ESL Departments as Centres of Expertise in International Middle and Upper Schools:

Exposing myth-information about second-language issues.

CIS Symposium, Amsterdam, 10th March 2017

Dr Maurice Carder http://www.mauricecarder.net

SLIDE 1   **Amsterdam March 2017**

Focus on middle and upper school

Today I am going to trace the various events that have led to the status and provision of programmes for second language students in international schools. It is complex, but a clear picture can be discerned of how events other than a concern with their best educational interests have dominated. I will then provide solutions.

SLIDE 2   **No other area of education has been more politicized in recent years.**

Crawford and Krashen (2007: 10) have summarised it 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.

SLIDE 3   **Denial, delegating, and remediation.**

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.

Terminology

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

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

SLIDE 4: ESL, EAL, ELL, SLL, L2, LEP, EFL, TESOL, 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.

Second, although 'for researchers the term second language may mean the third, fourth, tenth and so on language learned later in life, 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' (Ortega, 2013).

SLIDE 5: Foreign language, second language and mother tongue

This is important. In ISs 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.

SLIDE 6: History of ESL in the Anglosphere

Now some history: how has this 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.

Please note, for ESL purposes we'll be talking about England, not Britain, as it has different educational provision from other parts of the UK (apart from Wales).

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

SLIDE 7: 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), report 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'.

Also '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) postulated 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 was once 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 about 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 accommodate ESL students all the time becomes frustrating for both fluent students and harassed teacher.

A brief snaphot 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 English experience, 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.

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

USA

There was a backlash to the legal imposition of bilingual education in some districts and heated debate about the effectiveness of the program. Thus in 1998 in California 'Proposition 227' was passed. Salient points are:

• young immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency in a new language, such as English, if they are heavily exposed to that language in the classroom at an early age;

• therefore it is resolved that all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible. But: 1 year ESL, and then out.

The main features that have emerged in national systems as a result of the focus on pre-empting racism, focusing on 'inclusion', and establishing second language students as immigrants, are, in England:

ESL students have no dedicated programme of instruction;

ESL teachers have no recognition as professionals, or any requirement to be qualified as such;

ESL students and teachers are labelled as EAL;

ESL teachers report to SEN departments; SEN **is** recognised as a subject requiring certification;

Content teachers spend *half a day* in a whole year's PGCE on EAL issues;

ESL teachers are now largely TAs, with the negative connotations and results that accumulate to them: low pay, low status, insecure tenure.

This leads us to the comment by Pearce (2013:61, 62) that: *'In general teachers have performed international education according to the national models in which they have been trained'.*

SLIDE 8   In general teachers have performed international education according to the national models in which they have been trained - Pearce (2013:61, 62)

He could have added that school leaders do the same. I have met many ESL teachers over the years throughout the world, and teachers can also contact me through my website. I have thus collated a large number of vignettes attesting to the poor educational practices taking place in international schools worldwide.

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.

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 that focus on maintaining the mother tongue.

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 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

> 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).

Let us now look at how SL students and their teachers can be treated in ISs.

The importance of equal status for ESL staff

> In a well-established international school, the entire ESL department of ten teachers were told by their new director, a monolingual north American, that in future they would be seen as 'language support', and not as an academic department. They were relegated to a lower status, with a 'coordinator' instead of a Head of Department, with correspondingly lower pay. Their teaching rooms were also downgraded. When they attempted to have a discussion with the director he told them 'my decision is final, there will be no discussion'.

The position and status of the ESL teachers will reflect on the status of the students, allowing a perception throughout the school that 'ESL students are not so important', this in turn affecting their self-esteem and their learning potential. The support model is a colossal waste of resources and expertise: admin is not getting its money's worth if highly trained ESL teachers are reduced to subservient positions.

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.

SLIDE 9   The neo-liberal managerialisation of education

In the book 'Education management in managerialist times' Thrupp and Willmott (2003:182) write that current school change literature 'is fundamentally about extending and legitimating the neo-liberal managerialisation of education, and not about change, for example, curricular, that promotes real learning and engenders creativity in pupils and students'.

The power wielded by school leaders is backed up institutionally by the curriculum bodies and accreditation agencies that set standards.

ECIS ESL & MT committee

SLIDE 10   The CIS, ECIS and ESL

For many years the ECIS ESL committee had regular input to the Accreditation Guide. However, in 2003 the CIS published a new 'Guide to Accreditation' in which ESL was placed at the end of the guide under 'Learning Support Services', and ESL was grouped together with SEN as a non-curriculum subject, following the model of national systems. The committee, which by this time had renamed itself as the 'ECIS ESL and Mother Tongue Committee' in order to reflect the importance of the maintenance of students' mother tongues, protested vigorously about the new placement of ESL in the Guide and had meetings with the head of CIS accreditation services at that time but to no avail.

The fact that the 'language support' standard comes immediately after the standard (E2) for 'Children with learning differences or specific needs' gives a green light for school heads to justify their decision to place the two areas in the same box, to the detriment of ESL students as ESL is **not** a learning problem.

ESL in the IB, especially MYP, in International Schools

SLIDE 11: ESL in the IB, especially MYP, in International Schools

'The IB has become a franchised commodity, and thus is very much part of the hyper-capitalist transition of society. ... The IB has an image, evident in articles in the popular press, of being a curriculum of 'high flyers.' This entrenched perception now looks difficult to reverse, and is a moot point for many international educators. ... The education of the global elite ... contradicts strikingly with the inclusive notion of global citizenship' Bunnell (2008: 158).

The IB has made various attempts to recognise the burgeoning numbers of second language learners in its curriculum provision, but resiled on both of them. The IB set up a working group in the late 1980s to revise the Diploma programme language A/language B model, and this came to fruition in 1996 with the introduction of language A2, giving more choice to bilingual students, and taught successfully by many enlightened teachers. The basis of the argument for the change was given by Tosi in 1991:

> For the purposes of assessing language competence in international schools a fundamental distinction needs to be enforced between the notion of second language academic proficiency and that of knowledge of a foreign language. The first notion relates specifically to the academic use of a non-native language which is practised through the study of curriculum subjects. The second notion refers to an ability to function in communication with speakers of another language outside the school. The emphases are different. In the case of second language proficiency, the emphasis is on the high levels of competence required for academic use. In the case of the knowledge of a foreign language, the linguistic competence is expected to be confined to basic communicative tasks rather than sophisticated cognitive operations (Tosi, 1991: 93).

This highlights the fundamental distinction between foreign and second language, a definition which still stands.

SLIDE 12: Essential need for a clear distinction between 'second' and 'foreign' language.

In the MYP, which produced guides for language A and language B, a working group was set up to devise a guide for ESL students, the 'Second Language Acquisition and Mother Tongue Development Guide' – SLA and MTD. By this means, the MYP would mirror the Diploma language A2 programme. The Guide appeared in 2004, professional development materials

were developed to go with it and teachers were trained to pass these on at workshops. They show conclusively that the IB was and is well aware of the separate role of second language, and the need for a dedicated programme of instruction with its own materials, assessment and in-service training, as in the 'Introduction' document of the materials, the following appears:

> For a group of beginners (*ie* teachers), it is recommended to focus on the importance of providing second-language and mother-tongue programmes within the school and the reasons behind the IBO's advice to do this. It needs to be emphasized that MYP schools should be following the guidance provided by the IBO in *Second-language Acquisition and Mother-tongue Development: a guide for schools* that was published in 2004. Activities could also be designed to give participants a basic awareness of what they can do within their classrooms and schools to complement second-language and mother-tongue programmes.

Various slides were prepared, and slide 13 states: 'For the purposes of the MYP, "second language" describes the language learned by students, for whom the LoI (Language of Instruction) is not their mother tongue, in order to follow the curriculum of the school.' Slide 21 states: 'Needs of second-language learners: Second-language learners need a well-planned and well-delivered curriculum enabling them to access, take part, and achieve success in the academic, social, and cultural life of the school.' Slide 25 states: 'An effective second-language programme includes: Admissions policy; Provision for SL programme entry/exit and transition assistance; Integration of MYP objectives; Provision for varying proficiency levels; Inclusion of SL teachers in planning; Programme of communicative language learning (core and generic language skills); Reporting processes.'

Thus a comprehensive second language programme and documentation were all prepared, but never launched. No information was given to those who had participated in the scheme about its demise.

However, a change of structure was to envelop the IB, with a more corporate image. The IB board of governors decided in 2005 to restructure the entire IB. For the first time a businessman (American), not an educationalist, was appointed as director general and three new IB centres were established in the wealthiest or most influential parts of the globe (Bethesda in the USA; Singapore in Asia; in Europe, The Hague), superseding the old ones. Originally created specifically for the international school context, over 60% of IB clients are now in the USA, where 'ESL' is likely to imply immigrants – perhaps not so good for marketing.

The SLA & MTD Guide has now been discontinued. It is in fact an extremely useful guide, and the IB's 'disappearance' of it speaks volumes about the IB agenda on second language students (I can email details to you). At workshops for MYP language B teachers, to which teachers of ESL students are now addressed, participants report that workshop leaders have no knowledge of the needs of ESL students, and thus ESL teachers have nowhere to turn for appropriate IB ESL training.

Comments from an experienced ESL teacher:

Why does the IB not provide separate programmes for second language students in the MYP?

I believe the IB does not distinguish language differences of ESL and Language Acquisition students (previously language B) because although there is a clearly defined difference in pedagogy, there is not one acknowledged in the IB that would create an existence for ESL. It does not fit the octagon (the MYP scheme of subjects)

and with the mantra 'all teachers are language teachers' the IB also allows for disjointed flexibility because the job does not fall on one subject, but on all. What is needed is an ESL department and ESL teachers to engage in dialog with subject teachers to enhance the learning of ESL students.

Another teacher writes:

Throughout the year the MYP has been the thorn in our side when it comes to meeting the language needs of our students. The MYP Language Acquisition phases are geared towards the holy grail of literature and seem to neglect the real journey of language learning with its many variables and need for time.

What is the response of the IB to those criticisms of poor certification for ESL students both with regards to ESL and MT?

I do not believe the IB even addresses this issue. Do they even feel it deserves discussion? Most schools today just manipulate the framework to make it work as best it can for the sake of the ESL students in their school. So why would the IB acknowledge it as an issue? Everyone teaches with it and without viable data from ESL communities how does one go about proving the framework excludes students who are at this very moment in programs in the MYP in ESL?

Teachers at one school commented:

One problem with the MYP for ESL students really is the fact that they need to write reflections in every single subject, even PE, IT, and cooking. 'My 10th grade Japanese ESL students are seriously good at math but get lower grades because they can't write a reflection.'

MYP and MTs

We now come to mother tongues in the MYP. They are now working towards the e-assessment/portfolio arrangement for MYP5, and have dictated that only specific languages can be assessed, so parents who have committed to our home language programme have to be told that the language doesn't count. The students must have an A and B language to gain certification and some students don't have both because they are ESL students. 5 out of 9 languages are impacted by this decision which completely contradicts IB statements about promoting the maintenance of home languages.

In-Service

ISS WLI and the PTC

Two agencies that offer short courses for principals and teachers to be equipped for managing the teaching of second language students in international schools are The International Schools Services World Language Institute (ISS WLI) - http://isswli.org and The Principal's Training Center (PTC) - http://www.theptc.org/

The WLI offers an EAL pilot program (EAL in this context is described as 'English as Another Language' http://isswli.org/about-wli/program-overview). The Pilot Program was 'designed by an ISS consultant' (http://isswli.org/eal/eal-overview/pilot . The course is described as being 'CIS (Council of International Schools) PTC – Principals Training Center - sponsored', though confirmation of this statement could not be found on the CIS website (www.cois.org).

The course description for the PTC EAL course (and in this case 'EAL' is described as 'English as an Additional Language') launches straight into 'Every international teacher is an EAL (English as an Additional Language) teacher just by virtue of the fact that the majority of international-school students have primary languages other than English'.

(http://www.theptc.org/ttc104/). This is the by now well-worn phrase that upon analysis does not stand up to scrutiny. To be a Maths teacher, a Science teacher, a Geography teacher, it is necessary to follow a professional course of study, do teaching practice in the subject, and if successful, gain a qualification. According the description it is enough just to be in an international school to be an EAL teacher, which is qualification by osmosis.

The WLI website has a statement that is highly questionable. It reads: 'Are English learners really unable to succeed in some absolute sense as believed by many?', suggesting that it is common knowledge that they are not able to succeed. Just what evidence is this based on? Given Collier's and Cummins' findings of the 5-7 years needed to reach peer-level achievement, after how many years in an international school does one determine failure? Also, is language background, culture and transience of the family taken into account? Where is the evidence that the course model is better?

The first part of the statement is followed with the suggestion: 'or are they unsuccessful only when measured against the current EAL instructional capacities of international schools?' This implies that international schools do not have successful EAL/ESL instruction programmes, and is a strong condemnation. There have been many extremely effective ESL departments in international schools throughout the world, often struggling for staffing and higher levels of professionalism in the face of cuts brought about specifically by school leaders unaware of the different history of second language provision between national and international systems. An experienced, long-serving ESL department head has written that:

> I'm convinced that it's simply the fact that administrators want to economize as much as possible and this 'model' of push-in as opposed to offering legitimate English-

language instruction is simply easier and cheaper, and ultimately they aren't concerned that it does not meet the needs of the students.

The damaging effects of the WLI and associated courses cannot be over-estimated. Another long-time ESL teacher wrote that 'Just heard today that one of our new incredibly competent EAL colleagues has been told to do all push-in (*ie* in-class support) or 'move on.' This online certificate course is constructed to train teachers and administrators to adopt wholly 'push-in' teaching as a 'one size fits all' solution to addressing ELL needs. Any deviation from the narrow party line is frowned upon.' Reports have come to me over many years of entire, successful ESL departments being 'wiped out' after an in-service visit by the WLI program designer.

The incident referred to earlier, where an entire ESL department was downgraded, came about when that principal had recently completed a WLI course.

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).

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. 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).

'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:

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.

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

A reminder about some basic facts:

In ISs ESL students are not immigrants.

Their parents are usually professionals, often on short term contracts.

Thus in ISs there is a level socio-economic playing field.

Racism is rarely an issue in ISs.

Students often return to their countries and continue their education in their MT.

What is needed is a professional programme of SL instruction adapted to each individual's needs; a mother tongue programme to ensure that students maintain their MT; and CPD for all staff and admin.

Collier and Thomas

Inclusion is the word of the day in many schools. This is why 'support' for ESL students seems to be the only option for EAL programmes. But inclusion is only one part of the menu for ESL students:

SLIDE 13   Prism model (reproduced in Carder, 2007, chapter 2.)

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.

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 & Thomas, 2007:335).

This central area might be compared with 'inclusion', the concept which has tended to dominate current educational practice, to the **ex**clusion 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 & Thomas, 2007:335).

The 'L1 & L2 Academic Development' component of the Collier & 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 & Thomas, 2007:335-336).

Collier, who became involved with the international schools network, wrote the following text specifically for our 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, tested and tried by myself and others.

SLIDE 14   Moving target

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

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). 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 15   BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive and Academic Language Proficiency).

SLIDE 16: Chart of BICS vs CALP

SLIDE 17:   Coercive relations of power have constituted the predominant mode of inter-group contact since the beginnings of human history.

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).

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.

Cummins also presented (1979a) 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:

29

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 (Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1977:69)

SLIDE 18:   Chart of good and bad models

SLIDE 19: Sheltered subject-matter instruction

Sheltered subject-matter instruction

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. 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'.

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 foreign-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.

SLIDE 20: 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). '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, 2014:48-72).

Typically many international schools follow the TH School in Hanoi (http://www.ticrecruitment.com/th-school/) which states on its job vacancies spot that 'the first language of all applicants should be English'.

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'. The reason for this is that: 'The non-native speakers speak more purposefully and carefully, typical of someone speaking a second or third language', whereas 'Anglophones often talk too fast for others to follow, and use jokes, slang and references specific to their own culture'. Thus: '"Native speakers are at a disadvantage when you are in an English lingua franca situation." "It's the native English speakers that are having difficulty understanding and making themselves understood"'. Examples come to mind of native English speaking teachers in international school content classes . . .

Research 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, minority teachers are often able to form strong ties with students, and can thus help to empower youth of all backgrounds.

This issue is summed up by Cook, who 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, 2014:135). 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).

Cummins' recommends that ESL students perform better when empowered rather than disabled (Cummins, 2000), and an integral part of that is that their ESL teachers are also empowered.

Empowered or disabled?

Here is an example of how the students see the EAL 'support' teacher, from Creese (2002:605). 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.

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.

Contrived collegiality

SLIDE 21: Contrived collegiality

> 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 is 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 (Davison, 2006: 458).

Then we have Shaw, himself a school principal, who notes (Shaw, 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.

Assessment

'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, 2014:138).

'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).

Needed: a mainstream ESL programme

Researchers relate the need for direct instruction of language

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

SLIDE 22: 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'.

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"'. Please note the IB emphasis on 'critical thinking'. . .

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)'.

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 (2010), 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'.

As reported by Conteh and Meier (2014b: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).

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.

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

SLIDE 23:   International schools need professionally designed ESL programmes.

Only by establishing a department for the subject area of second language teaching, with its related partner of mother tongue teaching, will there be any chance of the ESL students' pedagogical needs being met. Moreover, this subject area department will not only have to have equal status with other departments, but be continually boosted and given prominence by all levels of school management.

ESL students need to have an institutional backer for their cause, and this department will be strongly 'empowered' by accreditation agencies, and curriculum bodies such as the IB. The failed model of 'support' which has permeated national systems and left ESL students labelled as 'learning disabled', or with 'severe bilingual problems' must be removed from educational vocabulary. School heads will be re-educated to promote this model throughout the world of international education, with the realization that the majority of international students are 'emerging bilinguals' and that there is a new paradigm in this increasingly globalised world.

School heads 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 IB results.

Above all, school leaders should not feel guilty about having a separate ESL track. In fact, they should encourage one. Leave 'support': get CPD for all content staff. Give second language issues and students the chance to take off.

References

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

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

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

Bunnell, T. (2008) The International Baccalaureate in England and Wales: the alternative paths for the future. *Curriculum Journal,* 19:3, 151-160.

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

CIS - Council of International Schools. www.cois.org

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

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 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.

Cook, 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. (2014) 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.

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.

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

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

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. (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.

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.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. and Short, D. (2004) Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP model, 2nd edn. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

ECIS: The European Council of International Schools. http://www.ecis.org

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

.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.

International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) (2004) *Second Language Acquisition and Mother Tongue Development* – Guide.

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. 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.

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).

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).

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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. Schecter, and J. Cummins, (eds) *Multilingual Education in Practice* (pp. 97-112). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

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

Tosi, A. (1991) Language in international education. In P.L. Jonietz and D. Harris, (eds) *World yearbook of education, 1991: International schools and international education* (pp.82-99). London: Kogan Page.

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.

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