higher levels of multicultural awareness are linked to better classroom environments' (Cherng and Halpin, 2016: 416). They add that

It also may be the case that minority teachers are particularly well perceived by minority students because minority teachers may have personal experience navigating racial stereotypes about academic achievement and can equip students to combat these stereotypes. And this rapport, built on positive student perceptions of teachers, might contribute to academic success for students (Cherng and Halpin, 2016: 416).

They conclude that their findings attest to the importance of having diversity among the teaching staff as research has shown that students' perceptions of teachers are associated with motivation and achievement. Ultimately, they suggest, minority teachers are often able to form strong ties with students, and can thus help to empower youth of all backgrounds. Though they do not specifically focus on language, the overall message is clear. An example of British teachers 'mobbing' their second language ESL teaching colleagues has been reported to me: '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.'

A thorough investigation of this issue is given by Cook (2014c:125-140). Cook states (2014:134) that 'If you ask L2 learners what they want to become in a second language, the answer is . . . : they want to be native speakers.' However, he points out that 'A native speaker is usually said to be "a person who has spoken a certain language since early childhood."' He adds: 'Most people seem to believe that the only person who speaks a language properly is a native speaker. But, if the definition above is correct, no L2 user could ever become a native speaker: it's far too late. The only ones to make the grade would be children brought up from the very beginning in two languages' (Cook, 2014c:135). The result can be that 'Consequently most L2 users consider themselves failures for not sounding like native speakers, something they could never be, by definition' (op.cit, p.135). In a summary of a thorough analysis of the matter, Cook writes: 'Many L2 learners and L2 users aspire to be as similar as possible to a native speaker. Yet it is hard to pin down what an ideal native speaker might be. This native speaker goal cannot be achieved because they already have one language in their minds. L2 users and L2 learners need to be assessed against successful L2 users, not against native speakers as reflected in many contemporary examination systems' (Cook, 2014c:138).

Cognitive psychology – why we go along with things

(Much of what follows is based on the work of George Marshall in his book *‘Don’t Even Think about it’*, 2014, which seeks to understand why people are reluctant to accept the reality of climate change).

Tame and wicked problems

Cognitive psychologists talk about two types of problems: simple or tame problems, and wicked problems. Tame problems have defined causes, objectives and outputs; wicked problems are multifaceted and constantly changing – they are complex, demanding a continuous process of evaluation and redefinition. There are obvious attempts by some governments in English-speaking countries to ‘simplify’ education generally. It is easier to control a simple mechanism. When an issue to do with state education defies having a clear definition it becomes frustrating as it keeps evolving as various solutions are tried. And when, as with our issue of ‘language’ and languages, it impinges on our basic comfort zone, ‘our’ English language’, it is easiest to proclaim that students should just get on with it, especially when parents mostly demand that their offspring should learn it quickly and get good grades in it.

In fact bilingualism, for that is what is involved, is an educational problem, a human rights problem, a social justice problem, a governance problem, and an ideological battle between contending factions.

To understand tame problems the solution is to first understand the problem, then gather information, collect it together, and work out and apply solutions. If students are not all equally good at maths, put them in different sets. This is precisely what happens in most international schools at some stage. For wicked problems you have to know all about their context; however, sometimes you cannot look for information about them without knowing the solution, and you cannot first understand the problem then solve it.

Many – most? – international schools treat bilingualism and ESL issues somewhere between a tame and a wicked problem. In fact they should be treated as a tame problem: we have understood the problem; gathered information, collected it together, worked out solutions, and are hoping that the international educational community will apply them by setting up the

structures recommended. We have known about the solutions for some time but various issues have intervened, which can be summarised as political, which have made the problem a ‘wicked’ one. So rather than actively addressing the bilingual learning needs of the many, many students who could have far better programmes of instruction and assessment than they are currently receiving, we actively disattend them, keeping them permanently on the edge of our pool of worry (see Rittel and Webber, 1973).

Presenting a compelling narrative is key to managing a school, a curriculum body or accrediting agency.

SLIDE 20

Presenting a compelling narrative is key to managing a school, a curriculum body or accrediting agency.

Research has shown that this – a compelling narrative - is best done by having a cause, effect, a perpetrator and a motive.

SLIDE 21: a cause, an effect, a perpetrator and a motive.

What is seen about the way that ESL students (the cause) are often treated, is that the governing body/agency/school (the perpetrators) justify the peripheralization of ESL students in order to marginalize them and save effort in devising appropriate programmes (the motive). The result (the effect) is that ESL students are often marginalized and not given the means to acquire their full potential.

SLIDE 22

Having a compelling story, even when we know that it is factually wrong, is often more emotionally compelling than dealing with the truth.

Having a compelling story, even when we know that it is factually wrong, is often more emotionally compelling than dealing with the truth.

Among a large body of mostly monolingual English-speaking staff, and parents who are keen – sometimes desperate – to have their children in an English-speaking school, the emotional

narrative of ‘putting them all in the mainstream with “support”’ is not so hard to sell. Parents can see that their children are in the regular classes, even if they don’t understand much and their writing skills in content areas leave much to be desired.

Different types of bias

There are also the issues of ‘bias’. Many people interpret language issues in light of their own assumptions and prejudices: they may prefer a certain accent, or insist that a particular point of grammar is wrong. If they believe that English-only is the natural way forward, they see speakers of other languages who learn to speak it, and lose their mother tongue, as proof that assimilation is the only solution; if they accept the fact that bilingualism can bring advantages, they see successful bilinguals as proof of the benefits of bilingualism. Psychological researchers call such conclusion-drawing ‘biases’. Those who cherry-pick evidence to accommodate to their world view, are showing ‘confirmation bias’. For example, if a student who has been diagnosed as an ESL student by ESL specialists, but has been determined by non-specialists to be ‘fluent’ as she can talk quite fluently about her wish to be in the content classes rather than in a parallel ESL class, the non-specialist will exclaim that the student has perfectly good English and her wishes should be followed, showing confirmation bias. Further testing of written proficiency, however, may show that the student’s writing skills are a long way behind the spoken ability.

There are also situations where we modify new information to fit in with our world view; this is called ‘biased assimilation’. For example, using the same student as above, the parents may bring in reports from a previous school in another country that show good writing skills in English. The non-specialist will immediately proclaim ‘here is the evidence’; but the ESL specialists may then produce more recent evidence from the present that show insufficient writing skills.

Attitudes towards language can become very heated and polarized, to the extent that a teacher from, for example, the English department, may say that the student in question has given very good presentations in class; but then she may backtrack and say, well, the writing skills were not so good today. Demonstrating this type of making up their mind on the spot on the basis of readily available evidence is called ‘availability bias’. It happens frequently to students with language issues in schools which do not pursue in depth the verifiable language abilities of every student - their spoken and written abilities in both their mother tongue and English - and

then provide the appropriate programme. Teachers in such scenarios are not doing their duty as educators.

All of these ‘biases’ are common human foibles, but there should be no place for them in the professional environment of international schools. Language is the basis of everything students do in schools, and with a complex multilingual student body it is essential to first investigate in depth the potential of each student in all the language skills in all of their languages, then to provide the appropriate programme of instruction.

For schools with ESL teachers coming from a system like that of England, where they are not given professional status and have become inured to being in a ‘support’ role, it is likely that content teachers who may believe that there might, in fact, be something that they could do about the situation, do not speak out as they are more likely to be victim to the ‘bystander effect’, by which the more that people have seen of a problem and the way it is dealt with, the more likely they are to ignore their own judgement. This is a strong factor working against ESL teachers in a British-style international school. With globalisation, language has become an issue needing a global response and is thus particularly prone to the bystander effect. People look around to see what others are doing and saying, or more pertinently what they are not doing or saying. Social conformity is a strong behavioral instinct built into people’s core psychology, as in earlier stages of human development not doing the same as others around us could imply ostracism or abandonment. There are often serious risks involved with holding views that are not in step with your social group. And of course in a school if an ESL teacher is repeatedly ‘out of step’ with the English-speaking peer group majority then the threat of dismissal is always present; the choice is to speak out honestly on the issues and be fired, or be silent, swallow, and sit in classes in a ‘support’ role. ESL teachers around the world have written to me about precisely this scenario, in real fear of losing their jobs.

It needs repeating that in fact the monolingual English teachers and administrators are the odd ones out as the student body is usually multilingual. Since experiments on social conformity have shown that people conform even when there is a real threat, there will have to be a determined, strong school leader to push through maintaining a professional ESL department; and school boards should take a long look at policies of only employing native English speakers. This in itself raises another potential problem: the board may feel that such a ‘strong’ leader does not have the backing of the staff, or is upsetting them, so will not renew her

contract. English speakers, when in a majority on a school staff, face two risks: the uncertain risk of bilingualism compared with the certain and very personal risk of opposing the norm of English-only; or keeping a 'support' ESL programme instead of having a professional ESL and mother tongue programme.

Issues relating to the misplacement of ESL students in SEN programmes.

In schools in England 'EAL' and 'language support teachers' come under the aegis of Special Education Needs ('and Difficulties') Departments. This model has become ingrained to such an extent that it is barely questioned, and publishers reinforce it. A glance at a well-known publisher, for example - Bloomsbury Publishing - shows how. On their website, <http://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/education/> under 'Secondary', there is a list of 24 subjects. One of these is 'Special educational needs and EAL'. Of the twelve pages that follow with books for this area, there is just one book on 'EAL', titled '100 ideas for supporting learners with EAL' (notice the 'supporting', not teaching), and the other books are on such subjects as psychological disorders, multiple disabilities, dyslexia, supporting deaf children, dyscalculia and such matters. 'Teaching modern foreign languages', of course, gets a separate link, even though this subject involves far less complexity than teaching a second language. The negative effects of treating ESL students as SEN students have been documented throughout the literature on ESL students (e.g. Cummins, 1984).

International schools in Europe are more affected by the proximity of the English experience and many ESL teachers in international schools in Europe are British, bringing with them the experience of the English school curriculum. The result is often a docile acceptance that ESL will not be seen as a separate discipline, will be labelled EAL in support mode, and will be subsumed under the SEN umbrella.

Woolley (2010:88) notes that

There is a growing international consensus in the literature that second-language (L2) learners have generally been underdiagnosed and overrepresented in special education classes.

So we need to establish a clear differentiation between ESL students and those with genuine learning difficulties. Of course such boundaries are not always clear, but they are not clear in

any discipline when it comes to distinguishing students who are struggling with a particular subject, and the concern here is to provide a learning environment for second language students which is geared to their potential and avoid them being placed with a particular group of students – SEN - which might be seen as de-motivating for eager ESL students.

Some research articles on the ESL/SEN boundaries will now be reviewed. What is interesting in reading through these articles is that the authors appear to take it as a given that teachers will not have basic training in ‘linguistically responsive teaching’ of the type recommended in this talk.

Tangen and Spooner-Lane (2008:63) write that

There is a growing body of evidence to suggest that some ESL students are being misidentified by teachers as having learning difficulties when, in fact, some of these students may not have a learning difficulty at all.

The reasons for this are described by Tangen and Spooner-Lane (2008:64)

Teachers need to take into account that students who have EAL must learn new concepts in a new language within a new cultural reference. Teachers, therefore, must make accommodations in their teaching but usually have no idea how to do this. Without adequate groundwork in developing learning activities to support their learning, students who have EAL may be missing out on important English language instruction due to limited teacher preparation and/or limited resources (Iredale, 1998). Lo Bianco and Freebody (1997) described this deficit mode of teaching as a ‘sink or swim’ approach. Students who have EAL are placed in an English speaking classroom and are expected to learn *in* English while still learning the English language. While some students adapt and learn the classroom protocol (swim), others struggle until the point of giving up (sink).

Tangen and Spooner-Lane continue (2008:65,66)

Students who have EAL very often experience an initial ‘quiet period’ (Igoa, 1995) as they come to grips with their new situation. There is no set time frame for these quiet periods but it has been observed that the younger the child, the longer the quiet period lasts. During this time, students may exhibit resistance to learning and being included

in class activities. Teachers may interpret this reticence to engage in classroom activities as students being uncooperative and misbehaving. It is important for teachers to remember that SL students experience incongruity in their home customs and practices while trying to adjust to their new culture (Sing Ghuman, 1994) and are often bewildered by their new circumstances. Teachers who are unaware of students' underlying difficulties for learning may become focused on the product of students' work (correct spelling, grammar, reading pronunciation) rather than the process of learning (Nunan, 1999).

This extract reveals that it is taken for granted that content teachers will not know about the 'quiet period' experienced by ESL students. This is yet another indication that all teachers require continuing professional development in 'linguistically responsive teaching'. Hayden and Thompson note that

Although programmes such as ESL in the Mainstream (Unlocking the world, 2013) have become increasingly popular in response to a need for support in this area, it is undoubtedly the case that too many international school teachers are expected to cope without specific training, and in some schools students may not be as well supported as they and their parents might expect to be the case (Hayden and Thompson, pp. 10,11, in Pearce, 2013).

Researchers Hansen-Thomas and Cavagnetto reported that

Many of the mainstream teachers ... reported the desire to learn techniques appropriate for ESL students, as well as to communicate more with the ESL teacher. This suggests a strong need to provide teachers with both time and opportunity to work with trained ESL professionals, through in-service professional development and through release time during the school day.

And also that

Further, a partnership between well-trained ... teachers who are informed as to the linguistic demands of ... curriculum, texts, and assessments and other teachers (including those with ESL training) would greatly benefit the teachers and the students by conducting training and dissemination of appropriate information. It is therefore our view that consistent, long-term training in ESL pedagogy and methodology, as well as in the current dimensions of [content matter] and its language-rich requirements, will

bring benefit to the teaching and learning of ELLs in content-area classes. (Hansen-Thomas and Cavagnetto, 2010:262).

The facts once again provide justification for setting up separate classes for ESL beginners so that they gain confidence in the hands of ESL specialists who are well provided with the pedagogical tools and training to handle all aspects of the students' development.

Tangen and Spooner-Lane then write (2008:64,65):

Some teachers embrace the opportunity to work with SL students, others may feel a cultural distance between themselves and their students (Gersten, 1999). Teachers who feel such a gulf may retreat into 'safe' teaching practices that involve little risk-taking for themselves and their students and that may mask what Wheatley (2002) describes as 'teacher doubt'. Teacher doubt may occur when a teacher feels that they are unable to differentiate between a learning difficulty and a difficulty in learning due to limited English language proficiency.

Again, the need for specialist advice, and professional development training, is clear.

Tangen and Spooner-Lane (2008:67) go on to provide a brief recommendation on how 'all can be solved'; - apparently! - teachers should:

provide appropriate instruction for all students in the class. Such practices include developing strong communication ties with support personnel, accepting responsibility for including all students, partnering with parents, knowing when and who to ask for help and getting the most effective resources to do the job.

So apparently simple, and of course well intentioned, but each one of these precepts involves a massive amount of obstacles. 'Developing strong communication ties with support personnel' – does this mean ESL teachers? SEN teachers? ESL teachers will, in our model, in any case be referred to in future as 'appropriate professionals'. This whole concept of 'support' continually subverts the professional status of all ESL teachers in the teaching profession. It plays straight into the hands of politicians who are out to 'de-skill' the profession. It is yet another example of how ESL students in international schools are victims of a model designed by political actors

in national systems to pander to the forces of nationalism and protectionism against immigrants.

And ‘accepting responsibility for including all students’ is so easy to write, but impossible for teachers with no training or knowledge of ESL, and with no idea of what it is that makes the lessons challenging or non-accessible for ESL students; but in a dynamic class where a content teacher is keen to proceed with the syllabus, having to apply the brakes every tenth sentence in order to explain for ESL students is often not an option. This is again where a parallel ESL class teaching the same content but at a different speed is the solution.

‘Partnering with parents’ is of course always recommendable, but issues of time again present themselves, especially if over 50% of the students are ESL students. ‘Knowing when and who to ask for help’ sounds a little desperate; if there was an appropriate model in international schools of parallel ESL classes, in a framework where ESL teachers each had responsibility for parallel content, a mother tongue programme, and continuing professional development, ‘help’ would no longer be necessary. There might be occasions when extra advice on details was valued, but ‘help’ simply reveals the failure of the ‘EAL as support’ model.

Mahoney and MacSwan (2005: 38) have another insight into the misclassification of ESL students as SEN:

Artiles, Rueda, Salazar and Higareda (2005) report that ELL children assessed as lacking proficiency in their native language (arguably incorrectly) have a high likelihood of being classified as special education students. Although it has been argued that assessing children’s native language provides supplemental information to help teachers and administrators better evaluate students’ English-proficiency test results (CCSSO, 1991 - Council of Chief State School Officers), we believe it is more likely to create an atmosphere of confusion and result in incorrect perceptions of children’s learning situations.

For those wishing to search for other helpful information on ways of differentiating ESL and SEN issues the following websites provide guidance:

SLIDE 23

SLIDE 24

<https://eal.britishcouncil.org/teachers/learners-special-educational-needs>

www.naldic.org.uk › *Teaching & Learning* › *EAL resources*

www.naldic.org.uk/Resources/NALDIC/.../eal-sen-trainingfile.pdf

www.colorincolorado.org › *School Support* › *Special Education* › *Articles*

www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.459.8345...

<https://bctf.ca/uploadedFiles/Publications/ESL-SpecialNeeds.pdf>

www.education.vic.gov.au › ... › *Language Support*

<https://www.school-portal.co.uk/GroupHomepage.asp?GroupID=968345>

www.assessmentforlearning.edu.au/verve/_resources/specialneeds.pdf

www.eriding.net/.../eal/.../120206_ldixon_eal_pri_sec_eal_and_sen.pdf

Research evidence:

What follows are quotes from researchers on the advantages of, and the need for direct L2 instruction:

SLIDE 25 The accumulated evidence clearly shows accuracy and rate advantages for instruction. Simply put, instructed learners progress at a faster rate, they are likely to develop more elaborate language repertoires and they typically become more accurate than uninstructed learners. Ortega (2014: 139).

‘The accumulated evidence clearly shows accuracy and rate advantages for instruction. Simply put, instructed learners progress at a faster rate, they are likely to develop more elaborate language repertoires and they typically become more accurate than uninstructed learners.’
Ortega (2014: 139).

Ortega (2013:27):

‘... knowing that young children may have a slow start when acquiring an L2 can be an important research-based argument against harmful attempts to promote so-called sink-or-swim educational policies that attempt to reduce or even completely withdraw the first and second language instruction that is to be provided to language minority children by schools. Such policies have been dangerously gaining ground ... for some time now’.

Ortega (2013:79):

‘For successful grammar acquisition, attention to form is necessary. This attentional focus on form can be externally achieved by instruction’.

And:

‘Cognitive-interactionist researchers agree that negative feedback (or the implicit or explicit indication that some part of an utterance is ungrammatical) is better overall than entirely ignoring errors’.

Harper, Cook and James, in Leung and Creese, (2010:84): ‘... fluent English speakers often hesitate to question or correct EAL speakers unless their meaning is unclear. Therefore, EAL learners at intermediate and higher levels of English proficiency typically receive *insufficient feedback* on their errors and thus have limited opportunities for English language development’.

Ortega (2013:80):

Specifically, grammar (a) requires more interest, attention and hard work than other aspects of the language to be learned; (b) may even require more time to simmer and deploy than the learning of other aspects of an L2; and (c) can act as a gatekeeper to development in other areas of the L2 beyond formulaic repertoires, particularly sociolinguistic competence.’

Ortega (2013:143): ‘Instruction has been shown to result in clear benefits in the areas of accuracy and rate of learning for both syntax and morphology’.

Leung and Creese, (2010:xx): ‘... inclusive pedagogies, unless properly resourced with appropriate teacher expertise and knowledge may fail the very students they set out to support. Mismatches between the rhetoric of inclusion and the sometimes excluding practices of classroom life illustrate how linguistically diverse students learning English as an additional language might suffer’.

Monaghan, in Leung and Creese, (2010:24): ‘Students’ difficulties in ‘reasoning’ may be due to their lack of familiarity with the linguistic properties of the language through which the reasoning is expected to be presented, rather than to the inherent difficulty of the cognitive processes involved’.

Harper, Cook and James, in Leung and Creese, (2010:75): ‘EAL students need language-sensitive content instruction to facilitate their conceptual learning through academic English. They also need content-based language instruction to assist their development of the new language’

Harper, Cook and James, in Leung and Creese, (2010:77): ‘Teachers [need to] set objectives for English language and culture learning for their ESL students. The process includes identifying and teaching the grammar and discourse structures that students need to understand and communicate important ideas in the content areas. It also means identifying and teaching key words and phrases that ESL students will need to learn in addition to the technical, content-specific words that will be new to all students (Echevarria et al., 2004)’.

Harper, Cook and James, in Leung and Creese, (2010:85): ‘Although many new words are learned through multiple exposures in everyday social settings outside schools, technical terms and their associated patterns of use in academic content areas require more focused attention’.

A major difference between SL students in national settings and those in international schools is that the latter usually have no exposure to English outside the school – another compelling reason for direct instruction of English.

Harper et al, in Leung and Creese, (2010:90): ‘... the placement of ESL students in mainstream classes without specialized ESL classes for their English language development makes it

extremely difficult for them to receive either the sheltered content instruction or the focused, content-based language and culture support that many need to succeed in school’.

Ortega (2014:36): ‘... monolingualism is taken as the implicit norm, the reality of bi/multilingualism is made invisible, and linguistic ownership by birth and monolingual upbringing is elevated to an inalienable right and advantage’.

Conteh, Copland and Creese (2014:151): ‘Now, with the lack of any coherent centrally mediated ESL policies or practices in mainstream schools, they are beginning to reinstate *withdrawal* practices ...’.

As reported by Conteh and Meier (2014a:4): ‘If children have a limited command of the language of instruction, and of literacy, and no efforts are made to welcome them on their own terms, social stigma can be constructed, based on the implicit association between how well individuals express themselves and their intelligence’ (in Torres-Guzmán, 2002:6).

Ortega (2014: 23) reports that ‘there is evidence in L2 phonology of exceptional post-pubertal learners whose accents are not recognized as foreign even under close scrutiny in the laboratory’. It seems this was the case because ‘These exceptional learners shared two features. They had all received considerable amounts of high-quality L2 instruction and they all self-reported high levels of motivation and concern to sound native-like.’

Finally, a clinching argument for the need for a designated ESL department with professional teachers comes from Ortega (2014: 139), who writes:

While the value of language instruction regularly becomes the object of heated debates in scholarly and public policy circles, supporters and sceptics often fail to pay sufficient attention to the fact that: ‘... the accumulated evidence clearly shows accuracy and rate advantages for instruction. Simply put, instructed learners progress at a faster rate, they are likely to develop more elaborate language repertoires and they typically become more accurate than uninstructed learners.

The above extracts from researchers present a convincing amount of evidence that L2 students need to have a structured programme of instruction tailored to their specific needs, in addition

to the evidence given by prominent researchers such as Cummins, Krashen, and Collier and Thomas already given.

It is so obvious to ESL professionals that ESL students require all the trappings of programme delivery, curriculum and assessment specifically geared to their needs that it is frustrating in the extreme to have to continually present arguments for their existence. Long-term stress is said to be the most debilitating, and in an already stressful (though rewarding) occupation, ESL teachers would be well-served by international schools acknowledging their expertise and ensuring that optimal conditions are established for the healthy modus operandi of their profession: a department structure, and recognition as a subject in its own right by curriculum and accreditation agencies.

Meanwhile I continue to receive reports of parallel ESL programmes being literally wiped out by managerial edict, with no recourse allowed.

Solution – the professionalization of ESL

‘Learning a language is a much deeper process than learning a somehow “neutral” linguistic phenomenon enriched by some anecdotal cultural knowledge. It is something that involves the whole person: “Nobody acquires a language as he/she would do for any other subject: language guides and filters our relationships, deeply questions what we have achieved but also our affective, symbolic and imaginary references, as well as our values”’ (Coïaniz, 2001:248, in Piccardo and Aden, 2014:219)

‘It is quite possible that ESL students are leaving the ESL classroom with false expectations of their own abilities, and when they cannot live up to these expectations, anxieties increase, resulting in withdrawal from interactions with others.’ (Pappamihiel and Eleni, 2001: 36, 37)

The solution is to establish an ESL and Mother Tongue department, which will be seen as ‘a centre of expertise’, with appropriately defined curricular objectives, assessment and accreditation. In an age of establishing equal rights for women; for all races; and for the gay and transgender community; the time to establish equity for languages is long overdue. 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 ever 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.

ESL and MT will require (A), a separate department, and (B), a head of department with the confidence and integrity to assert herself, and skilled enough to avoid being dismissed in the process. With such an institutionalised department for the subject area of second language teaching, with its related partner of mother tongue teaching, there will be the possibility of the ESL students’ pedagogical needs being met.

There is a specialized vocabulary to discuss ‘language matters’ which acts as a shorthand for experts in the field. Critics snipe at this as ‘jargon’, but maths, science, economics, and IT all have their own specialized language. Teachers in the department will need to be carefully selected as regards training, qualifications and experience: directors cannot afford to have any weak links in this area.

Only by adapting this model can the subtractive bilingual orientation, where students’ mother tongues are largely unknown and un-nurtured, and their English language needs are relegated to ‘support’ that so permeates international schools, be effectively challenged. It is thought in many circles that international schools are ‘leading the way’: they perhaps should be, given the clientele and the fee-level, but such aspirations leave a lot for the asking as regards ‘language matters’.

In today’s classrooms, academic and social success often hinges on a child’s language abilities. Children who need extra support in second language acquisition have been mainstreamed into classrooms where the teachers do not necessarily have the resources or the support to meet their needs. Without this support, the children who are struggling to acquire even basic skills in their second language begin to fall behind academically, creating an achievement gap that only widens over time (Harris, 2003). Providing teachers with adequate tools and techniques to support these learners is essential (Facella et al, 2005: 209).

‘Numerous bilinguals do not feel fully accepted by either of the cultures in question. There again, the cause is often not bilingualism/biculturalism so much as ‘monolingualist’ and ‘monoculturalist’ ideologies dominant in one or both of the

communities' (Lüdi and Py, 2009: 160).

School leaders will be re-educated to promote this model throughout the world of international education, with the realization that the majority of international school students are 'emerging bilinguals' and that there is a new paradigm in this increasingly globalised world. It will involve careful selection of staff for this new department, rigorous training for all managers and department heads in order to emphasise the equality of status of the ESL and mother tongue staff, and screening of each new staff member in the school to ensure that they have valid professional training in *linguistically responsive teaching*. As already noted, this must be 'consistent, long-term training in ESL pedagogy and methodology ... Quick and dirty 1-day, or 1-hour, in-service sessions simply cannot provide enough preparation and training for teachers expected to help ELLs succeed in their mainstream content classes in a new language' (Hansen-Thomas and Cavagnetto (2010:263). School directors will reap rewards: they will notice a steady improvement in progress by all ESL students, an interweaving of reading and writing processes among departments, more understanding of bilingual processes throughout the community, gratitude from parents, and improvement in grades and exam results.

Examples of linguistic input

Sound correspondences for English vowel letters (Cook, (a), in Cook and Singleton, 2014:77)

SLIDE 26

- **a** bait, wag, talkative, father, anaemia, daughter, many, aisle, boat, aerial, beauty, cauliflower, artistically (silent)
- **e** ten, cedar, be, kidney, offer, bureau, eight, lewd, pace (silent)
- **i** bit, bite, legible, auntie, sign, dirt, business (silent)

SLIDE 27

- **o** phone, dog, memoir, door, book, word, youth, ludicrous, cow, tough, flour, boy

- **u** but, fruit, burn, use, full, guest (silent)
- **y** yes, martyr, ratify, nylon, funny

When there is an ESL department, with fully trained professionals, these enthusiasts will not only know all the above facts but actually enjoy teaching them as such matters are the ‘life and blood’ of applied linguistics, and they will regularly introduce, explicate, and give opportunities for practice of such English language quirks, perhaps also briefly glossing over the historical reasons for them. In fact in English there are 26 letters in the alphabet to refer to the 44 phonemes, the basic unit of the language’s phonology.

Wolf, (2013), also points out the need for children to be actively taught certain phonological and orthographic constituent parts of English. An excerpt is given of common words with the vowel pair ‘ea’ and its wide range of possible pronunciations:

SLIDE 28

‘There once was a beautiful bear who sat on a seat near to breaking and read by the hearth about how the earth was created. She smiled beatifically, full of ideas for the realm of her winter dreams’ (op.cit:128).

A change is even beginning to take place in England, as already noted. Conteh, Copland and Creese (2014:151) note: ‘Now, with the lack of any coherent centrally mediated English as an additional language (EAL) policies or practices in mainstream schools and the decline in local authority advisory services in England, schools are beginning to reinstate withdrawal practices.’

The professionalization of ESL would also open career paths in the discipline. In the current ‘support’ role, where ESL teachers are often ‘teaching assistants’, there is a permanent reinforcement of low expectations. Even good ESL teachers become disenchanted and demotivated, many changing disciplines or even professions. This author has seen excellent ESL teachers, well-qualified, who in spite of being dedicated to their students have finally become unable to tolerate the steady downgrading of their profession and have moved to other areas. This is a huge loss for international education.

Characteristics of a good ESL & MT department

International schools need to ensure that there is a professional ESL department staffed with qualified applied linguists who can both advise content teachers on appropriate strategies, ensure that school directors only employ content teachers with appropriate training, and initiate such training in schools; but above all who can teach the ESL students in separate classes at carefully chosen times so that they can gain the confidence and skills required.

A good ESL and Mother Tongue department/programme would therefore have the following characteristics:

- It will have a suitably experienced and qualified department head (applied linguistics/bilingualism, preferably with fluent ability in at least one other language, and having direct experience of living in other cultures)
- It will be staffed with suitably qualified teachers, with similar backgrounds to the Department Head
- It will be an independent department, not part of another department, especially not an English or SEN Department
- These teachers may well be bilingual, or second language speakers of English
- It will need a department philosophy or mission statement which encompasses responsibility for the three programmes: ESL curriculum; Mother Tongue curriculum; linguistically responsive teaching in-service for all staff
- It will need a comprehensive plan of age-appropriate English instruction which will encompass the basics of language at the students' level, with a content-based

curriculum when children are past the 'readiness' stage. The programme should allow for regular communication with other subject teachers.

- A focus on the pastoral element: small group instruction, parallel to the mainstream, with attention to individuals' specific needs: academic, linguistic, emotional.
- Procedures to inform parents in depth of all the issues concerning second language learning
- Policies that ensure that the final decisions as to who should receive ESL and when to move students from ESL classes to mainstream classes are to be made by ESL teachers
- Funds for ESL allocated in line with other disciplines
- The understanding that the status of ESL students and teachers will be viewed as equal to that of other students and teachers, with efforts made to emphasise the positive aspects of this body
- The inclusion of the cost of ESL provision in the general costs of the school (see Carder, 2007, appendix 4).

Conclusion

To take away with you:

Most models for second language students are built on political or financial grounds, and are not educational or research-based.

SL students need to be empowered, not disabled. This cannot come about in a 'support' model.

SL students are aiming at a moving target – over a long period of time.

They need additive, not subtractive bilingualism.

Separate ESL from SEN

Secondary schools are tough working environments. A good ESL department needs a tough leader, and hard-working, dedicated, supportive ESL colleagues.

Parents need to be aware of what awaits them before their children come to the school; and they need regular updates on what their role might be (MT, reading books). They should never be led to expect that their children will become ‘native-speakers’.

Aim for an additive, not a subtractive, language model.

In his Foreword to my 2007 book, Jim Cummins wrote of ‘the huge potential of International Schools to play a leadership role in charting educational directions that respond to the realities of the 21st century,’ and also how ‘too many International Schools continue to see students’ linguistic diversity as a problem rather than as a resource. In some schools, families are penalized with additional fees if their children require support in acquiring English. Few International Schools have coherent programmes for supporting the development of students’ mother tongues.’

Ultimately, ‘it comes down to the three basic perceptions about language around which people and groups vary: language as a problem, language as a right and language as a resource.’ Ruiz (1984) proposed in Baker, C. (2006:375). For L2 students in international schools it should be clear which the right choices are: language as a right and a resource. Too many of those controlling the agenda continue to see it as a problem.

Postscript

Following discussions with many dedicated second language teachers during the present conference, my belief is that it is not only reasonable, but vitally necessary to urge all international schools to (a) recognise that the model for ESL provision, subservient to SEN, and in a support role, was designed for the entirely different modus operandi of immigrant populations in Britain and other countries, and (b) to establish professional programmes of

second language provision throughout all international schools, based on the sheltered instruction model outlined above. Only by this means can the second language children of the professional international community be positively enabled to achieve their true potential.

References

Arkoudis, S. (2003) Teaching English as a second language in science classes: Incommensurate epistemologies. *Language and Education* 17(3), 161-173.

Arkoudis, S. and Creese, A. (2006) Teacher-teacher talk: the discourse of collaboration in linguistically diverse classrooms. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 2006.

Artiles, A. J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J. J., and Higareda, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation: English language learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children*, 71(3), (pp.283–300).

August, D. and Hakuta, K. (eds) (1997) *Improving Schools for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, National Academy Press. In J. Cummins (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Azadi, S. (1987) *Out of Iran*. London: Macdonald and Co.

Baker, C. (2006) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 4th edition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. and Hornberger, N. H. (eds) (2001) *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. and Prys Jones, S. (eds) (1998) *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Boyle, B. and Charles, M. (2014) *Formative Assessment for Teaching and Learning*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Brown, C.L. (2004) Reducing the over-referral of culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD) for language disabilities. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2, (pp.225–243).

Camus, A. (2005) *The Myth of Sisyphus*. London: Penguin Books.

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

Cherng, H. S. and Halpin, P.F. (2016) The Importance of Minority teachers: Student Perceptions of Minority Versus White teachers. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 45 No. 7, pp. 407–420. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X16671718 <http://er.era.net>

Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. (2006) Integrativeness: untenable for World Englishes learners? *World Englishes*, Vol. 25, No. 3/4, (pp. 437–450). 0883–2919

Coñaniz, A. (2001) *Apprentissage des langues et subjectivité*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Collier, V.P. (2003) Foreword, pp. 7,8, in Murphy, E. (ed) *The International Schools Journal Compendium – ESL: Educating Non-native Speakers of English in an English-medium International School*. Saxmundham: Peridot Press.

Collier, V.P. and Crawford, J. (1998) Policy and Programs. In C.J. Ovando and V.P. Collier *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms* (pp.27-61). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Collier, V.P. and Thomas, W.P. (2007) Chapter 22: Predicting second language academic success in English using the prism model. In J. Cummins and C Davison (Eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Education*. Norwell, MA: Springer.

Conteh, J., Copland, F. and Creese, A. (2014) Multilingual Teachers' Resources in Three Different Contexts: Empowering Learning. In Conteh, J. and Meier, G. (eds) *The multilingual turn in languages education* (pp.194-216). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Conteh, J. and Meier, G. (eds) (2014a) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Conteh, J. and Meier, G., (2014b) Introduction. In J. Conteh, and G. Meier, (eds) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges* (pp.1-9). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. (2014a) How do people learn to write in a L2? In V. Cook and D. Singleton *Key topics in second language acquisition* (pp.73-88). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. (2014c) What are the goals of language teaching? In V. Cook and D. Singleton. *Key topics in second language acquisition* (pp. 125-141). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. and Singleton, D. (2014) *Key Topics in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Corrie, L. (1995) The structure and culture of staff collaboration: Managing meaning and opening doors. *Educational Review* 47 (1), 89-99.

Crawford, J. (2000) *At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

CRE (1986) *Teaching English as a second language* (The Calderdale report). London: Commission for Racial Equality. (Note: In 2008 the CRE was merged into the newly created EHRC – The Equalities and Human Rights Commission – along with the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission).

Creese, A. (2002) Discursive construction of power in teacher relationships. *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (4), 597-616.

Cummins, J. (1976) The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* No. 9, 1-43.

Cummins, J. (1979a) Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research* 49, 222-51.

Cummins, J. (1979b) Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19,121-29.

Cummins, J. (1980) The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. *NABE Journal* 4, 25-60. In Baker, Colin and Hornberger, Nancy H. (eds.) (2001) *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1984) *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1986) Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention. *Harvard Educational Review* 56, 18-36. In Baker, Colin and Hornberger, Nancy H. (eds.) (2001) *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1988) The role and use of educational theory in formulating language policy. *TESL Canada Journal* 5, 11-19. In Baker, Colin and Hornberger, Nancy H. (eds.) (2001) *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy. Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Davison, C. (2006) Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9: 4, 454 — 475.

DECS (1999) *ESL in the Mainstream*. Hindmarsh, South Australia: Department of Education and Children's Services; and *TESMC – Teaching ESL students in mainstream classrooms* www.unlockingtheworld.com

DES (1985) *Education for all: the report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups* (Swann Report). Department of Education and Science, London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Science (DES) Task Group on Assessment and Testing (1988) *National Curriculum Task Group on Assessment and Testing: Three Supplementary Reports*. London: DES.

Dewaele, J-M, Housen, A. and Li Wei (eds) (2003) *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E., (eds) (2009) *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Edwards, J. (2004) Foundations of Bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (eds) *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, (pp. 7-31). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Edwards, V. (2004) *Multilingualism in the English-speaking World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Edwards, V. (2009) *Learning to be Literate*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Facella, A., Melissa A., Rampino, K. M. and Shea, E. K. (2005) Effective teaching strategies for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29: 1, (pp.209 — 221).

Fathman, A.K., Quinn, M.E., and Kessler, C. (1992) *Teaching science to English learners, Grades 4-8*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Finlayson, J.G. (2005) *Habermas, A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1976) *Sociolinguistics: a brief introduction*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. A. (2004) Language Maintenance, Language Shift, and Reversing Language Shift. In T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, (pp. 406-436). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

García, O. and Flores, N. (2014) Multilingualism and Common Core State Standards in the United States. In S. May, (ed) *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp.147-168). New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Gersten, R. (1999) Lost opportunities: Challenges confronting four teachers of English-language learners. *Elementary School Journal*, 100, (pp.37–56).

Goriot, C., Bakker, J., Denessen, E. and Droop, M. (2016) Benefits of being bilingual? The relationship between pupils' perceptions of teachers' appreciation of their home language and executive functioning. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, December, 2016, vol. 20, no. 6, 700-713. Published online before print May 29, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1367006915586470

Gunderson, L., and Siegel, L.S. (2001) The evils of the use of IQ tests to define learning disabilities in first-and second-language learners. *Reading Teacher*, 55, (pp.48–55).

Hansen-Thomas, H. and Cavagnetto, A. (2010) What Do Mainstream Middle School Teachers Think About Their English Language Learners? A Tri-State Case Study. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33: 2, (pp.249 — 266).

Harris, J. L. (2003) Toward an understanding of literacy issues in multicultural school-age populations. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in School*, 34(1), (pp.17–19).

Hargreaves, A. (1994) Collaboration and contrived collegiality: Cup of comfort or poisoned chalice? In A. Hargreaves (ed) *Changing teachers, Changing times* (pp.186-211). London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. and Macmillan, B. (1994) The balkanisation of teaching: Collaboration that divides. In A. Hargreaves (ed) *Changing teachers, Changing times* (pp.212-240). London: Cassell.

Harper, C.A., and de Jong, E.J., (2009) English language teacher expertise: the elephant in the room. *Language and Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, March 2009, 137–151.

Harper, C., with Cook, K. and James, C.K. (2010) Content-Language Integrated Approaches for Teachers of EAL Learners: Examples of Reciprocal Teaching. In C. Leung, and A. Creese, (eds) *English as an Additional Language* (pp.75-96). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hayden, M. and Thompson, J. (2013) International Schools: Antecedents, Current Issues and Metaphors for the Future. Pp. 3-23 in R. Pearce, (ed) *International education and schools: moving beyond the first 40 years*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Haynes, J. (2002) *Children as Philosophers: Learning through Enquiry and Dialogue in the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Hébert, R. (1976) *Rendement académique et langue d'enseignement chez les élèves franco-manitobains*. Saint-Boniface, Manitoba: Centre de Recherches du Collège Universitaire de Saint-Boniface.

Hoff, K. and Pandey, P. (2004) *Belief Systems and Durable Inequalities: An experimental investigation of Indian caste*. Policy Research Working Paper. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Holderness, J. (2002) The role of continuing professional development in the improvement of international schools. In *International Education in Practice* (2002) (pp.83-98) M. Hayden, J. Thompson and G. Walker (eds.) London: Kogan Page.

Hu, G. and McKay, S.L. Multilingualism as Portrayed in a Chinese English Textbook, in J. Conteh and G. Meier (eds) (2014a) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. pp 48-72. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Igoa, C. (1995). *The inner world of the immigrant child*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Iredale, R. (1998). The impact of immigration on school education in New South Wales, Australia. *International Migration Review*, 31, (pp.655–669).

Lamb, M. (2004) Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, (pp.3–19).

Leung, C. (2001) Evaluation of content-language learning in the mainstream classroom. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, and C. Davison, (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp. 177- 198). Harlow: Longman Pearson.

Leung, C. (2004) Integrating EAL learners into mainstream curriculum. *NALDIC Quarterly* 2 (1), 3-10.

Leung, C. and Creese, A. (eds) (2010) *English as an Additional Language. Approaches to teaching linguistic minority students*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Leung, C. and Franson, C. (2001a) England: ESL in the early days. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, and C. Davison, C. (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp.153-164). Harlow: Longman Pearson.

Leung, C. and Franson, C. (2001b) Mainstreaming: ESL as a diffused curriculum concern. In B. Mohan, C. Leung, and C. Davison, (eds) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity* (pp. 165-178). Harlow: Longman Pearson.

Limbos, M.M., and Geva, E. (2001) Accuracy of teacher assessments of second- language students at risk for reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34, (pp.136–151).

Leung, C. and Lewkowicz, J. (2008) Assessing second/additional language of diverse populations, in E. Shohamy and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd edn, Vol. 7: Language testing and assessment. New York: Springer Science/Business Media (pp. 301-17).

Little, J. (1990) Teachers as colleagues. In A. Lieberman (ed) *Schools as collaborative cultures: creating the future now* (pp. 165-193). London: Falmer.

Lo Bianco, J., and Freebody, P. (1997) *Australian literacies. Informing national policy on literacy education*. Melbourne: Language Australia.

Lüdi, G. and Py, B. (2009) To be or not to be ... a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6 (2), (pp.154-167); doi: 10.1080/14790710902846715

MacKenzie, P. (2001) Bilingual education: who wants it? Who needs it? In Murphy, E. (ed.) (2003) *The International Schools Journal Compendium – ESL: Educating Non-native Speakers of English in an English-medium international school*. Saxmundham: Peridot Press, a division of John Catt Educational Ltd.

Mahoney, K. S. and MacSwan, J. (2005) Re-examining identification and reclassification of English language learners: A critical discussion of select state practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29: 1, (pp.31 — 42).

Marshall, G. (2014) *Don't even think about it*. New York: Bloomsbury.

McArthur, T. (1986) Comment: Worried about something else. *International Journal of the Society of Language* 60, 87-91. Quoted in J-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, and Li Wei (eds) (2003) *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles*, (p. 20). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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: <http://www.ioe.ac.uk/newsEvents/56528.html>

Ministry of Education (1963) *English for immigrants*. London: HMSO.

Mohan, B, Leung, C, and Davison, C. (eds) (2001) *English as a Second Language in the Mainstream: Teaching, Learning and Identity*. Harlow, Essex, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.

Monaghan, F. (2010) Mainstream participatory approaches: from slipstream to mainstream. In C. Leung, and A. Creese, (eds) *English as an Additional Language* (pp.15-31). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Morrison, L. (2016) Native English speakers are the world's worst communicators. <http://www.bbc.com/capital/story/20161028-native-english-speakers-are-the-worlds-worst-communicators>

Moore, H. (2002) Who will guard the guardians themselves? In J.W. Tollefson (ed) *Language Policies in Education* (pp.111-136). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P. and Smit, U. (eds) (2016) *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Nunan, D. (1999) *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

OFSTED (1994) *Educational support for minority ethnic communities: a survey of educational provision funded under Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act*. London: Office for Standards in Education.

Ortega, L. (2013) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ortega, L. (2014) Ways forward for a multilingual turn. In May, S. (ed) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education* (pp.32-53). New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Ovando, C.J. (1998) Mathematics and Science. In C.J. Ovando and V.P. Collier, *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms* (pp. 174-206). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Pappamihel, A., and Eleni, N. (2001) Moving from the ESL classroom into the mainstream: An investigation of English language anxiety in Mexican girls. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25: 1, (pp.31 — 38).

Paulston, C.B. (1980) *Bilingual Education: Theories and Issues*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Peal, E., and Lambert, W. (1962/72). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs, General and Applied* 76, whole of no. 546, (pp.1-23). (Reprinted in R. Gardner and W. Lambert, *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.)

Pearce, R. (2013) Student diversity: the core challenge to international schools. In R. Pearce (ed) *International Education and Schools: Moving beyond the First 40 Years* (pp. 61-84). London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Piccardo, E. and Aden, J. (2014) Plurilingualism and empathy: beyond instrumental language learning. In J. Conteh, and G. Meier (eds) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education* (pp.217-240). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Popham, W.J. (2008) *Transformative Assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ramírez, A. G. and Politzer, R. L. (1976) The acquisition of English and Maintenance of Spanish in a bilingual education program. In J. E. Alatis and K. Twadell (eds) *English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Rampton, B. (1997) Second language research in late modernity: a response to Firth and Wagner, *Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3): 329-33.

Rittel, H.EW.J. and Webber, M.W. (1973) Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences* 4: 155-169.

Romaine, S. (2004) The Bilingual and Multilingual Community. In T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, (pp. 385-405). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal*, Vol.8, Iss. 2, 1984.

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/48/4/5833>

Shaw, P. (2003) Leadership in the diverse school. In R.S. Schechter, and J. Cummins, (eds) *Multilingual Education in Practice* (pp. 97-112). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sing Ghuman, P.A. (1994) *Coping with two cultures. British Asian and Indo-Canadian adolescents*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tangen, D. and Spooner-Lane, R. (2008) Avoiding the deficit model of teaching: Students who have EAL/ESL and learning difficulties, *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 13: 2, (pp.63 — 71).

Torres-Guzmán, M.E. (2002) Dual language programs: Key features and results. *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Directions in language and Education*, 14.

Toukomaa, P. And Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1977) *The Intensive Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Migrant Children of Pre-school Age and Children in the Lower Level of Comprehensive School*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Troike, R.C. (1978) Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. *NABE Journal*, 3 (1), 13-24.

Vaughn, S., Bos, C.S., and Schumm, J.S. (2006) *Teaching exceptional, diverse and at risk students in the general education classroom* (3rd ed.). Sydney: Pearson Education.

Wheatley, K.F. (2002) The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, (pp.5–22).

Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) *The Spirit Level*. London: Penguin Books.

Wolf, M. (2008) *Proust and the Squid: the story and science of the reading brain*. Cambridge, UK: Icon Books.

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.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1983) The language learner as an individual: Implications of research on individual differences for the ESL teacher. In M.A. Clarke and J. Handscombe (eds.) *On TESOL '82: Pacific Perspectives on Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 157-171). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Woolley, G. (2010) Issues in the identification and ongoing assessment of ESL students with reading difficulties for reading intervention. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 15: 1, (pp.81 — 98).