UNIVERSITY OF Southampton

University of Southampton Research Repository

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis and, where applicable, any accompanying data are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis and the accompanying data cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content of the thesis and accompanying research data (where applicable) must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder/s.

When referring to this thesis and any accompanying data, full bibliographic details must be given, e.g.

Thesis: Author (Year of Submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University Faculty or School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

Data: Author (Year) Title. URI [dataset]

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

# SCATTERED IN THE MAINSTREAM: EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS

**Elizabeth O. Statham**

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES, 1993

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

**ABSTRACT**

Faculty of Educational Studies

**Doctor of Philosophy**

# SCATTERED IN THE MAINSTREAM: EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS

**Elizabeth O. Statham**

The purpose of this research was to study educational provision for isolated bilingual learners through a development project and reflection on the project. The development project was carried out, with hiatuses, over a three year period in a large shire Local Education Authority in the U.K. The aims of the development project were to work with teachers to meet the needs of isolated bilingual learners in four primary schools and one secondary school. The aims of the research were to establish the extent to which bilingual learners were submersed in the schools and to reflect on ways in which the educational needs of isolated bilingual learners could be met within a "curriculum framework common to all pupils".

My data was drawn from responses to a questionnaire to advisory teachers in Local Education Authorities similar to the one in which the development project was carried out,from minutes of meetings with project heads and teachers, from semi-structured interviews with project teachers, from a response to a questionnaire to project heads, from shadowing notes and subsequent notes on discussion with teachers on shadowing process, from notes on conferencing with pupils, from notes on discussion with teachers during and following collaborative teaching and from a research diary. All the data was qualitative.

The research showed that teachers were initially willing to invest in multicultural education rather than specific provision for bilingual learners. It showed that class and subject teachers were not prepared to invest in action research on provision for isolated bilingual learners by themselves. Neither raised awareness of multicultural issues nor reflection on what I observed during a period of shadowing impinged markedly on practice in the project schools. A more important factor in shifting provision appeared to be the ongoing change within schools whereby other specialist support teachers began to work within classes. When I, as a specialist teacher, worked with a class or subject teacher in a collaborative way we were able to ensure that isolated bilingual pupils were supported because the class or subject teacher had an investment in the reflection process that was not apparent with other development project vehicles. The willingness to invest was not dependent on awareness raising in the area of multicultural education or previous commitment to action research but hinged on the teachers' responsibility for all pupils. Because the intrinsic investment in one or two bilingual pupils is likely to be less in an isolated situation I concluded that collaborative work with teachers is even more vital there than in areas with larger numbers of bilingual learners.

# SCATTERED IN THE MAINSTREAM: EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS.

## CONTENTS


CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND ON EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR BILINGUAL LEARNERS AND INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH. ..... 1
1.1. Introduction and research aims ..... 2
1.2. Key shifts in educational provision for bilingual learners ..... 5
1.3. Inservice education project and research. ..... 8
1.4. Isolated bilingual pupils ..... 9
1.5. Submersion ..... 11
1.6. Assimilation ..... 12
1.7. Second phase learners ..... 14
1.8. Changes in the 1980s ..... 15
1.9. Child centred education ..... 20
1.10. Section 11 ..... 25
1.11. Likelihood of shift in organization of provision in areas with isolated bilingual pupils ..... 28
1.12. Are all bilingual pupils central in the Education Reform Act? . 29
1.13. Alternatives to submersion ..... 32
1.14. My own position ..... 39
1.15. Conclusion ..... 40

CHAPTER 2
EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS OF BILINGUAL LEARNERS ..... 42
2.1. Introduction ..... 43
2.2. Nature of evidence on isolated bilingual learners ..... 44
2.3. Are isolated bilingual pupils catered for in the National Curriculum? ..... 49
2.4. Link with special educational needs ..... 51
2.5. Why do schools not tackle these issues? ..... 52
2.6. Specialist services ..... 56
2.7. Continuing education ..... 60
2.8. Continuing education for teachers supporting bilingual pupils . 70
2.9. SCOPE materials ..... 73
2.10. RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools ..... 75
2.11. LEA framework for continuing education ..... 81
2.12. School-focused projects-provision for bilingual pupils ..... 84
2.13. The Bilingual Pupils Project ..... 90
2.14. Partnership Teaching ..... 91
2.15. In-service education for teachers of isolated bilingual pupils .. 93

CHAPTER 3
SETTING UP AND RESEARCHING A LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 97
3.1 Introduction-research options ..... 98
3.2. Development project options ..... 103
3.3. Schools' perceived needs ..... 106
3.4. Teacher development options ..... 110
3.5. Development using a resources pack as a vehicle ..... 112
3.6. Shift to multicultural education as a focus within the project .. 114
3.7. Planned shift to assessment focus within project ..... 116
3.8. Outcomes and reflections-first phase of project ..... 118
3.9. Constraints-first phase of project ..... 119

CHAPTER 4
EXPERIMENTING WITH SHADOWING AS A DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT AND RESEARCH VEHICLE ..... 124
4.1. Research Options ..... 125
4.2. Action research ..... 128
4.3. Shadowing ..... 129
4.4. Criteria ..... 131
4.5. Feedback sessions ..... 133
4.6. Reflection on shadowing outcomes ..... 135
4.7. My findings ..... 137
4.8. Provision for bilingual learners ..... 137
4.9. Provision-Morrison ..... 138
4.10. Provision-Walker ..... 139
4.11. Provision-Gunn Allen Infant ..... 141
4.12. Provision-Morgan ..... 142
4.13. Access to the mainstream curriculum. ..... 144
4.14. Support from adults ..... 145
4.15. Support from peers ..... 146
4.16. Use of language ..... 147
4.17. National Curriculum Implementation ..... 148
4.18. Records ..... 148
4.19. Use of first language ..... 149
4.20. Social aspects ..... 150
4.21. Conclusion ..... 150

CHAPTER 5
EXPERIMENTING WITH COLLABORATIVE TEACHING AS A
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND RESEARCH VEHICLE. ..... 152
5.1. Introduction-moving into collaborative work ..... 153
5.2. Role of specialist teachers ..... 154
5.3. Working towards further phase of the development project ... 155
5.4. Research options ..... 157
5.5. Section 11 bidding-initial discussions ..... 157
5.6. Section 11 bidding-link with the project ..... 158
5.7. Development project development ..... 160

**5.8. Collaborative teaching** ..... 161
**5.9. Collaborative approaches within the project** ..... 163
**5.10. Development project-negotiations** ..... 164
**5.11. Collaborative teaching-research methods** ..... 165
**5.12. Getting started-Walker** ..... 165
**5.13. Getting started-Morrison** ..... 167
**5.14. Shadowing, Spring 1991** ..... 169
**5.15. Planning specific sessions** ..... 171
**5.16. Collaborative teaching sessions-Walker** ..... 173
**5.17. Collaborative teaching sessions-Morrison** ..... 176
**5.18. Feedback** ..... 177
**5.19. Findings from shadowing bilingual learners** ..... 182
**5.20. Findings from collaborative teaching** ..... 183
**5.21. Reflection on collaborative teaching** ..... 184
**5.22. Factors contributing to support for bilingual learners** ..... 186
**5.23. Factors hindering the support of bilingual pupils** ..... 187
**5.24. Conclusion** ..... 188

**CHAPTER 6**
**EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS: FUTURE POSSIBILITIES.** ..... 192
**6.1. Introduction-summary of research aims** ..... 193
**6.2. Key outcomes** ..... 195
**6.3. General principles** ..... 197
**6.4. Considerations for the future** ..... 198

**REFERENCES** ..... 202

**APPENDICES** ..... 216

Appendix 1.1 Phases of the research ..... 217
Appendix 1.2 Isolated bilingual pupil survey ..... 219
Appendix 3.1 Draft project proposal: Support for bilingual learners in Beech ..... 222
Appendix 3.2 Revised starting points for pack ..... 227
Appendix 3.3 Sample-case study ..... 229
Appendix 3.4 Text of copy of Project Paper No. 4 which was circulated to schools ..... 232
Appendix 3.5 Semi-structured interview questions ..... 236
Appendix 3.6 Extract from interview with teacher Morrison ..... 238
Appendix 4.1 Draft re-submission Jan-April 90 ..... 241
Appendix 4.2 Royal Society of Arts Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum ..... 244
Appendix 4.3 Centre for Language in Primary Education Primary Language Record: Observations and Samples ..... 248
Appendix 4.4 Extracts from interview with Sufia, Year 5 Morrison ..... 253
Appendix 4.5 Categories for writing up observation notes. ..... 256

Appendix 4.6 Sample of written up observation notes with head's comments ..... 258
Appendix 5.1 Funding recommendations with regard to provision for bilingual pupils in Copperbeech ..... 263
Appendix 5.2 Section 11 proposal (excluding pupil details) submitted to Treeshire ..... 270
Appendix 5.3 Observation notes on Sukhjinder ..... 280
Appendix 5.4 Shadowing and collaborative teaching Spring Term 1991, Walker ..... 283
Appendix 5.5 Resume of work at Walker for Walker management team ... 286
Appendix 5.6 Morrison reflections ..... 288

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have reason to be grateful to many people in the course of this research. First and foremost I have learnt a great deal from the bilingual learners in Treeshire. One in particular helped me stay determined to keep going with the study. Now in her twenties she reminisces fondly about the warm atmosphere of the withdrawal language centre she went to. But she came to the U.K. during primary school and had left secondary school without any qualifications. She reminded me that my aims throughout were for pupils to experience a warm atmosphere in schools *and* achieve their academic potential.

I could not have carried out this study without the help and support of all the teachers and assistants involved in the development project. I am grateful to Treeshire officers for financial support for the project and also acknowledge financial support from Treeshire for part of the university fees. I also appreciate the support of all my Treeshire colleagues who have become friends and Jeni Smith's wise counsel and friendship.

At many points during the study I have had cause to appreciate the fact that Hillsdale High School, California, thought, in 1967-1968, that *all* its students should learn to touch type.

Pete has been an invaluable Word Perfect adviser and much more besides. My daughters have been patient. My younger one, when I extolled the virtues of a variety of childminders because she could rub shoulders with lots of different people, said as quick as a flash "But I want to rub shoulders with you". My thanks nevertheless go to all the childminders.

In the course of five years four people who have taught me a great deal have died before their time. Jerry Barrell taught me sports that have provided a continued source of relaxation over the years. Sheila Close's friendship helped me in my first years of teaching. Ann-Marie Davies was mentor to many but always made time to show me the way ahead. Paul Hibbert helped shape my anti-racist thinking.

Finally my sincere thanks go to my University tutors, Chris Brumfit and Ros Mitchell and especially Ros Mitchell for seeing me through, commas and all.

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

| | |
|---|---|
| ACSET | Advisory Committee on Supply and Education of Teachers |
| ACSTT | Advisory Committee on Supply and Training of Teachers |
| BLISS | Bilingual Learners in Secondary Schools |
| BUF | Bilingual Under Fives |
| ca | Chronological Age |
| CRE | Commission for Racial Equality |
| DES | Department of Education and Science |
| E2L | English as a Second Language |
| EC | European Community |
| EFL | English as a Foreign Language |
| ELRC | English Language Resources Centre |
| ELTS | English Language Teaching Service |
| EMT | Ethnic Mother Tongue |
| EP | Educational Psychologist |
| ESG | Education Support Grant |
| ESL | English as a Second Language |
| ESOL | English for Speakers of Other Languages |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent |
| GB | Great Britain |
| GCSE | General Certificate of Secondary Education |
| GEST | Grants for Education Support and Training |
| GRIST | Grant Related Inservice Training |
| HMI | Her Majesty's Inspectorate |
| INSET | In-Service Education and Training |
| L1 | First Language |
| L2 | Second Language |
| LEA | Local Education Authority |
| LEATGS | Local Education Authority Training Grant Scheme |
| LINC | Language in the National Curriculum |
| LMS | Local Management of Schools |
| NCC | National Curriculum Council |
| NCVQ | National Council for Vocational Qualifications |
| NFER | National Foundation for Education research |
| NTA | Non Teaching Assistant |
| PLR | Primary Language Record |
| PR | Pupil Record |
| PSC | Parliamentary Select Committee |
| ra | Reading Age |
| SAT | Standard Assessment Task |
| SEAC | Schools Examination and Assessment Council |
| SES | Socio Economic Status |
| SLIM | Second Language Learners in Mainstream |
| SLIPP | Second Language Learners in the Primary School |
| TGAT | Task Group on Assessment and Testing |
| TRIST | Technical and Vocational Education Initiative Related In-Service Training |
| TVEI | Technical and Vocational Education Initiative |

# CHAPTER 1

# BACKGROUND ON EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR BILINGUAL LEARNERS AND INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH.

## 1.1. Introduction and research aims

The purpose of this research was to study educational provision for isolated bilingual pupils in five schools in one town in a large shire authority. The main aims of this research were to examine how isolated bilingual pupils were learning English as a second language and everything that everyone else learns in mainstream classes; to consider how teachers were supporting isolated bilingual learners; and to reflect on the most appropriate type of teacher training for teachers working with isolated bilingual learners. In addition I wanted to see if isolated bilingual learners could develop bilingually and bi-culturally in the mainstream classroom.

The research was based on reflection on a development project carried out, with hiatuses, over a three year period. The phases of the research are outlined in Appendix 1.1. In order to evaluate the investigation I used a range of research questions. The research questions which guided the investigation were centred on five areas; language and learning; National Curriculum; use of first language (L1); teachers' record keeping and observation; use of the Primary Language Record (Barrs and Hester 1988); finally recommendations are made based on the five areas just outlined.

These questions reflected aspects I wanted to consider if I was to comment on how bilingual pupils were learning the curriculum. They also guided the work carried out with teachers within the development project and therefore allowed me to reflect on how teachers were supporting isolated bilingual learners and the most appropriate type of teacher training for teachers working with isolated bilingual learners.

I needed to ask first, under the heading of language and learning, if pupils were involved in classes, if they were fully active members of mainstream classes. I also needed to ask if they were supported by adults, if teachers were helping bilingual pupils to learn. In addition I needed to see if isolated bilingual pupils were supported by their peers, if a potentially valuable aid to language and learning development, collaborative work, was being utilized. Finally, under the heading of language and learning, I wanted to look at bilingual learners' use of

language in the mainstream classroom. I wanted to see if they had access through English to learning.

Secondly I needed to ask if isolated bilingual learners were being accessed to the National Curriculum, in theory an entitlement along with all other pupils. This was important to establish that isolated bilingual learners were learning and not just learning language. This would also confirm isolated bilingual learners' involvement in classes.

I did want to see if isolated bilingual learners could develop bilingually and bi-culturally in the mainstream classroom. My third research question was to investigate any use of L1 by pupils in school.

My fourth research question was to ask about the school's record keeping and observation systems and to look at how bilingual pupils' learning was recorded. This would give a further indication of whether isolated bilingual pupils were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally but also would confirm if all aspects of bilingual pupils' learning were fully covered in mainstream classrooms.

My fifth research question was to ask if the Primary Language Record was of use to teachers in their observations and record keeping.

Finally I needed to reflect on the recommendations shared with teachers. These recommendations provided a summary of my own findings on whether isolated bilingual pupils were being treated as 'normal' pupils in mainstream classes. With teacher feedback the recommendations were also of crucial importance in reflection on how teachers supported isolated bilingual learners and whether the development project enabled any shift in provision for them and training for their teachers.

Reflection on the recommendations offered to teachers on the basis of my shadowing and collaborative work was one part of the reflection that contributed to the research. The other was reflection on how the development project was working. There were two layers of ownership of the development project. The teachers and schools owned the direction of the development project in determining the end products, work with isolated bilingual learners. I owned my reflections on how the development project was working and my reflections on research questions. Originally I hoped that the development project and research

project would dovetail with shared ownership of action research. This was not possible.

In the rest of this first chapter I have summarized the changes in educational provision for bilingual learners in the 1980s which provide a context for the research. I have also described the initial setting up of the project and the use of pseudonyms (1.2). I have defined isolated bilingual learners (1.3). I have looked in detail at phases in provision for bilingual learners paying particular attention to the issues of submersion (1.4) and assimilation (1.5); changes in the 1980s (1.7-1.11);and alternatives to submersion (1.12). Finally I have considered my own position as teacher in the light of the provision described (1.13).

In Chapter 2 I have looked at educational provision for isolated bilingual learners (2.1-2.6); I have considered the nature of continuing education for teachers in general (2.7);I have considered continuing education for teachers supporting bilingual pupils (2.8-2.14); and I have focused on continuing education for teachers of isolated bilingual pupils (2.15).

In Chapter 3 I have outlined research options (3.1);I have outlined development project options (3.2); I have considered the schools' perceived needs (3.3); and I have outlined teacher development options (3.4). I have then described the setting up and outcomes of the first phase of the development project (3.5-3.8) which is concerned with development of a pack of materials to support schools with isolated bilingual learners. It was not possible to answer research questions to do with bilingual pupils' learning but it was possible to reflect on the development project itself.

In Chapter 4 I have described further development and research options (4.1,4.2); I have discussed shadowing as a development project and research vehicle (4.3-4.6); and have detailed my findings (4.7-4.20). It was possible to establish that each school had elements of extremely supportive practice but that no school accepted multilingual, multicultural classrooms as 'normal' across the board.

In Chapter 5 I have described collaborative teaching as a development project and research vehicle (5.1); I have considered the role of specialist teachers with isolated bilingual pupils (5.2); I have described project development in relation to Section 11 initiatives (5.3-5.8); I have discussed collaborative teaching

within the project (5.8-5.17);and I have detailed my findings (5.18-5.24). I concluded that specialist teachers working in collaboration with mainstream teachers provided the best way of ensuring that needs of isolated bilingual pupils were met in mainstream classrooms.

In Chapter 6 I have summarized the research project findings (6.1); I have outlined the key outcomes (6.2); I have discussed general principles arising from the work (6.3); and I have considered issues for the future (6.4).

## 1.2. Key shifts in educational provision for bilingual learners

For bilingual pupils generally there had been shifts in thinking about how they should be taught in the second half of the 20th century in the U.K. Leaving pupils to get on with learning by themselves in the late 1950s and early 1960s had given way to a concentration on English language teaching in withdrawal classes or language centres before pupils studied other subjects in school in the 1960s and 1970s.

The emphasis on prior specialist English teaching was challenged in the 1980s when it was felt that many bilingual pupils had missed out on learning everything that everyone else learns in school. Eggleston,Dunn and Anjali (1986) researched the reasons why young people of Asian birth or descent stayed in full-time education longer than young people of other minority groups. They found that the young people studied were very determined to persevere with education but that their efforts were counteracted by placement in schools and colleges at levels beneath their ability (Eggleston, Dunn and Anjali 1986 p. 279) and so they were often staying on at school or college to gain examination qualifications after their peers had left. Eggleston, Dunn and Anjali made the point that students might be held back from more demanding courses if they were unable to "utilise standard varieties of English usage" (Eggleston, Dunn and Anjali 1986 p.286). In the 1980s it was increasingly felt that bilingual pupils could learn language, i.e. English, through learning in mainstream classrooms; that if teachers paid attention to the language demands of tasks and provided activities that would help pupils to understand the concepts being presented, to practise the English involved and have

a chance to rehearse the English learnt in many ways, they would enable bilingual pupils to learn English and subject content at the same time.

This presupposed that mainstream classrooms were 'hospitable' places in terms of learning and language learning for bilingual pupils, hospitable places where "English as a Second Language learning has come to be perceived as part of a continuum of language development" (Bourne 1989 p.64). It presupposed that training for mainstream as well as specialist teachers was appropriate for a situation where all teachers would effectively be language teachers if they had bilingual learners in their classes, and specialist teachers would increasingly be involved in advising and training teachers. In a few areas there was an emphasis on access to English by allowing pupils to draw on first language skills e.g.by having a bilingual assistant to explain tasks and concepts,by having access to dual language texts, (see Houlton 1985, Tansley 1986). There was no concern for bilingual development i.e. implementation of the idea that use of more than one language in education is valid for its own sake. There was little central government support for the shifts described above. The government's report "Education For All' (The Swann Report) on the education of children from ethnic minority groups (DES 1985) recommended mainstream provision but there was no subsequent push towards implementation or support for training. Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) reported on the teaching of English as a Second Language (ESL) provision in six authorities in 1985 (DES 1988b). The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) examined "whether provision for bilingual pupils had been redefined and in what ways it had been reorganized" (Bourne 1989 p.1) since NFER surveys during the early 1970s. Neither of these initiatives represent a major government commitment to implementing Swann's recommendations.

The passing of the Education Reform Act in 1988 with the introduction of the National Curriculum and Local Management of Schools meant that grass roots thinking about bilingual learners would in theory be capable of being implemented. All bilingual learners would be centrally involved in following the National Curriculum in mainstream classes (DES 1989a p. 57). The implication was that English as a second language would be learnt through learning. Additional funding through Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act was to be directed at

opening up mainstream services and opportunities to ethnic minorities (Home Office 1988 p.v). But there was to be no emphasis on bilingual development; the core subject was English not language(s). There has been little guidance on how teachers would be trained in helping bilingual learners gain access to the National Curriculum. The National Curriculum Council's (NCC) Circular 11 on good practice, 'Linguistic Diversity and the National Curriculum' came out in March 1991 (NCC 1991). To people working as ESL teachers it felt like being handed an afterthought. Publication of all the materials for training programmes for all teachers, Language in the National Curriculum (LINC), was blocked in 1991 on the grounds that they would be a "distraction from the main task of teaching children to read,write and spell correctly" (Eggar 1991 p.14). Some of the materials produced by LINC teams, were published (Carter 1990 p.2) but the sections on accent, dialect and standard English; multilingualism; pupils' knowledge about language; and repertoires of language were not (Abrams 1991a p.3). A document which "argues that language should be placed in its social context" (Abrams 1991b p.1) was not acceptable. Assuming that bilingual learners' language development needs are part of a continuum, and that the social context is extremely important for teachers of bilingual pupils to understand, means that this programme could be seen as the very least requirement for class and subject teachers and means that the programme could have addressed the needs of bilingual learners centrally. Other training programmes supportive of mainstream teachers becoming effective teachers of bilingual learners (e.g. RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools) (RSA 1988) and similar Diplomas) also appeared to be under threat unless they could be funded as part of a national curriculum priority (personal experience).

Moves towards mainstream classroom support were "not yet complete nor secure" even before the passing of the Education Reform Act (Bourne 1989 p. 80) and there has been little research on how effective mainstream teachers are in developing bilingual learners' English, learning and bilingual/bi-cultural skills.
In my research I wanted to check the widely held assumption that submersion was the reality for isolated bilingual pupils. In doing so it would be important to look at the link between education for bilingual pupils and for pupils with learning

difficulties. I wanted to consider whether it was possible for schools with isolated bilingual pupils to provide education that moved away from a submersion model towards one that consciously supported learning of bilingual pupils, i.e. through providing 'hospitable' mainstream classrooms, that recognized pupils' linguistic and cultural diversity. I felt that schools with isolated bilingual pupils had missed out on the specialist English language teaching stage and in effect at the time of this study such schools needed to jump straight to helping bilingual pupils gain access to the National Curriculum. I needed to find out what provision was being made. I needed to find out what the needs of the bilingual pupils were. I needed to work on widening options for bilingual pupils through working with their teachers and I needed to reflect on that process but also to note the constraints involved.

Most of the authority and the town in which this research took place, could be described as 'all white' or (using a term in common usage) belonged to 'the White Highlands' although in fact parts of the town attracted bilingual families from a nearby city, as well as from other parts of the country and overseas. I therefore needed to consider the relationship between provision for isolated bilingual pupils and general multicultural initiatives being developed in the late 1980s in the authority in such areas.

### 1.3. Inservice education project and research.

I was appointed by Treeshire's English, modern languages and multicultural (now intercultural) inspectors to set up and run an Inservice education (INSET) project that would meet the needs of isolated bilingual learners through working with their teachers and that could provide a potential model for other parts of the authority. This work forms the basis of the development project described in this thesis.

My research was closely linked to the development project. This link is discussed in Chapter 3. Data for the research work consisted of responses to a questionnaire to advisory teachers in similar authorities, minutes of meetings with project heads and teachers, semi-structured interviews with project teachers, a response to a questionnaire to heads, shadowing notes and subsequent notes on

discussion with teachers,notes on conferencing with pupils, notes on discussion with teachers during and following collaborative teaching and a research diary.

Throughout, the shire education authority is referred to as Treeshire, the town in which the project was carried out is referred to as Copperbeech in the education area Beech. I have considered it appropriate to provide pseudonyms for schools, areas and the education authority. I was employed to work with teachers in the schools and all the schools knew that I was carrying out research. But as an insider observer I was in a privileged position in terms of obtaining data which has enabled me to write a richer description than otherwise would have been possible. This would make identification of people as workers rather than participants in the research very easy. I have also provided pseudonyms for all pupils.

At the time the project was initiated the county was divided into eight areas for education. These I have named Alder, Beech, Cherry, Chestnut, Poplar, Rowan, Walnut and Willow. Beech is largely an 'all white' area but Copperbeech at one end of the area is situated geographically close to Rowan, an area with most bilingual pupils in the county. Both Rowan and Poplar areas had specialist ESL services at the time the project started. At the beginning of 1990 the education areas were reorganized into divisions. These I have named Ash, Elm, Oak and Yew. Beech was subsumed in Ash. Rowan and Poplar's ESL services had to cover a wider area.

I have used the term bilingual pupil or learner as shorthand for a pupil who may in fact be multilingual. However where authors have referred to English as a Second Language (ESL or E2L) pupil or immigrant pupil I have used those terms in discussion of their work.

## 1.4. Isolated bilingual pupils

A definition of what constitutes an "isolated bilingual pupil" in terms of percentages of school population is tricky as school sizes vary so much. A rough guide might be up to 7% in a school. Poplar Area English as a Second Language (ESL) service has identified 42 out of 57 schools with bilingual pupils in need of ESL support as having less than ten ethnic minority pupils. The service has described this as a "very dispersed community settlement pattern" (Rowan and

Poplar ESL Inset Planning Committee 1991-limited circulation). There are degrees of isolation, depending for instance on whether small numbers in one or neighbouring schools are part of the same immediate or extended family or not.

Isolated bilingual pupils do not necessarily occur only in rural areas as patterns in towns can vary. Berkshire's outlying service for instance operates in 'pockets' in Slough (Oram-personal communication). In the London Borough of Richmond the majority of provision is considered to be for scattered pupils (Franson-personal communication).

Nor does talking about isolated bilinguals imply newly established groups. Keel, referring to the north-east of England which "has been viewed by both outsiders and many of those inside the region as being one untouched by the settlement of ethnic minorities" (Keel 1987a p.106), noted the presence alongside a well established Jewish community of an Arab community in South Shields for over a hundred years. She also mentioned that a seminar held when the Nissan car factory opened in 1985 highlighted the fact that there had been a Japanese presence at the beginning of the century when Japanese navy ships were built in the region.

It is clear that patterns in local authorities are changing. For instance Astill, referring to Dorset, commented that

> "Up until 1989, only 35 pupils were being supported within the county by two teachers. Many schools have had no call to ask for support and generally they only become aware of the team when they admit their first English non-speaker. In 1990, there are now five teachers in the county and as of the present, there are 100 children receiving support" (Astill 1990 p. 3).

Since then she has revised the figure upwards and has noted that in 1991 150 children were receiving support (Astill-personal communication). I informally surveyed twelve authorities' provision for isolated bilingual learners by asking representative advisers or teachers-in-charge of ESL services to fill in a questionnaire (Appendix 1.2) at an HMI Southern Region Ethnic and Cultural Diversity meeting in July 1991. Eight people noted an increasing number of isolated bilingual pupils, one noted probable increase but did not want to say

without statistics to hand and three noted no increase as dealing with isolated bilinguals was the normal pattern for the authority.

Astill noted the variety of reasons for increased moves to Dorset in the 20th century. For instance people moved because of the atomic energy establishment at Winfrith. The holiday industry drew a large European community. There has been Jewish settlement in Bournemouth, opening of Asian restaurants and settlement of Vietnamese families near Sopley refugee camp. Scandinavians came to work in the oil and gas industry. London insurance firms have relocated, and workers came to the European channel ferry port following the closure of the Southampton ferry terminal. Similar examples could probably be given for many 'all white' counties.

Despite such increases in some places bilingual pupils can also disappear in others. Astill was faced with questions about whether the English as a Second Language (ESL) team existed, the attitude that there were no children "like that here" (Astill 1990 p.3) and surprise that bilingual children should attend schools at all, rather than go to "some central centre somewhere" (Astill 1990 p.4). Astill found through a survey of two schools in Dorset that schools which did not "see themselves as having a great number of bilingual children" had 7.7% in the case of one primary school with 385 pupils and 14.5% in the case of a school with 242 pupils (Astill 1990 p. 11-12).

Recently Dorset has begun to recognize their bilingual pupils and this may account for the rise in numbers supported.

## 1.5. Submersion

What happens when bilingual pupils are not recognized? The term submersion has been used to describe lack of recognition of bilingual learners and their needs.

Skutnabb-Kangas defined submersion,or 'sink or swim', as

> "a programme where linguistic minority children with a low-status mother tongue are forced to accept instruction through the medium of a foreign majority language with high status, in classes where some children are native speakers of the language of instruction, where the teacher does not

understand the mother tongue of the minority children, and where the majority language constitutes a threat to their mother tongue-a subtractive learning situation" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 p. 40).She has commented that

"most migrants...in the UK...undergo submersion, resulting in dominance in the majority language at the expense of the mother tongue, and poor school achievement. Societally this means assimilation for some (depending on whether the country in question allows assimilation or not) and marginalization for the many" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 p.27).

Submersion is a situation whereby bilingual pupils are placed in schools without any different consideration being given to them because they are bilingual;they are not considered different to other 'normal' pupils. What is considered a 'normal' pupil is rarely defined but one can assume that he/she is monolingual.

### 1.6. Assimilation

Assimilation according to Derrick (1977), Ellis (1985) meant

"to share in the dominant culture and the dominant curriculum, to participate in it as though one were 'just another child' i.e. a native British-born child" (Derrick 1977 p.3).

It is clear that the block to such assimilation was felt by writers such as Derrick and Ellis to be language i.e. English and more specifically beginner English. How was that English acquired?

'Sink or swim' was a response to the entry into schools of considerable numbers of children of immigrants in certain parts of the U.K. in the 1950s and early 1960s. Derrick (1977) described the move towards specialist English language instruction in the 1960s. Local authority provision was surveyed by Institute of Race Relations (1966) and Schools Council (1967) (Derrick 1977 p.4). Schools Council subsequently produced influential materials from the curriculum project 'English For Immigrant Children' which stressed that teachers "should see to it that the pupils' knowledge of English is being systematically built up" (Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children (SCOPE) 1969 p.1). From the early 1960s onwards most authorities with considerable numbers of bilingual children

paid attention to their need to learn English at initial stages. The concentration on initial stages was very important. It reflected the feeling that pupils would be absorbed into mainstream life and learning of the school when they had acquired English. It was commonly held that English needed to be taught in steps and stages following either a grammatical progression from 'easiest' to 'most complex' or a functional progression which combined purposes for which you want to use language with grammatical forms. It meant that those steps and stages of English did not fit neatly with learning and teaching going on in classrooms and therefore children were taught separately by language specialists. Although the introduction to Scope Stage 1 referred to building on "language that pupils learn from other sources" the main emphasis was on developing and extending pupils' "repertoire of patterns" (Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children (SCOPE) 1969 p.i).

Swann (DES 1985) described how undue concentrations of bilingual pupils were avoided by government encouragement of local authority dispersal policies. Bussing continued in one authority until 1979 but doubts about how far it contributed to education of immigrants were expressed in 1971. There was a realization that initial English was not enough and Ellis described the recognition of 'first phase' and 'second phase' learners (DES 1985) and the need to modify schemes of work to reflect the cultural background and linguistic ability of ESL pupils. Scope 2 (Levine 1972), also produced by the 'English for Immigrant Children' project was designed for second stage bilingual learners (alongside monolinguals needing support). There was recognition that the class subject matter would be of primary importance and this would determine the language of the course. From hindsight A-M Davies commented that the strategies suggested could "enhance the English language of all the pupils" in classes but that "schools were not ready for an integrated curriculum approach to ESL, and the materials were usually used in withdrawal situations" (Davies 1991 p.366). It seems accepted that language-structured teaching went hand in hand with withdrawal provision. As Levine said

"withdrawal provision...fitted so well with both the need of mainstream teachers 'to get on with their normal work' (how could they when there were people in the class who couldn't speak English) and with language-structure teaching strategies (these being different work from normal teaching)" (Levine 1983 p.1)".

## 1.7. Second phase learners

Derrick and Ellis were clear that the debate about provision for first phase learners was over by the early 1970s. As Derrick said

> "Indian, Pakistani or Greek children who learn to speak, read and write English well will not 'disappear' once they have done so...however well they learn English they will still be children whose lives are lived through at least one other language and who will move between two cultures" (Derrick 1977 p.11).

The shift to recognizing continuing diversity was summed up in the by now classic statement from The Bullock Report:

> "No child should be expected to cast off the language and culture of the home as he (sic) crosses the school threshold, nor to live and act as though school and home represent two totally separate and different cultures which have to be kept firmly apart. The curriculum should reflect many elements of that part of his (sic) life which a child lives outside school" (DES 1975 p.268).

One of the other responses to the realization that immigrant children were not fully integrated once they had learnt English was to see them as sharing

> "difficulties of environmental deprivation known to native-born children living in the same areas. They frequently appear to suffer the same emotional disturbance, the same inarticulateness and difficulty with language, the same insecure approach to school and school work, the same unsatisfactory attitudes in social relationships-all of which affect their life and general progress in school" (DES 1971 'The Education of Immigrants' (Education Survey 13) quoted in the Swann Report (DES 1985 p.212).

At the time perceptions of correlations between deprivation and slow language development were strong. Confusion between language and learning needs continues however. Spolsky described how a combination of having a different language, a different dialect that is not favoured by the school and a different verbal style could lead to "an early mislabelling of pupils as uneducable" (Spolsky 1986 p.188). In extreme cases bilingual pupils can be statemented and sent to special schools. Of course there will be a percentage of bilingual pupils with genuine learning difficulties. But placement in slow learning groups or classes has been a feature of provision for bilingual pupils. Whether or not bilingual children were considered to have emotional difficulties or learning difficulties, provision under the special educational needs umbrella was another route to English and therefore assimilation. What this meant was that bilingual pupils who were seen not to be coping in class, often on the basis of being given a standardized reading test, would be withdrawn for remedial help by the special needs teacher or non teaching assistant usually for basic literacy and numeracy work, often divorced from subject content and often without an appropriate assessment of capabilities (personal experience).

## 1.8. Changes in the 1980s

Bourne writing post-Swann saw the key policy changes of the 1980s, as observed in the National Foundation for Education Research (NFER) 'Educational Provision for Bilingual Pupils' project as:

> "(a) The recognition of pupils' skills in languages other than English and of the desire of certain communities to maintain their languages; and the opening up of debate on whether and how most appropriately to develop bilingual skills within the school system.
> (b) An attempt to reappraise and redefine the mainstream curriculum, classroom organization and teaching strategies in order to take account of language diversity in the pupil population as the classroom norm rather than the exception; in order to give access to the curriculum for all pupils by providing for diverse language needs.
> (c) Most recently, an attempt to make any specific provision for bilingual needs negotiable with the linguistic minority groups concerned, and

accountable to them in terms of the effectiveness of the delivery" (Bourne 1989 p.7).

Bourne noted that "these changes in policy have been the result of a multiplicity of influences, much of the pressure coming from the grass roots rather than administration". She further noted that readers would "recognize them as ideals, more rarely observable in practice" (Bourne 1989 p.7-8).

If these were implemented then there would be a shift away from an assimilationist model of bilingual pupils having to become like 'normal' pupils before they could learn to a model where the needs of bilingual pupils were met within a "curriculum framework common to all pupils" (Bourne 1989 p.9). The move away from separate E2L provision,necessary if students were learning English before they learnt other subjects and therefore likely to be at a different stage, has been referred to as 'mainstreaming' but, as Bourne commented

> "bilinguals have always had a history of being mainstreamed but .... being assimilated into an unchanged monolingual system is not what proponents of 'mainstream provision' in the 1980s mean by the term" (Bourne 1989 p.5).

Mainstreaming 1980s style means bilingual pupils having learning as well as language supported in mainstream classrooms. But Bourne noted that provision varied:

> "while the picture is of a strong trend towards the implementation of a policy of mainstream classroom support,it is clear that the process of change is not yet complete nor secure, and that the realization of policy is still being worked out in practice within schools" (Bourne 1989 p.80).

Bourne summarized the development work of influential projects in the 1980s such as the Schools Council Project 'Language in the Multicultural Primary Classroom', Inner London Education Authority's (ILEA) 'Second Language in the Mainstream' and 'Bilingual Learners in Secondary School'. She analyzed the principles of these approaches (see also CRE 1986a and Wiles 1985);

" (a) Learning is best achieved through enquiry-based activities involving discussion.
(b) To learn a language it is necessary to participate in its meaningful use.
(c) The curriculum itself is therefore a useful vehicle for language learning.
(d) Some curriculum subjects are structured in such a way that they themselves give support to children learning English (e.g. through the patterning of certain activities and thus of certain linguistic structures).
(e) A main strategy then for both curriculum learning and language learning is the flexible use of small group work.
(f) This way of working allows also for the development of bilingual children's other languages if encouragement is given for their use in curriculum areas where there are other children who are speakers of the same languages, and especially if a bilingual teacher sharing the same languages is also present.
(g) By starting from encouraging children to apply their personal and already acquired knowledge to solving group problems and from observing their efforts in a collaborative situation, to identify and provide any support that might be needed by individual children to acquire curriculum concepts and the languages needed to express them (Bourne 1989 p.63-64).

The projects were fundamental in that they showed how normal curriculum activities could provide starting points for supporting children in their learning of English. For instance in the ILEA's 'Second Language Learning in the Primary School" (SLIPP) project in the teachers' notes for four videocassette programmes for use in in-service training "Language in the Multiethnic Primary School' it was noted that

"children in this country are learning English in an English-speaking environment and have access to English from many sources: English-speaking children, their teachers, and other adults in their schools, the TV, and often the community. Therefore methods which assume that the language teacher provides the only English-speaking model for the learners, and that language learning follows the carefully graded stages of a language teaching programme are not appropriate. What is needed for our context is a child-centred approach to children's developing control of their new language-an approach which builds on and extends the language learning which children take on for themselves from the sources they are exposed to. The work in the programmes revolves around normal curriculum activities. A crucial aspect of the approaches developed through the SLIP project is the concern with children's intellectual development as well as with their mastery of English. In our context, language teaching which ignores the ideas and messages being conveyed through the forms of the language and

children's conceptual development is inadequate for their learning needs. Language learning can take many years, and children cannot wait to begin their learning through English until they have control of the language. It is important that while working for that control they have access to ideas for thinking about, and can develop these ideas and their interest in them. Equally it is only through being exposed to new concepts and ideas, and given purposes for communicating them, that the need for learning new language will be felt" (ILEA 1982 p.23).

The take up of ideas via Schools Council and ILEA projects and Royal Society of Arts (RSA) and ILEA's Centre for Urban Educational Studies (CUES) courses provided a focus for translating ideas into classroom practice. The change in ideas was underpinned by several influences. Firstly teachers had access to the findings of the Linguistic Minorities Project which showed that bilingualism was not going to go away. Linked to statistical information about bilingualism were findings on bilingual development and second language acquisition. A-M Davies pointed to research that she and others involved in the Schools Council projects, RSA and CUES courses drew on in the 1970s;

> "Ann Fathman's research on the best type of provision found that the more time pupils spent in withdrawal classes the less their English developed; the work of Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt on the necessary role of 'error' in second language development; the developing recognition of the parallels between first- and second-language acquisition from the work of Susan Ervin-Tripp; the growing awareness of the crucial role that the first language plays in helping children acquire a second, as illustrated by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas's work from Scandinavia; and the increasing recognition of the role of racism as a factor inhibiting pupils' learning" (Davies 1991 p. 366-367).

What teachers learnt about bilingual development and second language acquisition was reinforced by what teachers learned about learning and assessment generally. The work of Wells (e.g.1981,1987) showed that all children, unless handicapped, come to school with prior learning and language (albeit at different stages). A consequence was that if children have problems it should not necessarily be the pupils who have to adapt; teachers should look at programmes, teaching of the ground rules in class. (see e.g. Barnes, Britton and Rosen 1969, Mercer 1981).

If the way pupils learnt a second language was by being motivated, by hearing language in a variety of contexts but always in context, by understanding meanings of what is said, by getting adapted speech from peers and developing at their own pace, making errors along the way, by taking on literacy by understanding and producing meanings, it began to seem nonsense to isolate pupils from the source of meanings i.e. classrooms where learning is concretely and visually supported and peers who will adapt their language to provide 'peerese'. The shift to 're-mainstreaming' implied that methods of teaching bilingual pupils would converge with methods of teaching 'normal' i.e. monolingual pupils.

It is clear however that even in London, where the projects described in this section were carried out, the effectiveness of 're-mainstreaming' was questioned at the end of the 1980s. According to the ILEA Research and Statistics Branch there was a general lack of agreement about whether participation in mainstream classrooms led to success in learning a second language (ILEA Research and Statistics Branch 1990 p.4). The ILEA Research and Statistics Branch challenged the mainstream approach to teaching English in Tower Hamlets, an area with "the largest concentration in London of a single ethnic group with a growing population" (ILEA Research and Statistics Branch 1990 p.5). Firstly, "the vast majority of mothers and a high percentage of fathers in the Bangladeshi community cannot read or write English" and therefore approaches to literacy (e.g Waterland 1985) which required "active and continuous participation and support from parents" were inappropriate. Secondly many Bangladeshi pupils "are in a totally ESL environment both in school and in the wider community. Children have little exposure to English, either at home or school". Thirdly "a systematic, structured approach to learning with clear cut stages and goals" (ILEA Research and Statistics Branch 1990 p.10) including work on phonics would be an approach that would be familiar to parents and expected of schools. Fourthly there was a 'growing call' for bilingual approach to the teaching of English but this 'ideal' approach was not possible to implement. Finally in an area with high pupil and teacher mobility it was felt that developmental and experimental approaches to language learning were less appropriate than "a centrally agreed and approved system of graded books" (ILEA Research and Statistics Branch 1990 p.10-11). I

would argue that although clearly Tower Hamlets is very different from an area with isolated bilingual learners the ILEA Research and Statistics Branch challenge to 'current good practice' ignores the fact that apprenticeship reading schemes have been successfully implemented in areas with a high percentage of bilingual learners with teachers and other adults acting in loco parentis (Levett 1988 p.27), and that such schemes can be systematic and structured. ILEA Research and Statistics Branch approves of a phonics-based method as it would be familiar to many Bangladeshi pupils and "would also help Bangladeshis to master correctly sounds which are not present in the Bengali language". Phonic approaches are used by ESL teachers but it is recognised that bilingual learners "can acquire decoding skills relatively easily" but have "greater difficulty making sense of the materials they read" (Wong Fillmore 1986 p. 661) (see also Davies 1988 p 6). It is perhaps surprising to advocate a phonics-based approach to reading which is relatively easy to implement because of parental expectations whilst rejecting "a growing call, in Tower Hamlets, for a "bilinguist (sic) approach to the teaching of English" (ILEA Research and Statistics Branch 1990 p. 10).

### 1.9. Child centred education

One person at the London Institute of Education Inner City Conference in July 1989 had come from the U.S. to the U.K. to study 'magnificent child centred education' but she felt it was being swept away (diary note). Whether magnificent child centred education was there across the board was questioned by Bourne; "effective 'topic' work in the primary school is not easy to achieve, and is not as often established in practice as the rhetoric of primary pedagogy suggests" (Bourne 1989 p. 93). English primary practice has been highly regarded. Galton in one of the reports of the ORACLE project "Inside the Primary Classroom" wanted to

"avoid impressionistic and highly subjective accounts of 'advanced' practice produced, and widely publicised, by educationists and journalists from the USA, for whom the 'English primary school' is part of the American history of education rather than the English" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.56).

Nevertheless the system has been envied and respected and according to Galton, "Plowden remains the most authoritative prescriptive document to hand" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.58). The Plowden Report 'Children and their Primary Schools' (DES 1967) "espoused child-centred approaches in general" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.40). As well as noting the official reflection and taking further of existing trends towards individual and active learning expressed in Plowden, Galton identified other factors contributing to changes in primary organization e.g. Local Education Authorities (LEAs) encouraging innovation,a move towards a 'permissive' society, extension of primary training, building open plan schools etc. Meeting individual needs is not the same as providing individualized programmes and Plowden did not recommend complete individualization of learning. Recommendations for group work were justified in terms of children "making meaning clearer to themselves by having to explain it to others" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.46). But such group work was not observed. The Plowden evidence was based on questionnaires. The ORACLE observational studies showed that although children were seated in groups most worked on individual tasks (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.55).

In my view complete individualization of learning does in fact restrict the opportunities to talk, gain meanings and make links between oral and written work vital to bilingual learners but Plowden's pragmatic espousal of group work which would have been very supportive for all children has been slow in being implemented or as Galton said "not Plowden has failed, Plowden has still to be tried out" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.141). In conclusion writing in 1980 about 1975-1980 Galton found that amongst other conclusions

> "the general pattern of the traditional curriculum quite certainly still prevails, and has not changed in any fundamental way,let alone vanished; no support for the idea that anarchy and confusion prevail" (a reference to the influential book 'Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress',Neville Bennett, 1976 which suggested that children who received 'formal' teaching were 4 months ahead of their peers and also to the Callaghan speech at Ruskin College in 1976 warning against current trends in education and the subsequent "Great Debate" on Education)

Galton found that the teaching as defined by Plowden barely exists in practice because the teacher does not have time to

> "devote her mind to, or to engage in, the kind of interaction with individual pupils which Plowden prescribed; no one method enjoys a total superiority over the rest, that some class teaching,at least in present circumstances appears to be desirable and that setting up and monitoring group interaction requires careful monitoring" (Galton, Simon and Croll 1980 p.155-164).

Even if Plowden had been fully implemented would this be enough to ensure effective learning at the primary stage? Edwards and Mercer in 'Common Knowledge-the development of Understanding in the Classroom' (1987) felt that "the progressive movement was right to argue for the importance of children's active engagement in their own education" (1987 p.36). But they found that there was no guarantee that general principles would be learnt through taking part in a practical activity per se. Pupils when interviewed were able to give what Edwards and Mercer described as 'ritual' reasons for doing a task but were not able to induce the 'principle' (Edwards and Mercer 1987 p.97).

Edwards and Mercer advocated "an understanding of education as a process in which children are helped and guided into an active, creative participation in their culture" (Edwards and Mercer 1987 p. 36) As they said

> "the traditional ideology was all about teaching, and the progressive ideology is all about learning. What is needed is a new synthesis, in which education is seen as the development of joint understanding" in which talk is valued as a tool for discovery, and which encourages teachers to make "explicit to children the purposes of educational activities and the criteria for success" (Edwards and Mercer 1987 p. 170).

Despite the reservations about finding such a synthesis in primary school it might be argued that it would be much more difficult at secondary. However Levine noted that generally by the late 1970s

> "There had been a noticeable organizational move to mixed ability teaching; and within that, a shift to the promotion of group activities and talk as a

> means of learning, with an ensuing recognition of pupils' vernaculars as a base for developing the spoken and written repertoires; mixed ability practices, taking account of mixed experience and taken together with the concept of developing repertoires, meant there was now a real possibility of bilingual learners inexperienced in using English having an active place in mainstream classrooms" (Levine 1990 p.24-25).

It would appear that many secondary classrooms changed from ones where chalk and talk was predominant to ones where starting from the pupil and that pupil's experience, being explicit about the ground rules, using interaction and activities for learning are predominant, certainly if not before the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) was introduced then while GCSE was taking shape in the 1980s.

Nevertheless despite such changes Davies and Sturman argued that "it is only by using their first language that (secondary) beginner bilinguals can enter into mainstream classroom learning" (Davies and Sturman 1989 p.12) because otherwise they would be excluded from options and courses on the grounds of not being able to cope in English. Support of bilingualism in the classroom guaranteed that intellectual growth of pupils was not frozen and there was continuity of learning.

Lastly but by no means least teachers looked at racist outcomes of their provision for bilinguals. As Chatwin said in 'Can ESL teaching be racist?':

> "It is a sobering and intimidating thought that we can, even with the best of intentions, be acting in ways which may not co-incide with the best interest of our pupils" (Chatwin 1985 p.181).

Although he made it clear that it is not as simple as saying withdrawal is racist and integration is not he gave a checklist of nine occasions when ESL withdrawal into groups and special classes has racist implications. These occasions were when the withdrawal teaching and assessment was inferior or inappropriate (Chatwin 1985 p.181-182). The racist potential of ESL provision was highlighted in 'Teaching English as a Second Language: Report of a Formal Investigation in Calderdale Local Education Authority' (The Calderdale Report) (CRE 1986a).

In 1986 Calderdale LEA was asked to re-consider provision for bilingual pupils with reference to the 1976 Race Relations Act after the CRE had reported on the impact of provision on educational outcomes for those pupils. The CRE found that children had to pass or be exempt from a language screening test before being accepted into mainstream school. The effect was that Asian children were less likely to be accepted into mainstream school than other children. The CRE argued that imposing this condition was not justifiable. In addition children who could not be accepted in mainstream school suffered detriment because they did not have access to benefits, facilities or services available in mainstream schools and classes e.g. parental choice, ability to appeal if dissatisfied with educational establishment, ability to appeal against language assessment, language centre prospectus made available, depth of curriculum and specialist teachers at secondary level in English Language Teaching Service (ELTS) compared with mainstream schools, chance to learn alongside native speakers of English, chance to go to neighbourhood school with less travelling time than to the language centres involved in some cases, chance to participate in parent governor elections, and continuity of education by not having to move from language centre to mainstream school. (CRE) 1986a p.5-6).

The CRE recommended that the admission test be terminated; a timetable for implementing integration of ESL teaching with mainstream schooling be drawn up; provision for bilingual learners and assessment of their needs be made in a mainstream setting; new arrangements be introduced after consultation; inservice training for mainstream and classroom teachers be implemented; consideration be given to increasing the number of bilingual teachers; and a new primary school be opened. (CRE 1986a p.16). For the first time the implications of the importance of access to learning rather than access to language were spelled out in a way that required authorities to take action if they were not to break the law. Although Swann had emphasised the value of bilingual learners being in the mainstream there was no government push in terms of training, research funding etc. to implement changes that would be needed. It is ironic to note that had the provisions of the Race Relations Act clashed with the provisions of the Education Reform Act the Education Reform Act would have 'won' (see decision on

Cleveland parental choice Mannel 1991). Authorities knew which way they had to move in the late 1980s;they had to educate bilingual learners centrally in schools and accountability and monitoring was to shift to ethnic minority groups themselves. I would argue that Section 11 provision contributed to delay rather than speeding up the move to mainstream, despite the fact that it was designed to help meet the needs of ethnic minority pupils.

## 1.10. Section 11

Section 11 is an important factor in provision for bilingual learners. Bourne noted in the NFER survey (see Section 1.2) that "85% of language support staffing for minority linguistic groups in England was supported by the Home Office through Section 11" (Bourne 1989 p.45). Bourne and McPake commented that "any changes in the criteria for Section 11 grant funding, then, have major implications for school staffing, and potentially for language support practice" (Bourne and McPake 1991 p.265).

Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966 empowered the Secretary of State to

> "pay grant in respect of the employment of staff to those local authorities who, in his (sic) opinion, have to make special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence within their areas of substantial numbers of people from the Commonwealth whose language or customs differ from those of the rest of the community" (GB Statues 1966).

Bourne highlighted the key principles: "first, the post must be extra to 'normal' staffing needs; secondly, the posts must be designed to meet the specific needs of 'Commonwealth immigrants'" (Bourne 1989 p.41).

Subsequent revision meant that local authority applications had to be accompanied by an analysis of needs,analysis of how needs would be met, evidence of consultation with potential beneficiaries, job descriptions for jobs that would be regularly reviewed (Home Office 1986). The CRE welcomed opportunity for ethnic minority groups to put in bids (CRE 1986b p.7) but were concerned that provision was still extra and specific. The CRE felt above all that "equality of opportunity

will only be achieved when race issues are dealt with through mainstream programmes and not through special needs provision" (CRE 1986b p.7).

One of the unresolved difficulties lay in the tension between meeting specific needs and improving mainstream provision. Bourne found in the survey carried out for the NFER 'Educational Provision for Bilingual Pupils' project (NFER survey) that by 1987 "little progress appeared to have been made in establishing actual structures for monitoring the effectiveness of Section 11 posts" (Bourne 1989 p.58). Nevertheless despite uncertainty about Section 11's future there was a

> "consensus that some form of extra funding was required if the needs of minority ethnic groups, however defined, were to be adequately met within the education system" (Bourne 1989 p.60).

The Home Office's Scrutiny Report of 1989 concluded that "Section 11 has a real and effective contribution to make in opening up services and opportunities to the minorities" but also "there is no clear objective for the grant, and no effective system for assessing results" (Home Office 1989 p.iii). The Report stated that improvement in "important aspects of life for members of the ethnic minorities" could only be achieved "once there is a clear policy, and an effective mechanism for judging performance and directing resources" (Home Office 1989 p.iv). The Scrutiny Report recommended that the grant should be directed at opening up mainstream services and opportunities to the ethnic minorities; that this aim should form the basis of policy which would be amended as objectives were met; authorities would be accountable for results-they would have to detail needs, strategies, evidence of results and targets, evidence of consultation with ethnic minority communities;the Home Office team should become pro-active to spread "best practice in the use of the grant"; the government should re-launch the grant in a high-profile way; the legislation should be amended to remove the concept 'Commonwealth immigrant' and allow the voluntary sector to apply for a grant (Home Office 1989 p.v).

The legislation was not amended. The draft circular to local authorities on Section 11 Grant issued in March 1990 set out new administrative arrangements. A

cash limit was imposed and bids were to be subject to a fixed timetable geared to the financial year. Bids would have to include details similar to those recommended by the Scrutiny Report (Home Office 1990a p.3). The administrative arrangements were tightened up during 1990 and Home Office Circular 78/1990 (Home Office 1990b) outlined arrangements that authorities worked on to bid for the first of the new projects due to start in April 1992. Bourne noted that two perspectives within current educational practice, both an "'individual problem orientated' perspective and a 'whole school change' focus were also played out within responses to Section 11" (Bourne 1989 p.59). Bourne commented that Section 11 operated "in contradiction to multicultural education as expounded by Swann, for example, which reveals diversity within the society as a whole" (Bourne 1989 p.40). It remains to be seen whether Section 11 will provide a push towards mainstream through its monitoring mechanisms.

Other authorities had already closed language centres by the time the Calderdale Report came out. But even within mainstream schools it is possible for learning opportunities to be denied. Her Majesty's Inspectors' (HMI) 'Survey on the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Six LEAs' (DES 1988b) noted that

> "the balance of the provision between language centres and work in schools was changing; in one authority language centres had disappeared completely and in others only very short and intensive courses for newly arrived secondary age pupils were offered. Provided adequate support is available to schools, these policy changes appeared to reduce the physical isolation of pupils and improved their capacity to learn effectively" ( DES 1988b p.16).

Out of six authorities surveyed in 1985 four had a small number of newly arrived secondary aged pupils with little or no English attached to a language centre for part-time intensive studies but all other provision for ESL teaching was in the schools. 60% of infant classes ESL work was "conducted in the child's own classroom" ;48% of junior class ESL work. In secondary schools however "just over 15% of ESL work took place in whole classes in which the ESL teacher acted in support" (DES 1988b p.5). The DES report said that "the recruitment and deployment of E2L staff presented some schools with organisational problems

which they resolved by linking E2L with special needs or remedial education. This was unhelpful" (DES 1988b p.16). In the late 1980s and early 1990s bilingual pupils were still being placed on arrival in remedial classes, incidentally with little ESL specialist support, on the assumption that once they had learnt English they would be able to cope with subjects and that the place to learn English was the remedial department (personal experience).

Just as initial placement was a problem area so was knowing when to drop support for bilingual pupils. The DES report said that

> "some (secondary) schools believed there should be a time limit to E2L work, after which, except in special circumstances, pupils should be in mainstream classes; other schools placed no particular time limit, although E2L support did decrease over the years" (DES 1988b p.9).

Bourne reported "no assessment procedures for deciding when pupils no longer needed withdrawal support" (Bourne 1989 p.98). Both the HMI report and Calderdale report were concerned about the lack of consultation with parents.

The organizational shifts mentioned above, albeit partially realized, implied a shift from assimilationist thinking to thinking that accepted multilingual, multilingual classrooms as normal. As mentioned mainstream provision for bilingual learners was patchy and, I would argue, bilingual development as opposed to access to English through mother tongue support, virtually non-existent. Bilingual support has mainly been for transitional reasons, to provide access to English.

## 1.11. Likelihood of shift in organization of provision in areas with isolated bilingual pupils

If the shift in organization of provision was not happening fully in areas with many bilingual pupils it was certainly not likely to be happening in areas with isolated ones, partly because the specialist teaching services and projects were located in inner city areas with substantial numbers of bilingual pupils. From 1966 onwards these were likely to be funded through Section 11. 'Substantial', in Home

Office terms, for the purpose of allocating funding was not defined but the Scrutiny Report noted that use of the term substantial was a problem "in relation to scattered communities like the Chinese or Vietnamese where the needs were clear but no individual local authority had substantial numbers" and that needs not numbers should be the real criterion (Home Office 1989). It was certainly only after the draft circular came out in March 1990 that Treeshire LEA considered applying for Section 11 funding in Beech. There were other reasons for applying;drying up of alternative funds, the work of the project but Home Office clarification on needs rather than numbers must have helped. Likewise teacher training for teachers of bilingual children was concentrated on inner city areas. Out of 19 centres listed as running the RSA Diploma in 1988 only two could be said to be based in authorities with rural areas though of course more than two would attract teachers working with isolated bilingual pupils elsewhere.

### 1.12. Are all bilingual pupils central in the Education Reform Act?

Throughout the Education Reform Act there has been an assimilationist focus. The conditions which have been described as supportive to 'learning' came under threat. In theory as long as mainstream classrooms espoused child centred education within the framework of the Act and bilingual pupils were included centrally in its provisions the shifts which have been described could be implemented across the board, i.e. including isolated bilingual pupils. But access to English rather than bilingual development was considered important. Child centredness has not extended to using one's first language(s). The Task Group on Assessment and Testing (TGAT) had recommended that:"assessment, particularly at age 7, might take place 'wherever practicable' in the pupils first language" (DES 1988a p.53). But the Cox Report, the report of the English subject working party, stressed the need for assessment of English in English. The report also recognised that assessment in English, particulary at age 7, could result in bilingual children reaching only a comparatively low level of achievement. The report commented that TGAT had noted that such a finding "would be no reflection on a pupil's general ability but merely an indication that the pupils needed special help in English language skills" (DES 1989a 10.8). Assessment for English in English was

confirmed in the National Curriculum Assessment Arrangements where it was stated "Pupils' responses in their home language should not however be accepted as evidence of attainment in English" (Gravelle 1990 p. 14). But Cox made it clear that bilingual pupils should be considered an advantage in the classroom and

> "the evidence shows that such children will make greater progress in English if they know that their mother tongue is valued, if it is recognised that their experience of language is likely to be greater than that of their monoglot peers and, indeed, if their knowledge and experience can be put to good use in the classroom to the benefit of all pupils to provide examples of the structure and syntax of different languages, to provide a focus for discussion about language forms and for contrast and comparison with the structure of the English language" (DES 1989a 10.12).

Nevertheless it was clear that bilingual children using English was what was meant. The irony has been pointed out in a Languages Matter editorial: "What use is it to a bilingual pupil to know that her language is valued in a language awareness situation e.g. 'to provide a focus for discussion about language forms and for contrast and comparison with the structure of the English language' if she cannot use it for communication, learning and assessment?" ( Hampshire MARN 1989).

'English in the National Curriculum', which included a copy of the statutory order and the attainment targets, made no reference to bilingual pupils although in the programmes of study when listening and responding to stories, rhymes, poems and songs "examples from different cultures" should be included (DES 1989b p.13). The circular 10/89 'The Education Reform Act 1988: National Curriculum: English Key Stage One Order Under Section 4' also made no reference to bilingual pupils. The non-statutory guidance for Key Stage 1 however made reference to them, for instance in preparation of schemes of work (NCC 1989 B1), including use of bilingual speakers from community or support service to "assist children, through the use of the home language, to a better command of English" in review of roles in the classroom, (NCC 1989 B2),in using two or more languages in role-play and drama (NCC 1989 C6),and in giving equal value to parents sharing books with their children in their own language alongside children reading to their parents and discussing the book in their home language (NCC 1989 C12). Further points

concerning planning for bilingual children were made two years later in the NCC's Circular no.11 'Linguistic Diversity and the National Curriculum' (NCC 1991). But inclusion of bilingual support in such non-statutory guidance is no substitute for recognition of bilingualism in the legal documents.

Bilingual support within the Maths and Science assessment tasks at Key Stage 1 was theoretically possible in 1991 but not practically arrangeable in many cases. It is not appropriate to assess pupils in first language if they have not learnt particular concepts in first language (although this was a consideration in Canadian immersion programmes where it was important that parents were satisfied that their children could achieve in subject tests in English) (Swain and Lapkin 1982 p.21). It was only weeks before the first unreported standard assessment tasks (SATs) at Key Stage One that many classroom teachers realized that they could work with bilingual non teaching assistants and ESL teachers in SATs delivery (personal experience). It was unrealistic to pull in bilingual assistants off the streets as they had not worked with the children-they should have been involved in the teaching as well as the assessment.

Arrangements for implementation of local management of schools (LMS) made no direct reference to bilingual pupils but in practice it affected arrangements for admitting them. Schools could accept pupils from outside previously geographically defined catchment areas up to a 'standard number' (see DES 1991) and also refuse them although they would have to ensure that they were acting justifiably within the provisions of the Race Relations Act of 1976. As of October 1991, given the ruling in the Cleveland case where parental choice was considered more important than the Race Relations Act, this is presumably no longer the case (Mannel 1991). In addition schools could decide whether they continued to teach particular students. For instance pupils who had been previously placed by the school in classes below their chronological age in secondary schools in Poplar were asked to leave when they reached the age of 16 in 1991 although they had not completed their General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) course (personal experience).

For schools with isolated bilingual pupils it would have been difficult to shift from an assimilationist position before the Education Reform Act. The structure to

include bilingual pupils centrally is now in place but I feel that the chance to widen the definition of 'normal' has gone. Like other schools, schools with isolated bilingual pupils can develop transitional bilingual programmes but not bilingual development ones.

## 1.13. Alternatives to submersion

If bilingual pupils have not achieved in English and therefore been assimilated then what happens? Skutnabb-Kangas argued that the majority of bilingual pupils in the U.K. could not assimilate and would therefore be marginalized (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 p. 27). Marginalization implies that bilingual pupils' language and culture is not central to the concerns of school and indeed that bilingual pupils themselves are not central. It is reflected in the curriculum core subjects list which refers to English rather than language. Not being able to use first language(s) for communication, learning and assessment as described above is one example of marginalization. Marginalization is also reflected on a school basis in, for instance, school uniform guidelines which prescribe shirt and skirt for girls and as an afterthought recognize the need for girls from some families of Asian background to wear trousers and add trousers to the list of possible options (personal experience). It is found when pupils are asked to bring sandwiches and a can of drink rather than something to eat and something to drink on an excursion (personal experience) because the first instruction excludes some pupils whereas the second includes everyone. These perhaps could be considered small examples but they build up to the extent that pupils do not expect any other treatment. It is reflected nationally, for instance, in the government's planning of the National Curriculum modern languages programme. Initially only European languages were considered recognizable for the first list of 'modern foreign languages' which schools had to offer. Other languages 'of commercial and cultural importance' could be offered but only later were 'world languages' included in a single list and were able to be taken by pupils as their modern foreign language provided the school offered an EC language. The Modern Foreign Languages Group changed the format because of "much criticism that the two list format implies a hierarchy of languages" (DES and Welsh Office 1990 p.145). It is

interesting to speculate why this aspect of the National Curriculum got changed and why English did not get changed to language. I would argue that allowing a wide range of modern foreign languages does not interfere with maintaining an essentially assimilationist society but that allowing language rather than English development does. Bilingual pupils are certainly not being thought of as normal if no consideration is given at Key Stage assessments to the fact that they are being judged on criteria chosen for monolingual pupils.

What happens in both assimilation and marginalization is that bilingual pupils' language and culture never becomes a 'normal' part of the mainstream curriculum;it is either not there or is there as an afterthought, diversity is not considered a normal state of affairs in itself.

But does it matter if language and culture never become a 'normal' part of mainstream curriculum? What factors have enabled bilingual pupils to learn content,and to learn English?

Certainly there have been no immersion programmes equivalent to those running in Canada where the "linguistic majority children with a high-status mother tongue" voluntarily choose (among existing alternatives) to be instructed through the medium of a foreign (minority) language, in classes with majority children with the same mother tongue only, where the teacher is bilingual so that the children in the beginning can use their own language, and where their mother tongue is in no danger of not developing or of being replaced by the language of instruction" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 p.26). There has been immersion in French for English speaking students in areas of the curriculum e.g. geography and cookery (chapters by Hadley, Winfield, Morley and Whiter in Hawkins (ed.)1988) but to my knowledge no immersion in e.g. Panjabi for English speaking students.

There have been successful alternatives to submersion in the shape of bilingual education programmes, programmes in which instruction is carried out in two languages. The MOTET programme (Fitzpatrick 1987) was carried out in an area of high ethnic minority concentration. Is achievement for all bilinguals possible without transitional or full bilingual development programmes in areas with low numbers? Is achievement through assimilation the only way?

In answering this it is important to look at how isolated bilingual pupils not only learn English but also learn, and also if they are able to develop bilingually.

Learning English is not an issue in most cases. Wong Fillmore in discussing "anxiety over whether bilingual programmes make it possible to learn English" (Wong Fillmore 1980 p.309) wonders how this could be regarded as a serious question in the U.S.

She was clear that once non-English-speaking students enter school

> "whether in a monolingual or bilingual programme children encounter the social forces that will have them learn English before long. Very few children can resist these forces and avoid the linguistic assimilation that is an inevitable part of growing up in this society" (Wong Fillmore 1980 p.309-310).

One can assume that in the U.K. with fewer bilingual programmes this situation would be the same. Nevertheless Wong Fillmore studied the kind of contact non-English-speaking children needed to acquire English quickly and efficiently.

She found that pupils could learn English even when conditions were less than ideal i.e. in situations with large numbers of non-English-speaking children where some would provide models for others at an earlier stage in learning English.

Not surprisingly she felt that

> "if only language acquisition is considered the ideal situation for learning would be one language learner placed in a class of perhaps 25 speakers with only English used for communicative purposes" (Wong Fillmore 1980 p. 311).

In this situation provided the learner could seek out children to interact with, the class could be quite 'open' i.e. the teacher herself did not need to provide exposure to the new language. It may be the case that when one English learner is amongst twenty five the teacher's role has little to do with specific language instruction but a lot to do with ensuring that there are possibilities for interaction by making sure

that the child is not subject to racial harassment, is grouped for different activities appropriately, has value placed on first language and culture etc.

This ideal situation for language learning was not studied empirically but Wong Fillmore felt that students would not derive benefit from school other than learning English until their English had become usable.

Wong Fillmore pointed out that

> "experience has shown us that in such situations (1 bilingual pupil in a class of say 25 English speaking pupils) until their knowledge of the new language has become usable, learners frequently derive no benefit from school other than learning English" (Wong Fillmore 1980 p. 311).

In one sense whether it is easier to learn English in a class of 1 out of 25 or 24 out of 25 is less important than whether pupils are able to have access to learning whatever the level of their English. It is language for learning that is crucial so that pupils can continue with learning.

Much of the thrust of provision for bilingual learners in the 1980s (e.g. through SLIP project see Section 1.8) has been to ensure that bilingual learners have access to learning whatever their level of English. Mother tongue support at early stages is obviously one crucial factor in this. Full bilingual education which allowed pupils to learn subjects in first language would be invaluable. However, providing access to learning through mother tongue support is different from saying that a bilingual pupil is deficient if they are unable to learn in first language before tackling learning in English.

Some researchers have argued that unless first language (L1) is properly developed there is a danger of pupils not knowing either L1 or second language (L2) properly and thus becoming semilingual. Martin-Jones and Romaine noted that:

> "the central concern of the recent research work in Scandinavia and Canada is with the poor performance of minority children of low socio-economic background on verbal tests, particularly where the sole medium of instruction in the schools is the majority language of the host country" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986 p.27).

Cummins and Swain suggested that

> "there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his cognitive functioning" (Cummins and Swain 1986 p.18).

They claimed that policy-makers have argued against bilingual education programmes because English speaking children educated in French immersion programmes in Canada have succeeded academically. They argued that the immersion programmes do in fact have a bilingual element (Cummins and Swain 1986 p. 33-34). Hamers and Blanc (1989) explain that Cummins was trying to explain the contradiction between results in immersion/submersion by suggesting that positive advantages accrued only to bilinguals who had passed a 'threshold' in first language to avoid a cognitive deficit and who had passed a language threshold to benefit from bilinguality.

Social factors rather than cognitive ones seem to explain the contradiction. As Hamers and Blanc said

> "under the right conditions bilingual experience may have positive effects on cognitive processes; under adverse social cultural conditions bilingual experience may hinder cognitive growth" (Hamers and Blanc 1989 p.57).

Development of first language could take place at home, in community language classes or in bilingual education programmes at school.

Since the Calderdale Report has shown the 'red card' to authorities continuing to run withdrawal provision and Swann has given the 'green light' to authorities teaching bilingual learners in the mainstream one must assume that immersion is widely desired but, as no immersion programmes exist, submersion must be the reality for the majority of bilinguals. Bilingual education programmes are not highly developed in multilingual areas in U.K. let alone areas with few bilingual learners. In addition there may be physical difficulties in getting to community classes for first language development.

Does this mean that isolated bilingual pupils are at risk in terms of learning if they do not have access to bilingual education programmes?

Martin-Jones and Romaine have argued that bilingual education is not a necessary condition for learning. In challenging Cummins (1979a) they argued that you do not have to learn a concept in first language before you can transfer knowledge of it to a second. They stressed that the literacy-related skills Cummins felt could be transferred once acquired were culture specific. They argued that competence could not be described in terms of 'full' or 'balanced' bilingual skills. Bilingual children they said "among linguistic minorities often acquire quite complex multilectal repertoires comprising several codes" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986 p.34). Problems arise, they stated when certain 'complexes of skills' were considered 'inadequate' or 'inappropriate'.

The implication of their argument is that if learning in a second language is what is acceptable and required that is what will take place. Poor performance cannot be improved by insisting on 'full' competence in L1 before learning takes place in L2. If support for understanding concepts in second language can be provided, bilingual pupils do not have to learn concepts in first language before they can learn them in English. For them not to be disadvantaged when English is the language for education however, support for learning would have to be provided. Martin-Jones and Romaine were not in any way dismissive of supporting the bilingualism of minority language children but felt "the productive skills of bilingual children" needed to be looked at "as strategic accomplishments in performance, rather than as deficits in competence" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986 p.35).

It looks as if isolated bilingual pupils may be in an advantaged position as regards language learning per se. Further they are not necessarily disadvantaged by the lack of bilingual education programmes in schools as regards learning provided certain conditions are met. These are that they have the chance to interact with peers as Wong Fillmore suggested and learning is supported as is implied by Martin-Jones and Romaine. It is more difficult to say how much benefit is obtained from community schools and parental encouragement.

For individuals learning the myth of deficit has been dismissed;pupils can learn through their second language. What happens if languages are not valued at society level for their own sake? If Hamers and Blanc said;

> "the child's environment encourages the valorization of both cultures, then the child will be in a position to integrate elements of the two cultures into a harmonious bicultural identity. By harmonious we do not mean that such complex processes are free from tensions, contradictions and conflicts, but that the individual finds personal solutions without having to deny one of his cultures" (Hamers and Blanc 1989 p.123).

When one looks beyond assimilation and asks if it is possible to be bilingual/bicultural per se in education in an isolated situation the picture changes.

Have schools with bilingual pupils which introduce mother tongue teaching or tuition in L1, aspects of bilingual education, done so on the assumption that schools should draw on the experiences that pupils bring to school and allow children to develop bilingually if they want to? I would argue that in most cases schools would not be able to offer a choice of how to develop bilingually. The basis on which they have introduced tuition in L1 or mother tongue teaching would depend on whether there is a consensus on supporting functional bilingualism or assimilation, a consensus which may or not be spelled out in a school or authority's language policy and may or may not be central government policy.

In some cases schools do not need to do anything to adapt to the children. Some children will learn English, will learn and will develop bilingually. Japanese children in British schools for a limited stay are effectively immersed; they have generally high status; they keep up with their homework on a distance learning basis (parent at Rowan primary school); functional bilingualism is achieved without school involvement. In other schools family support of mother tongue will lead to improved achievement; again functional bilingualism is achieved without school involvement.

It seems likely that, in many cases, schools which have introduced tuition in L2, intercultural education and mother tongue teaching have done so to facilitate assimilation.If they had been thinking about the whole identity of bilingual pupils they would have considered bilingual development per se as an aim and if they

recognized that they could not provide it they could aim to collaborate with those who could, parents and community language classes. The lack of consensus nationally about bilingual development has meant that the assimilationist status quo remains. As Tosi observed, different views about bilingual education tend to perpetuate a dilemma which effectively leaves the system in "control of the ideological dispute and neutralizes its political opposition" (Tosi 1988 p. 95).

Despite Skutnabb-Kangas's dismissal of practical obstacles in the way of bilingual education (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988 p.41) as legitimate obstacles it is unrealistic to expect schools in areas with isolated bilingual pupils to provide bilingual education programmes. But if schools in these areas start from a deficit view programmes they do provide whether in L2 or multicultural education will result in the "compensatory-monolingual approach to bilingualism" which Tosi argued the education system has been consistent in reproducing (Tosi 1988 p. 94).

If schools start from an enrichment view then they will support every initiative to recognize and value their pupils' bilingualism even if they cannot provide bilingual education programmes per se in school. That would mean incorporating information about progress in L1 in records of achievement, providing bilingual resources, publicly acknowledging the bilingual dimension of pupils' lives, allowing use of L1 in class and overcoming practical obstacles to marking work produced etc. I do not think many schools with isolated bilingual pupils have asked whether the aim is towards assimilation or functional bilingualism. In either case the peak of bilingual education has passed them by.

### 1.14. My own position

I have taught English as a Second Language since 1977. I have taught in withdrawal situations, I have supported bilingual learners in their mainstream classes, I have taught collaboratively. From a position of thinking that bilingual learners should learn English before they coped with subjects I have come to believe that bilingual learners should have access to the mainstream curriculum from the outset but they should not be left to sink. I myself have put teenagers who needed all the time they could get learning the subject matter at a disadvantage by asking them to come to 'special English'; I am sure that pupils

who had six months to a year's intensive English had a good grounding in language but were not much more able to cope with the realities of the classroom than if they had entered straight away. Since 1981 in my role as course tutor for the RSA Diploma course in Treeshire I have trained teachers, both specialist and mainstream, to make their classrooms or groups hospitable, to analyze the demands of learning tasks, to match those demands with the needs of the learners and to provide supportive activities which will enable learners to bridge the curriculum gap between what they know and the demands of the task; learning and language learning is possible at the same time. Most of my work has been in areas with considerable numbers of bilingual pupils. I have worked as a specialist and trained non-specialists. On embarking on the project in an area with few bilingual learners I felt it was unlikely that I would be training specialists and felt comfortable with the fact that I would be working with class and subject teachers as I did feel that English is best learnt through learning.

As regards bilingual development I had never drawn on bilingual learners' first language skills in my first years of teaching English as a Second Language but I had gradually begun to recognize and value skills in first language. I became aware of the difference between bilingual development and transitional bilingual education programmes but despite ideally wanting to work towards bilingual development I had not really realized that this was not possible through education alone. Nevertheless for me bilingual development remained something to be worked towards in the development project.

## 1.15. Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the main aims of the research and the research questions I used in evaluating the study. I have described shifts in provision for bilingual learners generally and looked at some of the constraints militating against bilingual learners being able to learn and learn language in 'hospitable' classrooms. I asked if the same shifts were likely in the case of isolated bilingual learners. I asked if there were alternatives to submersion in an isolated situation. I found that there is no barrier to isolated bilingual pupils learning and learning language at the same time and did not find any evidence to

show that schools which do support the development of pupils' bilingualism do so in other than an assimilationist way. I needed to look at how hospitable classrooms could become a reality for isolated bilingual learners.

# CHAPTER 2

# EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS OF BILINGUAL LEARNERS

## 2.1. Introduction

Isolated bilingual pupils should be able to learn content as well as learn English in schools, provided that they are able to interact with peers and their learning is supported. They are also able to develop bilingually if schools are clear about their objectives and start from an enrichment view that supports their pupils' development in L1 although they cannot provide bilingual education.

In saying this one has to assume that schools do make a difference to pupils' learning. Smith and Tomlinson drawing on their research in secondary schools have argued that schools do have an effect (Smith and Tomlinson 1989 p.150-151). Mortimore et al. drawing on their research in junior schools have argued that schools matter because "they can help pupils change and develop" and because "their effects are not uniform. Individual schools matter a great deal to the pupils that attend them" (Mortimore et al. 1988 p. 265). If the policy shifts described in Chapter 1 had been implemented then isolated bilingual pupils like others would be educated in a "curriculum framework common to all". However I believe that the majority of isolated bilingual pupils have been submersed; either marginalized with respect to their learning or assimilated and marginalized with respect to their bilingual development and that the policy shifts have largely had no impact.

I wanted to explore the provision for isolated bilingual learners, nationally and locally. I needed to investigate the possibilities with respect to starting up a project for isolated bilingual pupils. I needed to consider how best to work with teachers. I needed to identify constraints. For these reasons it is important to consider the nature of evidence available on isolated bilingual learners, look at provision for isolated bilingual learners within Treeshire and also make reference to provision in other areas. In particular it is crucial to look at the interface between bilingual learners and learners with special educational needs, as needs and provision often blur for these groups. It is important to consider reasons why schools have not made specific provision for isolated bilingual learners. An awareness of current thinking on staff development for teachers of bilingual

learners is also vital if the options for isolated bilingual learners are to be widened.

## 2.2. Nature of evidence on isolated bilingual learners

There has been very little written on provision for isolated bilingual learners nationally. What I have found has been small-scale and partial. There are references to isolated bilingual learners in writing on multicultural and anti-racist research. There are references in demographic studies, and there is a reference in relation to implementation of assessment aspects of the National Curriculum. In addition I carried out a small-scale survey among advisers in 1992. I asked all the representative advisers or teachers-in-charge of ESL services to fill in a questionnaire (Appendix 1.2). at an HMI Southern Region Ethnic and Cultural Diversity meeting in July 1991. Time was allocated during the meeting for advisers to complete the questionnaire. One questionnaire was returned after the meeting. What emerged from my survey is that isolated bilingual pupils can be said to constitute a 'problem' in terms of provision or, 'not to constitute a problem'. This is echoed in the literature on multicultural and anti-racist research in 'all white' areas. Although it sounds tautologous 'not constituting a problem' i.e. being invisible in Chris Gaine's sense of 'No Problem Here' (Gaine 1987) can be seen itself as a problem.

Seven out of eleven advisers questioned about provision for isolated bilingual learners in their authority (in the small survey referred to above) said that there was no particular structure for meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners. Two advisers said that their authority had a combined team, one said that extra hours were allocated to isolated bilingual pupils and one said that there was a Section 11 funded ESL team. One out of the seven advisers with no specific structure in an authority where all bilingual pupils were isolated commented that

> "with the introduction of LMS, provision for 1 or 2 children is not seen as a priority-there is no pressure (unclear) to act on pupil's/family's behalf and 1 or 2 children ignored per school do not cause 'problem' if ignored!"

Another felt that

> "in all probability there will always be some isolated bilingual pupils in the mainstream schools. It is really part of the mainstream schools' responsibility. Our (i.e. the specialist language service) role is to effect change so that the needs of such pupils are fully met".

This adviser's use of 'mainstream' is telling. If isolated bilinguals' visibility is not highlighted by specialist teams or within the schools, by definition mainstream, then there is a good chance they will continue to be ignored.

Martin (1991),in a comparison of demographic patterns in 1985 and 1990,found that in the Rowan Area of Treeshire the Asian community had grown in size and spread by location. For the purposes of his research Martin took the term 'Asian' to include "Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and African Asians or those groups whose ethnic origins are rooted within the Indian sub-continent" (Martin 1991 p. 30). He found that in 1990 there were representatives in all districts.

He argued that despite the dangers in generalizing from the experience of some ethnic minority groups to others, studies which have described inner city ethnic minority groups as "deprived, disadvantaged and under-achieving" (Martin 1991 p. 70) have provided comfort for teachers in other areas as they conform to an assimilationist perspective. He found that

> "most Asian pupils in predominantly 'white' schools were treated as children with special educational needs, denied access to their mother-tongue, their religion and culture were trivialized in tokenistic multicultural education or totally ignored and there was evidence that they and their parents were subjected to racism in overt and covert forms both in school and in the community in which they live" (Martin 1991 p.iv).

A similar demographic survey to the one carried out by Martin has not been undertaken for this study. But from a description of changes in one school in a paper written by a project teacher in 1988-1989 we know that the demographic shifts with respect to Asian families described by Martin for Rowan are parallelled in Copperbeech although on a smaller scale (unpublished essay Hordley 1989 p.3). Indeed some families moved 'out' from Rowan to Copperbeech in the 1980s who would otherwise have shown up in Martin's survey (noted subsequently in project pupil interviews).

Despite the changing demographic patterns shown by Martin (1991) for Rowan, repeated in Copperbeech, illustrated by Astill (1990) for Dorset and no doubt similar in many other counties, documentation of initiatives in terms of provision specific to isolated bilingual pupils is scarce. As Martin said

> "much of the literature relating to ethnic minority children has failed to reflect the developing nature of minority settlement and the consequences for the minority child in predominantly 'white' schools" (Martin 1991 p.1).

Writing on multicultural education does make reference to isolated bilingual pupils. For instance Keel described the history of multicultural education developments in an area with small numbers of bilingual pupils following the publication of the Swann Report (DES 1985). She described how an emphasis on making special provision for bilingual children, shifted in line with recommendations of the Swann Report, to one on 'education for all' i.e. including bilingual pupils as described by Swann. She also described how initiatives spread from inner city schools to outer city ones (Keel 1987b p.106-107). Carter described examples of Schools Council initiated multicultural education projects, e.g. exchanges between inner city and 'all white' schools, exhibitions, festivals, assemblies, curriculum initiatives, working parties, policies etc. in "localities and schools where there are few ethnic minority pupils" (Carter ed. 1985 p.5). But such projects have generally looked at the implications of cultural diversity for white children, not provision for bilingual children in 'all white' situations.

It may well be the National Curriculum that throws into sharp relief needs that have not previously been met or that have not been seen to exist and offers opportunity to reassess provision for scattered bilingual pupils. For instance Houlton, talking in a plenary conference session, referring to pressures to disapply pupils from the National Curriculum guessed that

> "the pressure is going to be most acute in areas where there are very small numbers of perhaps isolated bilingual children in rural and suburban areas where teachers are newly faced with children with languages other than English" (Cline and Frederickson (eds.) 1989 p. 21).

Houlton went on to pose questions in relation to potential disapplication from the National Curriculum-what alternative teaching provision could be offered, and how the child could be reintegrated into the National Curriculum when the disapplication procedures came to an end. A potential route to avoid problems, disapplication, would actually store up long term difficulties. Houlton suggested going back to the teachers and getting them to "look at their teaching strategies, their resourcing arrangements, their modes of classroom organisation, things like that" (Cline and Frederickson (eds.) 1989 p. 22).

In areas where no specialist ESL service exists to worry about lack of support bilingual learners are not seen as a 'problem' requiring systematic attention. In fact the lower the numbers the less of a 'problem'. For instance Mould quoted headteachers' responses to a draft LEA multicultural policy statement prepared by a Community Relations Council in the Tyneside area in the 1980s. The draft policy was circulated by the Director of Education to all headteachers for discussion and comment. One of the 20% of antagonistic responses expressed this lack of problem: "Our experience is that these children can be integrated easily and happily where they are few and far between" (Mould 1987 p.48). Martin found similar evidence in Rowan in 1985 of this kind of comment although this one from a school with 3% Asian pupils had a sting in the tail:

> "There are so few ethnic minority children that there is very little difficulty in absorbing them...those that come to school tend to be well integrated" (Martin 1991 p.51).

I have observed that the need for support outlined by specialist staff trying to add on a service for outlying areas revolves around the difficulties outlined below. It is important to note that it would be wrong to assume that all of these issues have been sorted out in schools with substantial numbers of bilingual pupils. It would also be wrong to assume that the difficulties apply in all cases. (For example, one comment on one survey return from an outer London borough made it clear that although pupils might be isolated in school they were not isolated in the community as there are week-end community schools.) But I felt before the

project started that it was likely that few issues had been sorted out in relation to isolated bilingual pupils;they are outlined below:

-in relation to first language and cultural issues

lack of peer or adult support in first language(s)(L1) in school

isolation from religious, cultural and community language activities e.g. Mosque, community language classes or considerable travel to get to them

lack of multilingual/multicultural resources and contexts for learning in many cases

assimilation, in the sense of becoming extremely competent in English, is often accompanied by a loss; a loss of competency in the pupil's first language(s) with little likelihood of this loss being a cause of concern to the school and indeed in many cases to the pupil

embarrassment and reluctance to acknowledge cultural and linguistic aspects of identity, affecting pupils' views of themselves as learners

-in relation to development in general

potential concentration on language learning at the expense of learning in school with subsequent potential gaps in learning at a later stage

potential concentration on spoken language in school initially with subsequent potential gaps in written language at later stage

worries about transition i.e. that records in many cases do not show pupils as bilinguals and that gaps referred to are not necessarily a product of learning difficulties

worries about appropriate assessment particularly at early stages of operating in two languages

increase in likelihood of stress reactions on part of new arrivals involving screaming and crying and in a few cases aggression and disruption as well as withdrawn behaviour

- in relation to confusion between language and learning

there is little chance to diagnose a pupil who presents as having difficulties as having anything other than learning difficulties

there is little chance of the learning situation rather than the individual child being diagnosed if there are difficulties

even if a pupil is not diagnosed as having 'special needs' it is hard to establish whether that child could have achieved more given support

confusion over language and learning needs has led to some children being withdrawn from learning in mainstream and as indicated by Houlton (see Section 2.2) potentially from the National Curriculum assessment arrangements.

The account of multicultural education in 'all white' areas with most reference to bilingual learners is 'Educating All: Multicultural Perspectives in the

Primary School'. The authors Grugeon and Woods observed a pupil entering school at age five. The inner city school had a "small minority of pupils from the New Commonwealth and Pakistan alongside other pupils of different nationalities whose parents were studying locally" (Grugeon and Woods 1990 p.19). Grugeon and Woods noted that the school had a strong sense of its multicultural nature. Section 11 provision was not strong but "awareness of individual children's needs was high on the agenda" (Grugeon and Woods 1990 p.19).

Some of the potential concerns described in the list above were mentioned in their account. They noted the need for someone to spend time with the pupil speaking to him in his own language. They noted the lack of familiar cultural representations. They also added the need to know more about the pupil's family background and how the school would have welcomed stronger links with home.

They pointed to the positive factors which could be built on. One of these, shared cultural experience with the other children in the class "since they live locally, shop and play together, and must have many domestic routines in common", is probably true for the majority of isolated bilingual pupils although the chance to play together is perhaps an unwarranted assumption. The other; "familiar faces among the children" in the school environment may or may not be a factor for isolated pupils (Grugeon and Woods 1990 p.54).

## 2.3. Are isolated bilingual pupils catered for in the National Curriculum?

Scant reference to isolated bilingual learners would not matter if we could be sure that isolated bilingual learners are catered for in the National Curriculum. Teaching strategies, resourcing arrangements and modes of classroom organization for the National Curriculum have not, however, generally been looked at with isolated bilingual learners in mind. Guidance is now provided for schools e.g. in supporting bilingual pupils in the SATs (SEAC 1992 6.5-6.6) and SEAC is careful to state that children "**may** (my emphasis) switch to and from their home language in the course of the Activity" when working with other children who share a language other than English (a practice considered generally beneficial). Similarly assessments in Mathematics and Science may be made partly or entirely through the medium of home language. This guidance is clearly of use where pupils have

been supported in 'home language' and theoretically does not exclude isolated bilingual pupils. But, as I have argued (see Section 1.12) ,the National Curriculum is concerned with English rather than language development and sudden translation or interpretation of the SATs where there has been little bilingual support previously is, confusing and possibly insufficient as SEAC itself recognizes (SEAC 1991 p.29 and 1992 6.5). Isolated bilingual pupils are unlikely to receive bilingual support on other than an emergency SATs basis, if that. They are even more dependent on excellent class/subject teaching and use of the other supports recommended by SEAC. That the pressure (in implementing National Curriculum) is going to be most acute in the areas Houlton refers to is likely. The issues are being addressed by ESL teams in areas with increasing numbers of isolated pupils, and changing demographic trends are being noted; all these areas are being tackled, but what the particular implications are have not to my knowledge been discussed in detail.

In areas which provide a service for their bilingual learners, I am aware of the pressures facing ESL staff; they have seen a problem in not being able to provide enough support for pupils in 'outlying', 'scattered' or 'isolated' areas in the same way as they can for areas with higher numbers of bilingual pupils (personal communication-teachers in charge Poplar ESL service (1990), Rowan ESL service (1990), Oram,team leader-outlying team,Berkshire (1990)). Seven of the advisers surveyed (see Section 1.4) about provision for isolated bilingual pupils said their authorities did not provide access to English through bilingual support for this group. One of these advisers commented that there was no bilingual support for any students and that this was a political decision. Only two advisers said their authorities were able to provide bilingual support. Three were able to provide- "a very little", "to some extent-not always", "possible but subject to appropriate staffing".

With the introduction of the National Curriculum and new arrangements for Section 11 funding, due to be implemented from April 1992, how staff provide services for all bilingual learners will change and in fact services for 'multilingual' areas and 'outlying' areas may well look more alike. It will be important to draw on the experience of areas like the London Borough of Richmond where the

majority of the service has been concerned with scattered bilinguals (Franson personal communication). It will be important to build on the positive factors identified by Grugeon and Woods and ensure that difficulties, particularly related to interface between bilingual learners and learners with special educational needs, are not ignored. It is worth looking at this interface in some detail.

## 2.4. Link with special educational needs

A particular concern, in relation to bilingual learners, is the "early mislabelling of pupils as uneducable" (Spolsky 1988 p.188). In extreme cases of confusion between language and learning needs bilingual pupils can be wrongly statemented and sent to special schools. All bilingual children, even those with statements of special educational need that take account of bilingual development, are likely to become isolated whilst special schooling takes place in a school which draws pupils from many schools rather than being integrated in the community. Moggridge has argued that despite the benefits of small classes and individual attention in special schools, the benefits of keeping a bilingual pupil with difficulties within a familiar environment outweigh these advantages. She noted that

> "special schools are usually removed from the community in which the child lives. This is a special problem if children come from areas with a large ethnic minority community. Interaction with parents is not so readily available and parents from such communities are often understandably reluctant to send their children to special schools. The catchment area school is usually in a better position through the advantages of its geographical position and general ethos" (Moggridge 1988).

What about already isolated bilingual pupils? Grugeon recorded the dilemmas faced by a teacher uncertain about whether the procedures carried out by educational psychologists without awareness of bilingual development were 'ruling out' or 'rescuing' a pupil at a school with a small number of minority pupils who was subsequently statemented and went to a special school. It was apparent that progress was made at the special school but Grugeon commented on potential re-entry problems to mainstream or the start of adult working life, the disruption

caused by the process of statementing to his normal development, the disjunction between cultural norms of home and community and those of school, the lack of parental contact with school. (Grugeon and Woods 1990 p.83-84).

Garratt, a specialist ESL teacher,has detailed the procedures followed before decisions were made about an isolated bilingual pupil with suspected special educational needs (Garratt and Moggridge 1989). Working in conjunction with the educational psychologist, where possible, she collected evidence that related to a bilingual development view of the pupil. Where educational psychologists do not collect this evidence themselves or in conjunction with other teachers the outcomes described by Grugeon, i.e. explaining procedures to the family only after decisions have been made, are likely.

## 2.5. Why do schools not tackle these issues?

Given the difficulties described above (Sections 2.2-2.4) and the particular concern surrounding bilingual learners and special educational needs why do schools not attend to the needs of isolated bilingual learners? There appear to be two main perceptions held by schools. One is that ethnic minority families accept the education on offer without question. The second is that bilingual learners pass examinations so there is no reason for concern. These two perceptions are worth examining. The fact that the issues described above are not generally tackled may be due firstly to the perception that the education on offer is perfectly acceptable. Judging by the number of times teachers have told me that they have requested parents to use English at home in communicating with their children (personal experience), I feel that many schools are sure that parents desire submersion, may even have moved by preference to an area where their children would have to use English at school, and are not bothered about them losing their first language. To the schools there may indeed appear to be no pay-off for parents and children keeping up their first language in this situation. But in a survey of 'ethnic' mother tongue (EMT) activists in the U.S. Fishman found that "total assimilation was unwanted and the melting pot was not invoked as an ideal". 77.5 of the activists

> "allowed that there were problems for many of their communities that were more pressing than the maintenance of the EMT. Economic mobility and acceptance in the larger Anglo-community were the most often cited, and if giving priority to English was what such mobility and acceptance demanded, it was very regrettable, but understandable, if in so doing some part of one's ethnicity (such as language) fell by the wayside" (Fishman 1989 p.154).

Giving priority to English and having language fall by the wayside was regrettable, not something welcomed. Similarly Martin found evidence in Rowan of parents concerned that their children might "lose the facility to speak their mother-tongue" (Martin 1991 p.72-73). Do schools perceive the whole view? Apparent family compliance with majority norms can lead to wrong assumptions on the part of schools. There may indeed appear to be no pay off for parents and children keeping up their first languages in many spheres of life including education, but it would be wrong to conclude from this that families would not appreciate there being pay-off in terms of first language being valued. Savva commented on the apparent lack of pay-off:

> "there is a stubborn and grudging resistance to the languages spoken by significant numbers of children in our schools. That is why children will not talk openly about their bilingualism and that is why their home languages sometimes fall into disuse. Our institutions have ignored and devalued them. Of course parents want their children to have a good command of English, and one of our jobs as educators is to help the children achieve that. But in the course of doing so, the very worst thing that we can do to children is to deny the wholeness of their linguistic and cultural experience and identity" (Savva 1990 p.249).

Savva described her own experiences of having her name changed by the registrar at her birth, of being advised not go on a six month trip to Cyprus because she would forget her English and of having her first language ignored;

> "throughout my schooling in England no-one took the slightest interest in the fact that I spoke another language. So what was there to tell? Of course my parents wanted me to learn English but they were never given the opportunity to decline the offer of Greek lessons at my mainstream schools. So I and many others like me learnt early on that the way to get

> by was to be like everybody else. We craved assimilation" (Savva 1990 p. 249).

Savva added that some bilinguals had better experiences, some had worse- bilingualism was not just a language issue, it was also a race issue.

Ivanic in the same book illuminated another reason related to Fishman's survey finding quoted above why schools might feel parents desire assimilation. She said referring to adult bilingual learners;

> "Often bilingual people will choose to conform to the conventions because opposing them is too demanding". She gave an example of bilingual adults who
>
> "will try very hard to use standardised English in a job interview, will conform to the convention that the interviewers will decide on the topics for discussion and will not complain if the interviewer says "We will expect you to work a bit harder at your English". It is not in their interest to be oppositional in such a situation; they won't get the job!" (Ivanic 1990 p.130).

Ivanic noted that bilinguals sometimes felt safe and brave enough to challenge conventions but many felt that all that was needed was competence in standardised English despite knowing "the way social practices including language exclude them from power" (Ivanic 1990 p.130).

Nevertheless Ivanic felt it important that bilingual students knew where everyone in language classes including the teacher stood on the issue of language values because individuals have many identities and may have power, including language power, in one situation but not others.

Another reason for an apparent failure to tackle issues is that often schools can point to bilingual pupils who have done better e.g. in external examinations than monolingual peers. Again this phenomenon is not restricted to areas with few bilingual pupils. A study carried out by the University of London and reported by the Times Educational Supplement showed that "Indian and Pakistani pupils, who attained better results than their white classmates under the old 0-level system, do even better under GCSE" (Abrams 1991c p.1). When resources are scarce it is not surprising that bilingual pupils should, if seen to be

coping, not be given particular consideration. The question of whether bilingual pupils are able to reach their full potential is not addressed.

Astill noted that in Dorset teachers very often pointed to particular isolated bilingual children and suggested that they must be assimilated, that they were "very well integrated", "a prefect now" etc. but "simultaneously hold very negative attitudes about the group that person belongs to "laying the foundation in prejudices in further generations" and potentially the lack of foundations for a cultural diversity policy (Astill 1990 p.14).

Similarly in a survey of 200 teachers Robertson found one group of teachers who thought that the ethnic minority pupils that were in their care had been accepted by the other children and believed that "recognizing and drawing attention to prejudice was thought to increase the problem for the children" (Robertson 1987 p.99). Robertson did not wonder however what the children would 'lose' if they had already been 'accepted'.

In Australia Bullivant found "that very many students from non-Anglo backgrounds were not being disadvantaged and were doing better than Anglos" (Bullivant 1989 p.91). Bullivant and his fellow-researchers were told about many students from Non English Speaking and Asian backgrounds who had done well academically, gained tertiary entrance, were dux of school, or attained comparable types of success even in the schools located in lower SES (socio economic status) areas where one might have expected that social class barriers would have worked against them.

Bullivant added riders to the picture however. For instance when success stories are told the large numbers who are unemployed are omitted. The London University research showed that "Bangladeshi and Caribbean youngsters, whose marks were below average, now achieve less than ever in comparison with their peers" (Abrams 1991c p.1). Quoting Tamma in the U.K. Bullivant commented that Asians may achieve more than Anglos because they invest more time in formal schooling. He also quoted Chan to show that beneficial effects of being migrants may be affected by length of stay. Chan found that

> "length of exposure to Australian values and loss of Chinese cultural values, especially those concerning education, did indeed have a deleterious effect of aspirations, motivation and achievement" (Bullivant 1989 p.94).

It may be the case that above average achievement of isolated bilinguals might be a particularly notable feature of areas with a 'poor' educational catchment area but not necessarily remarked upon so much in areas where bilingual learners are isolated amongst other high achievers. Teachers may well feel in 'poor' catchment areas that a high achieving bilingual pupils is one less to worry about and therefore that pupil might well not be 'stretched' even further.

How achievement is perceived may also relate to whether schools have had isolated bilingual pupils in the past. Schools may not anticipate other kinds of students when their small experience of bilingual pupils has been of high flyers.

Of course as mentioned it would be wrong to assume that all of these issues have been sorted out in schools with substantial numbers of bilingual pupils. But in areas where no specialist ESL service exists to worry about lack of support it seems that bilingual learners are not seen as a 'problem'. This in turn leads to different outcomes. Either pupils are assimilated in school and become extremely competent in English with English alone as an indicator of ability and a prerequisite to learning and achieving, or if they do not become extremely competent in English they are treated as pupils with special educational needs and receive remedial help. What seems fairly certain is that bilingual development issues are ignored.

## 2.6. Specialist services

Where specialist support services exist, what is on offer for outlying pupils varies in some areas from what is on offer for pupils in areas where there are substantial numbers. As mentioned the provision will probably become more standardized in the future. It is still worthwhile looking at what has been available. Treeshire is used as the main example because there is no national account of provision.

In Treeshire a combination of initial assessment (with or without bilingual input), materials and advice has been the most common type of service.

Until 1990 this was the responsibility of the county funded teacher in charge of the Treeshire English Language Resources Centre in areas where there was no ESL specialist teacher or team. Indeed she also had a remit for this work even where she overlapped with one ESL teacher or small team.

The service provided was reactive rather than pro-active. The teacher-in-charge noted that "the most desperate requests for help usually come from schools who have just admitted non-English speaking speakers" (teacher in charge; 'The Needs of Bilingual Children', mimeo 1989). Her response varied from "one visit plus a follow-up phone call, to several visits in one term. The constraints of time and distance usually prevent a concentrated input into any one school" (teacher in charge; 'The Needs of Bilingual Children',mimeo 1989). The teacher-in-charge was often asked to "provide reports or letters about individual children in order to help obtain N.T.A. (non teaching assistant) or Q.T.A. (qualified teaching assistant) hours" (teacher in charge; 'The Needs of Bilingual Children', mimeo 1989), requests for which might get picked up by the area education office.

In summary schools used the services of their area's peripatetic staff, the county centre's teacher-in-charge if they knew about the service, applied for flexible funding,used a combination of these services or did nothing.

However since reorganization into divisions in 1990,within the divisions that have ESL teams it has still not been possible to provide much more than a 'fire brigade' service for new isolated arrivals. All that was possible in Walnut, for instance, was that the school filled in a standard proforma giving details of language and curriculum needs, and then the school received a visit from the teacher-in-charge who made an initial assessment, explained the possibility of providing bilingual support, and gave the school a pack of information detailing the role of the centre, linguistic and cultural background information and information for teachers new to bilingual pupils. She also provided advice on multicultural and multilingual resources and also access to the contract arrangements with the Schools Library Service. Back at the centre the teacher in charge and the team reviewed timetables. If any money was available through the Local Education Officer, additional teaching time was made available. If no money was possible teachers in the team were asked to review current case load

and reduce or stop support to particular pupils to make room for support for new arrivals. If it was not possible to re-allocate case loads, i.e. all team members were already working with new arrivals, then the school was advised to contact the schools library service and lobby the local education officer. Schools which already had a specialist teacher for existing pupil or pupils referred new arrivals to the centre via that teacher.

It was when no specialist support was forthcoming that some schools in Walnut Division either gave up the possibility of support, called in the educational psychologists with a view to initiating statementing procedures to obtain financial support or placed pupils in classes below their chronological age, allowed partial timetables and (since the introduction of national assessment) considered disapplication from or nil assessment in Standard Assessment Tasks (teacher in charge, Walnut Multicultural Education and Language Support Centre, personal communication, 1990).

In Yew Division a more informal approach was taken. If the advisory head teacher or the teacher in charge of the English Language Resources Centre was informed of a new arrival the team was asked who could respond. One of the teachers in the team arranged to re-allocate her timetable and took an initial visit form and an information pack to the school. The initial visit form was filled in by the school. The teacher supported the pupils until there was another new entry and another informal discussion amongst the team.

Berkshire provides an example of a different approach to meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners. In Berkshire advice and resources were also provided but with the addition of in-service (INSET) for school staff. Crucially a small team was allocated to this outlying type of work so that the work of other team members was not disrupted in order to carry out assessments. The outlying team spent time in class and suggested support strategies. A particular time was not specified but there were usually three visits in the first term with ongoing monitoring plus a visit of a week every half term. Direct support to the pupil was offered very rarely. Although it was recognised that numbers were going up and up and that the outlying team could not meet all requests, the programme was not disrupted by having to take 'regular' team members away from other pupils and

schools. Without such a team, Oram felt, support for individual pupils would have to be prioritized; new arrivals speaking no or little English would be at the top and therefore other pupils would 'lose' support not when they were deemed not to need it but when they were pushed off the bottom of the list (Oram personal communication 1990).

There are obviously questions about the philosophy and efficiency of these approaches, which schools with isolated bilingual learners would need to address. They would need to address the issues of support of first language and culture, learning and assessment,and confusion between language and learning.

It seemed to me, from examining existing provision, that to ensure hospitable classrooms become a reality for isolated bilingual learners staff development for mainstream teachers of isolated bilingual learners was essential. Specialist ESL teachers working with individual pupils did not seem to provide the answer. Specialist teachers can both welcome and value evidence of bilingual achievement. They can buy in bilingual support e.g. for initial assessment and ongoing support. But individual monolingual or indeed bilingual teachers cannot cover all learning needs of individual bilingual pupils even if they are physically able to do so in a scattered context.

Advisory teachers can do so much in terms of carrying out initial assessment and providing background information but the real crunch comes with implementing support for isolated bilingual learners centrally in mainstream classes within the National Curriculum. Whether they can do this would depend partly on how the ESL service is organized i.e. if they could work in partnership with classroom teachers on a block basis. Also it would depend partly on the training both specialist and classroom teachers receive. The most scope for ensuring that needs of isolated bilingual learners were met seemed to lie within the schools themselves.

It was therefore important for me to spend time looking at current thinking on continuing education and in particular the shift towards school-focused INSET. Of particular relevance was the multicultural dimension in staff development work. It could be argued that development of multicultural education has provided a climate in which learning needs and bilingual development issues would be taken

forward. This would only happen if a multicultural dimension could be part of school-focused INSET.

## 2.7. Continuing education

There have been changes in continuing education provision for teachers in the second half of the 20th century. The term 'inservice' has been replaced by that of staff development emphasising the link between curriculum, organization and personnel development within schools, and a move towards school focused rather than individual continuing education has been apparent from the 1970s (Bolam 1980, Eraut 1987). It is important to look at the shifts in provision as they determine the structure of much INSET at the end of the 1980s, and it is also important to look at changes in content of INSET, as again these affect what teachers are encouraged to learn at the end of the 1980s. It is difficult to separate out individual aspects of the shift but broadly, school based and school focused developments have followed developments in teacher, classroom and action research in which the teacher acts as researcher. Increasingly, however, continuing education has come under more direct government control with resulting tension between control and content of INSET.

One of the main recent influences on both continuing education and curriculum reform has been the teacher researcher movement. It is held by Elliott (Elliott 1987 p.162) that the idea of teachers as researchers is usually associated with the Schools' Council's Humanities Project (1967-1972) directed by Stenhouse. Hopkins put forward two of Stenhouse's arguments:

> "that support and help define it. The first is the establishing and refining of professional judgement; and the second is the failure of traditional educational research to affect classroom practice" (Hopkins 1987 p.185).

Wideen and Andrews would add to that the perception that knowledge in education is "frequently written in a form that has little or no currency for teachers" (Wideen and Andrews 1987 p.12). In teacher research the teacher rather than research bodies, university departments etc. can carry out her/his own research. This teacher research in turn could include classroom research-research

concentrating on what happens in a teacher's own classroom-and/or action research, research which involves identifying problems within or outside the classroom, making observations and reflecting and acting on those observations. Classroom research, according to Hopkins, "generates hypotheses from the experience of teaching and encourages teachers to use the research to make their teaching more competent" (Hopkins 1987 p.112).

In theory, classroom research should both improve instruction for children and enable the continuation of personal and professional growth of teachers. But classroom research, along with action research, is not necessarily linked with whole school development. Both may contribute to an individual's continuing education rather than school development. Elliott points out that Grundy and Kemmis (1981) realized that action research, to be effective beyond the individual teacher, must focus on the "structural determinants of practice" (Elliott 1987 p. 164) as well as on those elements which teachers can change themselves. Action research theory, therefore, developed a political dimension. Tension in continuing education is clearly related to political issues-in Eraut's words "who decides what is to count as valid knowledge about teaching?" (Eraut 1987 p. 733). Or as Wideen and Andrews asked, if teachers are involved in identifying inservice needs and then planning to meet needs, "at what point does that process begin to set the goals of education?" (Wideen and Andrews 1987 p. 10).

But action research which questioned whole school approaches to education was not neatly incorporated into moves towards whole school approaches to INSET apparent from the early 1970s. The James Report on Teacher Education and Training had argued in favour of inservice provision reckoning that pre-service training and the probationary year provided no more than a foundation and noting that in the initial period it was "impossible to foresee, let alone to provide for, all the demands that may fall on the teaching profession in future or on individual members of it during their careers" (DES 1972 p.6). Moreover the James Report said that schools should be involved in this expansion: "every school should regard the continuous training of its teachers as an essential part of its task, for which all members of staff share responsibility" (DES 1972 p.11). The main vehicle for INSET at the time of the James Report was courses for individual teachers.

Problems of mismatch between teachers and courses, lack of feedback mechanisms, lack of status of teachers attending etc. led Hewton to observe that "courses might serve some useful functions, but alternative forms of INSET provision had to be found to enable teachers and schools to respond to, control and direct their changing circumstances" (Hewton 1988 p.6).

New styles of and approaches to INSET were tried out from the early 1970s (Eraut 1987 p.730). In particular schools began to analyze their own INSET needs. Baker found that motivation was high for "involvement with INSET defined by them (schools) as relevant to their needs, and that change results quite quickly from such INSET" (Baker 1980 p.191). Within whole school approaches it is important to consider the distinction between 'school focused' and 'school based' Inset. By school focused is meant the concentration on the needs of the school rather than the individual though a 'school focused' emphasis does not preclude the school acting as "broker and facilitator" (Eraut 1987 p.738) for its teachers for outside courses as well as organizing its own INSET activities and influencing local policy and provision. Organization of particular INSET activities located in the school context can be seen as school based INSET. Hewton argued that, despite the benefits of instant feedback from pupils, a school based emphasis could result in a parochial approach to INSET as a range of activities might be limited to that provided by school resources, external circumstances might be overlooked and the needs of school might "override the personal and professional needs of the individual teacher" (Hewton 1988 p.6).

Developments in school-focused INSET in the 1970s, Goddard (1989) argues, were not extensively implemented. It was not until the introduction of Grant Related In-service Training (GRIST) that the ideas of the 1970s were 'dusted off' because at the end of the 1970s although secondary curriculum and organization was on the agenda, e.g. in the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI), staff development was not. Secondments to Department of Education and Science (DES) courses were still financially safe as the money came from the DES pool, the pool of money to which local authorities contributed an equal amount regardless of number of secondments (Goddard 1989 p.17). In effect, therefore, training for individuals was still the main vehicle for INSET.

In addition, despite moves towards school focused INSET in which school needs were paramount, the problems of linking school focused INSET with school policy still remained. Or as Lanier quotes from Schlechty and Crowell: "those who run staff development seldom run schools" (Lanier 1986). Hence the emphasis in the 1980s on staff development in combination with curriculum and organization. Wideen and Andrews are clear that staff development is more than inservice, saying that staff development combined with curriculum and organizational development can lead to school improvement. Staff development in their view is needed because of an increased knowledge base, new social complexities and the need for self renewal.

Staff development, continuing education of teachers linked to school development, was still not implemented widely at the end of the 1970s and early 1980s. By the mid 1970s, however, it was clear that central government wanted more influence on continuing education for teachers in order to improve schools. It is important to look at how government control was increased. The idea of introducing specific grants for INSET "directed towards particular goals set by the government" (Harland 1987 p.125) and the idea of withholding funds which would otherwise have gone to LEAs was outlined in Callaghan's 'Ruskin' speech. This speech, given by the then Prime Minister, James Callaghan, at Ruskin College in 1976, has been considered to be "probably the most publicised Prime Ministerial speech on education this century" (Jones 1983 p. 73). In it Callaghan responded to "complaints from industry that new recruits from the schools do not have the basic tools to do the job that is required" (quoted in Jones 1983 p. 73). Jones felt that Callaghan's educational policy was to "license developments pointing towards an educational system firmly linked to conceptions of national need acceptable to industry and the IMF (International Monetary Fund)" (Jones 1983 p.89). The Ruskin speech indicated that central government would attempt to "put its aims into practice more effectively" (Harland 1987 p.125). The aims were set out in the 1977 Green Paper 'Education in Schools', the 1978 Advisory Committee on Supply and Training of Teachers (ACSTT) report,the 1984 Advisory Committee on Supply and Education of Teachers (ACSET) report and the 1985 DES report

'Better Schools' (Harland 1987 p.125). These reports emphasised the assessment of need and feedback to institutions.

Despite intentions both to centralize and to implement effective in-service training from the mid 1970s the various forces professional,political and economic only came together,in Goddard's view, with the introduction of earmarked grants in the mid eighties (Goddard 1989 p. 15). Professionally along with the development of alternative types of INSET came the realization that the money used on secondments was not the most effective use of money; politically the government wanted to promote its own strategies for educational development and Educational Support Grants (ESGs) did not provide enough resources. They were

> "locked away into one form of INSET that at its best could support major change but in its main mode was mostly geared to the needs of individuals, the traditional approach to change." (Goddard 1989 p. 15)

A series of government circulars:6/86, 9/87, 5/88 laid the foundations for the introduction of earmarked grants "to help LEAs organize in-service training more systematically so as to meet both national and local training needs and priorities" (DES Circular 6/86 quoted in McBride 1989 p.1). The LEA Training Grant Scheme (LEATGS) commonly called Grant Related Inset (GRIST) earmarked grants scheme was preceded by TRIST (Technical and Vocational Education Initiative(TVEI) Related Inservice Training). TRIST established submission writing and accountability as integral features. It drew on strategies that developed INSET both for the school and the teachers. But primary schools were not involved (Jones and Reid 1988 p.122).

The principles of GRIST outlined in Circular 6/86 were to promote the professional development of teachers, to promote a more systematic and purposeful planning of in-service training, to encourage more effective management of the teaching force; and to encourage training in selected areas, which are to be accorded national priority. The LEAs were to monitor and

evaluate all training, ensure value for money and collaborate and consult-account should be taken of "the expressed needs and views of teachers, schools, colleges and other eligible groups" (Circular 6/86 quoted in McBride 1989 p.2).

Goddard feels that LEAs accepted the benefits despite "the disadvantages government intervention would bring" (Goddard 1989 p.14). Increasingly LEAs became involved in categorical funding in which agencies bid to implement policies in return for money. The model assumes a given curriculum. McBride concludes that this is a 'workbench' model with teachers delivering rather than developing the curriculum (McBride 1989 p.9). With the introduction of the National Curriculum as outlined in the Education Reform Act 1988 the given curriculum could develop. Indeed more than the National Curriculum could develop; all aspects of implementation of Education Reform Act could be covered by grant schemes.

From looking at the LEATGS Circulars outlining procedures for bidding for Inservice money it is noticeable that the new inservice model was open to being gradually 'taken-over' by Education Reform Act concerns. This is expressed both in the rubric, the change in proportion of funding allocated to national and local priorities and the types of projects to be supported.

The subsequent aims have remained the same; Circular 20/89 repeats the aims quoted above from Circular 6/86. As Goddard says no-one can quarrel with them. To the "key ideas and practices... introduced into the LEA and their institutions", i.e. earmarked funding based on "need,systematic and strategic planning", Circular 20/89 added a main objective:

> "to ensure that teachers and other professional groups involved are sufficiently well trained to secure the effective introduction and implementation of the Government's policies to improve the quality of education. These include the National Curriculum and associated assessment arrangements, school teacher appraisal, schemes for licensed and articled teachers, managing pupils' behaviour and the teaching and assessing of competence-based qualifications in further education" (DES 1989c p.2 para.4).

The government admitted to redirection, e.g. in Circular 5/89 'The Education Reform Act 88: The School Curriculum and Assessment' in which LEAs were encouraged to apply for ESGs and LEATGs it was stated: "the redirection of specific grants will support new developments; planning their use will require LEAs and schools to examine their existing provision, and to identify the most urgent needs for training and other support" (DES 1989d p.6 para.13). The relevant Circular 5/88 'Local Authority Training Grants Scheme Financial Year 1989-1990' asking LEAs to apply for funding for 1989-1990 included "preparation of National Curriculum Development Plans as basis for use of ESG resources to assist implementation of National Curriculum" (DES 1988c).

The 1991-1992 Grants for Education Support and Training (GEST) scheme was outlined in a DES Circular dated 20 July 1990. The scheme combined ESG and LEATGS funding. It made no bones about its aim:

> "The Secretary of State's aim is to target as much support as possible on; -implementing the Education Reform Act (ERA), including the in-service training needed to ensure that teachers are properly prepared for the reforms; and-improving teacher recruitment. He expects to make those his priorities for future programmes as well." (DES 1990 20 July)

Various mechanisms reinforced the link between inset and implementation of the Education Reform Act. Training days were added; two were added in Circular 5/89 for use in 89-90 specifically for National Curriculum training and it was stated that the Secretary of State would

> "expect as much use as possible to be made of the existing 5 days on which teachers may be required to work when the school does not meet to support INSET related to the introduction of the National Curriculum and its integral assessment arrangements" (DES 1989d).

In addition from 89-90 LEAs would be able to appoint additional inspectors. Again this was linked in with National Curriculum.

The second area in which 'take-over' can be seen is in the area of national priorities. From 5/88 there was a focus on the National Curriculum. For example,

'Planning of the curriculum in the multi-ethnic society' had been one of the areas highlighted in Circular 6/86 but excluded in Circular 5/88. McBride quoted the circular:

> "changes in national priority areas in 1989-1990 compared with 1988-1989 reflect the importance of an effective introduction of the National Curriculum and other changes resulting from the Education Reform Act, 1988". (McBride 1989 p.3). What is included and the priorities lead McBride to state that "the training of teachers is plainly to be dominated by the demands of the National Curriculum that was imposed by the Secretary of State after little or no consultation with the teaching profession" (McBride 1989 p.3).

The relative allocation between national and local priorities is the third main example of 'take-over'. In fact local priorities were removed completely in Circular 20 July 90. Para. 19 p. 19 stated;

> "Given the range of national priorities needing support through the GEST programme, and the convergence of national and local training needs following the ERA, he (the Secretary of State) has concluded that it (local priority area allocations) should not (continue)."

So, a system of funding INSET which LEAs and teachers were dependent on for funding, was gradually transformed into a system for training teachers to implement the Education Reform Act.

Political shifts to the right and the government's formation of policy with the support of right wing interest groups rather than the DES lead McBride to believe that there has been an uneasy alliance of quantifiable information and the cult of efficiency. Despite a "large section" of Circular 6/86 being devoted to collaboration McBride suggested that

> "GRIST as a design is, above all a centralising mechanism in that it places the teaching profession in the cage,the bars formed by the National Curriculum and categorical funding. Lined up outside the cage are all of those with the results of performance indicators,potentially able to give the teachers a sharp prod.Within the imposed cage, teachers can wander as

long as they do not get too close to the bars and receive a prod" (McBride 1989 p.9).

He questioned whether

"professional teaching can take place in the 'space' left by the new conditions" or whether teachers can leave the cage occasionally "to help pupils develop, rather than encourage them to pass tests by replicating the knowledge that the central administration values" (McBride 1989 p.9).

Because the LEAGTS system and implementation of the Education Reform Act have become so entwined it is difficult to ascertain the benefits of a centralized INSET system per se. What is not clear is the future of INSET following financial devolution especially, if that was accompanied by the termination of the LEAGTS arrangements (Lee and Gough 1990 editorial).

Two conflicting strands have,in my view, emerged in continuing education; central control-teacher as technician; teacher control-teacher as colleague. In the late 1980s, and early 1990s the needs of the schools seem to be overriding the needs of individuals. And the perceived needs of schools appear to be firmly linked in with National Curriculum development.

One could argue that the mechanism for identifying needs, planning and implementing has in fact been established with INSET budgets being devolved increasingly to individual schools or clusters. In theory schools will be in an ideal position to implement school-focused INSET. But in effect the schools are constrained to identify needs that have already been identified nationally, to plan and implement what has been decided elsewhere. There appears little emphasis on what kind of pedagogy would aid implementation of the Education Reform Act, little evidence that the government has drawn on the move to school focused INSET in terms of content i.e. linked curriculum, staff and policy development as way of establishing best pedagogy. This lack of emphasis on pedagogy may be truer of the early documents. Teachers up and down England and Wales must have echoed the teacher responsible for assessment in 'Culloden' (BBC 2 15/1/91) who when sitting down to look at guidelines on assessment said more or less -'let's just check our existing guidelines to see if we've got everything, we don't want to

have to start all over again'. The lack of emphasis on pedagogy may be less true with regard to newer developments in assessment; certainly the Secretary of State for Education commissioned an enquiry at the end of 1991 into primary education generally to "review available evidence about the delivery of education in primary schools" and "to make recommendations about curriculum organisation, teaching methods and classroom practice appropriate for the successful implementation of the National Curriculum, particularly at Key Stage 2" (Alexander, Rose and Woodhead 1992).

Despite the fact that in Circular 20 July 1990 the Secretary of State asked LEAs to consider "benefits of using fullest range of training opportunities, including H.E. (including Open University)" (DES 1990 p.10 para. 20) it is not clear that teachers will be able to choose a reflective education rather than training i.e. training for the E.R.A.

Ironically in this situation there is probably more chance of individuals who gain qualifications being asked to share their findings especially as one source of new ideas in the past, advisory teachers, will have disappeared. In fact it is likely that teachers who go on courses will be trained to be technicians because the content of what will be taught is either already established or will be presented in 'quick fix' curriculum packages. There has always been tension between top down and bottom up in terms of change, but the tension between teacher control, teacher as colleague and central control, teacher as technician has increased. This tension argued about in terms of the curriculum is not going to be solved even if INSET is teacher controlled.

Developments in INSET in terms of structure i.e. a shift towards school focused INSET fit in with government thinking on local management of schools and have been encouraged with devolvement of funding to schools. No account however has been taken of the evidence that shows that for such INSET to be effective "whether implementation occurs will depend on the congruence between the reforms and local needs" (Fullan 1982 p.73). Developments in INSET in terms of content, i.e. schools using school focused INSET to develop their own linked staff, curriculum and organization policies, have been thwarted by the gradual 'take-over' of INSET for implementation of Education Reform Act. It is not clear

whether specific needs of schools match up with suggestions outlined in national documents. Ignoring change processes i.e. the fact that teachers will not adopt 'rational' schemes automatically, looks potentially disastrous:

> "neglect of the phenomenology of change-that is, how people actually experience change as distinct from how it might have been intended-is at the heart of the spectacular lack of success of most social reforms" (Fullan 1982 p.73)

In theory successful implementation of change is advocated by allowing schools control over their own INSET but in practice this is negated by denying professional control over content changes.

The shift to a structure of school focused INSET but a content of national design has implications for INSET in all areas, but particular implications for INSET in an area that is effectively ignored in the national design.

## 2.8. Continuing education for teachers supporting bilingual pupils

Changes in types of continuing education for teachers in the field of supporting bilingual pupils appear to follow the broad shifts in continuing education outlined in the previous chapter in terms of structure. But the shift noted from individual teachers attending courses to teachers becoming involved in school focused in-service across the board has not been exactly paralleled in the in-service of teachers supporting bilingual pupils.

There are no clear-cut patterns of continuing education in this field. This is partly to do with the fact that such teachers' clientele has perhaps changed more markedly than subject or class teachers' clientele in general, partly because there have been changing perceptions of that clientele and partly because there was restriction of interest in continuing education in the field of supporting bilingual pupils in the early post war stages to certain areas of the country. These areas were ones where there were substantial numbers of children of immigrants coming

into the school system. Because of the lack of interest in areas with few or no bilingual pupils it can be argued that issues around education of bilingual pupils have been marginalized in the mainstream of teacher education.

Whether bilingual pupils and their teachers have been considered to be a focus in themselves, part of a wider multicultural focus or part of a language in education focus has affected thinking about continuing education. These considerations have been affected by the patterns outlined in Chapter 1.

It is relatively easy to chart the structure of continuing education when teachers of bilingual children were concentrating on English, less easy when two strands-educating teachers to teach ethnic minorities and educating teachers to prepare pupils for a multicultural society- emerged in the 1970s alongside language in education.

As bilingual pupils were initially expected to assimilate and 'pick up' English, very few teachers would have been trained to teach 'immigrants' in their initial courses. Local Education Authorities played a very important part in meeting the needs of teachers. Courses were mainly according to 'Education For All' (Swann) (DES 1985 p.576) of the short course type. They were offered in areas with multiracial schools and were attended by language and remedial teachers. The Department of Education and Science Education Survey 13 noted that 1% of teachers had attended courses on 'teaching immigrants' between September 64 and August 67 (DES 1971 p. 84). 4% of teachers asked in a Manchester University survey in 1967, quoted in Education Survey 13, would choose to go on a relevant course if "all circumstances were convenient" (DES 1971 p.84). Such statistics do not as Survey 13 points out take account of what courses in other disciplines, particularly those concerned with "relations between the school, the family and the community" (DES 1971 p. 84) would touch on. But courses were not the only form of continuing education. Survey 13 notes that for instance Bradford LEA used an apprentice system for teachers employed at the Language Centre (DES 1971 p.42). Advisory teachers were appointed and teachers were involved right from the inception of the Schools Council's 'English for Immigrant Children Project' in 1965.

Swann chronicled a gradual expansion towards the end of the 1960s in in-service courses but still in areas where many teachers would be working directly with immigrant pupils (DES 1985 p.577).

Courses were not necessarily appropriate however. Those who were already providing specialist help were learning day to day and as Townsend and Brittan's quote from one head showed, they were possibly far ahead of anything course providers could offer. The head commented:

> "My staff, who are battling with this problem day by day, feel that they know more about the subject than the so-called experts who at one time or another have worked for me. I am inclined to agree with them" (Townsend and Brittan 1972 p.101).

In the 260 schools investigated by Townsend and Brittan for 'Organization in Multi-racial schools' only 7% had had in-service training for a multicultural society in the previous 3 years. Townsend and Brittan identified the confusion of need; there was

> "no valid objective measure of linguistic proficiency by which teachers can assess their pupils readiness for the next stage of work in English, and a wide variety of methods are currently used. There was an equal diversity in current practice as far as teaching English is concerned, a number of schools teaching immigrants in retarded classes" (Townsend and Brittan 1972 p.10).

There may well have been many formal courses that were couched in terms of 'special educational need'. In giving evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee which inquired into provision made for the training of teachers during the parliamentary session 1969-1970 one college that ran a full-time one-term course for teachers but with not enough LEA support observed that it was going to have to

> "bring it within the ambit of a year's course...for the education of children under social handicap" not because of "allergy towards in-service" but the "fact that schools are so short of teachers that it raises a very real problem

> of providing the in-service training that is desperately needed in those particular schools" (PSC 1970 p. 1625).

Courses were not the only INSET development in the 1960s and 1970s. The Schools Council Project 'English For Immigrant Children' (SCOPE) was set up in 1965. An unpublished report written by Derrick, subsequently project director,

> "recommended urgent action on two fronts; the preparation of teaching materials for use in junior and secondary schools to meet the linguistic needs of immigrant children speaking little or no English; and, associated with this work, the development of additional teacher training provision" (Schools Council 1972 p.18).

SCOPE was established as a curriculum development project but incorporated staff development. Teachers in 38 authorities were invited to try out the materials developed in their classes and the project team visited the classes and met the teachers for discussion and followed progress through reports sent in as the different units of work were completed. There was a call for those materials to be subsequently used in initial training and INSET work. In evidence given to the House of Commons Select Committee on provision made for the training of teachers the Schools Council Project said that it

> "had no brief to involve itself in the training of teachers but, since it was the first educational body charged with a specific responsibility in the immigrant sector, both LEAs and colleges have sought its help,and a substantial amount of Project time has been spent on such work. In many cases the teaching scheme and materials prepared by the Project form the basis of both LEA and college training courses" (PSC 1970 p.1595).

Training along these lines can be seen as deficit oriented. Jackson has for instance argued (cited in Eraut 1987 p.733) that teachers are either obsolescent or inefficient-in this case obsolescent; lacking skills for new situations.

## 2.9. SCOPE materials

The development of the first SCOPE materials fits the pattern of research, development and dissemination that was common at this time.

This type of curriculum development has been suggested as one of the foci of dissatisfaction with INSET at the beginning of the 1970s but it could be argued that it was extremely important that the Schools Council did pick up this cross curriculum area. The Schools Council project made the link between courses and school-based work. It was a national development and provided common materials but these materials were tried out and reported on in schools. However training for individuals was very closely linked to LEA needs. Basically a teacher who was not working with substantial numbers of immigrants would not be involved with Schools Council training.

Schools Council developments were clearly an important factor in terms of a shift towards school-focused provision. In the 1970s there was a recognition that bilingual learners were not going to go away, a second phase of needs after a beginner stage had been identified and increasingly the need was recognised for issues wider than language ie. culture to be taken on board. This phase is reflected in both in the SCOPE materials for Stage Two (see Section 1.6) and in expansion of 'multiracial education' courses in colleges. Both of these developments recognized that it would not only be specialists who taught bilingual pupils and there was debate about how many teacher training institutions should deal with the issues.

Witnesses submitting evidence to the House of Commons Select committee made the distinction between two separate questions; training teachers in the special needs for teaching immigrant children and helping teachers to "deal with the problems of a multi-racial society" (PSC 1970 p.1620).

They found a preoccupation in colleges with the education of the immigrant child rather than with the wider aspect of education for a multiracial society (PSC 1970 p. 1621). It was felt that colleges were further ahead in preparing teachers to teach non-English speaking children to learn English and

> "in the long term that is going to be a less important issue than the preparation of teachers to work in the multiracial class"(PSC p.1620-1621).

At the same time teacher research groups were developing their own work. SCOPE Stage 2, like Stage 1, also aimed to actively involve teachers, this time mainstream teachers, in its development.

Several enquiries at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s showed that courses were still limited in public sector institutions. HMI found that

> "in-service training provision was to be found in fewer than half of the institutions (49) and the fact that these were located in areas with multi-ethnic schools indicates where teachers perceived their INSET needs to be" (Ambrose 1981 p.164).

Eggleston examined in detail exemplars of different types of provision i.e. full and part time, award and non award bearing. He concluded that a range of provision arose largely through "chance incidence of local and even personal initiative rather than through co-ordinated policy" (Eggleston,Dunn and Purewal 1981 p.347). He also pointed to reasons for under-subscription. Courses still attracted specialists; mainstream teachers were too busy with other school-based inset in traditional subject areas.

Needs facing teachers continued to change in the 1970s and thinking about provision for bilingual learners changed, but with no clear guidance from central government on issues of education for ethnic minority children there was wide variation in continuing education practice at the beginning and the end of the 1970s.

ESL teaching was still regarded as the highest priority but I cannot find evaluations of the 1970s courses from that point of view. Researchers have been looking for evidence of multicultural education and not for effective ESL.

## 2.10. RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools

The development of what is now called the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools reflected changes in thinking about provision for bilingual learners, e.g. the shift

from specialist to mainstream provision, and took on board wider multicultural and anti-racist issues.

The RSA booklet 'English Across the Curriculum' reported how the 'Certificate in the Teaching of English as A Second or Foreign Language', set up in 1967 was introduced "at the suggestion of the Department of Education and Science and the Scottish Education Department with the support of the British Council" (RSA 1988 p.4). Then the 'Certificate in the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools' replaced the second language aspects of the combined Certificate in 1970. This latter certificate was set up

> "at the request of certain Local Education Authorities and in co-operation with the DES, to provide an appropriate qualification for teachers working in the rapidly growing field of 'English for immigrant children'" (RSA 1988 p. 4).

The RSA booklet noted that the Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language "initially catered for teachers working in English Language Centres and Services" set up in the 1970s but broadened "to reflect and anticipate the needs of teachers working in a wide variety of situations in which children from different backgrounds, cultures and mother tongues are to be found" (RSA 1988 p. 4).

The Certificate was upgraded to a Diploma in 1983 and in 1988 the title 'Diploma in the Teaching of English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools' was adopted to reflect the widened scope of the scheme.

A-M Davies (1985) shows how the Diploma concentrated in its early years on "dissection of the English language into its component parts, so that the teachers could compile their own language syllabuses based on a step-by-step approach" (Davies 1985 p.161). She gave an example from an early 1970s exam paper in which candidates were asked to choose an error from a piece of written work, write the correct version of the pattern and suggest initial and further practice. She made clear that given the isolation of some ESL teachers from the curriculum the certificate (as it then was) "reflected the only approach that the teachers could take; i.e. to follow a language syllabus" (Davies 1985 p.162).

Davies outlined how in the 1970s the RSA subcommittee decided that a new course syllabus was needed-

> "a syllabus that took account of the new research and allowed teachers who were mainstream subject and class teachers to remain in those roles using the knowledge and expertise gained from such an in-service course to the benefit of all the children in their class" (Davies 1985 p.162).

At an RSA conference in 1980 Whitney drew attention to how trained ESL teachers were actually working "when their obviously identifiable learners seem to disappear into the mainstream and FE" (Whitney 1980 p.5). He showed how ESL teachers were relevant to "all other learners in the school" (Whitney 1980 p.8). He argued for more flexible provision within the scheme.

Levine in 'On The "Training" of Teachers in Multicultural Schools'(Levine 1985) emphasised the need to think about the needs of mainstream teachers wanting to work with bilingual learners from the mainstream teachers' point of view. The structure of the English as a Second Language Certificate was not substantially altered subsequently. It could be argued that what Whitney was suggesting was a modular approach that would meet the needs of both classroom teachers and of heads and advisers. But a new syllabus adopted in 1981 certainly widened to consider issues from the point of view of mainstream teachers.

Davies summarized the emphases of the 1981 syllabus. The syllabus, she said,

> "demands that teachers consider more carefully the learning needs of the pupils in the context of the whole curriculum-no longer simply focusing on their language needs and development. The emphasis is now clearly on language through learning rather than learning language per se. In addition, factors such as attitudes to racism and teacher expectation are now seen as crucial elements in language learning, though in the early 1970s racism was rarely mentioned as an inhibitory factor to language learning" (Davies 1985 p.162-163).

The shift in focus of the 1981 syllabus both recognized that ESL teachers were "beginning to work in the mainstream classroom alongside subject and class

teachers" (Davies 1985 p.162) and encouraged mainstream teachers to take the Certificate.

Davies stated that the 1981 syllabus recognized that the "ESL teacher was now much more a consultant in the school, dealing with a range of issues including mother-tongue teaching and language across the curriculum" (Davies 1985 p. 163). She argued that this area was becoming more important as many teachers taking the Diploma were mainstream rather than ESL teachers who could "develop extra skills and expertise to enable them to support the language development of all the children in their classes-bilingual and native English speakers alike" (Davies 1985 p.162).

The picture relating to status of teachers who have taken the Diploma is confused however.

Swann hoped to see

> "all teachers having a far greater understanding of the role of language in learning, coupled with an awareness of the linguistic demands which they may make of their pupils, especially in a linguistically-mixed classroom".

Further,

> "Appropriate training and support" should be "available to all teachers to enable them to cater for the linguistic needs of all their pupils" (DES 1985 p.396).

There was a stress on teachers in multilingual areas:

> "LEAs and individual schools, within the context of a comprehensive programme of induction and in-service training, need to ensure that teachers have an increased awareness of the particular languages used by their pupils including an ability to identify which language an individual child is speaking, to identify various scripts and at the very least to be able to pronounce a child's name correctly. Teachers might also be encouraged to learn some of the basic vocabulary of the languages used by their pupils, and to understand how the structure or intonation of the languages may lie behind a child's difficulty with English. We believe that such information can most effectively be imparted through school-based provision so that it can be tailored to the particular circumstances of an individual school and so that teachers can see the issues covered as directly relevant to their own classroom situation" (DES 1985 p.396).

The Swann Committee wanted to move towards every teacher having responsibility for language development of all pupils but recognized that specialist help of ESL teachers was needed so that second language learners were not left to 'sink or swim' in mainstream. Swann noted that given negative attitudes towards bilingual learners in mainstream classrooms and hostility towards ESL teachers in some cases, there needed to be "a major shift of opinion in order to accord these pupils (ESL learners) equal opportunities within the mainstream school" (DES 1985 p. 395). Whole school initiatives in language across the curriculum and fostering of positive attitudes towards linguistic diversity would be clearly essential in "creating the positive climate necessary for integrated ESL provision to become a reality" (DES 1985 p.395).

The Swann Committee also recommended that staffing levels in schools with substantial numbers of pupils with ESL needs should be enhanced and advisory teachers should be able to work with class teachers on a regular basis where "the scale of language need is not sufficient to justify enhanced staffing on a permanent basis" (DES 1985 p.393).

Existing teachers with skills in the field of language, "such as specialist ESL staff or bi-lingual teachers with knowledge of appropriate mother tongues, would be particularly suited to the role we have in mind" (DES 1985 p. 393). It was for these teachers who were expected

> "to have had a wide range of experience in different teaching situations and to have acquired considerable expertise in the skills needed to help children from a range of backgrounds with their language needs" and to have classroom experience that the RSA Diploma seemed "to provide an ideal basis" (DES 1985 p.397)

at in-service rather than initial level. The Swann Committee saw the qualification as appropriate for experienced teachers and advisory teachers within a structure in which there were still specialists. But there was no particular recommendation for class and subject teachers to take the Diploma. The Swann Committee mentioned that ESL specialists had recommended the course for both mainstream and specialist teachers but the Swann Committee itself advocated much more

limited school-based provision for mainstream teachers in relation to developing awareness of languages used, identifying of scripts and pronouncing children's names correctly. This school-based provision would lead to a tiny fraction of the syllabus required to be covered for the Diploma. The National Anti-racist Movement in Education (NAME) commented on the Swann Report. Their document 'Name on Swann' noted that the Swann Report did not adequately stress the "training and appropriate support which all teachers in multi-lingual classrooms must have". The advice given above to LEAs and individual schools was a sham because "the Report is in fact fundamentally opposed to the development of true bi-lingualism and multi-lingualism in British society" (NAME 1985 p.8).

A difficulty with the RSA Diploma has been that it has both trained the class teacher and the senior manager. The Swann Committee did not discount award bearing courses for senior management and training for two groups is not a difficulty in itself. As with many other courses teachers who have taken the Diploma have gained promotion. But there has been no direct increment on completion of the Diploma and the number of senior managers who have taken the Diploma have been small. For instance in Treeshire out of 57 teachers taking the Diploma in the 1980s three held senior management positions (deputy head in primary school, head of department and ex-head in secondary school).
Bourne has commented that

> "if there is any consensus on the knowledge and skills (a specialist ESL teacher) should have in the mainstream context, it would appear to be most explicitly set out in the RSA Diploma 'Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools', which at the time of the study seemed valued in most LEAs as a relevant qualification" (Bourne 1989 p.108).

Bourne however felt that given the change in title to 'English across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools' and specific targeting of mainstream teachers "it would then appear to be essentially not a 'specialist qualification but an in-service development for any teacher in multilingual schools" (Bourne 1989 p.108).

Bourne argued that secondments to MA or M Ed level would be necessary to develop the expertise of language specialists at advisory teacher level

> "to work in schools and alongside teachers on a temporary basis, to enable change to take place in curriculum delivery, to initiate school-based in-service and to develop mainstream practice and curriculum materials" (Bourne 1989 p.108)

It could be argued that mainstream or specialist teachers have been enabled through the Diploma to begin to take on the requisites she suggests i.e. have become familiar

> "with ways of developing classroom teaching strategies for effective learning, but also have had time to develop a sensitive awareness of the language demands of different learning tasks, and ways to intervene in pupils' language development" (Bourne 1989 p.108 ).

It could also be argued that expertise can be developed through the Diploma by teachers at a variety of career stages. Having heads and mainstream teachers on the same course can be seen to provide an opportunity rather than a difficulty. Modular courses would meet structural difficulties that were not resolved with the new syllabus. What is not possible unless there is a coherent programme of in-service linked to a policy for provision for bilingual learners is the effective implementation of a range of in-service provision in local authorities.

## 2.11. LEA framework for continuing education

The RSA syllabus had changed but was not necessarily implemented within a co-ordinated framework in local authorities.

Landon summarized the 1981 syllabus changes in 'What Next', the report of a conference organized by London and South-East Course Tutors Group RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools in June 1987:

> "From a deficit model syllabus, based on EFL (English as a foreign language) perspectives and practices, we have moved to a syllabus which views the learner more positively as a developing bilingual, for whom equality of opportunity is only accorded in an institution whose structures and curriculum are anti-racist, and in which the bilingual learner learns with the peer group within the mainstream class" (Landon 1987 p.11).

The conference had been called to consider the implications of the CRE's investigation into ESL in Calderdale (see Section 1.9) and Sanders of the CRE stated that

> "experience shows that a great deal of care must be taken to provide the right kind of support within mainstream schooling. This in turn relies on a programme of teacher training for all teachers in multilingual schools, both mainstream and ESL teachers, such as that provided by the Diploma course" (Sanders 1987 p.5).

Landon commented that in the 5 years since syllabus change in 1981 there had been a greater enrolment of mainstream teachers.

He stressed the link between LEAs and courses i.e. if LEAs favoured mainstream provision mainstream teachers would be encouraged. If LEAs favoured withdrawal, specialists would be encouraged. Liaison about developments was essential especially if the RSA course had been running like clockwork previously. He also stressed the need to make links with schools so that teachers could take the course in a supportive context. Specific suggestions included recruiting a team from designated schools, undertaking small-scale school-based in-service in the school concurrent with the Diploma and arranging regular meetings with school staff. He emphasised the need for links with other post-experience courses so that the Diploma would "become part of a series of courses for all teachers interested in the whole range of language for learning within the mainstream" (Landon 1987 p.14).

Harper in a post conference discussion 'Afterword' in 'What Next' took up ideas of content and showed how within the Diploma itself it was important that practice should be examined and

> "cannot be understood outside an understanding of the ways in which racism constructs the limits of such a discussion and defines the terms used:'access to the curriculum' is through English:the 'curriculum' reflects and extends an Anglo-Centric view of knowledge: 'learning' consists of mastering suitable responses to this view of knowledge: 'bilingual learners' are pupils who are learning to use English" (Harper 1987 p.23-34).

She outlined ways of working in mainstream classrooms-individual, whole curriculum, collaborative and INSET. The shortcomings of the individual and the benefits of the curriculum-centred approaches were outlined. Such a discussion of curriculum-centred approaches was necessary because although Swann and the CRE (in the Calderdale Report) had recommended the Diploma the issue of focus within the course remained, related to various ways of working outlined above, indeed remained whatever improvements to format might be introduced by the RSA itself. Harper felt that there was a need for LEA policy to ensure that ESL provision did not reinforce institutional racism and that "the basis of effective provision is what the mainstream teacher does in the classroom" (Harper 1987 p.32).

'What Next' has been referred to in some detail, because it shows that by the second half of the 1980s RSA course tutors recognized what was needed was to implement training for all teachers working in mainstream classrooms to ensure access for bilingual learners.

Examination of chief examiners' and chief assessors' reports for the 1970s and 1990s (RSA 1973-1986) show that for the most part teachers taking the Diploma were moving towards working in mainstream situations. It is more difficult to assess the impact of Diploma trained teachers working in an advisory capacity. But it could be argued that the syllabus necessitated the training of teachers to function both in classrooms and across the school.

Harper noted that mainstream class/subject teachers recognized the usefulness of the Diploma and it became part of the bids for Grant Related In-service Training (GRIST). She commented that this "significantly increased the numbers of mainstream teachers participating in the course in some areas of the country" (Harper 1987 p. 29).

Given the confusion mentioned about the role of ESL teachers however it is not clear how much benefit from taking the Diploma accrued to individuals and how much accrued to the schools in the 1980s. Given Swann's recommendation of only a limited amount of training for all teachers it is unlikely that the training offered through the Diploma would have priority in all schools.

Without integration of the idea of re- mainstreaming of pupils and staff into curriculum and staff development was any aspect of the course likely to get implemented? At the end of the 1980s it seemed, as has been highlighted above (Section 2.7), even more important for continuing education initiatives to be part of overall school development. It is unlikely that the issues discussed at the 'What Next' conference would have priority in all schools. This is an extremely important consideration given the emphasis on school-focused continuing education, and particularly because of the support for such an approach in the Swann Report.

There has however also been some action research into provision for bilingual pupils. The next section shows that action research has been developed within courses and also that courses have adopted ideas from action research projects. It could be argued that these courses have been able to incorporate an action research focus because they have been held in an area where there are substantial numbers of bilingual pupils i.e. London. The implications for isolated bilingual pupils will be discussed below (Section 2.15).

## 2.12. School-focused projects-provision for bilingual pupils

The Swann Committee felt that "the area of in-service provision with the greatest potential for influencing the largest number of teachers in the most immediate and practical sense is without doubt the wide range of school-based and school-focused activities which have developed in recent years" (DES 1985 p. 584). The Swann Committee hoped that school-focused activities could be complementary to structured in-service course provision with a view to the effectiveness of course provision being extended beyond the actual participants (DES 1985 p. 593). The Swann Committee noted that school-based activities had to be "closely related to the resources and needs of an individual school" (DES 1985 p.594); it was not possible to recommend a model programme. The value of

distance learning and staff exchanges was highlighted; there was however no mention of teachers researching their own priorities.

But Levine argued that the teacher research experience was there before Swann. She said, echoing the quote from 'Organization in Multiracial Schools' (see Section 2.8) that teachers were ahead of courses, that the papers in 'English as a Second Language in the U.K.' (Brumfit, Ellis and Levine eds 1985)

> "are describing the work of learning-teachers, of creative people, taking risks, sharing their thinking and experience and learning as they go: they are developing the curriculum in the face of resistance to change, on many sides and at many levels, and in the face of a daunting lack of resources. They are the flexible, sensitive arm of the teaching profession that Swann (p. 397) is calling for-though they were there before Swann and have come up by various routes , not only via ESL" (Levine 1985 p.141).

She recorded that pioneering work had been done on in-service courses and projects which involved teachers and teacher 'trainers' learning at the same time, but if not on the RSA course with a predetermined syllabus and little scope for extensive action research then where?

Levine described a course in the Institute of Education which clearly drew on the teacher research tradition. In the 'Language in Multicultural Education' course at the Institute of Education teacher educators worked in the ways teachers believe is good for their pupils

> "offering food for thought, supporting, drawing out, telling, teaching,saying when we don't know, letting other people in with their expertise,sharing our research; providing different learning experiences and communicative contexts, spaces for people to do their own thing; giving time for information to become understanding that can be acted upon;helping people do their work no matter what their starting point; staging it when necessary; letting be, when that seems right....We all learn best when the learning takes place according to our needs and interests and the external demands of the situation" (Levine 1985 p. 146).

Levine added that an important element is how to go on learning;she claimed that follow up to the Institute courses is possible through teachers research groups attached to the Institute of Education, or LEAs "continuing the investigative mode

and contributing through materials making and the writing-up of case studies to curriculum development beyond their own classroom" (Levine 1985 p.147).

So a teacher research based course with learning taking place according to 'needs and interests and the external demands of the situation' rather than a syllabus based one might provide a way forward in terms of likelihood of implementation.

Also holding tremendous potential for effective implementation were key projects combining staff development and curriculum development described by Wiles.

Wiles described the development of Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) funded curriculum projects which also formed a central part of in-service. She said

> "it is tempting to see the projects, with their materials production, as one aspect of our work and the courses as another, in practice they were all part of the same process. The development work fed into the courses and indeed fuelled much of their content. But gradually an even more exciting process developed. The courses became the development work, as a result of the active participation of the course teachers. Instead of simply trying out, commenting on and helping us to refine our materials, as happened with the two earliest projects (Language for Learning and Reading Through Understanding...with the work of SLIP (Second Language Learners in the Primary School), BUF(Bilingual Under Fives) and BLISS (Bilingual Learners in Secondary Schools)...the teachers themselves became the researchers" (Wiles 1985 p.151-152).

Wiles noted that one of the early projects Language for Learning(1971) alerted Centre for Urban Educational Studies (CUES) staff

> "to ways in which good classroom practice made it possible for bilingual children to be actively involved and supported in mainstream class activities, and to the vital importance of collaboration and small group work across the curriculum in multilingual classrooms" (Wiles 1985 p.153-154).

Wiles claimed that teacher research on these courses was 'ahead of' current thinking on the RSA course. She felt that the course still reinforced the idea that

"only specialists could properly teach English to bilingual children, and that class and subject teachers should not dabble in it" (Wiles 1985 p. 153).

CUES staff on the other hand, recognizing that the majority of bilingual pupils spent the majority of time in mainstream, set up a major project 'Second Langauge Learners in the Primary School' (SLIPP) in 1975. SLIPP has been described in the section on mainstream provision for bilingual pupils (see Section 1.8) Here it is important to note that class teachers took on development of materials and approaches themselves (what other training they had had is not recorded) but the materials were presented for trainers-"teachers involved in in-service training; headteachers and their staffs; advisory teachers; and tutors responsible for running courses" (ILEA 1982 p.3).

The significance of the project led to its development into a Schools Council funded project 'Language in the Multilingual Primary Classroom' which ran from January 1982 to December 1983 under the Schools Council and until August 1984 under ILEA. Hester, the project director, outlined in Brumfit, Ellis and Levine eds (1985) the importance of teachers' research when she said about the project

> "teachers had collected evidence about children at work in their classrooms, to find out what children were actually doing as they talked and worked and to answer some questions they had posed for themselves. In observing their children they were, of course, observing themselves-examining their own behaviour and their own products. Of all the ways in which I have worked over the past few years, I think this notion of teachers acting as researchers in and out of their classrooms is one of the most powerful for providing in-service training and at the same time, promoting curriculum development" (Hester 1985 p.64).

Wiles recorded that collaboration between class/subject teachers, CUES and specialist teachers continued in ILEA within SLIM- Second Language Learners in the Mainstream project, (1983-?), BLISS-Bilingual Learners in Secondary School project (1984-?), BUF- Bilingual Under Fives project. I can find no record of the final outcomes and date of these projects, and in the case of the Bilingual Under Fives project the start date either. Despite the excellent materials produced by

e.g. the Bilingual Under Fives project (France and Wiles 1984) the impact of the projects remain sketchy.

The outcomes of such projects were, like outcomes of SLIPP, developed and disseminated through CUES courses. These courses shifted in structure but also in content, from ones dealing specifically with "education of children whose mother tongue is not English" (1978) to "Language issues in the multicultural classroom: supporting children's first and second language development" (1984) (Wiles 1985).

A variety of course structures were used; centrally organized courses e.g. RSA Diploma ran alongside school-focused work. CUES recognized that whatever the vehicle it was important for teachers to share INSET experience with staff in school. In particular Riley and Bleach writing about SLIM in 'English as a Second Language in the U.K.' said they were supported in their wish to develop a whole-school model for ESL provision in schools

> "by the experience in other whole-school projects in ILEA. This experience showed that the training of individuals (even, for example, through the prestigious Royal Society of Arts Diploma in the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools) and returning them to an unchanged institutional setting all too often prevents them applying what they have learned in their classrooms, let alone in the rest of the school..." (Riley and Bleach 1985 p.78).

Dissemination in the case of CUES projects was through courses. It could be argued that wider dissemination has taken place nationally through the RSA course tutors who have learnt about CUES courses from CUES personnel involved in both; that RSA course tutors have in many places tried to take on board content changes, methodology changes, expansion changes, format changes amidst a climate of national educational changes, INSET provision changes, local authority changes without backup. What is surprising is that the RSA course is not even further behind the kind of good practice Wiles advocated. It may be the case that school-focused teacher research of the kind described above is only possible when there is a nucleus of teachers who have received formal training. The Diploma has certainly raised issues in areas where it has not been possible to

fund school-based projects in this area of work. But it is very difficult to evaluate the relative importance of these projects and syllabus-led courses and their overall impact. Although the importance of the Schools Council in establishing cross curricular projects like the ones described above has been mentioned it is important to note that I cannot find any evaluations of them. Similarly there has been no national evaluation of the impact of the RSA course.

Despite these initiatives it is extremely disappointing that so little action research in provision for bilingual pupils has been forthcoming nationally and that the main Schools Council projects were not to my knowledge evaluated. Whether bilingual pupils are not seen as an issue because statistically they constitute small numbers and there are very few research projects on provision for bilingual pupils, the fact remains that bilingual pupils appear to have been marginalized as an area of teacher-research interest.

There is not necessarily a link with large scale research projects and teacher education either. Indeed Smith and Tomlinson in their DES funded study of multi-racial comprehensives carried out between 1981 and 1988 noted a reluctance on the part of teachers to co-operate with researchers. This was partly because the research was connected with racial or ethnic minority groups, considered a sensitive area, partly "because of the contraction and reorganisation of secondary schools in response to falling rolls". This "climate of uncertainty" was not "conducive to happy co-operation with outside researchers" (Smith and Tomlinson 1989 p. 31).

The project wanted to look at "aspects of the structure policies and practices" (Smith and Tomlinson 1989 p. 128) of schools that might be important in determining outcomes but because the response rate was low results could not be described. It was clear however that there were very large differences between schools "in their styles of organization, in the extent and nature of discussion amongst teachers about curriculum and policy matters, in the rate of change they have experienced and in the way they have dealt with change" (Smith and Tomlinson 1989 p. 129). Smith and Tomlinson recommended use of teacher questionnaires to establish the situation in future when the problems described had

lessened. It is therefore not possible to describe or assess the impact of staff development or lack of it in relation to provision for bilingual pupils in this study.

However two recent projects; the Bilingual Pupils Project and Partnership Teaching have had an explicit link with in-service education.

## 2.13. The Bilingual Pupils Project

The national research project "The Bilingual Pupils Project" sponsored and carried out between 1985 and 1988 by the National Foundation For Educational Research (NFER) aimed to "examine whether provision for bilingual pupils had been redefined and what ways it had been reorganised since the last NFER surveys by Townsend (1971) and Townsend and Brittan (1972)" (Bourne 1989 p.1). In its study of provision it outlined a model of ESL provision for bilingual pupils (see Section 1.8) and Bourne noted that most schools needed to travel some distance to reach that model. She outlined how one school had organized provision so that specialist staff could both support and lead classes with timetabled time for planning preparing and record-keeping with the possibility of attaching advisory teachers "for temporary in-service development" (Bourne 1989 p. 103). Bourne stressed that this 'enabling' role described was a vital one. She noted that LEAs needed to take into account the "variety of existing qualifications and experience" in planning deployment of ESL teachers as HMI had noted that only half of the six authorities studied in 1988 "had made concerted efforts to recruit teachers already qualified in 'ESL' and to train those already in post" (DES 1988b p. 4). Of the six LEAs the NFER project studied two were "able to claim that almost all their language-support team had appropriate specialist qualifications" (Bourne 1989 p.105). However Bourne mentioned that she had already questioned the validity of initial qualifications given the move of English language support from "the withdrawal teaching situation into mainstream curriculum areas" (Bourne 1987 p.9) and asked whether "training for the role of ESL specialist, as language adviser to the curriculum specialist, is appropriate for initial teacher training" (Bourne 1987 p.9).

In effect placement of bilingual pupils in mainstream was widespread;

> "some schools were working to create an environment which would enhance the language development of all pupils, carefully reorganizing in order to prepare mainstream classrooms and teachers for co-operative teaching to support interactive learning (Bourne 1989 p.109)"

These initiatives had been supported by LEA advisory services at, as with Smith and Tomlinson's study, a difficult period during the teachers' and employers dispute. Bourne, however, found that detailed models of language support described in Schools Council and ILEA projects already referred to above were not being widely disseminated. Bourne commented that

> "the evidence suggested that when the whole school takes responsibility for the language development of all its pupils and sets up structures which will support the review and reorganization of its provision, class teachers and English support teachers are enabled to begin to find ways of working together to support the learning of all pupils and provide suitable opportunities to meet any particular need " (Bourne 1989 p. 109-110).

Given Bourne's finding that the majority of LEAs claimed to meet the needs of bilingual pupils in mainstream classrooms Bourne argued that priority should be given to "helping schools reappraise their organization" (Bourne 1989 p. 110) to overcome the constraints which prevent needs of bilingual pupils being met in mainstream classrooms in practice.

## 2.14. Partnership Teaching

It would appear that the idea of 'enabling teachers to begin to find ways of working together' has been taken up in the 'Partnership Teaching' in-service pack for schools. This pack was the "outcome of a two-year project carried out by the National Foundation for Educational Research, sponsored by the Department of Education and Science" (NFER n.d.). The Partnership Teaching Pack "is aimed at facilitating whole school inservice for teachers working with pupils aged between 9 and 14 years" (NFER n.d.). The publicity information sheet noted that National Curriculum English Working Group for English 5-11 "endorsed the position taken

by the Swann Report and HMI on importance of supporting bilingual pupils within the mainstream classroom as part of normal lessons" (NFER n.d.). The handout said that this notion has been accepted by LEAs and many language support teachers have "received inservice on strategies for working within the mainstream class" (NFER n.d.).

However, the handout continued, whole school discussion "enables teachers to share their understanding of the purpose of mainstream support, and to examine the issues it raises in the light of their own classroom experiences and their own school context" so that mainstream teachers and language support staff can pool "knowledge, skills and experience" to provide access to the curriculum for pupils whose mother tongue is not English (NFER n.d.). Senior management would be involved in considering time tabling and resource implications. Partnership Teaching aims to intermesh "curriculum development, inservice education, policy development and language support" (NFER n.d.).

Thus from the publicity information and from the regional presentation (11th February 1991 held at Institute of Education, London) Partnership Teaching would appear to validate the 'enabling' role of ESL teachers apparent in some of the LEAs looked at in the NFER Bilingual Pupils Project.

It is not clear however how much analysis of language demands of tasks is advocated within the programme. Without an emphasis on such analysis there would appear to be no particular need for a language specialist as opposed to any other teacher to work in partnership. As Bourne asked in 1987

> "What exactly is it that a teacher trained in ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) can offer in a collaborative team teaching situation that any two good teachers working in tandem could not offer? (if being a 'good teacher' means knowing how to 'unpack' a learning task so as to present it in such a form that it will allow for challenge but also success.)" (Bourne 1987 p.28).

Nor is it clear how ESL teachers not already 'enablers' are to be trained in this role through the pack itself. It remains to be seen whether an 'inservice training pack' can facilitate whole school inservice. Ironically as schools are moving towards whole school inservice under Local Management of Schools, ESL teachers

are going to be largely funded by central government through Section 11 (discussed elsewhere) and managed by the local authority.

What is clear from the videos shown in the presentation is that the ESL teachers participating had already been trained somewhere else (in one case at least through the RSA Diploma) (personal communication) and were able to bring that experience to the sharing. I am not sure if the pack would provide adequate staff development for inexperienced ESL teachers -or for two inexperienced mainstream teachers working together. Similarly there was discussion about drawing on first languages, but no training for teachers of or in community languages. As with other forms of school focused Inservice, much depends on support from senior management in schools. If Partnership Teaching is successful and does enable schools to meet the needs of their bilingual learners it will be a good investment of £200,000 for the DES and represents a snip compared with other training programmes. The dissemination of partnership teaching strategies in itself will be something that course tutors have recognized as missing from the RSA Diploma (London and South East Course tutors, personal communications). There is, however, as with other suggestions for teacher research, no guarantee that coverage will reach schools i.e. that teachers will want to review what is going on in their classroom, identify one or more areas they would like to develop, set goals, experiment, evaluate achievements of partnership and disseminate ideas which have been developed so that the curriculum is responsive to "all pupils' language needs and abilities" (NFER n.d.) and even that such work can compete with other INSET priorities.

Given these reservations set alongside the marginalization of bilingual pupils within the scope of Education Reform Act, and the restriction in terms of content likely to be tackled by school-focused INSET, and given the future absence of funding for any research through Section 11, possibilities of future continuing education through teacher research with bilingual pupils look extremely bleak in the 1990s.

## 2.15. In-service education for teachers of isolated bilingual pupils

It is likely that if an INSET approach is adopted generally, fewer new arrival bilingual learners at early stages of learning English will be catered for directly by advisory ESL teachers. More of their time will be spent with class and subject staff. Given finite resources is the INSET approach acceptable or even possible in scattered areas or will pressures to meet needs of the individual child directly, i.e. the new arrival, be stronger here? An even scatter which would allocate one specialist teacher to working with a cluster of schools, which had a sufficient number of bilingual learners at early stages of learning English to have justified a teacher on a direct needs basis would be a rare find.

It is likely that provision for the foreseeable future will have to be allocated on a needs/numbers basis. The question then is how to maximise the INSET opportunities for staff whilst not putting individuals too far back on the priority lists. If advisory teachers in scattered situations work with teachers rather than individual pupils what are the INSET possibilities for the 'trainers' themselves?

A specialist ESL teacher, especially one with other, e.g. management, responsibilities is likely to have had training through whatever the normal ESL INSET programme for the authority has been. Teachers whose pupils are submersed are likely to have had no specific training-after all if bilingual pupils have no particular needs no particular training is needed. In cases where bilingual pupils are considered to have special educational needs then teachers may have had special educational needs training.

Even if INSET is seen as desirable by schools with isolated pupils, extended INSET is unlikely to take place. For example, in response to a publicity drive in Oak Division in the late 1980s for the RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum course it became clear that schools did not want to send a member of staff on a specialist course. Schools can also allocate non specialist staff or Special Educational Needs (SEN) staff to work with a pupil without necessarily thinking of extra training needs for that member of staff in a new role.

This lack of opportunity to get school backing for extended INSET is important. Individuals in Treeshire have taken e.g. RSA Diploma. (Mainstream teachers with one bilingual pupil in their class fulfil the condition of having

bilingual pupils in class for the RSA examination board.) There are a variety of reasons for these teachers taking the Diploma. Some have been interested in the issues. Some have seen it as a step to moving to a more multilingual area, some realize that the Diploma is useful in relation to all pupils (Treeshire course applications). However in all cases although the school has not objected to the secondment it has been an individual rather than a school initiative where numbers of bilingual pupils have been low. In fact in one of the few articles about the RSA Diploma Williamson commented on the choices made by candidates who want a qualification and those who did not as a further refinement of individual choice. The distinction between individuals choosing to take the Diploma and schools sending individuals on the course was not an issue (Williamson 1989 p. 73-77).

In Treeshire support for individuals has been possible with county funding. Once however school needs assume greater emphasis first in a divisionally organized system and ultimately within a system whereby all INSET money is devolved to schools, support for individuals wanting to go on long courses evaporates. Add to this the fact that loss of first language is not remarked upon in scattered areas and apparently accepted by the architects of the National Curriculum, and the arguments against straight submersion with no need for particular specialist training reduce. The reduction in support is less of a problem in multilingual areas where individual needs and school needs should dovetail, but it effectively closes the gates to individual teachers in schools with isolated bilingual pupils.

This is not to say that there have not been successful initiatives. Grugeon and Woods described successful action research on issues described as 'concerns' e.g. transition, whether or not to statement,and the first days at school in their book 'Educating All' (Grugeon and Woods 1990). The money for the projects came from an Open University research grant however; where would more come from in the future and how was the training funded which produced the "committed,critical,creative and curious" teachers (Grugeon and Woods 1990 p.214) who were chosen to participate?

County funded extensive training in Treeshire is clearly no longer a possibility because of local management of schools (LMS). County funded short courses (i.e. 12 hour) were particularly popular with teachers in outlying areas in Treeshire between 1982 and 1989 but there was no specific follow-up with schools and little with teachers unless they used the short courses as an introduction to the RSA Diploma course.

Section 11 funded projects are equally as applicable to areas with few bilingual pupils as they are to areas with substantial numbers, as there is no lower limit in the regulations. But there is no substantial training component within Section 11, and as previously mentioned, specialist teachers may be effective at the moment because they have participated in previous LEA training.

Given the effective closure of routes for individual teachers in schools to receive extensive training, the lack of Section 11 possibilities, and the difficulties with which schools justify training teachers of isolated bilingual pupils the LEA's role is absolutely vital. The question was: would it be possible to set up and reflect on a school-focused project on meeting the needs of isolated bilingual pupils? The opportunity to try came with LEA support for a project in schools in an area of Beech where teachers had already been asking for LEA support for bilingual learners. It was thus possible to attempt to see what could be drawn from the development of school-focused INSET movement described in this chapter. The development project and associated research are described in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

# CHAPTER 3

# SETTING UP AND RESEARCHING A LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

## 3.1 Introduction-research options

In this research I wanted to examine how isolated bilingual pupils were learning English as a Second Language and everything that everyone else learns, how their teachers were supporting them and if they were able to develop bilingually.

I needed to find out how these things were happening at the same time as I was involved in a teacher development project with teachers some of whom were working with isolated bilingual pupils and some of whom were not. There was no clear cut before and after. It was not possible to separate out how things happened from the development work which changed how things happened.

It was my aim in the work of the development project to ensure that isolated bilingual pupils were taught within a curriculum framework common to all. This would involve shifting isolated bilingual pupils from being submersed, if they were submersed, to being 'normal' pupils whose needs were catered for as a matter of course in the school.

For the development work to be effective, I considered that I would need to ensure that pupils were both learning English and learning curriculum content, that they were able to develop bilingually if possible and that mainstream class and subject teachers would take responsibility for and feel comfortable about teaching all bilingual pupils and if possible support bilingual development. I also had to ensure that schools without bilingual pupils involved in the project had their needs met in a way that would be supportive of any future bilingual intake and that would be supportive of bilingual pupils in the community, by raising the awareness of all monolingual pupils about language and/or culture. I presented an outline of a proposed project (see Appendix 3.1) to area advisers and also to headteachers of potential schools at meetings in Spring 1988.

For my research I wanted to comment on the current position of bilingual pupils in schools. Were they submersed? I wanted to comment on any shift to mainstream achieved within the project and suggest reasons for such a shift. I wanted to consider how teachers were supporting bilingual learners and reflect on the most appropriate type of teacher training for teachers working with isolated

bilingual learners. I also wanted to see if isolated bilingual learners could develop bilingually and bi-culturally in the mainstream classroom. The research questions which guided the investigation were centred on six areas; language and learning; National Curriculum; use of L1; teachers' record keeping and observation; use of Primary Language Record; and reflection on whether recommendations based on observations on the five areas outlined were useful in work with teachers.

I needed to ask first, under the heading of language and learning, if pupils were involved in classes, if they were fully active members of mainstream classes. I also needed to ask if they were supported by adults, if teachers were helping bilingual pupils to learn. In addition I needed to see if pupils were supported by their peers, if a potentially valuable aid to language and learning development, collaborative work, was being utilized. Finally, under the heading language and learning, I wanted to look at bilingual learners' use of language in the mainstream classroom. I wanted to see if they had access to learning.

Secondly I needed to ask if isolated bilingual learners were being accessed to the National Curriculum, in theory an entitlement along with all other pupils. This was important in order to establish that isolated bilingual pupils were learning and not just learning language. This would confirm whether isolated bilingual pupils were fully involved in classes.

I did want to see if isolated bilingual learners could develop bilingually and biculturally in the mainstream classroom. My third research question was to look at pupils' use of L1.

My fourth research question was to ask about the school's record keeping and observation systems and to look at how bilingual pupils' learning was recorded. This would give an indication of whether bilingual pupils were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally but would also confirm if bilingual pupils were fully involved in all aspects of learning in mainstream classrooms.

My fifth research question was to ask if the Primary Language Record (Barrs and Hester 1988) was of use to teachers in their observations and record keeping.

Finally I needed to reflect on the recommendations shared with teachers and ask how useful the summaries of observations were in working with teachers on developing their support for isolated bilingual learners in their classes.

This research could have been carried out in different ways. I could have interviewed heads in schools with isolated bilingual pupils or asked them to respond to a questionnaire. Following the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) survey (see Bourne 1989) this could have established what the policy and practice of mainstreaming for such pupils were. I could have shadowed isolated bilingual pupils in schools to confirm what the practice was. I could have asked teachers directly about their training and attitudes towards isolated bilingual learners. I could have interviewed the pupils about their bilingual and bicultural development. I could have commented on these aspects of interest to me and made recommendations.

In fact some of these strategies- interviews, questionnaires, shadowing- were used within the research. But how they were used was crucial. They were used in an action research context. The difference between the type of research programme described above and the one that I adopted involves me in a consideration of the nature of action research and hinges on the notion of ownership.

Action research as mentioned in Section 2.7, involves the practitioner in reviewing a 'problem', setting goals, experimenting-trying out action, evaluating the results of that action, disseminating results and reviewing the 'problem', setting further goals if necessary. A vital component of action research is documentation of these steps. The documentation acts as evidence. At each stage there is opportunity for at least discussion if not formal triangulation. It is usually carried out by people within the context where the 'problem' arises and the evaluation is inbuilt; there is no external evaluation of any stage.

As far as the development project was concerned I was, however, an outsider; someone asked to come in to schools and work with teachers and pupils. Each of the schools had their own agenda and I had to negotiate a joint agenda with the teachers that we would be able to work with together, to own. But we did not evaluate the project together and the aims we negotiated, although related,

were different from ones I personally wanted to work on. It was not an action research project for the teachers involved although I had hoped that it could be. I was able however to reflect on how the development project was working in terms of my own action research; reflection on setting goals, experimenting, evaluating, disseminating and reviewing. I was also able to use evidence from the project to answer my research questions. There were therefore two layers of ownership. The teachers and schools owned the direction of the development project in determining the end products. I owned my reflections on how the development project was working. The teachers knew that I was involved in research but I did not share my research questions with them.

A third layer would have been an outsider's evaluation. Originally I had thought that my research would dovetail with the schools' agendas, that action research for me would be the same as for the teachers in schools. It has become apparent that we were not able to negotiate an action research development project with shared ownership of 'problems' and that to carry on working in the schools I would have to alter the development project. This meant that the research questions could not be answered in a collaborative action research way. If I had realized this earlier I would have realized the necessity of considering different types of evaluation, evaluation that would be pertinent to the different strands, the development project and my research questions. In the event the teachers and heads were able to evaluate the development project through use of questionnaires, meetings, interviews. I was able to evaluate how the development project was working and answer my research questions using the same evidence. I am clear that there has been validation of the evidence in relation to the development project itself. The teachers' and heads' perception of the direction of the development project was recorded on the basis of teacher comment at meetings, recorded in minutes; on the basis of interview responses and comments on the transcripts of the interviews and response to one questionnaire. In addition teachers responded to my summaries of observation notes when shadowing and the comments were noted. However I have not had my reflections on how the project has developed validated. Nor have I had my reflections on the research questions validated by anyone within the project. It is arguable that I should have

arranged for an outside evaluator as soon as it became clear that we were not able to negotiate an action research project that would meet my research questions i.e. that the development project required an evaluation other than an inbuilt one.

Perhaps because there had not previously been research on bilingual pupils in these schools and because there was no climate of action research it was extremely difficult to establish an action research project on developing work with bilingual learners.

Nevertheless there were potential benefits of carrying out research in conjunction with the development project. Although the agendas were not the same, the focus on bilingual learners in schools was originally the same. None of the elements- the research questions, the reflection on the development project and the development project itself- was abandoned. I kept the development project going; I was being paid to do so. I kept the research going perhaps because I thought at some point the agendas would merge. The fact that I was employed over and above the schools' funding allocation ensured a welcome in the schools. I was working with teachers and therefore 'earning my keep'. I was working for the schools and therefore obtained full co-operation in terms of access to documentation, opportunity to gain cover for teachers so that they could meet to discuss the project, later the chance to shadow pupils in classrooms and eventually the chance to take part in collaborative teaching in classrooms. Just attending to research of an observational kind might have meant it was not possible to make the shift to action; action which I had hoped would be possible at the beginning of the process. When I came to working collaboratively with teachers I knew the schools, some of the teachers and some of the pupils. It was possible to be accepted as a member of staff to the extent that on one occasion when I was due to feed back on what I had been doing to the management team at Walker the head forgot I was a visitor due to speak and disappear and covered the rest of the business first because he thought of me as a member of staff. The direction of the project was changed not just because of the schools' changing development project agendas but also because of my reflections on how the development project was working and because of the research questions at the back of my mind. Informal validation which contributed to the direction of the

project as well as the research came from discussions with my University tutor for whom the research questions were uppermost. The opportunity to obtain more research data and research data of a different kind increased.

From my research questions I knew I was looking for a shift within the development project from submersion to mainstreaming.

This shift would have to take place without the specialist provision that had been a feature of the 1960s and 1970s in inner city areas. It would be a jump from submersion to mainstreaming direct. Theoretically learning English and learning everything that everyone else learns was possible if learning was supported in mainstream classes and not left to chance, but as mentioned earlier (see Section 1.8) mainstreaming had not been universally implemented by the second half of the 1980s even in areas with substantial numbers of bilingual pupils.

Mainstreaming therefore might be potentially much more difficult in an isolated situation. Although lack of previous specialist provision meant that bilingual pupils were likely to be physically mainstreamed if they were not considered to have special educational needs, this would be no guarantee that they were learning English for learning and/or reaching their full potential. Although bilingual education was not an option, support for bilingual development was, even though this could not be generally assumed even in areas with substantial numbers of bilingual pupils. Teacher training I felt was essential if the shift from submersion to 'normality' was to take place. This development had to have an impact on the whole school. Support for individual bilingual pupils in classes was important but whole school issues of e.g. why bilingual learners were placed in special educational needs groups also needed addressing. Otherwise bilingual pupils would continue to be supported in perhaps inappropriate settings.

## 3.2. Development project options

That working with teachers within a development project was a productive way to work was my perception and the perception of the group of advisers that met to set up the project in February 1988. For example, the special needs adviser felt that advisory teachers working in pyramids of schools worked well;it

was a flexible system and had lasting effects. I therefore chose to work in five schools for the project.

Direct help for pupils however was probably uppermost in the minds of heads who had asked for help in Beech area. Certainly it was because of requests from heads to advisers that the meeting to discuss "bilingual pupils in the scattered context" was held. Previous help over and above formula funding had been given by the area education office on a numbers/needs basis as requested. But this help was on an adhoc basis. It was mainly used to fund non teaching assistants (NTAs). Additionally money allocated for special educational needs was used.

It was clear that at an area level isolated bilingual pupils could be seen on the one hand as a problem because heads requested funding to meet their needs but on the other not a problem when insufficient funding was available, as "such children do actually survive and make progress in school and that of necessity they grasp the rudiments of the language and after a slow start tend to cope quite well" (extract from letter to headteacher from area official). Heads according to the same official (personal communication) would have to show that there was a stress related problem, i.e. the pupil would have to show signs of not coping mentally, before a little additional money could be allocated. The general feeling was that the area could not provide extra funding for these pupils.

That help was sought for individual pupils was confirmed when I met the head and special needs teacher at one of the schools, hereafter called Morrison, that would subsequently be involved in the project. The special needs teacher did not have responsibility for bilingual pupils on paper but in practice co-ordinated provision for them. Both emphasized that they had asked the area office for support for individuals. They felt that the NTAs appointed with area flexible funding money were the people taking most interest in the bilingual pupils. This is not to say that they were not interested in the suggestion of a project for teachers and they were very helpful in terms of information about how the schools in their pyramid had been working together. However their initial focus had been on individual pupils, and this focus was to cause tension later in the project in two of the other project schools where bilingual pupils were generally not considered to have particular needs.

In theory,schools already had the option of training mainstream class and subject teachers to meet the needs of bilingual pupils. I had offered both the RSA Diploma (see Section 2.10) and its accompanying six week introductory courses to teachers in all parts of the county. Individuals have come to the introductory courses from all areas bar Willow. But for the whole Diploma course numbers of mainstream teachers outside Rowan and Poplar have been very small. In Beech area for instance; one part-time English as a Second Language (ESL) specialist, one mainstream classroom teacher and (since the start of the project) one of the project teachers in one of the project schools have attended the course. In another area, Cherry,the response from schools in Cherry had been;

1. that they already used the services of the peripatetic teachers
2. that they did not have enough pupils to justify spending precious INSET time on training a teacher
3. there were other far more important INSET priorities.
4. they ignored the issue altogether.

I realized that a full Diploma was not always what schools would choose despite its practical orientation, close links with classes and acceptance of teachers with only one bilingual pupil in their class(es). It was still perceived as primarily serving individual desire to gain qualification. Particularly in cases where teachers studying for the Diploma had only one bilingual pupil the motivation has typically come from the teacher rather than the school although ironically many teachers have said (Treeshire course evaluations) that despite the course being concerned with bilingual pupils it has provided support for them in working with the whole of the class(es). I had been aware (see Section 2.7) of shifts towards a school-focused provision of INSET. However the schools in the pyramid could not justify putting ESL in Multicultural Schools on their list of priorities even for individual teachers. Another option was to modularize the RSA course into manageable packets. The dividing up of the course has in fact now been done but the modules have not been tried out in practice in Treeshire. In 1988 modularized courses were only running in a few places nationally and had to work in with RSA regulations. It was not until 1990 that the RSA examinations board set up a committee to look at

common features of its teaching examinations and made moves to change teacher training courses in line with National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NVCQ) regulations i.e. towards offering a bank of competency statements that teachers could work through in combination with statements in other areas.

However a modularized course would still be 'chosen' by individuals, perhaps with some encouragement from schools.

Another option would have been to use existing action research as a method of INSET-to try and change unofficial networks (e.g. Hampshire Multilingual Action Research Network, a cross-phase group of Hampshire teachers involved in collaborative learning and teaching with bilingual pupils) into official INSET ones. But this option would really only reach those already involved in such concerns.

Another option would have been focused INSET on the part of the Treeshire English Language Resource Centre (ELRC). However unless ELRC had negotiated a contract with schools with reference to support linked to INSET this option like the others mentioned would have been voluntary on the part of teachers. Schools would have to take on board the central idea that it would be the schools and teachers who would be supported as well as the individual children.

Although possible alternatives were not discussed at the meeting with county advisers in February 1988 there was a consensus that schools grasped for outside assistance too easily: "the ideal would be to develop the expertise in the schools" (minutes 18/2/88).

### 3.3. Schools' perceived needs

What were the needs perceived then in the five schools that were picked and agreed to be pilot schools? The head and special needs teacher at Morrison, a primary school, with the most bilingual pupils, distinguished between second generation bilingual pupils and those who had arrived in the country within the past three years. They felt that some of the second generation children who had moved from Rowan had coped with the early stages of learning English but had reached a plateau in their language learning and were not able to move on to

more complex language development. They felt that the main area to work on within the development project would be language development with some attention given to multicultural issues.

The head of special needs at the secondary school in the pyramid, hereafter called Walker, believed that the original brief I had outlined in a draft project proposal was too narrow "as at least some staff in all schools in this pyramid do not/would not come across bilingual pupils and the numbers we deal with are small enough to be seen as individual problems requiring individual solutions" (Minutes 3.5.88). Subsequently it became clear that the reason staff 'would not come across bilingual pupils' was that secondary school pupils were either seen to be coping, indeed considered high flyers in comparison with monolingual pupils or were seen to have special educational needs and to be placed in remedial classes with restricted contact with many of the staff. Nor for the head of special needs was dealing with multicultural issues appropriate. "It could be filled with pitfalls",it would need the support of all the staff and could raise levels of racial tension. Her suggestion that language awareness work could "build multicultural sensitivity and affirm bilingual kids" was positively viewed by the head. The head agreed that the focus on supporting bilingual pupils was too narrow. Other heads and teachers agreed. Two other schools had planned to make language development a priority for the forthcoming year before they knew about the possibility of a bilingual pupil project. In the event the head of special needs at Walker left the school before the project started and the teacher who joined the project, whilst subscribing to the view that bilingual pupils were coping in terms of learning or were receiving remedial help, was interested in cultural rather than language issues. This interest partly shaped the form the project took in Walker school.

One of the other primary schools currently had bilingual pupils. I gained the impression at planning meetings that this school, hereafter called Morgan, felt that their bilingual pupils were coping very well in the school. The teachers talked about allowing time for pupils to settle in to the school before thinking about specific support. It was not clear what such support might consist of but the impression that they perceived themselves as coping was confirmed when I

interviewed the project teacher (hereafter teacher Morgan) in April 1989 and asked her about her original aims. She said "I've found it (the project) difficult because, this is almost sort of blasphemy, we haven't felt we have a problem..." She went on to describe the bilingual pupils-

> "they seem to have no problems other than ones that are paralleled by other members of their class in so far as two of them are slow learners and need extra help, they're not remedial but they take quite a long time to take on board new concepts and they simply are matched you know by other children in the class as well, it isn't even noticeably language because their language doesn't seem to be a problem, it is the learning process, the other two children are high fliers" (26-35).

There was never an invitation to shadow these pupils and therefore no chance to confirm that language was not an issue in the case of the slow learners. The lack of recognition of bilingual pupils' development in more than one language also did not surface as a problem for this teacher although by then she had received a positive response to offering dual language books to one bilingual pupil in her class.

The head and teacher at Morgan felt initially that involvement in the project would have to contribute to one of their earmarked INSET priorities, aesthetics or language development. It was clear that teacher Morgan had done a lot of development work in RE and there was a definite desire not to re-invent the wheel in such RE work, seen as potentially part of a multicultural focus.

The other two schools, hereafter called Gunn Allen Infant and Gunn Allen Junior did not have bilingual pupils at the time of the planning or at the start of the project though I was to learn subsequently that both had had bilingual and black pupils in the past. Gunn Allen Infant planned to link the project to their INSET priority of aesthetic and creative development. Gunn Allen Junior had plans to develop language work in school. The school had been involved in a World Development Project and were keen that any multicultural aspects of the planned bilingual learner project should not start from scratch but should take on board existing developments. Both schools felt they had many children with special educational needs. It was clear that if they joined the project it would be to work

on support for bilingual pupils for the future and to concentrate on other relevant issues within a language/multicultural framework for the present. Gunn Allen Junior's head suggested that the project might have to work as an umbrella project i.e. that schools would have to come in for bits that related to their own priorities; there could be targets for each school to allow for individual differences. Gunn Allen Junior's deputy head who was to be acting head during the first part of the project said in response to a questionnaire for heads in May 1989:

> "I was concerned that the bilingual aspect was too narrow for our situation- we wanted to use greater language awareness to foster a more multicultural approach to our curriculum. Wanted also to update our language policy".

In the light of these statements I have no real idea about why the schools without bilingual pupils currently on roll joined. Perhaps it was the extra INSET money, perhaps it was the need to work on something specific with the other schools in the pyramid, perhaps it was felt that the project was a way of working on language issues generally.

It is perhaps not surprising in the light of these varying views that teacher development in relation to supporting learning of bilingual pupils got somewhat lost subsequently within the development project. Even Morrison had asked for funding specifically for bilingual pupils though this school was willing to participate in a teacher development project; the other schools needed a wider focus to justify a teacher development project either because they had already planned their INSET priorities or because the bilingual pupils were not considered a 'problem'.

The planned project was thus wider than I had envisaged, but I felt it could still be justified in terms of providing both language development support currently and in the future for bilingual pupils, and awareness of language for other pupils. The latter would mean a potentially a contribution to a welcoming ethos for bilingualism either in school or in the community.

Given initial requests for help for individual pupils from one school, little recognition that individual pupils needed support in another two and no bilingual pupils in the other two I had to consider what kind of school based teacher development was appropriate. I had to try and meet my research objective of

observing what the provision for bilingual pupils was and development objective of working with teachers so that bilingual pupils could learn effectively and be supported in bilingual development.

### 3.4. Teacher development options

As already mentioned, I had considered and dismissed using modules of the RSA Diploma:introductory awareness raising information sessions would have the same limitations. There were no agreements made with schools, on services to be provided by a central language support service, which could have included INSET as a strand because there was no central language support service. 'Cascading' information was how the project was originally conceived by the group of advisers who set up the development project in February 1988 but this was rejected as a title and a method by Beech funders. I did not consider curriculum materials development as an INSET mechanism because I saw the prime job of teachers being to analyze the demands of tasks and provide support to bridge the gap between the demands and the skills and experience of the learner. This process does require materials but not necessarily separate materials that you can make in a vacuum. Additionally other kinds of support such as chance to rehearse language, chances to work with peers etc. are not dependent on specific materials. Classroom research as an INSET focus would be difficult to sustain across the project as not everyone had bilingual learners in their classrooms. I felt however that a broader action research approach would be feasible. The problems could be different to reflect the different needs in different schools. There would be time to implement action as we had money for cover. This money could also cover time for sharing and reflection.

I felt that an umbrella project on language development would provide enough specific 'problems' to work on and that developing a language policy would provide a focus. The emphasis at the first meeting with heads had been on language: language across the curriculum; language awareness; needs for a transition study skills package. This would be beneficial both to those schools with bilingual pupils and those without-a common route either into particular support for bilingual pupils or a way into multicultural education for the all white schools.

At this stage I felt that all teachers in project schools with bilingual pupils should have INSET on basic issues around supporting bilingual pupils in mainstream classes. They would then be able to think of particular issues they wanted to look at in depth. In particular they would be able to advise other schools in the project if bilingual pupils arrived, should keep long-term records of bilingual pupils' development, should advise on assessment, should advise on materials. All project teachers should work on a language policy. The teachers in schools with bilingual pupils could concentrate on bilingual learners and the schools without could work on language awareness and language across the curriculum. This policy could draw on the Kingman Report (DES 1988d) and would be available for other schools in Beech.

At the next planning meeting however there was an extremely strong call from Morrison's head for the project to focus on providing a pack of resources that could be used both in the pyramid schools and for other schools in Beech. The other schools agreed to this direction. The pack would be piloted in some Beech schools. The minutes (13/6/88) note that the

> "contents could include
> 1. Teaching tips, assessment, language development policy, admission
> 2. Contact with parents, strategies
> 3. Information on cultural background
> 4. Strategies for consideration; positive exploitation of cultural heritage-mother tongue issues; career opportunities-prejudice"

There was a feeling that the issues of prejudice needed further discussion. This was on the agenda for the following meeting.

This shift to thinking about materials development changed the focus from what I had thought would provide a 'problem' for everyone-language policy development. It also potentially shifted the focus away from the classroom and bilingual pupils even for teachers with bilingual pupils as there were much wider issues in school to cover. But I was aware that in implementing any development project there had to be ownership of the issues and if a pack of resources was the agreed vehicle I had to run with it.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON LIBRARY

### 3.5. Development using a resources pack as a vehicle

In mapping out a way forward at this point I tried to link the idea of action research, which I was still hoping the teachers would do, with developing a resources pack. At the next meeting of project schools (28/6/88) it was confirmed that the programme was "basically to prepare a resource manual that can be of immediate value to any school that may suddenly find themselves dealing with children who have an ESL problem". But it was still important that this pack should be an umbrella vehicle or mechanism to draw people together and provide a focus for their work. Each school had to be able to contribute and wanted to link the work to their current INSET concerns. It was agreed that "each school within the pilot would consider certain parts of the resource manual more relevant to their own needs and would therefore wish to contribute to that part of the manual" (minutes 28/6/88). I still wanted the schools with bilingual pupils to have information about current thinking about provision for bilingual learners. It was agreed that there would be a day's initial INSET; half a day's background information input from myself and half a day planning the 'division of labour' i.e. what school would work on what for the pack. The rest of the time was divided amongst the schools to obtain supply cover for the project teachers-to carry out action research and to share findings.

The Area Advisory Officer stressed in his introduction to the INSET day that there was no possibility of obtaining extra teaching staff and that this project represented an opportunity to use GRIST money to support teachers with bilingual learners. I outlined the recent history of provision for bilingual learners and what I saw was the most effective type of support i.e. bilingual learners supported in mainstream classrooms. I had outlined five starting points:

1.admissions/assessment/records/advice to other schools;

2. careers/options/GCSE/pyramid liaison;

3.language development in particular area of curriculum/transfer to other areas/cross-curricular liaison;

4. working with parents/governors/exchanges etc. (cultural issues through this);

5. language policy/language awareness along with suggestions to record what currently happened and provide ongoing support taken from the schools' suggestions for the pack at meetings.

I hoped that in working on these in an action research way the project teachers would contribute to specific aspects of the pack. However, despite the introduction and my input no teacher volunteered to look at language development in a particular area of the curriculum i.e. the close focus classroom language strand of the pack suggestions.

The starting points were discussed and altered (Appendix 3.2) and there was agreement for everyone to provide support for their bilingual learners if they had them in class. Language policy development and cross-cultural work, mother tongue support and equal opportunity were also ongoing issues. I would be available to work with teachers in classrooms on a regular basis.

In the event the production of the pack and the action research I had hoped to do were difficult to reconcile. Each of the topics taken up by the schools although suggested for inclusion in an information pack were in fact tackled in a developmental way rather than in an information gathering way. In other words the teachers did not go out and find out what was being done in each of these outlined areas of work, write it up, produce the pack and then pilot it in the sense of trying to obtain comments from other schools as to its usefulness. Nor did we, despite my description of action research methodology on the input day, in fact record what currently happens in terms of provision or in fact survey parents pupils and teachers right at the beginning in order to formulate problems which then could be worked on and evaluated. We took the issues that had been raised from the content meeting and then tried to work through them. Following on from the input meeting I had individual meetings with each of the project teachers to discuss how they would work on the aspects of the pack. These individual meetings were in some cases followed by the teacher coming to the 'clinic' time, a time I made available for discussion with teachers, after school one day a week.

These individual meetings took place in September and October 1988. The discussions were wide ranging and in fact covered much more than the pack topic

which was the focus. The discussions and subsequent work are described in case studies of the schools (sample in Appendix 3.2).

Several difficulties arose with working in this way. The inherent tension between producing a pack for others and sharing development work was not resolved. I did not spend enough time on developing a way of working with the teachers. We touched on action research methodology on the INSET day but I did not link it with the specific content they were going to focus on. The issues we agreed on were very wide ones and not ones that could be researched within the teachers' own classrooms. No-one had chosen to look at classroom language for the pack. The possibility of me working alongside teachers on a regular basis had been forgotten. Above all I had assumed that teachers could decide what the 'problems' were without the groundwork in working with bilingual learners. These difficulties were compounded by the fact that there was a switch in terms of content the teachers wanted to consider and the lack of groundwork may itself have contributed to this switch. They were also compounded by the fact that individual project teachers had different aims from their heads in some cases and by the fact that the heads had also changed in some cases.

### 3.6. Shift to multicultural education as a focus within the project

It was clear during the discussions with individuals and at the first review meeting in November 1988 that some of the project teachers' existing interests lay in multicultural education. In the secondary school for instance the project teacher had not been involved in preliminary discussions; he had agreed to investigating option and career choices for bilingual pupils in the school, but was really interested in multicultural education. Teacher Gunn Allen Junior's feedback at the review concentrated on multicultural issues. He described part of a 'Neighbours' topic in which children had looked at life in Africa and India. Discussion followed on how direct experience could be drawn on e.g. if children who had recently been to India could talk to children in other schools in the pyramid would this reinforce differences or would it help their own school see that they had something that was valued by another. This led to a questioning of why pupils feel that their own feelings, experience etc. have no value. One example

given was of a Sikh pupil when asked to draw how they perceived their own God asked hesitantly if she could really draw a God from her own religion. Another example was the fact that bilingual pupils did not generally go on school trips, and the group wondered if there were excluding factors. So as well as feedback on placement and contacts with parents there were multicultural issues that related directly to bilingual pupils. The issues raised 'problems' that could have been worked on in an action research way. By this time the idea of teacher action research had been abandoned and so my suggestion that e.g. information about absences on school trips be collated, was not followed up.

If we had teased out the relationship between multicultural education and education for bilingual learners at this stage we might have been able to identify problems that were real to the teachers and jettison the content I had outlined, albeit from their suggestions. I was concerned to keep a bilingual pupil focus. But the teachers were finding great difficulties with such a focus. Teacher Walker summarized Walker's perceptions of bilingual pupils and pupils from ethnic minority backgrounds as integrating well and achieving very good exam results compared with contemporaries. He did say that the school's policy was to treat pupils 'the same' but he recognized that there were certain areas where their background experience did not enable them to 'take full part' in school activities e.g. the school visits. He carried on investigating careers and options but as a result of a visit to a careers adviser in Rowan obtained a stereotyped picture of bilingual pupils that did not match with his perceptions of the bilingual pupils he had come across at the school.

Teacher Morgan also found difficulty in making links with parents. She had tried making appointments for parents' evening to introduce herself as a point of contact in the school but this had not worked. She had visited one family but felt that this was an artificial situation.

Teacher Morrison asked for the group's help on letting her know how pupils were placed in the schools and on designing better admission records in schools.

Gunn Allen Junior project teacher was unable to move fast on language policy because he had to go at the schools' pace and the school was waiting for National Curriculum information before it re-vamped its language policy.

The teachers were clearly trying to tackle the issues they had agreed to work on. But as far as I know there was no feed-back from other project teachers to individual project teachers who had requested information for their pack topic and I had not been asked into schools to work alongside teachers. The 'problems' either were not 'real' problems to the teachers or could not be worked on by individuals in an action research mode. Or I had not been clear enough that having decided on 'problems' we would need to break them down into manageable units and then be rigorous in analyzing, carrying out the action and evaluating. Perhaps because they were not my choice of issues I did not feel committed to following through with the action research.

Nevertheless the INSET day, the discussions with teachers and the review day raised awareness of general multicultural issues e.g. of resources available to teachers in all the schools and awareness of individual bilingual pupils and their families within the pyramid. In addition there was material for the pack from the writing the teachers had done. The pack subsequently came out in a series of project papers (sample in Appendix 3.4).

### 3.7. Planned shift to assessment focus within project

Instead of trying to rescue the action research approach, at this point I felt I needed a vehicle to pull the teachers' findings together for the pack and to get the focus back to language and learning of bilingual pupils while at the same time tackling the multicultural issues that applied to them specifically. At the same time there were concerns about 'singling out' bilingual pupils i.e. being perceived as giving bilingual pupils more attention than monolinguals, that I had to be aware of. What I needed was an external stimulus that would be applicable to all pupils but would force teachers to look carefully at language and learning of bilingual pupils in classrooms and in the school, that would not seem to be re-inventing the wheel and that would incorporate all the issues the teachers had been tackling by themselves. In the process they would be doing research, not on a 'problem'

identified by themselves but on something that would subsequently be essential in all schools. In the process they would be having INSET in relation to bilingual pupils, but in relation to a particular aspect; assessment and record keeping.

If carried out well National Curriculum Assessment has the power to inform classroom practice. Because all teachers have to carry out teacher assessment, if that process is helpful there will be backwash in terms of practice to pupils. Given the reluctance to invite me to work alongside teachers in terms of classroom support per se I felt that we could talk about support for bilingual learners in the context of implications resulting from the teacher assessment process.

There was a vehicle that would cover all the aims outlined above-the 'Primary Language Record' (Barrs and Hester 1988). It had been piloted in more than fifty Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) schools in 1986-1987. It was based on the needs outlined in the 'Thomas Report: Improving Primary Schools' (1985) to provide information on children to

> "inform and guide other teachers who do not yet know the child; to inform the headteacher and others in positions of responsibility about the child's work; to provide parents with information and assessment of the child's progress" (Barrs and Hester 1988 preface).

It was also based on the need "for records to support and inform the day-to-day teaching in the classroom" (Barrs and Hester 1988 preface).

It was designed to involved parents and children, to "take account of bilingual development", and to provide teachers with "a framework to teach language and literacy". In addition it was designed to be a "basis for school-focused in-service meetings and activities" (Barrs and Hester 1988 preface).

At the PLR INSET session we arranged (31.1.89). I said that I felt that some sort of language record was essential to the work of the project. In terms of the pack it would draw together teacher Morrison's work on assessment and record keeping at initial stages, teachers Gunn Allen's work on language policy,and teacher Walker and Walker's need to take up information about individual bilingual pupils from feeder schools. Teacher Morgan's work on parental

involvement was central to the record. After watching the introductory video (Barrs and Hester n.d.) and discussing the pros and cons of the Primary Language Record a number of possibilities for trialling were suggested e.g. INSET to school staff (similar to the PLR INSET for project teachers); one school to pilot e.g. Morrison then feedback; all schools to try out a little; wait to see what the National Curriculum suggested. In the end teachers were keen to try out aspects themselves.

By the time we met to review the project in February 1989 it was clear that the teachers felt that further training had to be linked to the National Curriculum;they were beginning to feel the pressures to avoid what might be construed as extraneous to what would be the central focus of their work in forthcoming years. However because of uncertainties about future funding we planned two scenarios;one without further funding-to complete the pack, and one with-to arrange INSET about the project and to trial the PLR, trying out, feeding back, trying out again on a pilot basis. We also arranged, if funding was granted, to invite heads who had been involved in the original planning meetings to a review/future planning session.

### 3.8. Outcomes and reflections-first phase of project

Within the project, however, none of my original research aims had been met by the end of the first funding phase. I did not know how bilingual pupils were learning. I did not know how their teachers were supporting them. I felt, from the teachers' comments about their present and past pupils, that the bilingual pupils were submersed but had no other evidence. I had tried two mechanisms to work with teachers on supporting bilingual learners. The first, action research, had not worked because the issues for the teachers were not the issues I needed to work on,and were not in reality the issues they wanted to work on, and because I had not worked through an action research methodology with them. The second, using the Primary Language Record as an INSET tool, did not get off the ground.

Interviews with project teachers in March and April 1989 (interview questions in Appendix 3.5 and sample of interview in Appendix 3.6) confirmed that the teachers had not focused on one 'problem', carried out action research,

evaluated and considered another problem i.e. they had not carried out action research. The interviews also confirmed that the issues had shifted. The teachers did not first consider how bilingual learners learn in classrooms and the position of bilingual learners in schools before tackling wide issues, either whole school issues where there were bilingual pupils or language policy development issues where there were no bilingual pupils. Perhaps because of this priority the teachers in four of the schools used the project to consider multicultural issues in schools. The interviews also confirmed that future project work would have to address National Curriculum issues and that ironically multicultural work would probably have to go on the back burner then. There may well have been an element of 'last chance' in the interest shown.

Through analysis of the interview returns, diary and minutes of meetings I was able to see which of the goals I had negotiated we were able to experiment with. I taped, transcribed and indexed the interview returns according to questions asked and scanned the diary and minutes for reference to questions asked in the interviews. Evaluation drawing on the teachers' comments contributed to the revised goals.

### 3.9. Constraints-first phase of project

Several tensions constrained the work of the project in its first phase.

First there was the tension between supporting bilingual pupils and the need for wide language and multicultural policies and the need to deal with both given the varied nature of the five schools. In a way, there had never been at the negotiating meetings a focus on bilingual learners themselves. We did not talk about numbers or needs. The need for multicultural and language policies was recognized and offered scope to the schools with no bilingual pupils but the link between multicultural and language policies and bilingual pupils was not articulated. Even Morrison, the school which had been arguing longest for help with ESL, wanted to extend out and contribute to Beech in general and when they started on the pack they chose a wide issue that would be applicable to all schools.

So, although initially rejected as an aim for the project multicultural development became one. There was a wide range of activities carried out that

could come under the multicultural umbrella, but whether the benefit would be for the school and therefore indirectly for the bilingual pupil or directly for the bilingual pupil, was not considered. In an isolated situation I would argue that the anti-racist measures taken, e.g. consideration of placement will benefit the bilingual pupil directly, but that these take time and careful negotiation to implement. By contrast activities that are visibly multicultural e.g. discussion of clothes, food etc. benefit all pupils but may put isolated pupils in a vulnerable position unless extremely sensitively handled. Yet these are the activities that are 'easier' for schools to develop in terms of resources.

Secondly, the tension between supporting individual pupils and working with teachers remained, although I was clear that my role was to work with teachers. The schools had already been working on various issues as a pyramid. Without this prior interaction and solidarity amongst the heads it would have been a lot more difficult to get agreement to being involved,and impossible to have included schools currently without bilingual pupils; the schools with bilingual pupils would not have agreed to money being spent on e.g. general language development. The project appeared to be meeting whole-school needs. Yet as soon as the project teachers from the schools with bilingual pupils got together there was immediate discussion about individual pupils who were often related. At first it seems that this in itself justified meeting even if the project had got no further. But despite the pyramid base there were unresolved questions about how the schools would be supported within the project. One factor was the choice of project teacher. There were of course tremendous pressures even in summer 1988 on staff. Pay off for teachers becoming involved was non-existent; there was for example no mechanism by which teachers could use their work on the project towards a further qualification. Only one school nominated their deputy head, also co-ordinator for early years. One school nominated a teacher who was about to retire. I was not invited to discuss the choice of teacher with the heads and by the time I realized I should insist they had been chosen.

The fact that I needed to work with teachers in classrooms got lost when my invitations to work beside teachers were not picked up. Could I have pushed work in classrooms and thus have pursued a more direct focus on bilingual pupils

at that time? I am not sure. I knew that funding for bilingual pupils was in disarray and inextricably mixed up with special educational needs funding. I had suggested as a criterion for choosing teachers for the project interest in bilingual pupils with status to implement changes in schools. But I realized during the content planning meeting on 13th June 1988 at which it was decided to do the pack that teachers were not even aware that there were resources to aid them in working with bilingual learners accessible within Treeshire. This was quite a shock and brought home the fact that the teachers had never really thought about bilingual pupils' development except when there was a problem.

Given the need to raise awareness I thought that working together on a language policy would incorporate specific suggestions for classroom support for bilinguals as well as wider themes for the other schools. The negotiation sessions themselves acted as awareness raising sessions; e.g. the advisability of working openly on multicultural education was debated. Having accepted that working on a pack would suit everyone and subsequently working out myself directions schools could take from the input meeting on 20th September onwards, I felt that all project teachers could still work on providing support for bilingual pupils. But because we had not really focused on bilingual pupils in the sessions-they were still largely hidden- it was perhaps unrealistic to expect teachers to concentrate on them.

Another constraint was control of the research questions. When negotiations revealed the concern with multicultural education and language policies my reaction was not to insist on following the narrower conception I had had but to try and encompass the wider focus in the same INSET model. I felt that I would have to start from where the schools wanted to start from and went along with the change in emphasis. The teachers themselves raised the issues they wanted to deal with i.e. what would be in the pack. The teachers were starting off in an action research way by identifying issues to tackle. The only thing was the problems raised were not in relation to the central focus as I saw it. The issue I was concerned with as outlined in the draft project proposal, i.e. developing expertise in supporting learning of 'scattered' bilingual pupils in mainstream

classrooms within a Beech pyramid of schools/colleges, was still not a real problem to the teachers.

The difficulty of separating out the development work from the research questions was an additional constraint in this type of research project. Clearly this was no research on a static situation. Even without a development project there would have been shifts. But with a development project the answers to questions were changing precisely because of my interventions with teachers and pupils.

The tension in combining carrying out action research and producing a support pack provided another constraint; information and reports on development are difficult to blend. Much later we produced a straight information pack as the last project paper. Finally the project was constrained by national INSET factors before it had really got going. Although GRIST money was available the schools increasingly felt that they could not justify releasing class teachers. Also increasingly any time that could be spared had to be used for National Curriculum development. If bilingual pupils were central in the National Curriculum in practice this should have meant that project teachers would take on issues about support for bilingual pupils as they were developing National Curriculum programmes of study. But in fact the first circular in relation to supporting bilingual learners in the National Curriculum was issued only in March 1991. So many schools must have planned their National Curriculum programmes of study first and then thought about bilingual learners afterwards. In the project because participating teachers were not concentrating on support for bilingual learners there was no call to plan jointly with class teachers. And it was clear that schools were waiting for guidance on assessment from Treeshire's assessment group which itself was only just beginning to think about ensuring that needs of bilingual learners were met.

Nevertheless a group of teachers had begun to discuss bilingual pupils together. They had begun to adapt language policies to apply to all pupils. They had begun to consider issues of placement within one school. They had begun to consider the implications of National Curriculum assessment for bilingual pupils. They had begun to talk about ways of involving parents in the life of the school.

They had begun to do research on provision for bilingual learners in adjoining areas in Treeshire. Awareness of bilingual learners was raised.

At the end of the first phase of the project I could reflect on its implementation but still had very little idea of how bilingual learners were learning, how their teachers were supporting them and if they were able to develop bilingually. I felt, from the teachers' comments about their present and past pupils, that the bilingual pupils were submersed but had no other evidence. There were no discussions about how teachers were supporting them in terms of language as opposed to engendering a multicultural ethos in the school. There were initiatives to foster bilingual development but I had no overall picture of that development.

# CHAPTER 4

# EXPERIMENTING WITH SHADOWING AS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND RESEARCH VEHICLE

## 4.1. Research Options

In Chapter 3 I described the early phases of a development project and outlined some of the benefits and constraints of working on research questions linked with a development project. It was clear that at the end of the first phase I could reflect on the development project but was little nearer to answering my research questions.

In Spring 1989 I could have gone in three directions. I could have continued with the development project alone, I could have made a fresh start and found answers to my research questions in a different way or I could have continued to try and link the development project and the research questions together. I still wanted to link the development project and the research questions, and suggested continuing to try and use the Primary Language Record (Barrs and Hester 1988) as a vehicle at a heads and project teachers' meeting in May. There was general agreement to this proposal but it was not possible to carry out any piloting despite preliminary planning with project teachers because funding didn't come through.

In fact all energies were concentrated on seeking funding for any development project at all and in the hiatus between funding periods I worked using my remaining project hours on a county multicultural 'matched resources' project with teachers from the project schools. This tied in with the continuing interest in multicultural issues in the schools mentioned in Chapter 3 and left the pyramid with a shared set of multicultural resources. I did no reflection on the implementation of this scheme.

When it became clear that funding would be available both for myself and the teachers from January-April 1990 to continue the project (Appendix 4.1), for various reasons the Primary Language Record (PLR) was unfortunately no longer appropriate as a vehicle. I had not been funded for the Autumn term 1989 though the teachers had, and although we had planned together the teachers had not carried on themselves. Even if the will had been there to carry on schools were clearly having trouble releasing staff and finding supply cover during that Autumn term. For this reason, as well as wanting to know how the bilingual pupils were actually supported in class from observation as well as from teachers'

comments, it was decided to switch the emphasis from the project teachers working on specific areas and negotiating their own time, with me supporting-as they had done with the pack and as they would have done with the PLR-to me shadowing bilingual pupils. There was a built-in commitment from the heads to use supply time to discuss the shadowing and consider implications for the schools. Several factors contributed to this shift in emphasis. One was the support of my university tutor who supported shadowing as a way of beginning to answer my research questions. Another was a shift to a narrower focus on bilingual pupils themselves as a result of the May 1989 meeting. Of course the work on the PLR would have directly involved bilingual pupils but had,as with work on language policy and the pack, to be pertinent to all the project schools. Morrison school had always made a focus on bilingual pupils a main priority. A crucial shift now also came from Walker. At the initial discussion stages in 1988 (minutes 22/3/88) Walker had felt the focus on bilingual pupils would be 'too narrow' and therefore added weight to the emphasis on wider issues which were applicable to all-multicultural development through language development. But now Walker's head expressed concern that the project, having raised teacher awareness, should focus on the original aims; 'support for bilingual pupils'. He felt that there were such pupils who should be working at 'a higher level' (minutes 16/5/89). At the meeting there was no specific agreement on how this should be done. Indeed there were disagreements over the benefits or otherwise of a 'sustained block of language learning', i.e. language learnt before subjects were tackled (minutes 16/5/89). Nevertheless the bilingual pupils were again on the agenda.

Another factor was that one of the schools which had not had bilingual pupils in 1988-1989 did have two at the beginning of September 89. An ideal opportunity to use the PLR in monitoring these pupils was lost however. The school looked to the Beech area education office for financial support for additional staffing,but this was not forthcoming. The school was referred to the special needs adviser who in turn recommended the ELRC for advice. The head did in fact talk through the situation with me unofficially and I did arrange for some materials to be sent from the ELRC, but the school seemed effectively no better off in its degree of readiness to receive bilingual children than if it had

never been involved in the project. Thus they may have realized that they still needed a focus on bilingual learners per se.

The schools were still concerned at the meeting in May about inconsistent funding of provision for bilingual pupils. As a result of an educational psychologist's letter about one pupil, Walker had got 5 days NTA time for him. The heads felt there was still a need, expressed on a previous occasion, for recommendations on potential sources of funding to go to the area office for discussion. Other immediate concerns to do with supporting bilingual learners effectively were also taken up in the period following the May meeting e.g. advertisements were placed with the aim of developing an interpreters/translators network.

So from the May meeting and subsequent events, a shift back towards bilingual pupils was discernible. I drafted a fresh proposal for the period January-April 1990. I outlined what I thought were manageable priorities, given the knowledge that multicultural matched funding scheme money was available until the end of March, and given the many changes in personnel in the schools. Funding recommendations had not been discussed, all the project papers for the pack were not out, and there had been no further progress on the interpreters/translators network. I did not know what had been developed in relation to equal opportunities, another concern at the May 1989 meeting, but felt that that was an area in which we could contribute to schools' INSET. Ongoing support for bilinguals was crucial, but I did not see how the teachers would be able to carry out the schedule based on the PLR that had been agreed at the end of the summer term. Putting together the idea of me shadowing in Walker (agreed at the end of the summer term when it looked as if there would be funding) and the idea of using the PLR, I proposed to do the observations using the PLR if possible and feeding back, not just in Walker but in all the schools. It was agreed that the teachers would use their time to discuss the observations in a 'feedback' session, work on the interpreters/translators network, discuss the recommendations, visit resources centres and order 'matched' resources and use one half day to plan the shadowing.

The shadowing would thus enable me to link development project and research questions. The idea of using PLR and shadowing both came from me at the project meetings. I do not know why the shadowing should have got picked up by the project teachers in a way that the PLR had not. Perhaps the shadowing could be expanded or contracted in a way that involvement in an 'outside' i.e already established project such as the PLR might not allow. Perhaps there was perceived to be a closer link between teachers' existing work and shadowing i.e. 'other' change would not necessarily be needed at a time of National Curriculum implementation, and teachers would be more in control although I would be doing the actual observations, possibly seen as hard work. Perhaps the idea was currently more familiar to the teachers than the idea of long term teacher assessment of individual bilingual pupils. By the time the idea of shadowing was broached I was also a much more familiar figure; it is interesting to speculate what the reaction would have been if I had pushed for the PLR at this point, as opposed to raising it as a possibility which was rejected as teachers felt they were under a lot of pressure. The notion of shadowing appeared to be accepted much more easily, to the extent that few questions were asked about what interests and concerns guided the observations. This may of course reflect exhaustion and desire just to let me get on with the project without particular involvement in this aspect of the work.

Whatever the reasons for such acceptance, shadowing enabled me for the first time to be in classrooms with teachers and bilingual pupils within the project. Whereas the project had previously gone through a phase of action with regard to the matched funding scheme, there was now an opportunity to shift the balance and try and answer the research questions, though without ignoring working with teachers.

## 4.2. Action research

But acceptance of shadowing and my role meant that my perceptions would be paramount more than ever. My concerns (see Section 1.14) that English is best learnt through curriculum learning in mainstream classrooms would guide the observations and recommendations. I would not be looking for examples that

supported the thesis that withdrawal of isolated bilingual pupils, for instance, was a good idea, although I would not ignore examples of good practice I found. There could be no such thing as a neutral stance in the classroom. The dialogue between me and the teachers was on the basis of my, not joint, or alternate, or their observations. The answers to the research questions are therefore my answers; the recommendations made as a result of the shadowing are therefore my recommendations. Whether these recommendations would be more likely to get picked up by teachers than 'conventional' input e.g. on an INSET day is arguable-conventional input is no more neutral than observations. It still was not possible for teachers to carry out their own action research on what was happening to bilingual learners in their classrooms. Even with their involvement in the evaluation and the suggestions for action, they had not formulated the questions and there was no built in agreement that they would try out the recommendations and evaluate these.

## 4.3. Shadowing

The main focus was for me to shadow a range of pupils in the project schools (in all but the one which currently did not have bilingual pupils). In arranging the shadowing for the Spring Term 1990 I had requested that I would like to observe for at least a day and a half in each school to allow me to see the afternoon as well as the morning sessions. I asked to see a variety of pupils i.e. in terms of age, sex, first language, stage in English and ability.

In one school, Gunn Allen Infant, there was no question about who to shadow-this was the school where two bilingual pupils (twins) had started in September 1989. In the other schools project teachers took responsibility for selecting pupils. In the case of Walker it was the special needs project teacher (both she and the previous project teacher were still part of the project) who was most involved with the bilingual pupils. In Morrison's case there was considerable discussion beforehand with the staff about who should be shadowed, with a view not only to thinking about the current situation but towards the future i.e. which staff would still be at the school the following year and therefore which classes as

well as which pupils should be shadowed (diary). I do not know how much discussion there was at Morgan.

In the event I was able to shadow thirteen pupils, eight boys and five girls from Years R,2,5,6,7,8,and 10. I have used the year naming system which came into use nationally in September 1990. I have used fictitious names to preserve confidentiality. The pupils shadowed were as follows:

| School | | Year | Sex | Amount of time |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gunn Allen Infant | | | | |
| | Manoussos | 2 | M | 2 days (shared) |
| | Stavros | 2 | M | 2 days (shared) |
| Morgan | | | | |
| | Balwinder | 5 | F | 1 day |
| Morrison | | | | |
| | Abdul | R | M | half day (shared) |
| | Simon | R | M | half day (shared) |
| | Kowsor | 5 | M | day (shared) |
| | Sufia | 5 | F | day (shared) |
| | Simon | 6 | M | day (shared) |
| | Toru | 6 | M | day (shared) |
| Walker | | | | |
| | Makesh | 7 | M | half day |
| | Amarjit | 8 | F | half day |
| | Najmun | 8 | F | half day |
| | Jaswinder | 10 | F | half day |

I explained the reasons why I wanted to shadow to the teachers, and they were very thoughtful about who should be shadowed. However I did not go into detail with class or subject teachers I met about the criteria I was using, nor did I

share with them the interests and concerns that were guiding me. I clearly wanted to find out if bilingual learners were learning English, if they were learning curriculum content, how their teachers were supporting them and if they were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally in mainstream classrooms. Those observations would help me to begin to answer the research questions. In addition if the development project was to move forward, I would have to share my findings with the teachers, so that we could reflect on the findings together with a view to them taking ideas on board. Options for this aspect of the work could have been for me to write down my observations and for the teachers to comment, or for me to talk to the teachers about what I had observed. In fact we used my notes as a basis for discussion and in one case the head annotated my notes as well. I made it clear that the purpose was to disseminate aspects of good practice for the benefit of the pyramid schools.

How was I to find out if the bilingual learners were learning English, if they were learning curriculum content, how their teachers were supporting them and if they were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally in mainstream classrooms? And how could I share these findings with teachers in a helpful way?

### 4.4. Criteria

I had in the back of my mind the criteria I use when observing practical sessions for the RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools (Appendix 4.2). These concentrate on the whole classroom and particularly what the teacher has done to support learning. This framework would be particularly useful for looking at how teachers were supporting bilingual pupils. I knew I wanted to try out the PLR and found that its interaction grids (Appendix 4.3) helped me focus in on what the pupils were actually saying and doing. Even so I did not attempt to record any samples of English use in class mechanically, and only recorded brief extracts of conversation by hand. Although one of the research questions was to find out if the bilingual learners were learning English, I did not feel I could undertake detailed analyses of language use in the classroom situation at the same time as looking at other aspects that I would want to raise with teachers.

After the first two observations I realized that I had to make a conscious switch from considering the classroom and the teacher in general to the particular pupil. I wrote down as much as I could at the time, particularly making a point of observing interaction but without using systematic interaction analysis. In all cases I tried to observe as unobtrusively as possible, responding when spoken to by individual pupils, and seeing what other pupils were doing, not just the bilinguals.

To establish whether they were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally in the mainstream class I observed but also explored with the pupils in an informal interview situation how they were developing bilingually and bi-culturally (Appendix 4.4).

Later my university tutor helped me see that I had not focused on a way of establishing what curriculum content had been learnt. I was able to comment to some extent from observation, but included with the later pupils a question in the informal interviews that asked the pupils to reflect themselves on what they had learnt. Other information I gained from the records or from the teachers. I wanted information about what had been specifically National Curriculum areas of study; details about the admissions/placement of bilingual pupils in the school; details about how the school was keeping records and observing themselves.

So the observation criteria were drawn but not copied from RSA practical teaching list and from the PLR. Notes of observations and teachers' comments were added to with transcripts of informal interviews and notes from school records.

I annotated my notes from all these sources in terms of expanding my abbreviations etc. afterwards, and used them as the basis of write-ups of the observations. In most cases I wrote out a longhand description of everything I had recorded, and then for the purposes of feedback to the teachers condensed my observations, interview and record notes into various categories (Appendix 4.5). These categories were designed not just to reflect what stage I thought the pupils were at, but to explore strategies with teachers that might be useful in the future. The first area was a comment on how involved the pupils had been, to ensure that pupils were of the mainstream as well as in it-an essential prerequisite it seems to me for being able to learn English and curriculum content in mainstream

classrooms. My next two criteria-opportunity to gain support from peers and opportunity to gain support from the teacher-were used as tangible examples of how pupils could learn both language and curriculum content in mainstream. This was because it seems to me impossible for a pupil to gain access to learning and language in a mainstream classroom unless the classroom is organized to maximise peer collaboration, and unless the teacher is also aware that they are responsible for the language development of bilingual children within the class;and that this will not happen in short withdrawal periods.

My focus on use of language, the next category, was not a measure in isolation, but took into account language in relation to the tasks set. This follows the RSA model of analyzing the demands of tasks in terms of language needed and seeing if the pupil can cope; if they cannot then language, organizational or visual support is provided to ensure that the pupil has access to the learning. The feedback to the teacher is not just about language development but about task design. Similarly the PLR provides feedback to the teacher about more than language in isolation.

These criteria were the ones used in connection with individuals, and were mainly discussed with the teachers on the basis of observation. The other categories used in the feedback were more general, and drew on the other information obtained from interviews and records. A 'recommendations' section pulled together the main points about the whole process. The categories chosen clearly reflected my concern to look at how bilingual learners were doing in mainstream situations.

### 4.5. Feedback sessions

It was the 'recommendations' section that was mostly referred to in the feedback sessions. It seemed important that if the shadowing was not to be for me alone that there should be dialogue about the shadowing and my reflections on it. I feel that this was still valid, despite the observations mainly reflecting my research concerns. The schools had already agreed to being involved in that process when the shadowing was originally suggested. It was obviously more difficult to arrange to release teachers for the discussions than it had been for me

to shadow. Gunn Allen Infant used a supply teacher to release both of the class teachers and the special needs teacher involved. At Walker it was very difficult to arrange feedback, partly because pupils do not have one class teacher and partly because teacher Walker 2 (who had arranged the shadowing) was absent for a long period afterwards. I did however have some discussion with her before she was away, and much later a full discussion with one of the deputy heads and the head. Morrison were not able to release teachers during the term of the shadowing but did allocate supply time out of the following term's budget. The class teachers, the special needs teacher and the head were in fact all able to be present at the same time. At Morgan it was not possible to arrange a separate feedback time, and so the discussion session ran on from the observation, with an invitation for the school to offer written comment at a later stage. In the case of Gunn Allen Infant, as well as having the discussion with me, the involved staff discussed my comments further with the head, and a synopsis was then fed back to me (Appendix 4.6). This added a further layer of reflection and also emphasised the importance of the process for this school.

At the beginning of each feedback session I explained that I had only been able to 'take a snapshot' not a 'video' (Gunn Allen Infant's head's phrases) and that therefore the teachers would want to come back at me and correct inaccuracies. I also explained why I was concentrating on bilingual pupils when there were so few and said that I realized they had many other concerns.

For Gunn Allen Infants, Morrison and Walker the shadowing was perceived as a valuable process; at least, that was the impression I received, either by asking directly or from teachers' spontaneous comments. In reality I am not sure how effective the process was for discussion of practice. Certainly there was discussion among quite a few staff at Gunn Allen Infant, and the head annotated my notes as the result of the discussions that took place. Whether getting staff to discuss practice was long lasting or not I do not know. At Morrison one of the class teachers commented that she had been concerned about the number of notes I had been writing during observation but could see that an outside observer had been able to observe things it just was not possible for her to do. The Morrison teachers felt that the recommendations were things they had been thinking about

trying, so they added weight to proposed changes. That they did echo what the head and teachers had been thinking about was probably not just because of the shadowing process, but because of the work teacher Morrison (who had done the RSA course the previous year) had been doing in the school. My feeling after the feedback meeting was that Morrison would attempt to take on board some of the ideas I had suggested, and that they would find it much easier with new staff in the next academic year. But as with Gunn Allen Infant, I had no way of finding out whether practice changed.

The head and one of the deputies at Walker similarly picked up on issues at the feedback to do with areas that the school was already concerned about e.g. mixed ability groupings and provision for pupils in the 3-20% ability range, i.e. pupils who did not need a statement for special educational needs (0-3%) but were still at the lower ability end of the school population with learning difficulties. The head asserted that he believed that ideally pupils would be both learning and learning language at the same time, for example there should be opportunities to learn language in science. But because of lack of resources not everyone could be supported. This view represented quite a shift in thinking as in May 1989 he had argued powerfully that pupils at Walker benefitted from a 'block' of language before they tackled mainstream subjects. Again I did not subsequently find out whether possibilities I had raised at the feedback were taken up. At Morgan I was able to discuss my observations briefly, but not on the basis of written notes or recommendations. It was not clear what Morgan would take on board or disagree with. The class teacher's comment that the pupil shadowed was not 'a special case', i.e. a pupil needing particular attention, reflects other comments from teachers at Morgan. I do not have any idea whether the feedback session generated more staffroom discussion.

### 4.6. Reflection on shadowing outcomes

It is impossible to say how much impact the shadowing process had on provision for bilingual learners in the four schools at this stage. For the first time in the project it felt that we were concentrating on bilingual learners in classrooms. In reality it was me concentrating on bilingual learners in classrooms. At no stage

however had I really discussed with the teachers the principles that guided my observations and recommendations to schools. Even at this point, despite the 'open' nature of the shared reflections, these were very much my perceptions of how bilingual pupils were faring in mainstream classrooms, and even if recommendations were taken up they were valid for me, not necessarily for the teachers. Nevertheless I was able to talk to a wide range of teachers about my reflections in a way not possible before. Because the classes I actually observed were taught mainly by teachers who were not involved in the project, and the feedback was mainly with them, it appeared an effective way of reaching a wide number of class and subject teachers.

However despite willingness to be involved in the shadowing process and reflection, there were limitations on how effective this process could be. As mentioned it was a one sided venture, with me making most of the running. Although there was more interest in bilingual learners because of the shift back to them in project focus, and willingness on the part of schools to accommodate me, this was not enough to persuade anyone to play an integral part in subsequently taking up the issues in their school. Schools were increasingly tied up in school INSET on the National Curriculum and assessment. Therefore it appears crucial for getting isolated bilingual pupils on to schools' development plans to link the shadowing process and reflection into access to and support for the National Curriculum. At the stage of the shadowing, primary teachers could say more or less which attainment targets were being covered, but had not put in 'official' ongoing teacher assessments. At this stage the Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs) for Key Stage One were still being piloted.

The ultimate INSET aim is to improve practice for the bilingual pupils themselves. As mentioned earlier (see Section 2.15) long or even short term options were difficult to arrange in schools which did not see bilingual pupils as a priority. The project and the shadowing aspect of it seem a long way round in comparison with e.g. 20 day courses in multicultural education run in Treeshire for senior management, but in the end may have reached teachers that other courses did not, either as individuals or through school initiatives. Shadowing in future

needs to be linked with the National Curriculum,and with LEA Inspectors also concerned about access to and support within the curriculum for bilingual pupils.

## 4.7. My findings

Although the development project did not move on in an action research way and outcomes did not necessarily get taken up, I can still provide preliminary answers to my research questions on the basis of my observations and the feedback discussions, to obtain a picture of how isolated bilingual pupils were learning English as a second language, how they were learning everything that everyone else learns in mainstream classes, how their teachers were supporting them and whether they were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally in four schools during one term. In attempting to answer the questions it is possible to identify supportive strategies for schools with isolated bilingual pupils.

As mentioned in Appendix 4.5 the main criteria used for classifying the observational notes were language and learning; involvement in classes-both physically and mentally; opportunity to gain support from adults in the class; opportunity to work with other pupils, and use of language. These categories reflected aspects that I felt I should consider if I was to comment on how bilingual pupils were learning English and also learning through curriculum content. I would also be able to comment on teacher support. The information gained from the teachers, the interviews, and the records which came into the other categories on the feedback notes also helped me comment on learning English,on learning and on teacher support. The information on whether bilingual pupils were able to develop bilingually and bi-culturally came mainly from observation, but also from the interviews with them.

## 4.8. Provision for bilingual learners

In Morrison, bilingual pupils I observed were involved in all class activities; the two Year 5s and the two Year 6s (in a vertically grouped class) in mixed ability groups, the reception pupils grouped as 'needing extra support'. At Walker the bilingual pupils were also involved in all class activities but effectively two pupils that I observed were in Special Educational Needs classes, i.e. in bottom ability

groups because of the organization of the school. Both Gunn Allen Infant and Morgan made provision for the bilingual pupils to be withdrawn from class to be given help by the special needs teacher. In the case of the two pupils at Gunn Allen Infant, this was for language work that was different from the language work the others in class were doing. In the case of the older pupil at Morgan, this was for 'reading and phonics' work.

## 4.9. Provision-Morrison

There were thus a variety of approaches to making provision for the bilingual pupils. Only Morrison had a specialist English as a Second Language teacher but as she was also the special needs teacher bilingual pupils received special provision along with pupils with special educational needs. In effect she was a language support teacher. In Morrison the four Year 5/6 bilingual pupils were involved in normal class activities and in theory were keeping up with the syllabus, but the language and special educational needs support provided by the language support teacher was not planned in advance to ensure that pupils had full access to understanding both what was required and the content of the tasks. Clear instructions were given in class as to what each group were to do and there was discussion within each group, either with the teacher or the NTA or the language support teacher about the 'content' of the task, but there was no opportunity for whole class discussion about e.g. findings, problems or for a review of the time I observed. In addition, here the language support teacher was sometimes in the role of helper i.e. not fully involved in planning and therefore just one step ahead of pupils.

One of the two Morrison reception pupils,here called Abdul, although involved in the class activities was clearly isolated in the classroom and in the playground. He waited until the very end of class instructions to see what the others did and did the same on the edge of a group. In the playground it looked as if he was involved but in fact he was swooping from side to side of the playground by himself. It may have been unsettling having a student teacher (her second day) as well as his class teacher in the room but he needed access to the friendship of someone to 'show him the ropes'. This was important in involving

him both socially and in working on tasks that would enable him to begin to understand English in context. He needed the class to be prepared to work with him, and access if not to bilingual personnel (a junior school child even) then at least cassettes in first language. I felt that mixed ability grouping rather than the 'slightly smaller' grouping of children who 'needed more time' would have been more helpful. In fact on the day of observation his group and the group of children who had most recently arrived were working together (the student had kept the class teacher's groupings) on integrated activities. This was potentially a very supportive situation. The class teacher, however, withdrew him once physically to another part of the class to listen to a story, and once mentally off the group task, to revise basic numbers "to help the student". There was in fact work on number in the student's review of the morning's work in any case, and the class teacher's intervention may well have been a distraction from the concepts of 'full' and 'empty' that the group was working on at the time. In addition the sharing of a story, potentially very supportive, took place at the same time as the class teacher was marking another pupil's written work and telling off another pupil from the water tray. In this classroom I had the feeling that a view prevailed that language should be learnt first and then you could get on with learning i.e. 1-10 should come before 'full' and 'empty'. It seemed as if the 'need more time' group would always 'need more time'. I was personally extremely angry at seeing the pupil so isolated. However, other bilingual children in the school had fond memories of being taught English by the reception class teacher (pupil interview transcripts).

### 4.10. Provision-Walker

At Walker the Year 10 pupil, here called Jaswinder, and one of the Year 8 pupils, here called Amarjit, were fully involved in the class activities and learning I saw. The other Year 8 pupil, here called Najmun, had in my view an extremely disaffecting morning. She had chess (which she did not like) in lieu of English,a supply lesson (where I felt the teacher treated the class like eight year olds) in lieu of Information Technology and a Humanities test she could not cope with. I wondered if she would come back after dinner. The Year 7 pupil, here called

Makesh, was fully involved and learning. In fact during the two science periods with a supply teacher he organized his own work when it was clear that a lot of the class were doing everything possible to avoid work. He very quickly worked out what was required in Maths, and supported his partner on the computer. I did not observe him doing an extended piece of writing but from a piece of writing he had done on a trip to an agricultural college he had got things to say but was writing as he spoke. He was one of the lower two forms however and I felt that if he had been supported with language, particularly writing development, in mixed ability groups he could have coped with higher content in subject areas. Observing both this pupil, Makesh, in Year 7 and Najmun in Year 8 made me question the appropriacy of placement of bilingual learners in the two lower streams in the school. The Year 7 pupil was at his fifth school, because of house moves, and in fact was trilingual. Integration of learning seemed vital. Makesh had scored low on a standard reading test (Salford) at his previous school (reading age (ra) 6 years 11 months; chronological age (ca) 9 years 2 months) and his transfer records referred to "overall weakness" in his language, hence his placement in the low form. An Educational Psychologist (EP) at Walker had been called in to assess Najmun in October 1989. She too had been found to have a low reading age (ra 8 years 1 month; ca 12 years 6 months). But the EP had noted that the reading tests had "limited value with children for which English is a second language" and that on a non-verbal test (Recall of Digits item of the British Ability Scales) Najmun had scored slightly above the average for her age. To start off in a low stream, where the basics i.e. basic skills in literacy and numeracy, are tackled separately from subject content could mean that the student might never catch up even with the promise of being moved up when basic skills had been acquired. Unless literacy skills are developed in relation to subject content the pupil cannot catch up, either the language or the subject content has been missed out.

It is impossible to say whether Najmun would have been involved in the regular programme for the day. From the work she was asked to do after she had finished the Humanities test, on life in medieval Britain, which was clearly a familiar task and which consisted of copying out sections from the textbook, it did not appear that there was any integration of language work with humanities. The

Maths involved catching up with basics (tables test, work on angles). The first supply teacher (for Information Technology) asked the whole class to do an activity, (describe an elephant using a complete sentence, then draw, then think of a description of another animal for others to draw) which I felt was appropriate in subject matter for junior age children. Instead of English she got chess with a friend which she said she was not interested in.

The contrast with provision for pupils in the top stream may have been accentuated by the fact that the Year 10 pupil, Jaswinder, had only one supply teacher during the period of observation and I only saw the Year 8 upper stream pupil,Amarjit, for two periods of English. But I did feel that the co-operative and collaborative working that I saw in this class, and the integrated approach in English would be even more helpful to pupils in lower streams itself. Ideally, mixed ability would obviate the need for bilingual pupils to prove themselves in isolation before they got a move up, and therefore a chance to tackle the secondary syllabus because they could hopefully get support for literacy while keeping up with content.

### 4.11. Provision-Gunn Allen Infant

Gunn Allen Infant had clearly felt it best that new arrivals should have some specific language help on a withdrawal basis. This had to be provided for out of the special needs teaching allocation. The teachers were adamant that this help could not have been provided in class. There were perhaps conflicting pressures; parental expectations that the pupils would learn 'structure' and 'vocabulary', and also prior experience of the special educational needs teacher working on structure and vocabulary on a withdrawal basis rather than in the class, versus a realization that the boys,here called Stavros and Manoussos, were bright and therefore should be stretched and should carry on with learning not just language in class in topic work, maths etc. The boys were not in fact included in the top group for language work. I argued in the feedback that certainly from the current time (the beginning of the pupils' second term), these pupils could be supported in mainstream. Educationally as well as pragmatically I also felt they could have been there in the beginning.

Both class teachers at Gunn Allen Infant operated an individualized programme. There were differences however. In one of the classes it meant that pupils ticked off what they had done individually on a large chart in the classroom. There was no necessity to have to co-operate with others although this did happen informally in friendship groups i.e. friends or people in the same group helped each other on the same task but with individual work produced at the end. In the other class pupils worked in groups for the day and worked co-operatively sometimes because they were working on the same tasks. Both class teachers mentioned opportunities to work collaboratively i.e. where the structure of the task was designed so that pupils would have to work together, but I did not see this type of organization in action.

In fact Stavros, who ticked off what he did, coped very well, but it did mean that opportunities to discuss work came by accident rather than being built in. Certainly both types of organization provided quite a contrast to the control of the withdrawal group where the teacher decided what the boys would read.

Even though the staff were clear that they wanted the boys to be stretched by normal class work I wondered if the boys felt that the class work was not 'real' work in comparison with withdrawal where the emphasis was clearly on English development. The benefits of withdrawal may appear more than they are because of the importance attached to the sessions by the staff.

### 4.12. Provision-Morgan

At Morgan it was difficult to say what emphasis was placed on withdrawal for help with 'reading and phonics'. The special educational needs teacher was away and so I did not observe the withdrawal session. The class teacher felt that the pupil, here called Balwinder, would gain more than just reading and phonics from withdrawal i.e. would benefit from a small group situation and a chance to discuss other aspects of her work. The special educational needs teacher felt that she had gained a great deal and her language had improved. I felt that there was also a debit side. I did not know when she would catch up with the group work or instructions; her co-group member clearly felt she would have to 'help' her on one occasion when Balwinder asked for help with measurements, and the girl next to

her said "Do I have to do everything for you?". Although going out to special needs may not have been the whole reason it cannot have helped. Although I did not see the group in action I also have grave reservations about the use of the Fuzz Buzz reading scheme in use in the school (see Harris 1978a 1978b 1986). Certainly it is my belief that for younger bilinguals a phonic scheme in English is totally inappropriate as a considerable body of language is needed before pupils can attack phonic schemes and the language of the scheme may not be widely used in other learning contexts. If young bilingual children are to use such schemes they have to take time to learn that language orally first. But reading is high status and something motivating at the beginning of school, not something to be delayed. I would argue that it is more appropriate to encourage language development and skills of reading at the same time by using books which relate to everyday experience. That is not to say that phonic work is not useful but that it should not be the starting point. However I am still not convinced that phonics work in isolation from the other language work needed across the curriculum, and using a scheme where the subject matter and language is far removed from suburban experience (and for that matter needlessly stereotypes Scots) is the best use of resources.

It was all the more puzzling when I felt that within the class were all the ingredients of excellent support for Balwinder. The groups were mixed ability. The teacher spent a considerable amount of time with the whole class reviewing previous work, posing questions about future work, calling on individuals to summarize what they had done, and checking that everyone was clear as to what was required. In all these cases there was opportunity for the language of the topics to be used, listened to, and expanded on orally. In addition there was opportunity to talk about the work in groups and with neighbours. As with Gunn Allen Infant I did not see collaborative work, but again this was described. There were opportunities for written work to be re-drafted and for co-operation in checking drafted work both with pupils and the teacher. Reading that pupils had done individually was checked in a whole class situation. The class teacher and floating teacher planned so that their sessions would be complementary. In sum,it was a reflective classroom of the kind described by Edwards and Mercer (1987).

The contradictions inherent in having a pupil in the class who was not seen as a 'special case', and yet was seen to be in need of additional help with reading and writing, needed to be untangled. I am not saying that there were no distinctive literacy needs. I believe that there is a gap which shows up with junior age bilingual children between their oral competency and their literacy development. The solution however is not to further isolate the literacy skills but to make sure that the oral and literacy work are linked. What had happened here (and at Morrison) is that there had never been any chance to look closely at the particular development of bilingual pupils because of funding through special educational needs . Those who had been at school long enough to learn to read and write in English were fully integrated and doing fine; those who were struggling with literacy had 'problems' and were referred to special educational needs. For what is the role of special educational needs teachers if it is not to give specific literacy help? I feel that the provision was there, and therefore the class teacher made use of it. What the class teacher was hoping for however (interview) was that special educational needs help would be much more linked with the class in the future, in line with shifts within Special Educational Needs provision itself.

In all the schools it was possible to reflect on language and learning,including involvement in classes, opportunity to gain support from adults, opportunity to gain support from peers and use of language; National Curriculum; use of L1; teachers' record keeping and observation;and PLR. In Sections 4.13-4.20 I outline my findings according to these categories.

### 4.13. Access to the mainstream curriculum.

The pupils I saw were 'in the mainstream' but special additional provision either outside or inside the classroom was not integrated with the learning in all cases. In addition the 'gap' between oral and written language development, which was causing concern and being tackled through different solutions at junior school level, was likely to be accentuated by the streaming system in the secondary school. Unless this changed the junior bilingual pupils seen to have 'problems' on arrival at secondary school would therefore still be put into the lower streams.

Access to the primary curriculum was partially delayed in cases where it was thought appropriate for the pupil to 'learn the language' first rather than through the curriculum, and denied where the pupils were fully active but not supported in their understanding of what they were doing and in the development of language needed to carry out the tasks. In the reflective classroom where it seemed this could have happened continuously, the pupil was removed from that source of support although only for 2 short periods. I would argue that access to the secondary curriculum was also delayed, with the aim that bilingual pupils should catch up on basic literacy and numeracy, partly because of experience in the primary school and partly because of the streaming system in the secondary. This denial of access was reinforced by referrals to Educational Psychologists and reliance on reading tests, as the EPs have been the gatekeepers of funding. Once this funding has been obtained it has been used for special educational needs provision; special educational needs provision is then used to give support in literacy and numeracy.

I felt that for bilingual learners to be learning in mainstream classes the cycle needed to be broken across the board. There were elements of good organization seen in all the classrooms observed. These needed to be combined and a longitudinal view of bilinguals' development considered.

### 4.14. Support from adults

Bilingual pupils did have a good chance to get support from adults. But in the case where there were three adults available for part of the week (at Morrison) there was little opportunity for them to plan apart from a few words at lunchtime. Teacher Morrison herself mentioned at the feedback session that this made for difficulties. I received the impression that it was quite hard for the class teacher to control what the NTA did i.e. she planned tasks for her but these were not always carried out as she expected. The potential was clearly there nonetheless for a planned team approach to meeting the needs of the bilingual pupils. I mentioned at the feedback session that the NTA herself had thought it unproductive to be repeating herself so much during the day. She had given the instructions on the 'coal' worksheet to different groups three times. She was in

effect doing the access work to the task for all the pupils. Whether a planned team approach was going to be possible the following year was unlikely given staffing constraints, but the class teacher, the colleague who had the parallel class and teacher Morrison agreed to consider ways of building in planning and working in a more collaborative way. Unless the school staffing was changed there would still be classes of thirty-nine with one class teacher and one NTA for the bulk of the week.

At Morgan, Balwinder was clearly supported by the two teachers. For instance, when the class teacher specifically involved her in reflecting on the book she had read before being asked to speak to the class, he discussed her language work with her giving specific things to focus on. Later he checked it, praised her and offered future help on handwriting,and then paired her with another pupil for drafting work. He was very aware of her needs as I do not think she would have approached him in the way she had done the floating teacher, for help. Nor would she have got a new English book which she needed if he had not come over to check her work. The amount of time available in this setting for the teachers to help individuals with learning was impressive.

### 4.15. Support from peers

In most classes observed there were also opportunities for pupils to gain support from their peers. This was usually on a co-operative basis. I did not observe fully collaborative tasks, apart from Year 7 Music, where pupils had to work out a rhythm together, and Year 8 English where pupils were provided with one matrix per group to complete. Each group had to choose a selection of books to take to a desert island. These two activities were definitely planned to be collaborative. A third activity in reception in Morrison might also have been designed to be; because for 'filling and emptying' work there was only one kind of each container-this could have been deliberate or simply for space reasons. In any event it did lead to collaborative work with one container. I particularly felt that in Morrison the possible benefits of collaborative work were not exploited. Group discussion on one topic sheet might have obviated the need for the NTA to access the pupils to the task, and would have promoted language work in relation to it.

In the feedback session at Morrison there was quite a bit of discussion on reviewing such work in class.

## 4.16. Use of language

It was difficult to obtain detailed notes on pupils' use of English. As mentioned previously I did not use a tape recorder in the classrooms. I was able to record instances of language use but did not always note the exact language used. For example my comments on a Japanese speaking pupil,Toru, at Morrison for feedback purposes were as follows:

> -use of language. Clearly understood what he was required to do. Extended oral work not observed. Interested in the story he was reading with Mrs B. (a special needs assistant), when she left to sort out the science experiment he flicked over the pages to see what was coming next, and continued this later in silent reading before choosing one with a lot of print which he didn't read but did look at the pictures throughout. Had difficulties with worksheet on coal mining and got help along with the others and individually. He remained on the table with some of the group (too many for all to sit comfortably) and wrote very slowly; in half an hour he'd written 5 lines, drawn 1 diagram and started on another diagram. Didn't see how he coped with vitamins sheet as he left class early (Written up observation notes).

Even in a situation with an oral task such as the one given to Najmun by the supply teacher at Walker (see above) where I was particularly using the observations and samples section of the Primary Language Record my examples of spoken language were limited e.g.:

> Responding to teacher's request for description of elephant (she'd been asked to start off) "everybody know the elephant is fat...(long pauses and prompting)....he's got long nose and big teeth and .....big foot, big ears". Conscious of class's reaction to task set-"everybody know" and keeps tabs on whole class's reactions to her. At one point says "shut your gob M." to classmate when he makes a comment. Switches between 'Copperbeech' English for talking to friends and 'Bengali' English for talking to this particular teacher-uses 'Copperbeech' English to other teachers. Only 2 girls in class on this day (Written up observation notes).

This observation was particularly revealing as it provided evidence of Rampton's finding that bilingual learners use what he describes as 'Babu' English (Rampton 1987). In fact all the pupils I interviewed talked cogently about their language use. Najmun was likely to encounter low expectations of her language abilities.

I did collect some examples of pupils' written language where it was possible to do so. It would have been possible to have done an error analysis of e.g. Stavros's 'clown and shark' story but the teachers were already keeping it as evidence of development. I did not think a 'snapshot' (to use the Gunn Allen Infant head's phrase) would be particulary useful and did not have the opportunity to do detailed recording. In retrospect joint discussion with the teachers about the clown and shark story might have proved just as,if not more, useful than discussion about wider issues such as withdrawal.

### 4.17. National Curriculum Implementation

I did not obtain much information about National Curriculum implementation. All the primary teachers were working on school planned topics that would cover various National Curriculum attainment targets. At Morgan, Brian was clearly worried about being able to integrate the maths work into the topics. I was never shown overall plans and so it was hard to estimate how far schools had got in their adjustments to the new status quo of the National Curriculum.

### 4.18. Records

Schools were at different stages of developing assessment and record keeping systems. At one end Morrison was using Treeshire pupil record (PR) forms and reading tests and at the other Walker was developing a whole system of records of achievement. No-one was using the Primary Language Record (PLR) specifically even to try out and no-one commented on whether my comments using the PLR proforma were useful at Gunn Allen Infant and Walker (my notes available). I looked at records. The existing Treeshire pupil record forms were very difficult to use. Perhaps because of the structure of the form (e.g. no assessment or even account of first language), the bilingual pupils at early stages

of education were assessed as 'below average' in many categories. But because funding had been linked to special educational needs there was no impetus to complain about the forms; it was in the schools' interest in fact to have the pupils seen as 'below average'. As well as the PR forms there was also a screening schedule at Morrison. In several cases on these screening schedules there were comments additional to the ticks in boxes which reiterated the need for extra support. I believe these were looked at when it was time for applying for formula funding (capitation). Several forms had detailed information from previous schools, and in the case of Makesh who had been at inner city Rowan schools this did include information about first languages; this would have been extremely useful to draw on. Unfortunately the schools which had had contact with the E.L.R.C. had no summary of the findings of the teacher in charge there. I do not know what type of records Morgan used.

### 4.19. Use of first language

Use of first language was an area I was able to ask about in the interview with the pupils. There was tremendous variation both in first language class provision available locally and desire to make use of the classes. I feel that the bilingual pupils definitely saw themselves as bicultural even if they were receptive bilinguals. For instance Simon in Year 6 and Sufia in Year 5 at Morrison talked (interview transcripts) about going to the Gurdwara and Mosque. But they did not expect to draw on their own life stories in school. Sufia started to tell me (interview transcripts) about Ramadan and explained what it was very patiently to me. I feel that if she had talked about Ramadan in school she would have assumed I knew too. You could not say that any of the schools had paid attention to the development of their bilingual pupils' first languages. For instance, the reception class teacher at Morrison knew that Abdul spoke a different language at home but did not know what it would be if the family came from Bangladesh. The Year 5/6 class teacher at Morrison thought Simon spoke Urdu but would check with the special needs teacher. There was no mention on the PR forms about first languages except in cases where pupils had come from Rowan. There was no evidence of bilingual pupils being asked about or asked to use their first language

in class. I saw no bilingual materials. There was very little recognition of culture pupils brought to school. There was one link with Japan in an energy project (i.e. the examples of hydro-electric power stations were of Japanese hydro-electric schemes) at Morrison. I certainly could not say that isolated bilingual pupils were able to develop bilingually and biculturally on what I had seen.

## 4.20. Social aspects

Generally, all the pupils seemed at ease socially in their schools although when interviewed three of the Year 5/6 pupils at Morrison mentioned that they were targets of racist name calling and some beating up. In Morrison, Walker and Morgan the amount reported varied depending on the response of the teacher. All three as mentioned earlier felt more could be done-this was expressed in terms of more punishment or not knowing what could be done. Najmun, one of the Morrison pupils, came back after the interview to ask my advice about what you should do if friends only liked you for your possessions.

At Walker I did not note any social issues in the write up for the school but it was clear that Jaswinder, Amarjit and Makesh had particular friends. Jaswinder and Amarjit had English speaking friends in school but clearly amongst these friends there was a support network of Sikh cousins. It is only possible to guess at the value of this informal network. Certainly the school could not rely on it for all bilingual pupils.

## 4.21. Conclusion

It seemed from the shadowing study that no school was completely able to ensure that bilingual pupils could learn English, learn everything that everyone else learns and develop bilingually and bi-culturally at the same time. Each had elements of what I felt were extremely supportive practice, and in most cases teachers were as personally supportive as they could be. But in looking at overall patterns in four schools I realized that the isolated bilingual pupils were, as suspected, submersed and not recognized. There was no major shift from assimilationist thinking. No isolated bilingual pupils had been in project schools which accepted multilingual, multicultural classrooms as normal. All would have to

accept that school did not currently value their bilingualism and bi-culturalism. English was the currency. Generally if they could cope in English they could progress; and as shown earlier (see Section 1.13) pupils can indeed learn effectively through their second language. However if they were at early stages or were having difficulties they were placed in low groups or streams and given special educational needs support. In this case it was not possible to learn English through learning and the cycle of English, particularly literacy in English, acting as gatekeeper would start all over again.

It was not possible to get teachers in this situation to do action research on how bilingual learners could learn in mainstream classrooms. The reflections on my findings were related to individual situations and were not taken up collectively. It is very tempting to suggest that information on how bilingual learners should learn be included on INSET courses but there is still no guarantee that messages would be picked up consistently.

I had thus found out from my research questions at this point that mainstream provision with learning as well as language supported across the board was virtually non-existent for this group of learners. I was no nearer a way of working with teachers so that they could discover for themselves the long term implications of continued submersion and help them move towards mainstream provision that consciously supported learning of bilingual pupils.

# CHAPTER 5

# EXPERIMENTING WITH COLLABORATIVE TEACHING AS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND RESEARCH VEHICLE.

## 5.1. Introduction-moving into collaborative work

The shadowing process described in Chapter 4 allowed me to begin to answer my research questions. I found out that isolated bilingual learners were typically submersed but that there were elements of what I felt were good practice in mainstream classrooms that could be built on. In particular I felt it would be important to emphasise for the schools the importance of learning English through curriculum content. Otherwise, it seemed, bilingual pupils found themselves in special educational needs groups and classes concentrating on English, isolated from the English they needed for other subjects. The shadowing phase also allowed me to reflect on the shadowing process itself as a vehicle to further the development project. It was clear that project teachers, some of them new to the project, were happy for me to observe isolated bilingual pupils in their classes. They facilitated the shadowing. It is also clear that the schools were willing at this point of the project to focus on bilingual learners. It is not clear however how effective the shadowing plus reflection was in the long term. Although my suggestions for action were discussed and it appeared that some would be taken up, these were ones in line with what schools had already been planning and so it is difficult to determine particular outcomes of the project work. In addition there was no opportunity to follow up the process the following academic year as the funding had stopped.

This chapter describes subsequent moves to continue the development project with school agreement to focus on bilingual learners. Collaborative teaching now became the vehicle for development work, partly for the following reasons: willingness to focus on bilingual learners but limited involvement in pack, PLR and shadowing. More importantly I was still looking for a way of working with teachers so that they could discover for themselves the long term implications of continued submersion and help them move towards mainstream provision that consciously supported learning of bilingual pupils. Thus I needed to consider more fully the role of different categories of teachers. I also felt that collaborative teaching would provide opportunities to further explore and refine the research questions addressed in the shadowing phase.

## 5.2. Role of specialist teachers

In all the previous project work I had tried to work as much as possible with teachers themselves so that they would ensure that bilingual learners could learn both English and curriculum content in mainstream classes. We had tried out different vehicles; the project pack, potentially the Primary Language Record, and the shadowing and reflection process. As noted in Chapter 1, I felt that schools with isolated bilingual pupils had missed out on the specialist English language teaching that had been a feature of provision for bilingual learners in the late 1960s and 1970s in inner city areas and at the time of this study had had to jump straight to helping bilingual pupils gain access to the National Curriculum. One particular constraint mentioned in Chapter 3 in connection with the first stages of the project-schools feeling they could not release class/subject teachers- was still there, but as mentioned there had been a shift back to thinking about bilingual pupils, as opposed to tackling multicultural aspects, on the part of the project heads.

I had been thinking about whether a specialist English as a second language teacher was needed in this context. Such a teacher can concentrate on language development within subject areas. Was the catalyst role of a specialist an essential one that could not be missed out in getting schools to take responsibility for isolated bilingual learners, properly supported in mainstream classrooms? I had written a paper outlining the funding, and therefore staffing, options to the area education office (Appendix 5.1) as requested at the May 89 meeting of heads and project teachers. The possibilities I outlined were:

1. continuing to ask for flexible adhoc funding from the area education office.
2. continuing to ask for special educational needs funding.
3. applying for Section 11 funding.
4. allocating hours from existing staffing in school.
5. funding a full time specialist ESL post either within a school or a cluster.

I had hoped that in the development project class/subject teachers would be able to jump to full responsibility for isolated bilingual learners. I was reluctant to go back a step and 'fill in' the specialist English language teaching stage. I had

managed to talk to a range of classroom teachers about bilingual learners. Was this enough? I did not feel this range of classroom teachers were people who would have taken specialist modules of a Diploma or signed up for short twilight in-service sessions. What would be the outcome if a specialist was appointed? Would the specialist take over responsibility for bilingual learners with the schools breathing a sigh of relief, and even less necessity for class/subject teachers to be trained? Was it nonetheless preferable to have one consistent 'line' on provision for bilingual learners, even if this meant losing the benefits of teachers in schools working out strategies for themselves in an action research way? Would we not be back to a situation of one person not being able to cover all the pupils and therefore finding it very difficult to work with all teachers? These were unresolved questions at the beginning of 1990. It was not clear whether there would be another development phase in which they could be worked on.

### 5.3. Working towards further phase of the development project

I did attempt to initiate a further development phase in 1990. During the shadowing period in Spring 1990 I had aimed to get heads together to discuss the paper on funding (Appendix 5.1) which had never gone to Area Education Office. I called a heads' meeting (13/2/90) to which the new Gunn Allen Junior head came along with Gunn Allen Infant, Morrison and Walker heads. At this meeting I planned to discuss the changes in circumstances since the paper had been written (September 1989) particularly in relation to special educational needs provision; to think about the changes in Section 11 outlined in the Home Office's Section 11 Scrutiny review (see Section 1.10); and to consider what was happening with regard to the county formula (capitation formula used to fund schools). The next move would be to consider what steps the schools themselves had taken to obtain funding- I knew for example that Gunn Allen Infant had written to the assistant county education officer (ACEO) in what was by now Ash Division asking for adhoc support for two pupils who had arrived in September 1989. I hoped we would consider whether to take forward any of the options I had proposed or others that I had not considered.

There had been significant changes in special educational needs provision in the schools. From April 1990, for instance, Walker which had had 1.7 special educational needs staffing would have no provision. The Department of Education and Science (DES) had asked local education authorities (LEAs) to produce a formula to meet special educational needs. The one that was accepted was based on free school meals. In Walker head's view this bore no relationship whatsoever to pupils with special educational needs. The school had relatively very few pupils receiving free school meals despite the fact that the head considered that the school was situated in a deprived area. Many of the single mothers worked and therefore did not qualify, and many of the ethnic minority pupils, for whom the only extra funding came through special educational needs, went home for dinner. Even without the changes in formula, the heads were questioning whether they should be taking away scarce money from children with learning difficulties whose needs were potentially just as great as those of bilingual learners. Gunn Allen Infant's head had made this point in her letter to the A.C.E.O. In effect special educational needs funding had been the heads' only option for additional support for bilingual learners however, and as recently as June 1989 Walker had received financial support by calling on the educational psychologist (E.P.) to state that a bilingual pupil needed help. The impossibility of providing specialist teaching for bilingual pupils, even on a shared basis, out of locally managed budgets (Morrison and Gunn Allen Junior were due to start local management of schools (L.M.S.) in 1991, Gunn Allen Infant in 1993) was stressed. I outlined the key changes in the Home Office's Scrutiny Report on Section 11 funding (Home Office 1989) and reiterated the reservations I had expressed about Section 11 in the paper. But the heads felt that it was the only avenue that they could look to for funding that would be centrally supported and would not take away from hard pressed resources that were needed for others. Section 11 would mean staff additional to the school rather than additional school staff or additional resources from the school.

There was a consensus that the pyramid should put in a bid for Section 11. I stressed that there would have to be further funding for me to be involved, but

that I was willing to take the development project further, and I was keen to pursue research questions further.

## 5.4. Research options

The government's Section 11 proposals were significant for thinking about research. It was likely that there would be little change nationally in provision through routes other than Section 11 in schools. If Section 11 projects got off the ground in Treeshire then they would shape future provision. Further research questions thus emerged. How were the needs of isolated bilingual pupils going to be met within a framework very much designed originally to meet the needs of bilingual learners in inner city areas? Would a Section 11 project be possible in areas where it might be difficult to "demonstrate a special need in the target group of sufficient size that it cannot be properly addressed without the additional help that may be obtained through section 11 funding" (Home Office 1990a p. 1)? How could the needs of isolated non-New-Commonwealth pupils be met? How would schools respond to the tension inherent in the "Grant Administration:Proposals" (Home Office 1990a) between meeting "certain needs particular to ethnic minorities that prevent full participation in the mainstream of national life" (Home Office 1990a p. 2) and aiming to "embed new practice into mainstream provision" (Home Office 1990a p. 18)? Reflections on my research concerns; language and learning, National Curriculum, use of L1, teachers' record keeping and observation, use of PLR and recommendations would still be pertinent in answering such additional questions.

## 5.5. Section 11 bidding-initial discussions

A meeting between the intercultural inspector and the heads was arranged (8.5.90) to summarize the project and receive advice on submission. In between the February and the May meeting the Home Office had produced "Grant Administration: Proposals" which set out the new arrangements in line with the Scrutiny Report's proposal (see Section 1.10). It was clear that Treeshire was reviewing existing provision overall and was willing to consider new initiatives.

The key aspects of the government's proposals were:

1. Funding would be used for projects matched against identified needs rather than posts.
2. Time limits of no more than 5 years would be established.
3. For the first time the grant would be cash limited.
4. Numbers would have to be defined.
5. Grant would have to meet 'significant' need that could not be met by mainstream funding.
6. Grant was still to meet needs of pupils of Commonwealth origin only.
7. Language support a key mechanism of access to mainstream life.
8. There would be an annual review against National Curriculum targets.

Existing Section 11 posts would be re-formulated, the county proposal would go to the education committee in November 1990, Home Office would notify successful authorities in June and projects were due to start in October 91.

### 5.6. Section 11 bidding-link with the project

The heads re-emphasised to the intercultural inspector that they were looking for funding that would not take away from others in the schools. Under LMS they would not be able to meet needs of pupils who had special educational needs but were not statemented. I followed by outlining my perceptions of what information for a Section 11 submission would be obtainable from the project work: Statistics were not complete and identification of needs was not complete, but the shadowing of pupils at four of the schools would give indications; there was access to mainstream (key feature of Section 11 proposals) but no guarantee of achievement. I raised the issue of submersion by mentioning that in effect bilingual pupils in the bottom two classes at Walker were in remedial classes. A beginning had been made with home-school links, but more work was needed linking progress of bilingual pupils with attainment targets. Discussion followed on a number of points such as the fact that in Morrison they had begun to recognize the breadth of cultural experience pupils bring to school. Walker's head also mentioned that the project had raised awareness of staff to needs of bilingual pupils but had not actually provided support for individual bilingual children. They were reflecting on the multicultural developments within the project and expressing a specific need that, in their view, had not been met.

Heads had to accept that Section 11 was likely to be the only source of funding to meet the needs of individual bilingual pupils, though reservations about the necessity of having to use this route were expressed. How, for example, could Morrison and Morgan put in a grant for money 'over and above' mainstream provision for pre-school groups when the mainstream provision had just been cut?

We agreed that putting in a Section 11 bid had to be a project priority. Obtaining a source of funding which would be used for employing ESL specialists, a different use of funding from ways I had envisaged in the earlier part of the project, became part of the development project. I said that I would 'service the bid' if funding came through. Thus in the summer term 1990 I used 8 days to draft the Section 11 project. In drafting the Section 11 document I followed the Home Office Guidelines, drew on information gleaned by colleagues as a result of a Treeshire review team's visits to schools with existing Section 11 staff, discussed overall principles at the education sub-committee of the Rowan Racial Equality Council (REC) and with the Poplar Multicultural Education and Language Support Centre. Much discussion centred on how to assign bilingual pupils to stages of English learning . The Home Office Guidelines in the objectives/targets section gave as an example of a good extract

> "50% of pupils at Stage A (little or no English) will progress to Stage B (some English, reading language support); 50% of Stage B will progress to Stage C (oral fluency but support needed for written work); and 30% of Stage C will progress to Stage D (fluency but support needed for equal access to full curriculum)" (Home Office 1990a Annex C p. 16).

Clearly this categorization bore no relation to National Curriculum Attainment targets. For the Ash and Poplar proposals, a staging scheme devised by Hester of the Centre for Language in Primary Education, was adapted and used (Barrs, Ellis, Hester and Thomas 1990 p. 41).

Other discussion with two of the project heads on the draft led to sharpening of the performance indicators. For the next stage, parental consultation, I drafted a letter to parents via heads explaining that funding was

going to change and inviting them to hear about the proposal. I checked the letter to parents with one of the Rowan home-school liaison teachers for clarity as there was no time to get it translated. It went out as it was at Morrison. I do not know if Morgan sent it out. The head at Walker however felt that if parents did not have much English it would be too difficult to understand without being translated. The final version, which was not checked with me, changed the tone of the letter completely, and did imply 'deficit'. It was not checked with me. There were only two responses from families, who said their children had not had any 'problems' in English, and nobody turned up at the meeting. It is of course impossible to say why, and what difference (a.) the lack of translation (b.) the tone of the final letter made. To me it meant that the parents whose children had had support were not made aware that any previous sources of funding were drying up and thus could not be called on to lend support to an initiative that might secure funding for those following on. For a pupil in one of the Morrison classes, the fact that just 'Commonwealth' families had been targeted caused her to reflect that "it's just us brown faces who've been given the letter" (personal communication). I have stressed this incident because it reinforced my impression that families with bilingual children in an isolated situation did not want their children to be singled out in terms of special help or funding for that help. From that perspective highlighting 'over and above' funding through Section 11 is a disaster.

So the proposal went in to the review team without parental comment at the end of June. It also went in without statistics from Morgan. I received no responses whatsoever in connection with Section 11 from the new head there.

### 5.7. Development project development

By the Autumn term it was clear that the implementation of Section 11 nationally would be delayed until April 1992. Before this became apparent I had submitted a proposal to Ash division in July 1990 to obtain funding to carry on the pilot project from September 1990-March 1991.

It was clear that there were no other sources of funding apart from Section 11. I had come to terms with the idea of having funding for a specialist teacher because that was what would be funded within Section 11. I had tried to work

with teachers in various ways that did not demand great expenditure or enormous time commitment on the part of the school and that would avoid putting bilingual pupils 'on the spot'. I had tried to embed good practice, language through learning, in mainstream classrooms without specifically supporting individual pupils in their learning of English alone. Despite the progress the heads were still looking for support for particular individual pupils, even though the Section 11 rubric stated that Section 11 projects would have to show that they had shifted responsibility for bilingual learners to mainstream teachers. Despite the tension still inherent in 'over and above' funding (see Section 1.10) and confusion about indicators of progress described above, there was a recognition by the headteachers, shown in the shift of perceptions at the meeting on 16/5/89, that language through curriculum content could be worked towards. Although there was no mention in the Grant Proposals of ways in which the shift towards mainstream could be worked through in practice, and it was only later that NFER's 'Partnership Teaching' pack (NFER 1991) (see Section 2.14) was recommended by the DES (Treeshire funding and information manager,personal communication 1991) it made sense to me to consider collaborative teaching.

## 5.8. Collaborative teaching

I am using the term collaborative teaching in the way described for co-operative teaching in the Partnership Teaching Pack (NFER 1991). The Partnership Teaching Pack defines and contrasts support, co-operative and Partnership teaching. Support teaching is where the classroom is organised and the curriculum is planned by the class or subject teacher. The support teacher helps individual bilingual pupils learning English to cope with tasks set. Co-operative teaching is where the language support teacher and class or subject teacher plan together a curriculum and teaching strategies to meet needs of all pupils in the class. It implies equal status and shared responsibility with lead and supporting roles alternating. Partnership teaching links the co-operative teaching with curriculum and staff development in an action research framework. Teachers' joint work is supported and valued by the school. In retrospect elements of Partnership Teaching were taken up in the final development project phase.

The schools supported co-operative teaching in an action research framework but there were no formal links between co-operative teaching and curriculum and staff development. The main focus was on collaborative teaching. I have chosen to use the term collaborative teaching rather than co-operative teaching, analogous to the difference in emphasis between co-operative learning and collaborative learning. Co-operative learning may happen when pupils are friendly towards one another in the group they are working in and support each other. In collaborative learning, tasks and groupings are planned to maximize peer support. Similarly ESL teachers have often said that they can only work in classes where they get on with the class/subject teacher. Collaborative teaching begins to address the professional need to share expertise in relation to bilingual learners in whatever situation. Collaborative teaching within the project could combine the skills of the specialist and mainstream teachers and therefore provide the support that the headteachers were looking for in relation to individual pupils. It could also address sharing of practice and access to the curriculum with mainstream teachers that was required by Section 11 despite its continuance as an over and above grant. It had not been possible to get into classrooms via the project for two years and then it had happened on a much more one sided basis than hoped but hopefully with a legitimate, 'Home Office Approved' structure we would be able to move faster.

Continuation of the development project in this new phase would allow me to look at another vehicle for implementing provision for isolated bilingual learners. It would allow me to consider whether collaboration between a specialist and a class/subject teacher,as recommended by the DES, would actually be more effective as a way of embedding good practice into mainstream than working in the way I had in the project up until then. It would allow me to consider whether bilingual pupils' needs were being met on an individual basis. It would allow me to consider whether collaboration, recommended primarily for areas with substantial numbers of bilingual learners given the focus of Section 11, would also be worth advocating in areas with isolated bilingual learners. I would look at the same areas as I had with shadowing; language and learning, National Curriculum, L1, teachers' record keeping and observation, use of PLR and recommendations. I also wanted to see if organizational changes, such as mixed ability in the case of

Walker, and year team planning in the case of Morrison made a difference to bilingual learners. Finally I wanted to see if any of the recommendations I had made in the shadowing phase had been picked up.

## 5.9. Collaborative approaches within the project

The shape of the collaborative phase of the development project was influenced by the preceding research on shadowing. Having drafted the proposal for the pyramid to ensure that the shift towards mainstream responsibility was covered in performance indicators, and having tried other ways of shifting the responsibility to mainstream teachers through the development project, I did not want to 'lose' the elements of good practice that I had identified through the shadowing that could be built on. Collaboration within the development project would also help me focus and build on these elements already identified. I also knew that Walker and Morrison having 're-focused' on bilingual learners were keen to obtain support for individual pupils. I knew that Section 11 required an assessment of progress in relation to National Curriculum. I knew that the schools which had shown most interest in my suggestions during the shadowing feedback were Morrison and Walker; my reflections had reinforced their intent to try out different patterns of organization. Hopefully the Section 11 proposal would get funded, and so it made sense to try out aspects on a small scale in the interim.

In the submission for funding of the final development project phase submitted to Ash in July 1990 there were two layers. One was the extension of the development project with yet another vehicle-collaborative work which I would myself conduct with teachers of isolated bilingual pupils. The other involved research on the implications of introduction of mixed ability groupings. Although they were not included in the submission, reflection on whether previous parts of the development project, particularly the shadowing recommendations, had borne any fruit and reflection on provision for isolated bilingual learners in a collaborative teaching situation were important elements in my own planning. I would need to draw on the reflections on the collaboration in answering the research questions.

## 5.10. Development project-negotiations

This time the development project direction was decided by me, having taken into account the need to respond to Section 11 and the schools' support for it. I did not involve any teachers in planning an interim submission but it was cleared by heads.

The key aim as described in my July submission was;

"to provide continuity between the work of the project and Section 11 funding which, if approved, should start in October 91". The Section 11 proposal which was submitted to Treeshire was enclosed (Appendix 5.2)

Funding was sought for the co-ordinator (myself) to;

work for one day a week mainly in two schools (Walker and Morrison) within the pyramid in order to-

1. support individual bilingual pupils in collaboration with class/subject teachers.
2. work with class/subject teachers to record achievement and assess bilingual pupils in relation to National Curriculum requirements and to analyze language demands of tasks and provide effective methods of support for bilingual learners.
3. carry out research on the implications of introduction of mixed ability groupings in some subjects in Walker in the first year (letter 2/7/90).

By the time the money was allocated (for both collaborative teaching and reflection on the part of the teachers involved) it was difficult to arrange collaborative teaching for the rest of the Autumn Term, and so I arranged to use the money in the Spring Term 1991. I made arrangements to negotiate with the schools at the end of the Autumn Term 1990. At Walker I was able to meet with Deputy head 1 and the (new) teacher responsible for special educational needs in the school. We arranged 6 days collaboration for the Spring Term, and that I would primarily work with the first years. At Morrison the head was keen that I continue to work with Years 5 and 6.

### 5.11. Collaborative teaching-research methods

I kept notes on negotiations, lesson plans, and notes made immediately after the lessons. I wrote these up, along with the notes on individual pupils after shadowing, into feedback notes to discuss with the class/subject teachers. The feedback notes considered planning, involvement of pupil(s) in lesson, content of lesson, organization-particularly role of teachers, my reflections on the process. These notes plus questions to the teachers at the feedback sessions on wider issues e.g. the possibilities of future collaborative teaching in the school, allowed me to reflect on the six research areas; language and learning, National Curriculum, use of L1, teachers' record keeping and observation, use of PLR and recommendations. Reflection on these areas allowed me to try and answer whether collaboration between class/subject teacher and specialist teacher was an effective way of meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners.

### 5.12. Getting started-Walker

One of my aims was to look at the implications for bilingual learners of the introduction of mixed ability grouping at Walker. I would have used the five days at Walker with pupils who would have been placed in the bottom two classes i.e. special educational needs classes and their teachers. As it turned out, in Walker there was no pupil in that situation in the first year. These were the pupils I was particularly concerned should be able to learn English through learning. One of the bilingual pupils who I had shadowed at Morrison the previous year had not come to Walker. That meant that there were only two bilingual pupils to work with in Year 7, and it was these two I shadowed. One was in the top set for English (streamed) and one was in the second top set. They were in mixed ability classes for all subjects apart from English and technology. I did not feel it was possible therefore to reflect specifically on the 'implications of introduction of mixed ability groupings in some subjects in Walker in the first year' with reference to pupils who would have been in special needs English, but it was possible to comment on the experience of pupils in both situations. The pupil in the top set for English was a Chinese speaking Vietnamese pupil (hereafter called Vu); the other was the receptive bilingual, a bilingual who was talked to at home in Panjabi

but responded in English, I had heard about from teacher Morgan (hereafter called Jatinder).

Deputy head 1 arranged for me to shadow them. I am not sure why I agreed to the shadowing, as in retrospect it would have been more useful to spend the limited time in planning and carrying out collaborative teaching. But I did want to see how some of the pupils I had shadowed the previous year were faring and in fact the shadowing allowed me to gain a picture of the pupils I had not met previously. Basically I spent the first two mornings shadowing the two Year 7 pupils, the first afternoon with Vinod, whom I had shadowed the previous year, and the second with the teacher responsible for special educational needs, (hereafter Margaret), planning to shift into collaborative teaching. (The shadowing of the pupil I had shadowed the previous year was in fact useful as I realized that recommendations had not been taken on board.)

I arranged to work with Margaret who took Jatinder for English and a science teacher, hereafter called Lesley, who took Vu for mixed ability science. There was therefore a chance to work with both streamed and mixed ability classes in the first year. Both teachers worked in core National Curriculum subjects, but both had wider school responsibilities in that Margaret was head of Year 9 and also special educational needs co-ordinator, and Lesley was head of Year 7. I hoped it would be possible to discuss issues beyond their classes. I was able to arrange some planning time. I switched to working in the English and Science sessions for the third day, took and both took Margaret's class and also taught with Lesley on each of the final two days. For the remainder of the time I tied up loose ends from multicultural resources work, accessed teachers to courses and resources and talked to the Management Committee about what I was doing (Appendix 5.5).

In English it was arranged that I would act as lead teacher for drama sessions. It was possible for me to plan these knowing what stage the class had reached in their reading of a text-in this case 'Dragon Slayer' adapted from Beowulf by Rosemary Sutcliff (Sutcliff 1961). The subject teacher and I would both support the following group work.

In Science it was arranged that we would alternate being lead teacher within the sessions. We would both support individual and group work. I was conscious that the teachers would both be in a better position to set and mark homework and carry out disciplinary action if that was needed beyond the classroom. I hoped we would be able to consider the areas I had made recommendations on: collaborative work and links between different aspects of English e.g. drama, library, reading and writing. The drama aspects of the English class were meant to be self-contained. I would link the sessions to the chapters covered. The Science sessions could not be self contained as Lesley did not know precisely what was coming up on the syllabus until a few days beforehand and we could not plan for work on a whole topic together.

### 5.13. Getting started-Morrison

At Morrison it was not possible to discuss shadowing/team teaching in detail before the Spring term 1991. I raised the recommendations I had made the previous year with the head. He felt that awareness of needs of bilingual learners had been raised but that the staff (many new in September 1990) needed to develop provision for bilingual learners collectively. He was delighted that the staff had been able to use the multicultural resources in preparing for a concert on a 'Celebrations' theme. He was keen to work on social awareness i.e. awareness of differences pupils bring to school. I felt that the best way to support such awareness would be to help support access to tasks in the classroom, to analyze the demands of tasks and provide support where necessary in the areas I had recommended. The head of Year 5/6 year had already said that they would be working on a theme of 'One World' in the summer term 1991. The head was keen for me to help the school get to know the families. I felt that would be difficult; not least physically difficult in four days.

All of us had differing agendas. We decided I should work with the Year 5/6 year team. Once that had been decided it was possible to make a direct appointment to see the head of year, hereafter Lucy. In fact it was possible to spend a whole day shadowing in her class and discussing how I would work. There were four bilingual pupils in Lucy's class-three in Year 5 and one (one of the

pupils I had shadowed in 1990) in Year 6. The class teacher and I agreed that we would work on my suggestion of 'The Heartstone Odyssey' (Kumar 1988). The Heartstone Odyssey is a book which tackles racism but also the environment and social awareness generally as well as the arts. Lucy felt that it would support the work on world structure, conservation issues and migration that they were planning. It therefore supported content already planned. I wanted to use it to tackle the head's agenda of raising awareness of differences pupils bring to class, and I knew I would be able to develop language work through using the story. It supported processes that had not been specifically planned by the year team. It would be possible to address most of the recommendations I had made in the shadowing in 1990. These, in summary, were:

1. Pupils should learn language through learning.
2. There should be opportunities to work together on e.g. science, maths and topic not just orally but for reading and writing as well.
3. Peer collaboration should be maximised to cut down the repetition of individual support.
4. Talk in physical activities should be encouraged e.g. brainstorming session.
5. Developing reading of non-fiction in topic work would cut down the amount of time bilingual pupils would have to miss out on topic work to read fiction individually in class.
6. Time for planning between class teacher, ESL teacher and NTA needed to maximise use of specialist teacher's time.
7. Materials in L1 would support one particular pupil.
8. Links with cultural background (e.g. work on forms of energy used in Japan) could be extended.
9. It might be a good use of time for the specialist to work on specific area/tasks to be tackled by pupils in rotation.
10. Year 6 teachers should recommend that pupils should continue to work in mixed ability groups in secondary.
11. School should respond to racist name calling.
12. Pupils should be able to draw on their life stories.

To maximise the time available I felt that what we chose had to be self-contained because I had not been involved in topic planning, because I was only in classes for part of the week, and because I felt that something self-contained would be easier to review with teachers. At the same time it had to be something that linked in with the class work, and that lent itself to being continued after the

brief period of work together. The 'Heartstone Odyssey' lent itself to all of these criteria and work on it would enable us to work on many of my recommendations.

We agreed that we would plan jointly for the sessions, that I would act as lead teacher for a whole class session with Lucy's class and then work with small groups on further related language work.

## 5.14. Shadowing, Spring 1991

At both schools I used the same criteria for shadowing as the previous year i.e. RSA Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum framework alongside the Primary Language Record interaction grids. I had been aware however that although I had asked the bilingual pupils when I interviewed them in Spring 1990 about the bilingual aspect of their lives I had not asked them about what they felt they had learnt in their classes. I was able to talk to pupils at Walker informally during the classes I shadowed in Spring 1991 and made a point,this time, of checking with them what they felt they had learnt. I made recommendations after shadowing in both schools, and the discussions informed the planning for collaborative teaching.

My notes on Jatinder at Walker show that he was fully involved in English. He was asked to read aloud, was asked questions about the story, was involved in discussion about the illustrations and initiated a discussion about lack of heroines. He was involved in pair work on heroes and heroines. There was evidence that Jatinder was considered the class joker ("Oh shut up, Jatinder"- obviously not for the first time). In Science he got on with pair work on detecting changes between paired objects with one significant difference, part of the introduction to work on senses, discussing ideas with his partner. In Maths Jatinder worked individually on puzzles. He worked with interest until the end of the session although he chose at that stage not to stretch himself with a more difficult puzzle as the teacher had suggested. He did not have to collaborate on a puzzle but did discuss puzzles with pupils around him. It appeared from the shadowing that Jatinder could cope easily with the spoken demands of classes and was able to produce what was required in terms of talking, reading and writing. I wondered when the reading, writing tasks became more complicated further up the school whether he might

lack 'depth'. For instance in Science he could get by (as others did too) by using 'ears' rather than 'hearing' to describe one of the senses but later he would have to take on increasingly complex vocabulary. He let me know that his favourite subject was IT and that he did not like Science, but was clear about what he had been learning in Science.

Vu was also involved in all classes at Walker. He was supported by teachers on an individual basis as they moved round the room. He worked individually in English and Art but co-operated with others in Science when putting up a display of work and in making a parachute. He was clearly able to understand and write everything that was required. He was willing to talk to me about what he considered funny in Chinese humour, but I am not sure he would have told the class without staged oral work in groups. I did not have an opportunity to see how he coped with complex reading tasks. He was able to reflect on his learning. He was able to explain the connection between air and boomerangs in Science. He was able to say what he had learnt about different textures in Art and was able to discuss different types of humour.

At Morrison there were four bilingual pupils in Lucy's class-three in the Year 5 and one (one of the pupils I had shadowed in 1990) in Year 6. The class was very independent, working by themselves on a week's work at a time. I was asked to observe one pupil particularly, a Panjabi speaking boy here called Sukhjinder. He had recently arrived at the school having moved from an inner city school in Rowan but also having had 3 years at hospital school. He was behind in terms of reading and writing. Sukhjinder was writing up an experiment on sounds as scribed for him and another pupil by Lucy. Lucy let me know his background at break time and then I spent some time talking to him on his own. He was very fluent orally in English. He was able to tell me about being presented with a prize by Tony Hart of television's Hartbeat; about moving to Copperbeech; about how he rated Morrison compared to his previous schools (better); about his language use at home-he spoke Panjabi to his mother and father and had just started to learn to read and write Panjabi before he left the school in Rowan; about how he was faced with beating up and name calling and how he retaliated with beating up others. He said he had difficulty in choosing

what to write about on the computer. He could read his current story book and the writing that had been scribed but said that he could not read very well and did not take books home to read.

I was aware that a lot of people were already involved in Sukhjinder's case. Lucy had initiated statementing procedures. This meant waiting until funding came through from EPs. Lucy did not feel she could wait until Section 11 funding came through although she recognized that the statementing process might take that long. I made specific suggestions about approaches to reading and assessment (Appendix 5.3) and suggested that work on recording observations would be very useful. We discussed these when we planned collaborative teaching. I was able to work in five classrooms where there were eight pupils (including Jatinder, Vu and Sukhjinder the shadowed pupils), five boys and three girls from Years 5/6 and 7. I have given the pupils fictitious names. The pupils worked with were as follows:

| School | | Year | Sex |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrison | | | |
| | Charanjit | 5/6 | F |
| | Gurprit | 5/6 | F |
| | Imran | 5/6 | M |
| | Nazrine | 5/6 | F |
| | Pankiz | 5/6 | M |
| | Sukhjinder | 5/6 | M |
| Walker | | | |
| | Jatinder | 7 | M |
| | Vu | 7 | M |

## 5.15. Planning specific sessions

I explained to both teachers at Walker that I wanted to shift from shadowing to team-teaching because when Section 11 started, hopefully the ESL

teacher for the pyramid would be blocked to work with teachers/departments. I outlined the aims of this part of the project (see Section 5.10). I mentioned that I wanted to pick up on the recommendations from the previous year's shadowing. I mentioned that I had wanted to look particularly at bilingual pupils in mixed ability situations. No alternative ways of working were discussed. It was not suggested that I work with the pupils on an individual basis. I did however make it clear that I would contribute to work for the whole class including the bilingual pupil, as teachers would not be able to spend a lot of effort on one child. I shared with them that I felt that it was important to look at the demands of the tasks on the pupil,both language and cultural, and if there were demands that the pupil could not cope with then we needed to provide extra support e.g. facilitate collaboration, provide visuals, allow drafting,give chance to use L1, provide opportunities for review; strategies mentioned as supportive of learning language through learning in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.8) and recommended in the notes following shadowing both in 1990 and 1991. There was no 'mainstream' versus 'withdrawal' agenda this time as the pupils were firmly in mainstream.

The two sessions with Margaret's English classes were drama sessions. We agreed that I would act as lead teacher for the classes and Margaret would join in the group work. Margaret would remain responsible for homework. Discipline during the sessions would be joint. If any ongoing discipline was needed Margaret would follow it up. Lesley was working from a science syllabus and we agreed that I would tackle the lead-ins, group discussions and debates, e.g. on smoking, and that she would arrange for the experiments, e.g. showing the effects of smoking, to be set up. We agreed that Lesley would remain responsible for homework and that discipline during the sessions would be joint. If any ongoing discipline was needed Lesley would follow it up. We were able to have quick words 'on the run' about how the lessons had gone. My emphasis on active involvement in language development aspects of the tasks meant that we were short of time to cover all that we had planned but Lesley had welcomed the emphasis nevertheless. With the Morrison teachers I arranged to take sessions with each of the teachers' classes in turn and then to take small groups for further language work within the class. We agreed that Lucy and subsequently Stephanie and Anne would arrange

the pupils into groups for further language work. We did not talk specifically about discipline and homework.

### 5.16. Collaborative teaching sessions-Walker

I shall describe two Drama sessions in English,and two Science lessons. The Drama sessions were designed to be collaborative and to link different aspects of English. The first Drama session started with a warm-up activity in a circle. I related the warm-up activity, telling a story of a wound or accident that had happened recently to another pupil, to story telling generally and story telling in Dragon Slayer. The pupils were numbered off into twos and had two minutes each to tell their story and answer questions from their partner. Then I asked them, still in the circle, to remember one character each, if they could, who was in the Great Hall. Then I asked them to remember the night the visitors came to the Great Hall. They then divided into four groups. Each group then divided into two, one group of Geats, one of Danes. The Danes were asked to consider how they would get the story of the re-emergence of Grendel the monster across to the Geats. The Geats were asked to consider how they would welcome their friends the Danes. Both groups were asked to make a moving picture of the time when the Danes had just got inside the door of the Great Hall. They were asked to freeze their picture and a 'chronicler', myself, asked them questions about how they had communicated. They came up with ideas about how one of the Geats had been sent to Denmark when young to learn Danish as a second language; they identified one of their group as an interpreter; they made it clear that they would use gesture and signs and one group volunteered that the languages used to be very similar and so they could manage to communicate with each other. Then they were asked to work on a picture of when the mead ran out; they had to decide who would be asked to go and get fresh supplies. Again the 'chronicler' asked them questions. We wanted to see what sort of society they thought Danes and Geats might have. We wondered if the women would be asked to go. In fact no group mentioned women. But one group definitely thought there would be slaves. One group thought the top Geats would go themselves to show how highly they rated the Danes. I acted as timekeeper and director of the drama and also

worked with one group. Margaret worked with groups in turn. For a final activity back in the circle individuals were asked to think of things they would take on the journey in 'freshly painted and caulked ships'. Jatinder was fully involved and wanted to answer everything. In fact he got annoyed when, as is the nature of drama, he had to respond to other pupils rather than having attention specifically focused on him by the teachers.

By the next drama lesson the class had made masks and were wearing them. It was somewhat difficult to get pupils to retell the story as their character straight away. They needed to retell the story generally first. Nevertheless they did a warm-up of retelling the story so far from the point of view of their character to a partner, and then divided into groups of chroniclers who had to make a record of the journey from the Great Hall to Grendel's cave. The groups had to make a map from the description in the 'chronicle' i.e. Dragonslayer. Again I acted as timekeeper and director of the drama. Margaret worked with different groups. I worked with the group Jatinder was in. There were words in the description the others understood straight away e.g. shingle and moorland, which he did not. He seemed defensive about his lack of experience of the countryside. Again he seemed to resent working in a group with only a small number of pupils as audience rather than being called upon by the teacher. The other members of the group gave him meanings. Most groups found out a way of working e.g. they shared out the reading in turn or one person read, one person wrote. But on reflection there was too much reading. Everyone got the idea of using the maps to make games for their grandchildren to show Beowulf's journey. But there was not enough time in the Drama session for the pupils to make cardboard characters and fortune cards. Margaret picked up this idea later and the games were made. In light of this session I noted that Jatinder needed to be guided in tasks that were currently outside his experience. He would be able to learn e.g. new vocabulary from the group and he would benefit from an active approach to reading in class if he could contribute in other ways. Drawing on the idea of quadrants devised by Cummins (Cummins and Swain 1986 p.153) I noted that Jatinder would be able to cope with more difficult reading tasks if they were related to stories and books

that were closer to his experience. Likewise with difficult texts the tasks had to be very easy.

In Science I started off the lesson on breathing with pair work on why breathing is so important. Lesley then took the whole class through a diagram showing how breathing works. I talked to the class about the slogans for 'No Smoking Week' and then divided the class into groups. I asked half the groups to think about reasons for not smoking and how they would stop others smoking. The other groups had to consider reasons for smoking and how to encourage smoking. Everyone had Health Education Council booklets to refer to. The groups on each side then got together and put all the ideas together. Then they chose a spokesperson and put forward an idea on each side in turn. The whole class then watched a demonstration, with test tubes and cotton wool in lieu of lungs, of what happens when you smoke. The groups were involved in the activities and certainly knew more about how breathing works than I did, but they put forward very few ideas for reasons for smoking, or not smoking. They were certainly all fascinated by the demonstration. I only made one note about Vu. That was that he was made spokesperson for his group and carried out that task effectively. The other notes were about how the session had gone generally. The pupils had not been used to random pairings in Science and some pupils in larger groups did all the work. They would need more staging of group work. Some pupils had already learnt about breathing in junior school and were repeating the topic, this time at break neck speed. It was hard to establish whether those pupils that had not covered breathing before took the ideas on board.

The next Science session was on hearing. I started with a tape of school sounds and asked the whole class to write down in rough what they could hear. I then asked them to play a game of 'Chinese whispers'. I made the point that ears were very important but not everything. They had used experience to understand the tape. I then asked them to design a test to check hearing. Lesley then added an unplanned test that she knew to check the differences using one or two ears. Lesley talked the class through a model of how the ear works and then the technician showed the whole class a demonstration about how sound waves work.

I had planned a jigsaw activity on animals' hearing but there was no time for this, and so I left the materials with Lesley.

How effective was this session and my observation of it? I did not make any notes at all on Vu. I had aimed to build in language aspects through collaborative work, and I had started with talking, but was not able to carry this through to written work. The workbooks used provided the opportunity for supportive short reading/writing tasks e.g. matching, completion, but even these needed to be discussed together so that principles could be understood. There was no chance to develop extended reading, writing tasks. The amount of talking we did was clearly a luxury, as we discussed questions which would not come up in assessment tasks, and left us short of time for written work. I wondered why we had to move through the syllabus at such speed when there was so little time to develop language use within the scheme of work. On reflection however, it seemed Vu could cope extremely well with the current demands made on him in Science. The question remained; would he be able to realize his full potential? When he moved higher up the school where the demands were greater would he have developed ability to express himself in Science as well as understand the concepts?

### 5.17. Collaborative teaching sessions-Morrison

In Morrison I shall describe the first and second Heartstone lessons which were repeated with all three classes. In a circle pupils had to say one thing they knew about mice and then one thing about astronomy. I then told the pupils they would be asked to retell the story and read Chapter 1 to them. They then did retell the story to each other in pairs, half a chapter each. Then I mentioned that Chandra had had a very precious thing destroyed, her opportunity to dance. I asked the class in groups to think of a very precious thing to them that they would not like destroyed. They then chose one precious thing for each group and made a 'still picture' of the precious thing being destroyed. Some of the groups chose people and one group depicted one of the group's uncle who was at that time fighting in the Gulf War. I acted as journalist and asked the groups questions about their roles. The still pictures brought out strong feelings. In the debriefing

Lesley asked them how they had felt about being asked to do drama and the pupils talked about the feelings they had had. The bilingual pupils; Nazrine, Imran and Sukhjinder, already referred to, were involved in the re-telling, the group discussion and composing the 'still picture'. Sukhjinder said he had heard the story from a cousin "up there" (in ?Rowan). It was clear when he talked about the story in the small group that he had understood the story line. He knew that baddies had cancelled the show. He said that he had done Bhangra dancing-he had been able to bring his experience to the story-but would be shy about showing people. He was keen to say that his Mum wore a sari sometimes. Nazrine was keen to follow up on the dance aspects of the story.

In the second session the class was asked to recall their predictions about what would happen next, listen to the second chapter, and make dance gestures e.g. for moon, stars, mice. They also had to mark places mentioned in the story on maps of the world. Imran was able to draw on his dance experience and produced exquisite gestures.

### 5.18. Feedback

During feedback with both Walker teachers and the Morrison teachers I used notes with the categories I had used for observation during shadowing the previous year as the basis for discussion on the individual pupils (see Section 4.4). These were support from pupils, support from teacher, and language use. I let both teachers have the notes (Appendix 5.4) I had written on the collaborative teaching-these were not categorized in any particular format- and also asked them what they saw as the aims of working together, what they thought the outcomes were for them and for the school, whether a teacher could have come in and shadowed bilingual pupils/team teach without the project having taken place, and what they could comment on for the future. I wanted to assess what if anything had been taken on board from the shadowing recommendations, but also check their perceptions of the potential of collaborative support for bilingual learners. As indicated earlier (see Section 5.11) I was looking to see if collaboration between specialist and class/subject teacher was an effective way of meeting needs of bilingual pupils and working with teachers of isolated bilingual pupils.

At Walker we did not discuss Jatinder at the feedback session as we had talked about him a lot 'on the run'. Margaret felt that planning was needed for further collaborative teaching; that it would not automatically work with all teachers. Some teachers in the school still felt threatened by others in the class. She was keen on the idea of collaborative teaching, but felt that it needed longer to work. We had not had time to teach properly in the sense of sharing every aspect of a series of lessons e.g discipline, homework as well as planning, evaluating. She would have liked to start the experience again, knowing it might have been possible to teach collaboratively from the beginning. The collaborative teaching had made her stop and think about her teaching. In particular she had rethought ideas about structuring classes, and accessibility of concepts. She had also realized that the school did not have a multicultural policy that was working for her (some of the sessions incorporated multicultural aspects which we discussed). On the negative side she had felt her own lack of knowledge about bilingual learners and felt she wanted to know more. She felt the whole process had raised awareness of issues to do with bilingual learners for her.

Lesley agreed with what I had said in the notes. Again we did not talk specifically about Vu in detail. She laughed at the bit about me not understanding the scientific principles, as she had just started teaching Science recently in a bid to shift eventually from her P.E. specialism. When I asked her what she thought the aims of the collaborative teaching had been she felt it was a chance to share, although not necessarily about Vu or language. She was very aware of me shadowing Vu, concentrating on him and then conscious of herself perhaps concentrating on everyone but him. She felt when asked about outcomes that she was much more aware of the potential of grouping pupils in different ways in class i.e. in groups other than friendship groups to facilitate talk. When I asked her if teachers could come in and shadow/team teach without the prior work of the project, she commented that there was no problem me coming in as the pupils were used to teachers being in and out although she felt that this had not always been the case. She felt the climate in school was generally more favourable to lots of people, e.g. parents, coming in since the present head had started (September 1987). In addition special needs provision had gradually changed to in-class

support. Nevertheless she would need pre-warning of how we were going to work and why. This did not really answer my question. It dealt with the aspect of two teachers, but not of two teachers offering different skills. She did not feel she knew anything about the project beforehand and that my resume for the management meeting (Appendix 5.5) put things in perspective for her. She felt a future report on the collaborative teaching for the management committee would be very useful.

I had half an hour with Stephanie and Lucy at Walker. I asked them what they felt the aims had been,and what they thought the outcomes of the work were. We only touched on plans for the future and did not talk about individual pupils. They felt that my notes (Appendix 5.6) were an accurate account of what had happened. Both felt the aims had been in the area of multicultural education/tackling racism. Lucy felt that we had been trying to deal with racism in an overall way rather than dealing with particular incidents. Stephanie felt that the aim was for teachers and pupils to realize that multicultural issues were wider than a part of Religious Education (R.E.); that multicultural education was for everyone, not just "those children" i.e. ethnic minority children. She felt that the aim was to draw on children's experience "on a level of normality".

They felt that they had been shown a different way of structuring multicultural education i.e. not direct questions such as "oh you're different, what's that you're wearing?" but that through the story children had volunteered information about themselves that did not put them on the spot. They could not carry the work on Heartstone forward however as they felt the book was too difficult for the pupils. I checked that they did not feel this way because they did not, later on, have the extra support i.e. for the small group writing sessions based on the story that I had provided. They felt the book was excellent; it pulled no punches. The pupils were also enthusiastic; they looked forward to the sessions. They felt that the children understood the storyline but that there were just too many words and complex themes running through, so that once the children lost concentration it was very hard to get them back again. They wanted a children's version or a precis. Lucy had got to Chapter 8 but Stephanie had run out of time after Chapter 4. Anne had also got to Chapter 4. Another factor was that for

Stephanie and Anne, using the book had been added on to their detailed planning for the term, whereas Lucy had planned it integrally from the start.

Both Lucy and Stephanie however had begun to tackle issues of racism. Lucy had found that the children had wanted to talk about people who wore badges i.e. National Front and Nazism, and how such movements grew from a small start. She was able to talk with the pupils about what they could do e.g. make friends in the playground. Stephanie felt that all the pupils had felt that racism was "a bad thing" but did not get on to why it happens. It was clear that the class had discussed what emerged as the theme for each chapter. When name calling came up the pupils were able to talk about the things they had heard other people say and give examples of being called names e.g. 'because you're Irish'. She had done an assembly on name calling and felt that it had made children in the school think about it. She was not sure that it had had a long-term effect and could not say whether the sense of unity built up in her class was a result of a year's work or the Heartstone project. They asked me to find a junior version that could be fitted into the two year planning cycle for Years 5 and 6. I have spent a considerable time discussing reactions to the book because this was my choice of material. The teachers agreed to take part in work on it with me but that was quite different from me taking specific bits of their programme. I was interested to see that their reactions to the work were very much to do with multicultural/antiracist aspects which had been indirectly one of the recommendations-I had suggested the school tackle racist name calling. But as with development within the early stages of the project this focus perhaps diverted us from looking closely at how bilingual pupils had been supported in language and learning development.

As regards teaching these teachers did not feel that we had really taught collaboratively. They felt that I had come in and done sessions for them without being involved in the year planning. They had been working towards group discussions and felt that the Year 6 pupils could cope whereas the Year 5 pupils found it difficult. Those who were able to understand the ideas and language of the book had got most out of it; those who were not able to cope with ideas and language and were not able to concentrate were the ones who perhaps needed it

most. Perhaps they still felt that individual support for bilingual pupils was what was needed although this was not expressed. Yet they found that my organization e.g. laying down the ground rules for discussion, had had a positive knock on effect into other areas. And in fact Lucy had been involved in planning for individual sessions and had played a very active role in the discussion about feelings, a role that I would have found extremely difficult on a first session.

For the future they felt that willingness to carry out collaborative teaching was in place although it would be crucial for the specialist teacher to be involved in the planning. They felt that if the school was already concerned it would be possible to develop a series of sessions as we had done. If the school was not concerned a lot more groundwork would be needed. They felt that the year team structure-joint planning and support amongst the Year 5 and 6 teachers- was crucial e.g. for the probationer who they felt would need back-up if tricky racist issues emerged. They still felt they needed to work with a specialist teacher within the Year 5/6 structure to draw on the experience of bilingual learners 'normally' and to develop the language skills of bilingual learners. We did not have time to talk about language development and particularly assessment of language development.

The emphasis on multicultural work in the feedback was a surprise. The 'awareness of different things pupils bring to school' aspect had been highlighted as opposed to the environmental or language aspect. It may have been because we did not have time to discuss the other aspects. It may have been that the content of the story overshadowed the language development involved. I am still confident that Heartstone is an excellent vehicle for supporting the language development of bilingual learners within a context of trying to tackle racism without putting bilingual learners on the spot. It is particularly useful when you have a limited 'slot' and many items on the agenda. It certainly proved a valuable tool in discussion with the teachers. Perhaps to ensure that we were able to discuss support for bilingual learners I should have chosen to work on tasks that the teachers had chosen themselves.

In both schools teachers thought about classroom organization and groupings. Two of the teachers had carried on using different ways of organizing

the class since my sessions. Using Heartstone at Morrison had helped provide an example of solving the tension between multicultural education for everyone, and support for the bilingual pupils in the sense of drawing on pupils' experience, as their experience had 'come out' naturally in the context of discussion about the story. But having given up the story because it was too difficult, it was very difficult for the teachers to say whether there were other vehicles that they would be able to use to allow bilingual pupils to develop language, and draw on their experience at the same time as tackling the issues of racism with the rest of the class. It is obviously more difficult without an integrated topic, and I do not feel that this tension had been solved in Margaret's class e.g. one unused opportunity had presented itself when the class were discussing the illustrations in Dragonslayer. Jatinder in fact pointed out that the hero was illustrated in colour on the cover as a white person when the class had been describing the black monster illustrated inside as 'angry, scary' etc. This could have provided a moment to consider why heroes were portrayed as white and monsters as black. Margaret was worried about 'too many' positive black images being used in an 'all white' school at once but she was willing to incorporate them in future. Likewise the Morrison staff were keen to build in anti-racist aspects when they started to plan the next projects. In Morrison in fact it appeared that the multicultural issues had been the main aim. This may have appeared so because there was not enough time to discuss language issues in the feedback session. I am aware that we did not discuss, at either school, demands of tasks, use of L1,visuals, drafting-the actual support strategies I had said we would look at.

### 5.19. Findings from shadowing bilingual learners

As a result of the shadowing in Walker and Morrison it was clear to me that pupils in classes where I subsequently worked were fully involved in classes. They had the opportunity to gain support from adults. In fact in Jatinder's case at Walker he perhaps had more support from adults than other members of the class. It may be the case that teachers single out bilingual learners particularly because they are different. In Sukhjinder's case at Morrison the adult support was in the form of EP, SNA and class teacher concern. All the pupils shadowed were

able to gain support from peers in group and pair work. The two secondary pupils were able to cope for the most part with all language demands of tasks. There was no particular reference by teachers to National Curriculum attainment targets. There was still no opportunity for pupils to use their first language in class. I did not find out about any more developments in record keeping and the PLR had not been taken up. Socially the two secondary pupils appeared well integrated in class. I recommended that Sukhjinder at Morrison be involved in more paired literacy development work. It is hard to say why the bilingual learners were better catered for in 1992 than in 1991. Most of the pupils and teachers were different. Certainly the recommendations about one pupil I had shadowed in both years, Vinod, did not appear to have been taken up. He appeared to be less involved in Year 8 than he had been in Year 7. However this impression may have reflected a change in Vinod's attitude to school that would have happened regardless of the recommendations.

### 5.20. Findings from collaborative teaching

It was possible to plan collaborative teaching in all cases. At Walker we planned initially in teachers' 'free' time which they said they would take later in lieu at a later stage. Then we planned 'on the run' at the end of lessons. At Morrison we planned initially in Lucy's 'lunch hour' when I was shadowing and then 'on the run' while the pupils were watching TV.

A variety of approaches were planned; myself as lead teacher with subject teacher supporting group work (drama at Walker); myself alternating as lead teacher with the other teacher supporting and vice versa (science at Walker); myself as lead teacher and supporting group work (drama at Morrison). The planning was vital in order to plan a focus on language, groupings and materials.

It was possible to use the same categories that I had used for shadowing to assess the outcomes for bilingual pupils. I also looked to see if strategies I had suggested to teachers before the collaborative teaching (see Section 5.15) had been employed. All bilingual pupils were involved in lessons taught collaboratively. I felt that in the case of pupils at Morrison more than they would have been in other whole class discussion. For instance the work on Heartstone

Odyssey Chapter 2 allowed Imran to demonstrate dance gestures to the whole class. Sukhjinder was also clearly keen to participate in small group literacy work on Heartstone. The two pupils at Walker were not necessarily involved more in lessons as they were already fully active. In fact Jatinder had to cope with giving less input to the whole class and found small group work difficult.

All pupils gained support from adults. Work had been planned to allow the teacher who was not the lead teacher to work with groups at Walker and at Morrison. All pupils gained support from peers. Opportunities for pair and group work were built in. Some of the specific support strategies discussed with teachers beforehand were employed. I provided extra visuals e.g. maps for Heartstone work and drew attention to existing visuals e.g. in Heartstone and Dragonslayer. The pupils responded well to this support. Sukhjinder used the Heartstone illustration to talk about his mother. There were opportunities for drafting e.g. in small group re-writing of the Heartstone story. This gave the bilingual learners at Morrison the opportunity to link writing with oral work. There was no chance to use L1. There were opportunities to review work in the group work and in whole class feedbacks. These gave the bilingual learners the opportunity to review language used. Which National Curriculum attainment targets were being covered was not discussed. Nor was it possible for me to feed into the teachers' records of teacher assessment. I did not use the PLR. My observations on the pupils were fed back to the teachers alongside my reflections on the collaborative teaching.

### 5.21. Reflection on collaborative teaching

The focus of this part of the development project was on schools, two this time, and the emphasis was on bilingual learners in the classroom. The key focus had been to provide continuity between the work of the project and Section 11 funding. It was possible to work on the first aim, to support individual bilingual learners in collaboration with class/subject teachers. It was possible to think through what the next step in collaborative work at Morrison would be i.e. involvement in planning, would be.

However it was not possible during this brief period of contact to record achievement and assess bilingual pupils formally. Ideally once collaboration was in

place it would be possible for one teacher to focus specifically on observation during class. Without recording of achievement it is difficult to establish how effectively isolated bilingual pupils were able to learn language and curriculum content during the sessions. But as with shadowing I feel that assessment has to be an inbuilt part of school requirements and Inspectors' concerns. I do not feel that, at either school, assessment was yet an integral part of the planning and teaching process for any pupils. It was difficult to establish what progress individual pupils had made in the very short time available. It is arguable however that even if the mechanisms were in place it would have been difficult for the teachers, without more knowledge about development of bilingual learners, to make focused observations.

It was not feasible to carry out action research on the 'implications of introduction of mixed ability groupings in some subjects in Walker in the first year'. Perhaps this was too ambitious an aim in any event, but I would have been particularly keen to see how bilingual learners who would have been placed in special educational needs classes the previous year were supported in mixed ability classes. Until English went mixed ability however the gatekeeping potential of English (see Section 1.8) would have remained. Discussions about Jatinder moving up or down a group in English might well take on lesser significance than discussions about how his language might best develop in the situation he was in. Nevertheless it was possible to note how Vu for instance fared in both mixed ability and streamed situations. What is impossible to ascertain is whether there would have been the opportunity for him to discuss e.g. types of humour in small groups in English if the class had been mixed ability, which he missed out on in the streamed class. I would argue that there might have been less whole class discussion; whole class discussion with Vu able to follow but less able to contribute from his own experience. If he was held back in mixed ability science this may have been to do with the fact that some pupils were covering topics that they had already covered in Year 6 at their previous school because topics covered in Year 6 were not standard in different feeder schools.

## 5.22. Factors contributing to support for bilingual learners

What were the factors that now made it possible to support individual bilingual learners in collaboration with teachers? Both schools had shifted their policy in terms of access to specialists since I shadowed the previous year. Walker's special educational needs team was now working in mainstream classrooms and Morrison's Year 5/6 team, Lucy, Stephanie and Anne the class teachers, were comfortable about planning together. How much the ease with which it was possible to work alongside the teachers in relation to meeting the needs of bilingual learners was due to such changes within the schools is impossible to say. How much was due to the previous work of the project is also impossible to say. In the case of Lesley at Walker, the existence of the project made no difference as she had not heard of it! The support from the heads, the much clearer focus on bilingual learners right from the beginning, familiarity with me in the schools, willingness on my part to fit in with and teach what was already on the agenda at Walker, perhaps willingness to start off with shadowing rather than collaborative teaching, must all I feel have made the collaborative teaching easier to accept.

What became apparent from all the feedback sessions however was the need for joint planning time. In the Morrison teachers' case they felt that the teachers needed to be already aware of issues for the team teaching to work;if not aware, the teachers would need to have their awareness raised. It was not possible to ask whether the project had, in their view, raised the concerns for them. All would have wanted more time to develop particular aspects. In fact Lucy assumed I still had an involvement when she asked me to look out for a junior version of Heartstone at the feedback meeting. I would also add to the need for joint planning time the need for reflection time. In half an hour, because they knew they would be asked to reflect at some point, two class teachers had addressed collaborative teaching, support for bilingual learners, classroom organization, anti-racist work including assemblies and support for probationary teachers , and had commissioned an ideal anti-racist book for juniors in their heads!

The joint reflection process itself seemed easier in relation to collaborative teaching than to shadowing. It was no easier physically to fit the time in. In both cases time had been agreed beforehand but in both cases I had to insist and there was quite a lot of juggling of time. What made the difference? I am sure it was action. Even though I was not sharing all aspects of English sessions with Margaret, she was involved because I was lead teacher for two Drama classes. I was lead teacher for part of Lesley's Science classes and the lead teacher for the main part of the Heartstone sessions at Morrison. There was far more of a vested interest in observing what was going on. There was more opportunity to observe the pupils. There was perhaps more commitment to share in the reflection process with me as I had shared in the teaching with them. Nevertheless had we had to produce joint assessment notes or a report to staff I am sure that the engagement would have been more serious.

There was little tension in terms of research questions. There was no request from teachers for a different direction within the development project. This was definitely the last amount of funding. The lack of questioning may have had less to do with desire to control the project in a particular way than with the distraction of increasing pressure on the schools to implement the National Curriculum. But it may also have reflected confidence in the preceding work. Whatever the reason, I felt that my aims and those of the schools were more closely matched in this final stage of the project.

### 5.23. Factors hindering the support of bilingual pupils

What were the factors hindering the development of supporting isolated bilingual learners in collaboration with teachers?

Although I was a paid specialist and had agreement from the schools for the subject teachers to claim for liaison time I was still an outsider working in the schools for a phenomenally short time. We were able to liaise on specific lessons but not on building in support for bilingual learners into termly planning.

The opportunity to contribute to teacher assessment was missed. As mentioned above I am sure that there would have been more involvement on the part of the teachers if we had jointly recorded teacher assessments. I am sure

that use of a good profiling system e.g. the Primary Language or Learning Record would have had a washback effect on classroom practice.

The choice of text to use at Morrison may well have blocked reflection on language development with the Morrison staff because the discussion centred on multicultural, anti-racist concerns. Given Morrison's emphasis on multicultural rather than language development aspects in the early stages of the development project, it may have been a particularly inappropriate choice on my part. Nevertheless there is no evidence that it was any easier to talk about language development of particular bilingual pupils at Walker where the topic was not chosen by me, either in Science or in English. Admittedly, I did introduce cross cultural elements here, where perhaps none were going to be highlighted, thus also perhaps making an inappropriate introduction. It had been clear that Morrison staff did want to work on 'drawing on children's experience' and perhaps it would have been better, in these circumstances, to choose a book that did not portray Indian culture in an exotic way. However the tension between supporting individual bilingual pupils and promoting multiculturalism apparent in the early stages of the project was not resolved.

## 5.24. Conclusion

In terms of vehicles for a development project, collaborative teaching worked out better than producing a pack or shadowing had done. It was possible to support individual isolated bilingual pupils in collaboration with class/subject teachers, albeit for an extremely short time e.g. by paying attention to opportunities to rehearse language orally, by providing active reading tasks, and by choosing material that allowed pupils to bring their own experience but not be put on the spot. It was easier to involve the teachers in discussions about support for isolated bilingual pupils in contexts that the class teacher and the specialist had had more equal shares in, rather than in a situation where it would be possible to ignore recommendations or choose not to read the pack. Thus the tension between supporting bilingual pupils and working with mainstream teachers was reduced. But it was not possible to follow up the collaborative teaching and re-address the outcomes for pupils and teachers after July 1991. By the time we

reflected on the Heartstone work the Year 5/6 teachers had put some of the practical suggestions, such as thought about groupings and how to develop anti-racist work, into practice. That immediate practical teaching strategies got taken up was not a surprise. Lucy had said when asked if the 1990 shadowing recommendations had been taken up that she felt that, in the same way as with advisory teachers coming in, the practical teaching strategies had got taken up. I am hopeful that there will be a 'longer lasting' outcome from the work we did than from the shadowing recommendations.

I suspect that more time was needed to move on bilingual development. There had been no discussion about valuing bilingual learners' first languages in the time I was working collaboratively with the teachers, though we were able to tackle aspects of bi-cultural development through the Heartstone work.

In all the mainstream situations I felt confident that with time the isolated bilingual pupils would not be submersed, and in the meantime they would be able to learn English and curriculum content. But I felt now, partly as a result of difficulties teachers had had in taking on support for bilingual learners in other aspects of the project and partly as a result of the collaborative experience, that a specialist teacher was needed. I did not think that the other ways of getting mainstream teachers to take responsibility worked. I felt that a specialist teacher could work with mainstream teachers over a longer period, to ensure that the isolated bilingual pupils were supported, and that teachers were confident themselves of supporting them.

Having worked through different vehicles I must conclude that the role of the specialist teacher has to be one of collaborating, either in teaching or in assessment or preferably in both. Willingness to work with pupils on an individual basis will not shift responsibility to class/subject teachers. General willingness to work with teachers, e.g. in supporting their own action research so that they find out the needs of isolated bilingual pupils and act on them, will not generate results if they do not perceive that there is a 'problem'. Even without an action research focus in mind, willingness to give information to class/subject teachers about supporting bilingual learners will not generate results unless the teachers are engaged with the issues. Even then there is no guarantee that

practice will be altered as a result of information about support. Willingness to observe and share observations will not involve them enough.

If collaboration between specialist teacher and mainstream teacher that shifts responsibility is the way forward for isolated bilingual pupils as well as for bilingual pupils in areas with larger numbers, the question remains why it was not possible to implement right at the beginning of this development project. As mentioned above, Lesley had not known about the project before and yet was quite happy to collaborate straight away. However several preconditions seem vital. Walker as mentioned earlier had started to implement mainstream support over the three years in the area of special educational needs and so many teachers,though not all, were more comfortable with other teachers working with them. My offers to work alongside teachers in classes in the first year of the project were not taken up in any school. Schools need to be able to see the presence of bilingual learners as a distinctive issue, not as pupils who will either cope in English and therefore do not need specific support in classes/subjects or as pupils who need special educational needs provision to learn English and therefore gain access to mainstream. I am not sure how much the early work of the project and the diversion into multicultural education actually helped and I am not at all convinced that the schools have taken provision for bilingual learners on board as principle as opposed to problem, but certainly there was growing awareness over time of a need to think about bilingual pupils. Pragmatically, of course, the tightening up of special educational needs funding did also mean that schools had to think very carefully about who they could support with special educational needs money.

I found that teachers were not involved enough with bilingual learners to take action research on board themselves. Schools probably also need to have one 'line' on bilingual pupils at least initially with new arrivals until some teachers have the baseline principles sorted out and are confident to do action research. Because of the need for bilingual learners to learn everything that everyone else learns in school (see Section 1.9) this line should be that isolated bilingual learners should be in mainstream classes, that lack of English should not be a bar to subjects, and that English should be learnt through curriculum content. Specialist teachers

should concentrate on analyzing the demands of tasks with teachers and providing appropriate support. They should also be integrally involved in planning, assessing and reflecting.

I was not able to reflect on bilingual development in this part of the project. It seems unlikely that schools with isolated bilingual learners will be able to provide bilingual education but need to be able to encourage their isolated bilingual pupils to develop bilingually themselves and need to take their biculturalism on board in a 'normal' way. It is these preconditions that the specialist teacher needs to work on if they do not already exist. But the reflection on the project has shown that collaboration with mainstream teachers is probably even more important in isolated situations because investment in one or two pupils is likely to be rare. Therefore the specialist teacher has to deal with the preconditions as well as collaboration right from the beginning.

It is important that the specialists should understand that their role is to help teachers take responsibility for bilingual learners and the importance of collaboration in this process. It is vital therefore that the baseline training for specialists should be setting up collaborative situations as well as analysis of tasks, matching demands of tasks to skills and experience of pupils, and providing types of support for even one pupil.

This of course means that specialist teachers are needed in areas where there are isolated bilingual pupils, not to support individuals but to work with their teachers. In some ways the collaborative teaching within the development project approximated to Partnership Teaching. Certainly the schools knew how I was working with staff and arranged cover for liaison. The next step would be to ensure that findings were disseminated and that future provision was centrally incorporated into the school development plan. The Section 11 bid I submitted in June 1990 was for two teachers and bilingual assistance for one pyramid. The Section 11 project that started in April 1992 was for one and a share of a teacher and one full time equivalent (FTE) bilingual assistant for a whole division. The questions about whether all the isolated bilingual pupils could be covered remained. The teachers would have a lot of collaborating to do.

# Chapter 6

# EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR ISOLATED BILINGUAL LEARNERS: FUTURE POSSIBILITIES.

## 6.1. Introduction-summary of research aims

In this final chapter I intend to emphasise important conclusions from the research on provision for isolated bilingual learners, identify general principles which have implications for other teachers and consider how the implications of these principles could be carried out in practice.

In the Home Office's Section 11 Grant Proposals of 1990 the aims were to give "school age children whose mother tongue is not English a command of English which, as far as possible, is equal to that of their peers" and "to help school age children from ethnic minorities to achieve at the same level as their peers in all areas of the curriculum" (Home Office 1990a p. 15). I hoped at the beginning of the research that I would be able to find isolated bilingual pupils who had their needs catered for as a matter of course. This would indicate that teachers had worked with isolated bilingual learners to develop both English and learning of curriculum subjects. As the Swann Committee had said the ideal would be to develop the expertise in the schools (DES 1985 p. 395). And if isolated bilingual learners turned out to be submersed; either assimilated with their language and culture marginalized or considered to have difficulties in learning English and therefore treated as learners with special educational needs again with culture and language marginalized, I wanted to reflect on the lessons to be learnt from a development project which aimed to work with teachers to meet the needs of their isolated bilingual learners within a "curriculum framework common to all pupils" (Bourne 1989 p.9). I wanted to consider whether it was possible for schools with isolated bilingual pupils to provide education that moved away from a submersion model towards one that consciously supported learning of bilingual pupils i.e. through providing 'hospitable' mainstream classrooms, that recognized pupils' linguistic and cultural diversity. Bourne had found that hospitable classrooms existed in theory rather than in practice across a range of local education authorities (see Section 1.8). I showed in Chapter 2 that there had been a shift in training for teachers of bilingual pupils; that ideas about school-based INSET and classroom research had been taken up in areas with substantial numbers of bilingual learners. I wanted to consider whether Levine's thinking about teacher education was applicable in the scattered situation and would assist

in the implementation of conscious support for learning. Levine argues that "We all learn best when the learning takes place according to our needs and interests and the external demands of the situation" (Levine 1985 p.146).

The Swann Committee had come to the conclusion that

> "the area of in-service provision with the greatest potential for influencing the largest number of teachers in the most immediate and practical sense is without doubt the wide range of school-based and school-focused activities which have developed in recent years" (DES 1985 p.584).

Would it in fact be possible to implement school-focused activities in schools with isolated bilingual learners?

At a time of frantic change nationally in education the stop-start three year development project as it evolved appears to have been ineffective on its own. The directions taken did not contribute to meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners across the board. Submersion was the reality for isolated bilingual learners in participating schools. They were expected to learn in English. Their culture was not taken on board readily in school. If they could not cope with English, without English as a Second Language teaching, any specialist provision was as for pupils with special educational needs on the assumption that bilingual pupils could not start learning without basic English. This situation had not shifted much by the end of the project. Elements of good practice (such as development of language related to the topic (see Sections 4.9-4.11), collaborative pair and group work (see Sections 5.14, 5.16, 5.17), drawing on children's experience without putting them on the spot (see Section 5.17)) identified during the shadowing and collaborative phases were not, to my knowledge, disseminated further than the teachers and heads involved. I was able to value individual pupils' bilingual and bicultural skills e.g. by showing that I was interested enough in Asian languages to have learnt some Panjabi (see Appendix 4.4), but did not feel that there had been an increase in valuing of these skills by the schools.

However when the outcomes of the project are looked at alongside concurrent changes it is possible to draw out implications for future work in the area of provision for isolated bilingual learners.

## 6.2. Key outcomes

Firstly attention within the development project to multicultural education as an issue did not mean that provision for isolated bilingual learners improved. Tensions that existed between multicultural education and meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners at the beginning of the project (see Section 3.6) were not resolved. Anti-racist initiatives in schools that reflected on the impact of anti-racist policy development on isolated bilingual learners themselves were not attempted.

Secondly changes in school provision for pupils with special educational needs were a more significant determiner of changed provision for isolated bilingual learners than focus on isolated bilingual learners themselves. Although it was of crucial importance that isolated bilingual learners should not be assumed to have learning difficulties, the status afforded to learning support departments meant that when learning support teachers started working in mainstream classes and were accepted by teachers it paved the way for the ESL specialist to begin to work in mainstream classes too.

Thirdly it is important to reiterate that in the secondary school I was not able to work with learners who would have been placed in a low stream the previous year before the introduction of mixed ability in some subjects. Nevertheless the fact that mixed ability groupings were being introduced was symbolically important within the project. I saw it as an important marker of change for bilingual pupils.

Fourthly the difficulty in asking class and subject teachers to do action research on classroom strategies for supporting isolated bilingual learners should not be underestimated. Class and subject teachers wanted immediate support for isolated bilingual learners, particularly new arrivals. There was no reason for them to invest in finding out the most useful approaches for themselves because of the history of isolated bilingual learners either achieving by themselves without support or of being given special educational needs help.

Fifthly, following on from the point above, there appeared to be a continued role for specialist teachers. It might be hoped, and certainly the Home Office's funding was aimed at enabling schools to "embed new practice into

mainstream provision" (Home Office 1990a p.18), that schools would meet the needs of isolated bilingual learners themselves and thus save on e.g. travel, training etc. I would now argue that schools with isolated bilingual pupils had not by the start of the project catered fully for the needs of isolated bilingual learners and without specialist provision might well revert to submersion. Provision for isolated bilingual learners I concluded was not an area that could be dealt with without specialist input. As specialist ESL teacher, working in collaboration with class and subject teachers (see Sections 5.16, 5.17), I was able to implement active language development tasks in relation to the topic. I was able to suggest resources that enabled pupils to draw on their knowledge without being put on the spot in relation to their home background. I was also able to point out occasions when the teacher could use opportunities to develop an anti-racist stance in the context of ongoing rather than specifically planned anti-racist work. I was able to demonstrate the advantages of collaborative group work which enabled the bilingual learners to hear models of English language use and to contribute from their perspective. I was able to work in both primary and secondary situations and therefore to bring a longitudinal view of the development of bilingual learners to primary topic and secondary departmental scheme planning. I was able to suggest a type of teacher assessment that would be appropriate for all primary learners because it included bilingual learners centrally. I am not saying that class or subject teachers did not have or could not obtain these skills. But it was because I was a specialist teacher with these skills at my finger tips, rather than any other teacher that the collaboration was so fruitful.

Sixthly various staff development project vehicles were tried out within the project. The one with the most potential for involving teachers in reflecting on practice in relation to meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners was collaborative teaching. I concluded that collaborative teaching was even more important in an isolated situation than in an area with larger numbers because the class/subject teachers' intrinsic investment in one pupil in a class, as shown by the difficulties in getting action research off the ground, was likely to be lower. An emphasis on collaborative teaching would obviate the need for 'separate' training on meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners. Despite attempts to

experiment with the use of the Primary Language Record (PLR), an emphasis on collaborative assessment within the collaborative teaching was not possible within the development project because the initiative was suggested before class/subject teachers had to tackle National Curriculum teacher assessment. It would be useful to carry out research on whether collaborative assessment provided particular motivation and backwash to the curriculum in schools with isolated bilingual learners.

Finally working with schools within a pyramid was, on balance, helpful. It was difficult accommodating the needs of schools without bilingual learners within the development project. Nevertheless when one school did admit bilingual learners during the project staff had already been involved in aspects of the project and were more receptive to e.g. shadowing subsequently. In addition when it came to submitting a Section 11 bid I was confident that two people, one head and one deputy, checking the bid were representative of the pyramid. Finally the teachers themselves clearly felt they benefitted from being able to discuss individual pupils with teachers from the other schools.

## 6.3. General principles

What are the general principles that can be deduced from the research? My research has shown that the isolated bilingual learners in my study had not yet 'moved into the mainstream' by 1991; every teacher was not a teacher of language. Despite their inclusion centrally in National Curriculum and therefore in mainstream classes in theory, there needs to be sustained consideration given to provision for isolated bilingual learners. At a time when schools are expected to meet most of the needs of all pupils themselves and support services are not being encouraged by the government it is crucial to realize that the embedding of good practice in mainstream classrooms does not happen automatically. It requires recognition by teachers in schools that isolated bilingual pupils can learn curriculum content without having to have passed a particular threshold in English. It requires accessing isolated bilingual pupils to specialists who work with class or subject teachers to teach language through learning. Being taught subjects in first language is unrealistic for pragmatic reasons but pupils can use their first language

in e.g. drafting and can receive bilingual assistance even in isolated situations. Encouragement of first language in situations outside school and helping isolated bilingual learners so that they do not have to assimilate completely to succeed in subject areas is important for an emphasis on learning as well as their own bilingual and bicultural development.

Out of the range of initiatives within the development project the initiative with most potential for meeting the needs of isolated bilingual learners and meeting staff development needs to cater for the needs of isolated bilingual learners was collaborative teaching. Collaborative teaching was the initiative that was taken seriously by teachers in schools. Collaborative teaching rather than shadowing by an 'outsider' was the situation on which they were prepared to reflect. At the start of the development project in 1988 NFER's 'Partnership Teaching' pack (NFER 1991) had not been published or publicised. However in this study I have, in effect, begun to evaluate 'Partnership Teaching' from the perspective of its usefulness in areas with isolated bilingual learners. Partnership teaching which builds collaborative teaching into a whole school development plan and enables good practice to be disseminated needs to be actively promoted and supported in areas with isolated bilingual learners as well as areas with larger numbers.

However Partnership teaching programmes cannot rely on any two teachers working in collaboration. At a time when the government is advocating more specialist teaching in primary schools it is ironical that ESL specialists are facing funding cuts (Home Office 1992). However much the government wants schools to cater for their own needs it is unrealistic to expect schools with isolated bilingual learners to employ a specialist of their own because isolated bilingual learners are not considered a priority.

## 6.4. Considerations for the future

How are these principles informing provision for isolated bilingual learners to be put into practice at a time when LEA support services are under attack?

There needs to be continued central government funding for isolated bilingual learners, whether this comes through the continuation of the Section 11

scheme or enhanced formula funding for individual pupils; whether there is a central support service or whether clusters or pyramids of schools buy their own teacher. Funding should be for all isolated bilingual learners whether or not their families come from the New Commonwealth. It would have been invidious to have worked alongside the teacher of a learner of New Commonwealth origin but not alongside the teacher of a learner of Non-New Commonwealth origin during the development project. Nevertheless funding should be substantial enough so that members of New Commonwealth communities do not feel that they have 'lost' support.

There should be an insistence by central government that schools should employ trained specialist ESL teachers. If funding is not targeted for this it would be possible for a school to employ a 'cheap' classroom assistant; not an assistant paid for out of special educational needs funding-that route has been tightened up-but certainly to remove the 'problem' from the class or subject teacher. Submersion would be a likely outcome because English would possibly be taught in isolation from other subject content. It would also be possible for schools to employ any two teachers in a 'Partnership Teaching' situation. Unless one is a specialist the investment in the isolated bilingual learner is lost; the expertise described above is not generally at class or subject teachers' fingertips.

Training then continues to be a crucial issue for the specialist partner, whether a support service teacher or a class or subject teacher. LEAs were not allowed to bid for training funding for Section 11 teachers. The assumption, I presume, was that LEAs would support their staff. With devolving of training money to schools LEAs were increasingly at the beginning of the 1990s not in a position to be able to train specialists. I know of one local education authority (Northamptonshire-Steve Thorp personal communication 15.6.93) where Partnership Teaching training is accredited within a regional credit transfer scheme. Some way of accrediting teachers within schools for the specialist training they undertake still needs to be considered in many authorities. The effects of such accreditation need to be evaluated.

Some way of enabling specialists to work with all teachers of isolated bilingual learners still needs to be found. NFER's Partnership Teaching project

asks teachers to disseminate their work. Further research in the area of disseminating the results of collaboration, to see if all teachers involved with a pupil share in the investment, is needed. It would be very useful to establish the minimum amount of time a specialist teacher needs to spend in a school with isolated bilingual learners. In primary schools is it the length of time to work through a topic area, usually a half term, or is more time needed? In secondary schools is it the length of time needed to work with one teacher in all departments or would involvement in planning at departmental level suffice?

Because resources are thinly stretched there are pressures on existing specialist ESL teachers in Treeshire to become advisory teachers in effect, i.e. to provide advice to teachers on a larger number of isolated bilingual pupils. This pressure should be resisted. My research has shown that teachers did not take up advice on provision for bilingual learners unless it reinforced changes that would be made in any event (see Section 5.1) or there was joint responsibility for a class (see Section 5.20). A Treeshire head teacher confirmed (personal communication 6.5.93) that her staff learnt far more from having a specialist teacher working alongside them than from INSET. It would be better, however painful given limited resources, to target schools-or pyramids- which with currently do not provide focused support for bilingual learners in mainstream classes but would be willing to work on a Partnership Teaching project. This would mean ignoring schools which are already confident about providing support and ignoring pupils in schools in which there is no hope of shifts towards needs being met in the mainstream classroom. Schools would need to make a commitment to working with a specialist service in their school development plans. It would be important to target schools in which the teachers are comfortable about welcoming other teachers into their classrooms.

These tough choices have to be made because collaboration between specialist and class or subject teacher on access to and support within the National Curriculum appears to hold the most potential for isolated bilingual learners scattered in the mainstream. To hold on to the idea that isolated bilingual pupils can learn curriculum content without having passed through a particular threshold in English will require "the need to develop the curriculum" not "in the face of

resistance to change" in Levine's words (1985 p.141) but in the face of radical National Curriculum changes. There are pressures to have separate specialist subject teaching in primary schools, there are moves to "define and place more emphasis on the basic skills of handwriting, spelling and grammar in the programmes of study and statements of attainment for Key Stages 1 and 2" (NCC 1992 p.12) and therefore there are pressures to teach English as a separate subject. In the 1990s these changes mean the likelihood of continued submersion of isolated bilingual learners in effect.

But society needs to draw on all the skills of all its learners. This research has shown the need to continue to focus on isolated bilingual learners, and has made a significant contribution to our understanding of how teachers can best be helped to meet their needs.

# REFERENCES

**Abrams F.** (1991a) 'Accents and dialect still unmentionable subjects', *Times Educational Supplement*, 14.6.91.

**Abrams F.** (1991b) 'Minister suppresses £21m study', *Times Educational Supplement*, 14.6.91.

**Abrams F.** (1991c) 'GCSE fails to eliminate inequality', *Times Educational Supplement*, 15.2.91.

**Alexander R. Rose J. and Woodhead C.** (1992). *Curriculum Organization and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: A Discussion Paper*. London: DES.

**Ambrose I.** (1981) 'An HMI Perspective' in Craft M. (ed.) *Teaching in a Multicultural Society. The Task for Teacher Education*. Lewes: Falmer.

**Astill L.** (1990) *Why Bother Here?* Unpublished Royal Society of Arts (R.S.A.) Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools extended essay.

**Baker K.** (1980) 'Planning school policies for INSET: the SITE Project' in Hoyle E. and Megarry J. (eds.) *World Yearbook of Education 1980 Professional Development of Teachers*. London: Kogan Page.

**Barnes D. Britton J. and Rosen H.** (1969). *Language, the learner and the school.* London: Penguin.

**Barrs M. and Hester H.** (n.d.). *The new ILEA Primary Language Record: an introduction to its use*. London: Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) Learning Resources Branch, videocassette.

**Barrs M. and Hester H.** (1988). *The Primary Language Record: Handbook for teachers*. London: Inner London Education Authority (ILEA)/ Centre for Language in Primary Education (CLPE).

**Barrs M. Ellis S. Hester H. and Thomas A.** (1990). *Patterns of Learning: The Primary Language Record and the National Curriculum*. London: Centre for Language in Primary Education.

**Bolam R.** (1980). 'In-service Education and Training' in Hoyle E. and Megarry J. *World Yearbook of Education*. London: Kogan Page.

**Bourne J.** (1987). *Changing Perceptions, Changing Ways: A Discussion Document*, mimeo. London: University of London Institute of Education.

**Bourne J.** (1989). *Moving into the Mainstream: LEA provision for bilingual pupils*. Windsor:NFER-Nelson.

**Bourne J. and McPake** (1991) 'Discussion Paper 1. Section 11 and Partnership Teaching' in National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) *Partnership Teaching: Co-operative teaching strategies for English language support in multilingual classrooms. An in-service pack for schools: Materials for whole-school inservice*. London: HMSO.

**Brumfit J. Ellis R. and Levine J.** (eds.) (1985) *English as A Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts*. ELT Documents 121. Oxford: Pergamon with the British Council.

**Bullivant B.** (1989). 'The Pluralist Dilemma Revisited' in Verma G. (ed.) *Education For All: A Landmark in Pluralism*. Lewes: Falmer.

**Carter A.** (ed.) (1985). *Teachers for a Multicultural Society*. York: Longman for School Curriculum Development Committee (from the former Schools Council's Programme 3 (Developing the Curriculum for a Changing World)).

**Carter R.** (1989). *The LINC Project* (Draft). Nottingham, mimeo.

**Carter R.** (ed.) (1990). *Knowledge About Language and the Curriculum-the Linc Reader*. London:Hodder and Stoughton.

**Chatwin R.** (1985). 'Can ESL Teaching be Racist?' in Brumfit C., Ellis R. and Levine J. (eds.) *English as a Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts*. Oxford: Pergamon.

**Cline T. and Frederickson N.** (eds.) (1989). 'Plenary Panel Discussion' in *Bilingual Pupils in Primary Schools and the National Curriculum: Report of a day conference on 4th November 1989 organised by the University College London Department of Psychology*. London: Department of Psychology, University College London and DCLD, Ebury Teachers' Centre.

**Commission for Racial Equality** (CRE) (1986a). *The Teaching of English as a Second Language:Report of a formal investigation in Calderdale Local Education Authority*. (The Calderdale Report).London: Commission for Racial Equality.

**Commission for Racial Equality** (CRE) (1986b). *S.11 of the Local Government Act: revised circular: the commission's response*. London:Commission for Racial Equality (CRE).

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

**Cummins J. and Swain M.** (1986). *Bilingualism in Education*. New York: Longman.

**Davies A-M.** (1985) 'Appendix:Royal 'Society of Arts Diploma in Teaching English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools' to Wiles S. 'Developments in ESL INSET: one centre's experience' in Brumfit C. Ellis R. Levine J. (eds.) *English as a Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121*. Oxford: Pergamon with the British Council.

**Davies A-M and Sturman E.** (eds.) (1989). *Bilingual Learners in Secondary Schools*. London: Centre for Urban Educational Studies.

**Davies A-M (1991).** 'Integrating bilingual learners into mainstream secondary classes' in National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) *Partnership Teaching: Co-operative teaching strategies for English language support in multilingual classrooms. An in-service pack for schools: Materials for whole-school inservice*. London: HMSO.

**Davies K.** (1988). 'Shajna's Shari. Creating a context for bilingual pupils' voices', *Languages Matter:Issues in the Multicultural Classroom*. No. 1. Autumn 1988. Hampshire: Hampshire Multilingual Action Research Network.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1967). *Children and their primary schools; a report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. (The Plowden Report). London:HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1971). *The Education of Immigrants* (Education Survey 13). London:HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1972). *Teacher Education and Training*. (The James Report) London: HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1975). *A Language For Life* (The Bullock Report). London:HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1985). *Education For All* (The Swann Report). London: HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1988a). *National Curriculum Task Group on Assessment and Testing: A Report*. London: DES and Welsh Office.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1988b). *A Survey of the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Six LEAs*. London: Department of Education and Science.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1988c). Circular 5/88 'Local Authority Training Grants Scheme Financial Year 1989-1990'

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1988d). *Report on the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of English Language* (The Kingman Report) London: HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1989a). *English For Ages 5 to 16; National Curriculum: proposals of the Secretary of State for Education and Science and the Secretary of State for Wales* (The Cox Report). London: HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1989b). *English in the National Curriculum*. London:HMSO.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1989c). Circular 20/89 'Local Education Authority Training Grants Scheme: Financial year 1990-1991'. London: Department of Education and Science.

**Department of Education and Science** (DES) (1989d). Circular 5/89 'The Education Reform Act 1988: The School Curriculum and Assessment. London: Department of Education and Science.

**Department of Education and Science** (1990). Circular 20 July 90 'Local Authority Grants Scheme Financial Year 1991-1992'. London: Department of Education and Science.

**Department of Education and Science** (1991). Circular 6/91 'Implementation of more open enrolment in primary schools'. London:Department of Education and Science.

**Department of Education and Science and Welsh Office** (1990). *Modern Foreign Languages for ages 11 to 16: proposals of the Secretary of State for Education and Science and the Secretary of State for Wales*. London: Department of Education and Science.

**Derrick, J.** (1977). *Language Needs of Minority Group Children*. Windsor: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).

**Edwards D. and Mercer N.** (1987). *Common Knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom*. London:Routledge.

**Eggar T.** (1991). 'Correct Use of English is Essential', *Times Educational Supplement*, 28.6.91.

**Eggleston S. J., Dunn D.K. and Purewal A.** (1981). *In-service Teacher Education in a Multiracial Society*. Keele:University of Keele, mimeo.

**Eggleston J., Dunn D.K. and Anjali M.** (1986). *Education For Some. The Educational and Vocational Experiences of 15-18 year-old Members of Minority Ethnic Groups*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

**Elliott J.** (1987) 'Teachers as Researchers' in Dunkin M.J. (ed.). *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. Oxford:Pergamon.

**Ellis R.** (1985). 'Policy and Provision for ESL in Schools' in Brumfit C. Ellis R. and Levine J. (eds.) *English as A Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121*. Oxford: Pergamon with the British Council.

**Eraut M.** (1987) 'Inservice Teacher Education' in Dunkin M.J.(ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. Oxford:Pergamon.

**Fishman J. (1989).** *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

**Fitzpatrick F.** (1987). *The Open Door*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

**France P. and Wiles S.** (1984). *Working with young bilingual children. A videocassette guide.* London: ILEA.

**Fullan M.** (1982). *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: OISE/Teachers' College Press.

**Gaine C.** (1987). *No Problem Here: A practical approach to education and "race" in white schools*. London: Hutchinson.

**Galton M., Simon B. and Croll P.** (1980). *Inside the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

**Garratt J. and Moggridge B.** (1989). *Educational Psychology in a Multicultural Society. A follow-up paper to INPUT 21 on Multicultural issues in Education*. Southampton: Continuing Professional Development in Educational Psychology, University of Southampton, mimeo.

**Goddard D.** (1989). 'GRIST:the Development of the Design' in McBride (ed.) *The In-service Training of Teachers:Some Issues and Perspectives*. London:Falmer.

**Gravelle M.** (1990). 'Assessment and Bilingual Pupils', *Multicultural Teaching*, 9:1.

**Great Britain** (1966). *Statutes. Local Government Act 1966*. London: HMSO.

**Grugeon E. and Woods P.** (1990). *Educating All: Multicultural Perspectives in the Primary School*. London: Routledge.

**Hamers M. and Blanc J.** (1989). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Hampshire Multilingual Action Research Network** (Hampshire MARN) (1989). 'Change in Schools', *Languages Matter: Issues in the Multicultural Classroom*. No. 2. Autumn 1989.

**Harland J.** (1987). 'The New INSET: A Transformation Scene' in Murphy R. and Torrance H. *Evaluating Education*. London: Harper and Row.

**Harper F.** (1987). 'Support or Development' in *What Next:Implications of the Calderdale Report for Teaching, Learning and Inset in Multilingual Schools. Report of a Conference organized by London and South-East Course Tutors Group R.S.A. Diploma in Teaching English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools*. Enfield, mimeo.

**Harris C.** (1978a). *The Clan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Harris C.** (1978b). *The Glen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Harris C.** (1986). *Fuzzbuzz. A reading scheme for special needs. Teacher's book.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Hawkins E.** (ed.) (1988). *Intensive Language Teaching and Learning Initiatives in School.* Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT). London:CILT.

**Hester H.** (1985). 'Learning from Children Learning' in Brumfit C. Ellis R. and Levine J. (eds.) *English as A Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121.* Oxford: Pergamon with the British Council.

**Hewton E.** (1988). *School Focused Staff Development: Guidelines For Policy Makers.* London:Falmer.

**Home Office** (1986). *Circular 72/86.* London:HMSO.

**Home Office** (1989). *A Scrutiny of Grants under Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966:Final Report.* London: Home Office.

**Home Office** (1990a). *Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966. Grant Administration: Proposals.* London: Home Office.

**Home Office** (1990b). *Home Office Circular No. 78/1990 Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966.* London: Home Office.

**Home Office** (1992). Letter to chief executives 26.11.92.

**Hopkins D.** (1987) 'Teacher Research as a basis for Staff development' in Wideen M. and Andrews I. (eds.) in Wideen M. and Andrews I. (eds.) *Staff Development For School Improvement: A Focus On The Teacher.* New York and Philadelphia:Falmer.

**Houlton D.** (1985). *All Our Languages: A Handbook for the Multilingual Classroom.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Inner London Education Authority** (ILEA) (1982). *Language in the Multi-ethnic Primary School.* Teacher's Notes. London: Inner London Education Authority.

**Inner London Education Authority** (ILEA) (1985). *Improving Primary Schools* (The Thomas Report). London: Inner London Education Authority.

**Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) Research and Statistics Branch** (1990). 'Second Language Acquisition: A critical Literature and Research

Review with special reference to Tower Hamlets' in *Learning English*. London:Tower Hamlets Education.

**Ivanic R.** (1990) 'Critical Language Awareness in Action' in Carter R. (ed.) *Knowledge About Language and the Curriculum: the LINC Reader*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

**Jones K.** (1983) *Beyond Progressive Education*. London: Macmillan.

**Jones K. and Reid K.** (1988) 'Some Implications of the New INSET Regulations', *British Journal of In-service Education*, 14:2.

**Keel P.** (1987a). 'An Outline of Multicultural Education Development in an Area of north-east England' in Chivers T. (ed.) *Race and Culture in Education: Issues arising from the Swann Committee Report*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

**Keel P.** (1987b). 'Action Research as a Medium for Curriculum Development in Multicultural Education' in Chivers T.S. (ed.) (1987) *Race and Culture in Education:Issues arising from the Swann Committee Report*. Windsor:NFER -Nelson.

**Kumar A.** (1988) *The Heartstone Odyssey. Chandra's Story*. Buxton: Allied Mouse.

**Lanier J. with assistance of Little J.** (1986). 'Research on Teacher Education' in Wittrock M. (ed.) *Handbook on Research and Teaching: Third Edition. A Project of the American Research Association*. New York:Macmillan.

**Landon J.** (1987) 'The Calderdale Report-Implications for Course Design' in *What Next?:Implications of the Calderdale Report for Teaching, Learning and Inset in Multilingual Schools. Report of Conference organised by London and South-East Course Tutors Group R.S.A. Diploma in Teaching English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools*. Enfield, mimeo.

**Lee M. and Gough B.** (eds.) (1989) British Journal of In-service Training, 16.1.

**Levett G.** (1988). 'Home-School Reading Projects. The involvement of parents with young bilingual children', *Languages Matter: Issues in the Multicultural Classroom*. No. 1. Autumn 1988. Hampshire: Hampshire Multilingual Action Research Network.

**Levine J. with Hester H. and Skirrow G.** (1972). *Scope Stage 2:A language development course Teacher's Book*. London: Longman for the Schools Council.

**Levine J.** (1983). 'Going Back to the Mainstream', *Issues in Race and Education.* Summer 1983.

**Levine J.** (1985). 'On the "Training" of Teachers' in Brumfit C. Ellis R. and Levine J. (eds.) *English as A Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121.* Oxford: Pergamon with the British Council.

**Levine J.** (1990). 'Responding to Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in the Teaching of English as a Second Language' in Levine J. (ed.) *Bilingual Learners and the Mainstream Curriculum* Basingstoke:Falmer

**Language in the National Curriculum (LINC) Project** (n.d.). *Statement of Working Assumptions.* Nottingham, mimeo.

**McBride R.** (ed.) (1989).'The Setting' in McBride R. (ed.) *The In-service Training of Teachers:Some Issues and Perspectives.* London:Falmer.

**Mannel G.** (1991). 'Parents 'wary' when ethnic roll hits 45%', *Times Educational Supplement*, 25.10.91.

**Martin D.** (1991). *Schools' Perceptions of the Education of Asian Pupils and of the Role of their Parents in relation to changing demographic patterns.* Southampton: University of Southampton MA (Ed) Dissertation.

**Martin-Jones M. and Romaine S.** (1986). 'Semilingualism: A Half-Baked Theory of Communicative Competence', *Applied Linguistics*, 7:1.

**Metropolitan Boroughs of North and South Tyneside** (n.d.). *Welcome to Your School.* Newcastle upon Tyne: The Multicultural Centre.

**Mercer N. (1981).** *Language in School and Community.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Moggridge B.**(1988) *Special School Placement.* Unpublished. Intended as integral part of 'Educational Psychology in a Multicultural Society' (see Garratt and Moggridge) but not published so far either as part of it or in subsequent issue of INPUT.

**Mortimore P., Sammons P., Stoll L., Lewis D. and Ecob R.** (1988). *School Matters. The Junior Years.* Wells: Open Books.

**Mould W.** (1987) 'The Swann Report: an LEA response' in Chivers T.S. (ed.) *Race and Culture in Education: Issues arising from the Swann Committee Report.* Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

**National Anti-Racist Movement in Education** (NAME) (1985). *Name on Swann.* Walsall: National Antiracist Movement in Education.

**National Curriculum Council** (NCC) (1989). *English Key Stage 1. Non statutory guidance.* York: National Curriculum Council.

**National Curriculum Council** (NCC) (1991). *Circular number 11. Linguistic Diversity and the National Curriculum.* York: National Curriculum Council.

**National Curriculum Council** (NCC) (1992). *National Curriculum English: The Case for Revising the Order. Advice to the Secretary of State for Education, July 1992.* York: National Curriculum Council.

**National Foundation for Educational Research** (NFER) (not dated) *Partnership Teaching: Co-operative teaching strategies for English language support in multilingual classrooms. An inservice pack for schools.* HMSO, publicity mimeo.

**National Foundation for Educational Research for the Department of Education and Science** (1991). *Partnership Teaching:co-operative teaching strategies for English language support in multilingual classrooms. An inservice pack for schools:Materials for whole-school inservice.* London:HMSO.

**Parliamentary Select Committee on Education and Science** (PSC) (1970). *Session 1969-70 Teacher Training Volume V Sub-Committee C Evidence and Appendices.* London:HMSO.

**Rampton B.** (1987). 'A Non-Educational View of ESL in Britain', *Adolescence and Language Use* Working Paper 1. London: Sociological Research Unit, Institute of Education.

**Riley S. and Bleach J.** (1985) 'Three Moves in the Initiating of Mainstreaming at Secondary Level' in Brumfit C. Ellis R. and Levine J. *English as a Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121.* Oxford:Pergamon with British Council.

**Robertson W.** (1987) 'In-service Strategies for Teacher Education' in Chivers T.S. (ed.) *Race and Culture in Education: Issues arising from the Swann Committee Report.* Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

**Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board** (RSA) (1973-1986). *Examination*

*Papers for the Certificate in the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools (1973-1983) and Diploma in the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools (1984-1986)*. London: Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board.

**Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board** (RSA) (1988). *English Across the Curriculum*. London: RSA Examinations Board.

**Sanders P.** (1987). 'Calderdale in Context' in *What Next: Implications of the Calderdale Report for Teaching, Learning and Inset in Multilingual Schools. A Report of Conference organised by London and South-East Course Tutors Group R.S.A. Diploma in Teaching English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools*. Enfield, mimeo.

**Savva H.** (1990). 'The Rights of Bilingual Children' in Carter R. (ed.) *Knowledge About Language and the Curriculum:the Linc Reader*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

**Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children** (SCOPE) (1969) *Scope. An Introductory English Course for Immigrant Children: Stage 1 Teacher's Book*. London:Longman for the Schools Council.

**Schools Council** (1972). *Race Relations and the Curriculum; a short analysis and summary of work initiated by the Schools Council*. London: Schools Council.

**Schools Examination and Assessment Council** (SEAC) (1991). *School Assessment Folder 1991*. Key Stage 1. Schools Examinations and Assessment Council.

**Schools Examination and Assessment Council** (SEAC) (1992). *School Assessment Folder 1992. Key Stage 1*. Schools Examinations and Assessment Council.

**Skutnabb-Kangas T.** (1988) 'Multilingualism and the education of minority children' in Skutnabb-Kangas T. and Cummins J. (eds.) *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

**Smith D. and Tomlinson S.** (1989). *The School Effect: A study of Multi-Racial Comprehensives*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

**Spolsky B.** (1986) 'Overcoming Language Barriers to Education in a Multilingual World' in Spolsky B. (ed.) (1986) *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

**Sutcliff R.** (1961) *Dragon Slayer*. London: Puffin in Association with Bodley Head.

**Swain M. and Lapkin S.** (1982). *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study*. Clevedon:Multilingual Matters.

**Tansley P.** (1986). *Community Languages in Primary Education. Report from the SCDC (Schools Curriculum Development Committee) Mother Tongue Project.* Windsor:NFER Nelson

**Tosi A.** (1988). 'The jewel in the crown of the Modern Prince: The new approach to bilingualism in multicultural education in England' in Skutnabb-Kangas T. and Cummins J. (eds.) *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

**Townsend H.** (1971). *Immigrant Pupils in England: The L.E.A. Response*. Windsor: National Foundation for Educational Research.

**Townsend H. and Brittan E.** (1972). *Organization in Multiracial Schools*. Windsor:National Foundation for Educational Research.

**Waterland L.** (1985). *Read With Me. An Apprenticeship Approach to Reading*. Stroud:Thimble Press.

**Wells G.** (1981). *Learning Through Interaction: the study of language development*. Cambridge:1981.

**Wells G.** (1987). *The Meaning Makers*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

**Whitney N.** (1980). 'Summary: The ESL Teacher and the Multicultural School: Practice and Potential' in *One Day Conference on the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Multicultural Schools*. London: Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board, mimeo.

**Wideen M.** (1987) 'Perspectives on Staff Development' in Wideen M. and Andrews I. (eds.) *Staff Development For School Improvement: A Focus On The Teacher*. New York and Philadelphia:Falmer

**Wiles S.** (1985). 'Developments in ESL Inset: one centre's experience' in Brumfit C., Ellis R. and Levine J. (eds.) *English as a Second Language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and Educational Contexts. ELT Documents 121*. Oxford:Pergamon.

**Williamson J.** (1989) 'Not for the sake of a ribboned coat: a study of in-service motivation', *British Journal of In-service Education*: 15.2.

**Wong Fillmore L.** (1980) 'Learning a second language: Chinese children in the American classroom' in Alatis J. (ed.) *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1980.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

**Wong Fillmore L.** (1986) 'Teaching Bilingual Learners' in Wittrock M. (ed.) *Handbook on Research and Teaching: Third Edition. A Project of the American Research Association.* New York: Macmillan.

# APPENDICES

# Appendix 1.1 Phases of the research

Appendix 1.1 Phases of the research

| Dates | Data | Analysis | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Phase 1- Setting up** | | | |
| Feb 1988-<br>Feb 1989 | diary<br>personal communication noted in diary<br>minutes<br>correspondence<br>notes of meetings | response noted,scanned for reference to questions asked in semi-structured interviews | the semi-structured interviews and teachers' comments on transcripts of interviews were the most productive source of data in generating findings in this phase of the research |
| | semi-structured interviews | taped, transcribed and indexed according asked | |
| | teachers' comments on transcripts of interviews<br>questionnaire | indexed according to questions asked | |
| **Phase 2- Shadowing** | | | |
| Feb 1989-<br>Feb 1990 | diary<br>minutes<br>personal communication noted in diary | kept, scanned for reference to shadowing criteria | the notes on shadowing, the discussion and notes on discussion along with one head's comments were the most productive source of data in generating findings in this phase of the research |
| | notes on shadowing used as basis for discussion<br>notes on discussion<br>head's comment on shadowing notes | indexed according to shadowing criteria | |
| **Phase 3- Collaborative teaching** | | | |
| Feb 1990-<br>June 1991 | diary<br>minutes<br>notes on meetings personal communication noted in diary | kept, scanned for reference to collaborative criteria | the notes on collaborative teaching and notes on teachers' responses to questions on collaborative teaching were the most productive source of data in generating findings in this phase of the research |
| | notes on shadowing | indexed according to shadowing criteria | |
| | notes on collaborative teaching | indexed according to collaborative criteria | |
| | notes on teachers' responses to questions on collaborative teaching notes | indexed according to collaborative criteria | |

# Appendix 1.2 Isolated bilingual pupil survey

Appendix 1.2 Isolated bilingual pupil survey

Isolated bilingual pupil survey

I'm currently researching into provision for isolated bilingual learners i.e. pupils in small numbers in classes and/or schools-up to 7% in schools.

I should be very grateful if you could respond to the following questions. In doing so I assume you give agreement to information being used. I will not identify the authority.

1. In your estimation would you say the numbers of isolated bilingual pupils are increasing in your authority?

---

2. How is provision for isolated bilingual pupils funded in your authority?

---

3. Does your authority have a particular structure for meeting statutory obligations towards isolated bilingual pupils that is separate from other provision for bilingual pupils e.g. a separate team, advisory teacher, teacher, non teaching assistants?

---

4. If the authority does have a particular structure how does it work e.g. advisory visits to provide information/materials, in-class support and/or assessment, teacher support/INSET, team teaching? With or without follow-up visits?

---

5. If you operate a contract system with schools how are priorities established?

---

6. Is it possible for the authority to offer access to English through bilingual support and/or opportunity to develop bilingually for isolated bilingual pupils?

---

7. What training do teachers (mainstream or specialist) working with isolated bilingual pupils receive?

---

8. If the authority does not have a particular structure how are the needs of isolated bilingual pupils met? If they are not met please say so.

---

9. Is your authority's provision for isolated bilingual pupils evaluated. If so, how how?

---

10. Is provision for isolated bilingual learners likely to change as a result of a) Education Reform Act b) Section 11?

---

Any other comments or fuller answers to previous questions.

Many thanks for your co-operation

Liz Statham

## Appendix 3.1 Draft project proposal: Support for bilingual learners in Beech

## Appendix 3.1 Draft project proposal: Support for bilingual learners in Beech

DRAFT

# Support for bilingual learners in Beech

Draft Pilot Project:

This paper outlines a proposed pilot project which seeks to develop expertise in supporting learning of 'scattered' bilingual pupils within a Beech pyramid of schools/colleges.

The project would focus on supporting bilingual pupils in mainstream classrooms.

It is intended that a co-ordinator/trainer activate a cascade development with the support of the INSET co-ordinator and the county adviser for multicultural education. One person from each school would be involved in a staff development programme in his/her school.

The main project would run in 1988-1990.

It should be noted that this project is intended both for schools/colleges where there are currently bilingual pupils and those without. So it is hoped that <u>all</u> schools in a pyramid would participate together and thus anticipate possible changes in intake.

<u>Selection of pyramid</u>

It is anticipated that the pyramid would be chosen by the area INSET co-ordinator, area advisory officer, county adviser for multicultural education and the co-ordinator/trainer.

<u>Selection of participant in each school</u>

It is anticipated that the co-ordinator/trainer would discuss selection of participant with the head teacher/principal of each institution in the pyramid.

Important criteria would be:

-status in school/college i.e. credible provider of INSET for other staff

-interest in, but not necessarily experience of working with bilingual children

-interest in action research, dissemination to colleagues

Contract

Each school involved in the project would have to commit themselves to supporting the work of the selected teacher in staff development re supporting bilingual learners.

In particular it would be necessary to make a commitment in 1988-1989 to:

-seconding selected teacher to initial input and ongoing INSET
-having co-ordinator/trainer working alongside selected teacher
-allocating time for selected teacher to plan and run INSET for colleagues
--allocating time for selected teachers to act as consultant in schools on, for example;

a. placement of pupils and liaison with feeder schools
b. assessment
c. language and learning support
d. choice of materials

In 1989-1990 it would be necessary to make a commitment to;

-seconding selected teacher to work on evaluation and to attend follow-up INSET
-allocating time for selected teacher to continue to act as consultant as above plus be involved in induction of probationary teachers
-allocating time for selected teacher to plan further input to school/college INSET

Cascade development

Proposed process:

Initial input-1 week (88-89), full time for selected teachers

'Clinic' sessions-1½ hours per week, (88-89), available to all selected teachers and colleagues

Visits-1 half day per week (88-89) 'blocked' for discussion, planning, teaching

INSET-1 day per term (88-89), for selected teachers
-1 day closure (88-89), for selected teachers to disseminate in school/college
-1 day per term (89-90), for evaluation and follow-up

Role of co-ordinator/trainer

-to be involved in selection of teachers

-negotiate contract with each school

-to set up initial input

-to be available for clinic sessions for teachers to 'phone or come in person

-to respond to requests for immediate help from pyramid schools/colleges

-to visit schools on a 'blocked' basis, to discuss issues, help plan classroom work, teach alongside, help plan school/college INSET, provide resources

-to provide INSET for selected teachers on issues raise by teachers or co-ordinator/trainer (88-89)

-to work with teachers and their colleagues in schools/colleagues to evaluate the project (89-90)

-to provide follow-up INSET (89-90)

The structure of the co-ordinator/trainer's day would need to allow for visits, 'clinic', planning and administration and materials collection.

<u>Funding</u>

Funding would be needed

1. In 1988-1989

for selected teachers:

| | |
|---|---|
| Secondment | 1 week full time initial input<br>3 days INSET per year<br>½ day consultation per week<br>+ travel |

for co-ordinator/trainer:

1 week full time
1 day per week (88-89)
? hours setting up beforehand
3 days per year (89-90) INSET
? days evaluation, INSET planning (89-90)
+ travel, 'phones, stamps

for administration:

'phone
Xerox
stamps
clerical help

## Timing

It is anticipated that pyramid and teachers would be selected in the summer term '88. Since schools are likely to want help at the beginning of the school year both for 'newly arrived short stay' scattered bilinguals and bilingual children moving from other schools it is suggested that the initial input week is held at the end of the summer term.

## Evaluation

Selected teachers and co-ordinator/trainer would evaluate project, inviting response from colleagues, area INSET co-ordinator and county adviser for multicultural education.

## Remaining questions

1. Pay off/recognition for selected teachers?

2. Venue for project base

3. Link with current language consultants?

Liz Statham March '88

# Appendix 3.2 Revised starting points for pack

Appendix 3.2 Revised Starting Points for Pack

Bilingual Learners in Beech Pilot Project

| 1. | 2. | *3. ongoing for everybody:* | 4. admissions/ assessment/advice to other schools<br><br>Teacher Morrison |
|---|---|---|---|
| Record what currently happens<br><br>survey parents/ pupils/ teachers if needed | materials<br><br>available | support for bilingual teachers<br><br>support for other teachers<br>-materials<br>-staff inset<br>-policy etc | careers/options/ GCSE<br><br>Teacher Walker |
| | | | working to develop links with community<br><br>Teacher Morgan |
| | | work towards language policy | Working towards language policy<br><br>teacher Gunn Allen Infant<br><br>Teacher Gunn Allen Junior |

# Appendix 3.3 Sample-case study

Appendix 3.3 Sample-case study

Morrison's Involvement in September 1988 Input Day.

..... This division of labour on the pack was taken up again on the Input day in September 1989. As mentioned Morrison chose to concentrate on placement and assessment of bilingual pupils and the links with Walker. This was one of the areas mentioned at the preliminary meetings in Spring 1988. Working on this aspect of the pack was to be in addition to carrying on with development of provision for bilingual pupils and INSET for other staff as agreed by all the project schools. The head again made the strong point that the project should be producing materials that could be immediately usable for a school that received bilingual pupils, materials that could be used for staff INSET-for raising awareness when a school was sitting down to work out its philosophy and programmes. He felt that basic awareness was needed; that teachers might not respond to the title "Bilingual Learners in Beech Pilot Project"-what did bilingual mean?
On reflection placement, assessment and links with Walker as specific areas to cover seemed to me to meet both the immediate need to contribute to Morrison's own provision for bilingual pupils and the need to contribute to other schools by considering liaison between Morrison and the secondary school. It is perhaps not surprising that teacher Morrison should have been interested in this area. She had half an allowance for special needs and half of that half responsibility was concerned with decisions regarding placement and assessment of bilingual children because there was no other particular responsibility post for them. She was obviously personally interested in the area of record keeping and having worked in an inner city Rowan school was aware of the background information that could be obtained and which would be useful to pass on to class teachers and more widely to other schools in the pyramid, particularly the secondary. More liaison with Walker had been mentioned by the head at the meeting on May 3rd, 1988 but in the context of language work and study skills.

First planning meeting with teacher Morrison.

.....I met with teacher Morrison on 4th October 1989 to discuss placement and assessment of bilingual pupils. In fact she really wanted to focus on admissions procedures. She was aware of some issues that needed looking at. She was concerned for instance that health information was not complete for all bilingual pupils because of communication difficulties with parents on admission to school. she was interested in resources from other areas e.g. booklets such as 'Welcome to our School'(North and South Tyneside undated), background information on naming systems and felt that within the project we should try and get an interpreter network established perhaps using a pool of older children, staff, NTAs and parents as well as professional interpreters. Because we thought that teacher Morgan would contact Adult Education she didn't find out how they coped with interpreting/translating needs. I subsequently did some investigation into

moves towards an interpreter/translation network in Rowan. She said that she would feed back on admissions to the whole school.

Appendix 3.4 Text of copy of Project Paper No. 4 which was circulated to schools

Appendix 3.4 Text of copy of Project Paper No. 4 which was circulated to schools

This is the fourth in a series of project papers from the Bilingual Learners in Beech Pilot Project. It is hoped that taken together the papers will provide a support pack for schools with bilingual pupils but also for schools without who, nevertheless are interested in issues of language and multicultural education.

The third project paper concerned placement and record keeping and mentioned importance of cementing links between the schools as regards placement of bilingual pupils. We have also been trying within the project to focus on improving links between schools and parents of bilingual pupils. One central way of involving all parents is through the reporting process. We mentioned Walker's developing system of records of achievement and said that we hoped information gained from using ILEA's primary language record which involves a parental as well as a child conference could be considered worth including.

In this paper we include a report of a talk given by Norman Stanton of Walker to project teachers about developments in the records of achievement system and a report on the initiatives taken at Morgan school to make more contact with parents.

Records of Achievement

Walker got involved in developing records of achievement in 1984 just at the time when 9 national pilots were coming to an end. Of these the best known was probably Oxford Certificate of Educational Achievement. It was based on accreditation and underpinned with certificates and statements. Norman worked with the Treeshire TVEI consortium to establish a representative working party in the school. At their first INSET they looked at the main features of the current record keeping system-parents and teachers knew what they were getting; at what was wrong-there was no whole school approach, no common method of assessment, no consultation throughout the year and no help for pupils in setting their own targets; at what outcomes were wanted-pupils should be more aware of what they're doing as people, workers and achievers; at what developments were needed to achieve outcomes-development of a profile.

For 4 months every 2 weeks 2 years ago the working party hammered out a profile. They tried using computer banks of statements but the resulting profiles made pupils look like robots. Harriet Frears (of Treeshire TVEI) had suggested that dialogue with pupils was needed and the record of achievement now takes the form of a review drawing on teachers' records and dialogue with pupils. The first year statement has been introduced this year. The teacher's evaluation is written for the pupils as audience, parent comments are optional and there is space for the head's comments. Some parents found the statement "a bit woolly" but more found they had a better picture of their child. It hasn't worked with all pupils but where it has it has been very useful for teachers. As teaching and the curriculum change the forms can change too. Staff were able to help pupils work out their comments using prompt sheets.

In 89-90 the reviews will be done for the 1st, 2nd and 4th years and for everyone the year after.

In addition to the review during Years 1-4 the working party has produced a portfolio for school leavers. It gives academic detail, at the moment linked to subject areas but potentially and effort and a summary negotiated with the pupil. Tutors were given 2/3 days for appointments with pupils. The pupil then wrote their comments. Some teachers felt that they had got to know their pupils properly for the first time. It also had an effect on the 4th years as they saw 5th years leaving with a portfolio. The Walker portfolio will be superseded by the Treeshire record of achievement. They are similar but the Treeshire record leaves it up to the school as to how the record is built up so the cumulative review will be extremely useful. the statement of achievement will be used for the pupil's reference if the pupil gives permission.

Obviously time is needed to ensure that the records are properly compiled. Neither assembly or tutor time were considered appropriate. Walker has therefore decided to scrap existing tutor group format and every member of staff except the head will be responsible for a group of 15 tutees. Each tutor will meet with 2 pupils for 15 minutes every Monday for review so each child will have a review every 7 weeks. A guidance booklet for teachers and parents will outline the purpose of the review and will give guidance to pupils on how to prepare each time. For instance the first review may be to check timetable and work in, say, Maths and English. Later on the pupils should be able to set their own agenda. The working party will probably, next year, be monitoring the reviewing process and making more links with feeder schools at one end and colleges, employers etc, at the other.

P.S. The records of achievement system has proved so successful that instead of gradually introducing it year by year it has been introduced for all years in 89-90. Children also now have an open portfolio to which they can add pieces of work.

<u>Home-School Links</u>

This report on increasing contact with parents was written in May 89 and so it refers to 88-89.

In a school of just under 300 pupils we have five children who are from ethnic minority groups. Of these five, two have been in my 3rd year junior class this year.

Early in the year we had our usual Parents' Evening but the families of these two children did not attend. Later in the year I wrote to them and made an appointment to see them as well as one of the other families. In two cases I called to see the parents at home and in the third case one parent came to see me at school.

The meetings at the children's homes were by far the most productive from my point of view, in that I was able to meet older and younger members of the family, some of whom I had taught previously, and during the course of lengthy chats I

was able to ask for the parents' view on dual language books for their children and several matters regarding allowed food, P.E. and religious customs. I found all this information very useful to have, and it was considerably more meaningful to me, having discussed the situation with a parent rather than just having read the information from a form.

All the parents I interviewed were happy for their children to have access to dual language books. Even one child who does not speak his family mother tongue, Punjabi, was excited at the prospect of taking home books that he could read to his mother in English and she could read to him in Punjabi. He read through the small pile of books borrowed from the Treeshire Language Resources Centre in a very short time and I am now trying to get further supplies.

I was made very welcome in both homes that I visited. I was able to talk to the children about items in their sitting room, particularly the religious pictures. I was shown photographs of one family when they had returned to India for a visit two years ago. The children very much wanted me to stay to watch an Indian video, which they explained to me as it went along. During our talk it transpired that two of the children had been intimidated when on their way home from school by two older girls. Knowing this, I was able to check with the children concerned from time to time to make sure that there was no reoccurrence of the episode.

None of the families felt they had any need of school information being translated to their mother tongue as there was at least one person per family who spoke and read English fairly fluently.

The interview in school was far less informative and expansive because of the setting and this was generally unhelpful in contrast to the two home interviews which I considered to be very useful on many counts.

While encouraging the families to come to school functions, if and when possible, I am aware that in all cases the parents are all working until 6 p.m. each evening. At our last Parents' Evening I made sure that the parents of these children received appointment times after 6 p.m. and although they both indicated that they would attend, in fact neither of them did.

I had intended making contact with these parents on a regular basis but due to their inaccessibility I have not been able to do so. I feel that to present myself on their doorstep when they have just got in from work and are trying to make a family meal would be insensitive on my part. I must hope that they are genuinely happy with their local school and that should they need a contact in school to whom they could turn to discuss any school based problem, then at least we have introduced ourselves and I would not be quite the stranger that I would otherwise have been.

Teacher Morgan

# Appendix 3.5 Semi-structured interview questions

Appendix 3.5 Semi-structured interview questions

What did you think the aims of the project were when it started:
-for you
-for your school
-for Beech?

At this stage of the project do you think the aims of the project are the same:
-for you
-for your school
-for Beech?

If aims are different how are they different?

What impact do you think we are having?

What do you feel about your own level of involvement in the project?

What further do you think needs attention with regard to outcomes we negotiated:
1-ongoing support for bilingual learners now in school
2-support for other teachers in your school
3-production of pack to support ourselves and other schools with bilingual learners in Beech
4-language policy development?

How would you rank these in order of priority?

How do you feel about the way we've been working
-as an individual
-as part of a group?

How does this way compare with other types of INSET?

Do you have other ideas about how we could work?

# Appendix 3.6 Extract from interview with teacher Morrison

Appendix 3.6 Extract from interview with teacher Morrison

L.=Liz Statham
M.=Teacher Morrison

Numbers refer to transcript line numbers

247 L....I mean what do you think needs further attention in
248 regard to the things we've actually negotiated, that is
249 -ongoing support for bilingual learners,perhaps we could
250 start with that one rather than...shall I say the four things
251 and then go back to the first one, the first was ongoing
252 support for bilingual learners in school, secondly support
253 for other teachers in school, thirdly production of the pack
254 to support ourselves and other schools with bilingual
255 learners in Beech and fourthly there's language policy.
256 Can we go back to the first one the ongoing support for
257 bilingual learners. What do you see needs doing and...
258 M. I think the authority really must take those children out
259 of the special needs pigeon hole and allocate teaching time
260 to the school even if it added up to effectively the same
261 time if it was under two separate headings I think it would
262 go a long way and what we're doing at Morrison is taking time
263 from special needs and taking time from other places but
264 because the office won't actually say right we've got a child
265 who definitely needs support in English you can have twenty
266 minutes teaching time and if the office doesn't recognise
267 it,well then it comes down to the school but what if the
268 school either doesn't recognise it or says right well if that
269 child is mentioned on the special needs list then it has to
270 have special needs type help or what happens with us is the
271 only way really those kids can get any teaching help is by
272 being in a group that ideally I wouldn't have them in...
273 L. So within the project I suppose it's linked to the second
274 point which is support for other teachers In the project we
275 agreed to try and make sure that all teachers felt
276 responsible for their bilingual pupils.So within the project
277 is there anything specific that we actually need to make that
278 happen. I mean you've obviously mentioned the office so are
279 you saying that something in the pack for instance should be
280 specifically spelled out,to say that this is the way of
281 working in terms of the distinction between a teacher of
282 special needs and bilingual kids..
283 M. Yes I think you probably need to say that you've got to be
284 very careful in assessing needs of the bilingual learner
285 right from sort of step one. I think at the outset if you've
286 a child coming in from another country who obviously cannot
287 speak very much English then you know that that is the

child's need is to learn English but then when they get to a certain point where you've got children who were born in this country and not achieving their potential academically then it's a question of assessment and when you actually get to the point of a child who is bilingual and has special needs inverted commas as well that's when the real difficulty comes but I think probably the rule of thumb ought to be to sort of assume that a bilingual child isn't special needs rather than they are. I think listening to the Ed. Psych. who came to talk to us (on RSA course) they're often called on aren't they and it's not necessary at all but really what the school is saying is we know we need more help for this child and the only avenues we've got of getting more help is through the Ed. Psych. I'm sur.., well I'm not surp..., that's wrong..the speech therapist is approached as well aren't they. It never occurred to me at Morrison to get a speech therapist because a child couldn't speak English but I think there is.. but it's just again there's no other way of getting more support for the child.

L. So that whole area of placement, provision, who does what, whose responsibility, you see that as crucial?

M. Also I think really it's got to be discussed on a whole staff basis. If we're saying at this point in time we think bilingual children and indeed special needs children being, their needs being met in the context of the normal classroom that's got to be agreed on by the staff, the whole staff, how you actually externally direct a school to achieve that I'm not sure but maybe because the office runs its special needs in the way it does, does that encourage people to withdraw, can the office come up with a different approach that has the spin-off of making the schools have a different approach. Because at the moment in special needs you're allocated say 10 minutes for the lowest 5%, 7 minutes for the next, you're allocated a certain length of time per child; that's then lumped into x number of hours per week, the school is then told it's got that number of hours sort of thing which means having a teacher for that number of hours therefore a teacher is employed to do that number of hours and I'm wondering if therefore the children are taken out and given to that teacher but what other alternative there is I don't know.

Actually when the school's given a budget that might be better then there's a danger it just gets lost completely then you're torn between the devil and the deep blue sea.....

# Appendix 4.1 Draft re-submission Jan-April 90

Appendix 4.1 Draft re-submission Jan-April 90

**Bilingual Learners in Beech Pilot Project**

**Draft re-submission January-April 1990**

Introduction. The main aim of this proposal is to pick up the threads of initiatives started during 88-89. Given the many changes of personnel in the project schools these aims need to be negotiated carefully and schools funding is only estimated in relation to co-ordinator's aims at the moment. (See schools' funding below)

Co-ordinator; funding for 1 day December 1989
12 days January-April 90

Priorities

| *tackle in order* | *ongoing* | *ongoing* |
|---|---|---|
| 1. funding recommendations<br>2. packs out<br>3. interpreters/ translators<br>4.?INSET -equal opportunities | observing bilingual pupils in class-rooms using PLR and feedback | matched funding resources-spend money set up base |

Provisional programme

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Week 1 | Replanning | Resources visit |
| Week 2 | Shadow-school 1<br>Pilot | Recommendations meeting |
| Week 3 | Shadow-school 1 | Shadow school-1 |
| Week 4 | Shadow-school 1 | Pack |
| Week 5 | Shadow-school 2 | Feed back school 1 |
| Week 6 | Shadow-school 2 | Shadow-school 2 |
| Week 7 | Shadow-school 2 | Pack |
| Week 8 | Shadow-school 3 | Feed back school 2 |
| Week 9 | Shadow-school 3 | Shadow-school 3 |
| Week 10 | Shadow-school 3 | Pack |
| Week 11 | Shadow-school 4 | Feed back school 3 |
| Week 12 | Shadow-school 4 | Pack |
| Week 13 | Interpreters/ Translator<br>Resources & Review | Feed back shadow 4 |

Breakdown

14 1/2 days shadowing
4 1/2 days feedback
4 1/2 days pack
1 1/2 day replanning
1 1/2 day recommendations meeting
1 1/2 day interpreters/translators + meeting
1 1/2 day resources visit

+12 x 1 hour resource base development (using hour previously allocated to 'clinic' time)

Schools

Supply cover would be used as follows;

4 x 1/2 day resources visit
5 x 1/2 day replanning
5 x 1/2 day recommendations meeting
4 x 1/2 day shadowing feedback
5 x 1/2 day interpreters/translators + meeting

Original estimate approved was for 102 1/2 days for 4 terms i.e. approx. 25 1/2 days for one term. 23 1/2 days would roughly cover plan outlined with co-ordinator and schools working together.

Schools' use of summer and autumn 89 money would have to be discussed further.It has not been possible to establish at this stage how intensive a commitment schools would be prepared to make from Jan-April 90. There are obviously considerations of continuity in classes with overload of supply cover. In principle Morgan and Gunn Allen Junior would be willing to use more than approx. 5 1/2 days supply time. Areas which should be considered are;

1. Equal Opportunities/Multicultural Policy Development and Inset
2. Shadowing by teachers themselves possibly in other project schools
3. Further work on assessment in relation to National Curriculum

Next stages

Planning meeting arranged for 12th December 89

1. Discuss co-ordinator's plan
2. If approved plan detailed timetable
3. Discuss use of more supply time in schools

Then re-submit estimate for schools supply time.

Liz Statham 22nd November 89

## Appendix 4.2 Royal Society of Arts Diploma in Teaching English Across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools 'Final Examination': Report on Practical Test'

RSA EXAMINATIONS BOARD

CONFIDENTIAL

| | |
|---|---|
| CENTRE NUMBER | |
| CANDIDATE NUMBER | |
| OVERALL RESULT for use at Board only | |

DIPLOMA IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH ACROSS THE CURRICULUM IN MULTILINGUAL SCHOOLS

FINAL EXAMINATION: REPORT ON PRACTICAL TEST

Candidate's Name _____ Centre: _____

Place of examination - School: _____

Address: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

SECTION 1 Preparation of the lesson

Using the notes provided by the candidate comment below on his/her preparation with reference to:

| | S* | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| a) the relevance to the school curriculum and to the social/ cultural needs of the learners | | |
| b) the degree of integration with ongoing work | | |
| c) the analysis of the learning demands of the lesson | | |
| d) the learning objectives for this lesson | | |
| e) the analysis of the English language demands of the lesson | | |
| f) the linguistic objectives for this lesson and their relevance to the linguistic level of English language competence and needs of individual learners/ groups of learners | | |
| g) the appropriateness of the selection of materials | | |
| h) the appropriateness of planning of activities | | |
| i) the appropriateness of the organisation of the class | | |
| j) an overall anti-racist perspective | | |

* Satisfactory Tick if appropriate and comment.

## SECTION 2 Execution and management of the lesson

Comment on the candidate's ability to support the English language development of bilingual learners by providing:

| | S* | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| a) clear instructions and models of English language usage | | |
| b) effective teacher/pupil interaction | | |
| c) effective organisation and management of the whole class | | |
| d) a variety of activities | | |
| e) effective materials | | |
| f) support for understanding | | |
| g) opportunities for learners to apply their existing skills and knowledge | | |
| h) opportunities for developing English language use | | |
| i) opportunities for peer group interaction | | |
| j) effective monitoring of learning | | |
| k) a sensitive environment for individual learners and their communicative needs | | |

## SECTION 3 Candidate's evaluation of the lesson

Comment on how the candidate evaluated her/his own lesson after the assessment in terms of the objectives set out in the notes. (N.B. The candidate is not expected to write, nor to submit later, an evaluation of the lesson)

SECTION 4 Overall comments with reference to the following criteria for the assessment of practical teaching

At pass level candidates must:

(i) in their notes
(a) show an understanding of the language and learning demands of the lesson and relate these to the ages, stages of development and the language and learning needs of the bilingual pupils in the class.

(b) present a lesson, fitting into a scheme of work within the framework of the mainstream curriculum, which will support the English language development of the bilingual children

(ii) in the execution of the lesson shwo their ability to organise, monitor and genuinely support language and learning over a range of activities which allow the bilingual pupils to exploit their existing skills and knowledge.

In addition at a distinction level candidates must:

(i) in their notes

(a) show a clear analysis of the language and learning demands of the lesson and show how these relate to the stated language and learning needs of the children.

(b) show a clear understanding of the processes of language acquisition in terms of the development of the lesson and the imaginative use of the activities and materials employed.

(ii) show an outstanding ability to execute the lesson in terms of (a) organisation, (b) activities, (c) the exploitation of the bilingual pupils' learning and language potential and (d) sensitivity to the needs of individual pupils in the class.

SECTION 5 Final assessment

FINAL ASSESSMENT(Write PASS/FAIL*/DISTINCTION*) _____

* Reasons for award of a FAIL or DISTINCTION assessment:

Assessors are reminded that they must return this form, ET22(M) and the accompanying teaching notes within one week of the practical test.

Name of Assessor: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

# Appendix 4.3 Centre for Language in Primary Education Primary Language Record: Observations and Samples

# Observations and Samples (The Primary Language Record)

*attach extra pages where needed*

**Name:** **Year Group:**

## 1 Talking and listening: diary of observations

The diary below is for recording examples of the child's developing use of talk for learning and for interacting with others in English and/or other community languages.

Include different kinds of talk (e.g. planning an event, solving a problem, expressing a point of view or feelings, reporting on the results of an investigation, telling a story...)

Note the child's experience and confidence in handling social dimensions of talk (e.g. initiating a discussion, listening to another contribution, qualifying former ideas, encouraging others...)

The matrix sets out some possible contexts for observing talk and listening. Observations made in the diary can be plotted on the matrix to record the range of social and curriculum contexts sampled.

*(Handbook pages 37-39)*

| | SOCIAL CONTEXTS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LEARNING CONTEXTS | pair | small group | child with adult | small/large group with adult | |
| collabrative reading and writing activities | | | | | |
| play, dramatic play, drama & storytelling | | | | | |
| environmental studies & historical research | | | | | |
| maths investigations | | | | | |
| science investigations | | | | | |
| design, construction, craft & art projects | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Dates | Observations and their contexts. |
|---|---|
| | |

© CLPE 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991 Centre for Language in Primary Education
(London Borough of Southwark). Webber Row. London. SE1 8QW

## 2 Reading and Writing: diary of observations
(reading and writing in English and/or other community languages)

*(Handbook pages 40-44)*

| Date | Reading |
|---|---|
| | Record observations of the child's development as a reader (including wider experiences of story) across a range of contexts. |

| Writing |
|---|
| Record observations of the child's development as a writer including stories dictated by the child) across a range of contexts. |

## 3 Reading Samples (reading in English and/or other community languages)

*to include reading aloud and reading silently*

*(Handbook pages 45-49)*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Dates** | | | |
| **Title of book/text** (fiction or information) | | | |
| **Known/unknown text** | | | |
| **Sampling procedure used:** informal assessment/running record/miscue analysis | | | |
| **Overall impression of the child's reading:**<br>• confidence and degree of independence<br>• involvement in the book/text<br>• the way in which the child read the text aloud | | | |
| **Strategies the child used when reading aloud:**<br>• drawing on previous experience to make sense of the book/text<br>• playing at reading*<br>• using book language*<br>• reading the pictures*<br>• focusing on print (directionality, 1:1 correspondence, recognition of certain words)*<br>• using semantic/syntactic/ grapho-phonic cues<br>• predicting<br>• self-correcting<br>• using several strategies or over-dependent on one | | | |
| **Child's response to the book/text:**<br>• personal response<br>• critical response (understanding, evaluating, appreciating wider meanings) | | | |
| **What this sample shows about the child's development as a reader:**<br><br>**Experiences/support needed to further development:** | | | |

**Early indicators that the child is moving into reading*

## 4 Writing Samples (writing in English and/or other community languages)

*'Writing ' to include children's earliest attempts at writing*

*(Handbook pages 50-54)*

| Dates | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Context and background information about the writing:**<br>• how the writing arose<br>• how the child went about the writing<br>• whether the child was writing alone or with others<br>• whether the writing was discussed with anyone while the child was working on it<br>• kind of writing (e.g. list, letter,story, poem, personal writing, information writing)<br>• complete piece of work/extract | | | |
| **Child's own response to the writing:** | | | |
| **Teacher's response:**<br>• to the content of the writing<br>• to the child's ability to handle this particular kind of writing<br>• overall impression | | | |
| **Development of spelling and conventions of writing:** | | | |
| **What this writing shows about the child's development as a writer:**<br>• how it fits into the range of the child's previous writing<br>• Experience/support needed to further development | | | |

*Please keep the writing with sample sheet*

# Appendix 4.4 Extracts from interview with Sufia, Year 5 Morrison

Appendix 4.4 Extracts from interview with Sufia, Year 5 Morrison

L. = Liz Statham
S. = Sufia

Transcription conventions
..... indicates end of extract
...indicates pause

L. I'm really asking about the languages you use in school and at home. So you speak another language at home?
S. Yes
L. And is that Bengali?
S. Yes
L. And is it Sylheti Bengali?
S. Yeah
L. and can you tell me who you speak that to? To everybody at home
S. Yeah
L. Your Mum, your Dad, your brothers, your sisters, everybody
S. Yeah
L. What about friends?
S. No.
L. So you always speak English to your friends
S. They don't understand what I'm talking
L. Have you taught them any yet?
S. No I haven't they say what to say hello is in Bengali, I sometimes say but it's too hard, they to say it out, too hard
L. They can't remember Salaam Malaikam
S. No, you can
L. Well just a very little, I'm learning a bit of Punjabi so some of the words are nearly the same
It's too hard for them to learn Bengali but you've been learning English do you go to any Bengali classes at all
S. No if I was in Newcastle, London or Portsmouth they have these special schools on Saturday and Sunday in bengali and you go and teach up there but in Copperbeech you don't get any of those schools...I don't read any books of Bengali because there isn't any place....we have this special kind of school..you know you go to churches, well we go to another place, when we have our Eid, a special day, all the boys and Dads they go up to the church, not allowed to have girls in there only boys and dads and girls and ladies are meant to pray in the house and we don't celebrate Eng..Easter and Christmas because it isn't our religion to celebrate.

.....

S. But I've lived in Bangladesh. I was born up there and we've been to school up there. But what we do in school is we have these tests, we have these spellings and all these things for homework. And if you don't learn something at home you get this big whack on your hand with a stick.

.....

I've been to Bengali school when I was three years old and I... there 'til I was five, til my Dad came back.

.....

L. Can we go back to Bengali and speaking Bengali? You said your Dad had helped you with English and writing. Has he helped you at all with Bengali? Have you learnt to read and write.
S. Yeah my Dad was a teacher when he was in Bangladesh. He learned me teaching when he didn't get married he was a teacher, after he got married he stopped being a teacher because he had to go back to Copperbeech.
L. So he's taught you a little bit of reading and writing in Bengali. So how much can you do? Can you write a letter in Bengali, can you read stories in Bengali?
S. I can do that but sometimes I get mistakes and I can't do it. I can write down Bengali but I can't read. I can do everything but I can't...

.....

## Appendix 4.5 Categories for writing up observation notes.

Appendix 4.5 Categories for writing up observation notes

1. Language and learning

-involvement in classes

-opportunity to gain support from adults

-opportunity to gain support from peers

-use of language

2. National Curriculum

3. Use of L1

4. Record keeping/observation

5. Primary Language Record

6. Recommendations

## Appendix 4.6 Sample of written up observation notes with head's comments

Appendix 4.6 Sample of written up observation notes with head's comments

Headteacher's comments which were in pencil on notes are shown in italics.

*Criteria. Twins unidentical. Cannot be taught in the same class (fight!). (This was tried for half-term)*
Gunn Allen Infants-shadowing

Manoussos and Stavros
9th January (a.m.)
16th January (a.m. and p.m.)

1. Learning/language learning

with Daphne (special educational needs teacher) *First morning that Daphne had worked with the boys*

-link with ongoing class work e.g. reading development, handwriting, general discussion about topic not link with immediate part of topic boys engaged with
-chance to read to adult with opportunity for conferencing about what's been read
-chance to collaborate in Greek about vocabulary needed for writing
-English structures still developing e.g. Manoussos "Stavros no like pillows" but getting meaning across in most cases
-both relaxed about talking even with stranger very close
-Stavros drawing on German learning skills *Not obvious-only has a German word book-perhaps they are taught German in Greek school?*

with Sue (Stavros's class teacher)

-Stavros clear about organization; pack home to parents, using NNEB very supportive
-Stavros involved in oral work with other pupils e.g. discussing wheel model with other pupil (but didn't work at it to get it better after showing it to Stella); a very little discussion with the pupil next to him when both writing,about getting started rather than content of writing but very little talk at other times
-with teacher Stavros initiated talk with teacher e.g. to request to spend some time silent reading, to ask for work to be checked
-Stavros knew what he had to do but ?more support for actual tasks needed e.g. if story is central for topic work/writing need chance to hear often (?with Daphne, act out with friend, tape, read to self again-impression from Stavros was 'I've done that' but struggle with writing)
-writing a struggle (teacher Gunn Allen Infant's notes from beginning of year say boys involved in different writing from rest of class) ?able to do same writing but with support e.g. ? retell story (does it matter if Stavros sticks to original rather than creating new story line?), teacher scribing from

oral work, words needed available, picture planning, drafting, response partner, using dictionary (check again what happened with Iason and dictionary), clear about purpose for writing (Stavros felt it was daft to read back his own writing) *Stavros always insists -but this was an unusual morning for him and he reacted in this way*, models e.g. give sentences about process-ask to sequence, match pictures with sentences, give instructions to someone else, build in collaboration as much as possible *Sue-less attention paid to Stavros than usual so that Liz could evaluate how Stavros would cope unaided. Not a typical day-points raised would not occur usually therefore generalisations were made on "snapshot" incidents..*

with Sarah (Manoussos's class teacher)

-Manoussos fully involved, understood instructions in context, Sally explained every task (use NNEB to explain?)

-Manoussos involved in interactive work, chance to discuss sets work with girl he hadn't worked with before;collaboration not specifically built in i.e. each had own task but did exchange ideas to help each other,informal discussion about toys picture work with boy at same table. Manoussos talking a lot more with peers in class than led to believe from special needs teacher's report

-Manoussos initiated conversation many times with Sarah, asking for work, asking for work to be checked

-listening at news time and to chapter book, laughed at joke-understood or just joining in?

National Curriculum

Admissions/provision

-school records included information about previous education (German-Greek school) *?Greek school teaching German*

-no report from Treeshire English Language Resources Centre, had visited (?kept elsewhere)

-very good links between teachers described,?because already members of staff

-some withdrawal (1 1/4 hours x 3 days)

Advantages described/seen

...boys work hard,feel they've achieved something in school

...learn language before they need to cope in class

...close eye can be kept on progress

...?would frustrations re-occur if all time was spent in classroom

Disadvantages described/seen

...feeling that class work is not real work cfd. with withdrawal

...subject to racist gestures/comments in corridor (9/1/90-pupil going to toilet passed making gestures and muttering gibberish) *Child might do this to anybody*

...not as close link as could be e.g. "The Impossible Rocket" could be read again/worked on in class
...missing out on beginning of tasks ?more teacher time later to explain
...Iason capable of planning for himself e.g. asking for 'time out' in the reading corner; all time controlled in withdrawal
...assumes they can't carry on with more learning until they've learnt more language-*not true-vocab. needed for tasks in curriculum area*
...uses special needs budget

Use of L1
-noted that boys are working with parents in Greek at home

Social
-a lot of work done to make sure both boys have integrated
-other children supportive e.g. 1 boy checking with Manoussos on English of toys picture e.g. "What's this?" "What's this?" "What's this?"
-Manoussos shadowing, literally, friend in P.E.
-Manoussos's friend sticking up for him when other boy said "I don't like the way Manoussos speaks" he said "I do"
-Manoussos playing happily in playground at lunch-time

Record keeping/observation
-special needs record termly
-reading/other records

-PLR
...child conference
...parental conference? *Almost daily-oral and written in folder*

Recommendations
-not to worry about gaps in vocabulary or grammatical structures *we do not do this with other children-speech tenses simple grammar as application demands* but to concentrate on language demands of tasks i.e. don't need language before learning but language through learning *contrary to parents expectations*
-technical features of writing could be dealt with in class-room (time-out); doesn't necessarily need teacher time with pupil (planning important of course)
-use Greek for support ; dictionary, alphabet up ?refer to German
-provide opportunities for it to be normal practice to work on stories many times for everyone, ?translation of long chapter books read to class
-build in as much collaboration with peers as possible especially for writing and activities of which writing is a part
-class teacher responsible for recording with help from support teacher (N.C. implications)
-?cut down withdrawal to assembly time, share between boys, use time to reinforce class work in classroom

-build in time to liaise with class teachers-?assembly time at some point during week,?make class work main focus-shift importance
-if worried about boys not being stretched ?put them in top groups for everything *class teachers disagree for language grouping* i.e. don't worry about needing language before learning, give chances for them to teach others
-?draw on as much cultural background as possible e.g. wheel

Materials
?Stories in the Multilingual Primary Classroom

## Appendix 5.1 Funding recommendations with regard to provision for bilingual pupils in Copperbeech

Appendix 5.1 Funding recommendations with regard to provision for bilingual pupils in Copperbeech.

Introduction
This paper takes up issues raised before and during the work of the pilot project from the co-ordinator's perspective.

1. Existing system of provision in Copperbeech.

From discussions with officer, area advisory officer, multicultural Inspector and heads and teachers of schools it has been possible to establish that before the start of the pilot project in September 1988 heads requested additional help with respect to bilingual pupils from the area education office. Help in the form of teaching or NTA time was allocated from flexible funding. (Formula?) "The current method of meeting this need seemed to be ad hoc and drew on the flexible funding budget" (Minutes of meeting on February 18th, 88 to consider language support in the scattered context).

Officer, in a letter to the chairman of governors-a Beech school 16/3/88 mentioned that help was given to schools but only after schools had let him know if there was evidence of a stress related problem, in that case he would do what he could to give a little support. He also said that in many cases he had refused help because of insufficient resources. Area advisory officer confirmed at the input meeting of the pilot project on 20th September, 88 that help had been given from flexible funding in this way.

This system of flexible funding has continued since the start of the project and in addition, in Walker's case, funding has been linked to special needs; funding has been allocated as a result of a report from the educational psychologist attached to the school. (Other e.g.'s)

When schools have asked for additional help they have been asked to allow the child a settling in period to see how the child will 'pick up' English. Time involved? Officer said in the letter previously mentioned that it had been his experience that "such children do actually survive and make progress in school in that of necessity they grasp the rudiments of the language and after a slow start tend to cope quite well."

Schools have also been able to get help from the Treeshire English Language Resources Centre in the form of initial and follow up visits and materials. Occasionally it has been possible for the teacher in charge to shadow some pupils for a limited about of time. There has been some confusion however in the past, with Morrison School for instance at first being told that they could not avail themselves of these services and then when the current teacher in charge started being told they could.

2. Numbers involved.

In November 1987 teacher in charge, Treeshire English Language Resources Centre gave multicultural inspector a list of numbers of children in Beech schools she had visited or supplied materials to or who had themselves visited the Centre. 14 schools were mentioned. in Copperbeech only Morrison and

a secondary school were mentioned as having bilingual children; 1 in Morrison, 1 in the secondary school. The figure for Morrison was certainly an underestimate. (how many). Although bilingual pupils are isolated in Beech it was clear from Morrison head's repeated attempts to get help that numbers were quite significant.

Current numbers

3. Provision in other areas. ESL specialists in Poplar work at a ratio of approximately 1:25 bilingual pupils. There is considerable variation however depending on the age of the pupils and the type of support given. In Berkshire specialists work at a ratio of approximately 1:20.

4. Philosophy

It is sometimes felt that what is needed for bilingual learners, particularly new arrivals, is English teaching. At first it was assumed that bilingual pupils would pick up English for themselves but from the early 60's onwards local authorities with considerable numbers of bilingual children did pay attention to the need to teach English at initial stages. This reflected the feeling that pupils would be absorbed into mainstream life and learning of the school after they had acquired English. It was felt that English needed to be taught as a system in steps and stages and of course these steps and stages didn't fit neatly into learning and teaching going on in classrooms, so children were withdrawn for special help.

But we now realize that children can learn straightaway. They may not speak straightaway but we know that learning a second language goes through similar but not identical stages to learning a first language and we know that babies do an incredible amount of listening before they speak. But that listening is within an understandable context. Bilingual children will learn and learn English if meanings are understood and if they have the motivation to want to. We have to accept the fact that language, whether first or second, comes in messy ways to all children-from peers, from teachers, from T.V., in the playground. This does not mean leaving bilingual pupils unsupported in the classrooms. Yes they may grasp the 'rudiments of the language' but they are here to learn and shouldn't necessarily have to put up with a 'slow start'. It means making the learning accessible through using practical activities accompanied by talk, involvement in active group work. Such support has to be built into planning and of course needs to be evaluated. Quite often supportive work with bilingual children has been the catalyst for all children in a class. Certainly working in this way enables everybody to have equal access to learning. The report by HM Inspectors on a survey of the teaching of English as a second language in six LEA's refer to "a growing awareness of the potential problems that a separation of English as a second language (E2L) teaching from mainstream schooling can create. An over-concentration on E2L at the expense of other aspects of education meant that some pupils did not acquire English in ways that enabled them to use it in many different situations. They also missed out on important elements of the curriculum which, in turn, made for a narrowing of later subject choice, especially in courses leading to public examinations." it further says that 'work of the highest quality was seen when pupils were able to engage fully in tasks, where they had opportunities to discuss and where they worked from first-hand experience". It also mentions three

government initiatives which served to reinforce changes in provision. And it quotes from the third "Education for All" (the Swann Report) "We would therefore hope to see E2L being viewed as an extension of the range of language needs for which all teachers in schools should, provided they are given adequate training and appropriate support, be able to cater."

5. It is in this context that the pilot project was set up. It is very understandable that schools suddenly receiving bilingual pupils should ask for outside help and perhaps think that there is a magic formula/teacher available. But as mentioned language development is messy and moreover needs will continue and change. The minutes of a meeting held at the LEA's offices on 18th February,88 to discuss language support in the scattered context (at which the idea of the pilot was born) say "Clearly the ideal would be to develop the expertise in the schools"

The pilot is attempting to do this in 5 schools in Copperbeech. (The February 18th meeting minutes stressed that the needs of pupils county wide should not be lost sight of while this experiment was taking place). There was some initial confusion when I was asked to visit a new arrival at another Beech school and in fact officer also referred another school to me. The teacher in charge, Treeshire English Language Resources Centre and I sorted this out and she responds to schools outside the pyramid. But as mentioned this is just visits and materials.

At the initial input meeting on 20th September,88 teachers from the schools involved in the project, while obviously welcoming the initiative, still asked the area advisory officer about further funding. He had explained in his introductory remarks that bilingual pupils didn't have a handicap and therefore statementing which would bring extra resources wasn't on, that Copperbeech wasn't an inner city area and therefore wouldn't attract inner city funding and although Section 11 funding hadn't been overlooked the best way was to use flexible funding and support initiatives such as the project as well as reviewing cases of bilingual pupils with severe learning difficulties who would receive extra help. The teachers asked why temporary teachers weren't employed in Copperbeech. The area advisory officer said that extra teaching help had been given to 6 Chinese students in an other area of Beech.

That feeling of needing teacher support still exists, most recently expressed at a review meeting 20th June and earlier at a meeting with heads of project schools on May 16th when it was clearly felt that, despite the project, money wasn't forthcoming for bilingual pupils from Area funding. Morrison for instance was still receiving steady numbers of bilingual pupils and unlike Rowan had no staffing.

Clearly during the project we have not reached the stage where everyone is confident of supporting bilingual pupils right throughout the school. It is only very recently that I as co-ordinator have been invited to shadow students in one of the project school. The teachers still the need for specific teaching time allocated to the schools. But what has come about is that the schools in the pyramid would a)use the funding in a way which furthered the aims of providing access to the curriculum rather than for separate provision-there is definitely an awareness of the difficulties of linking support to individual children and b)would be able to share a key person i.e. bilingual teacher, bilingual aide, ESL teacher. The fact that

schools are currently trying to obtain funding by referring to the E.P. without any consultation with me as project co-ordinator on the bilingual aspects and are still trying to obtain NTA support indicates still which are the most likely sources of funding and inevitably schools have continued to try these options. In one particular case it is clear that a pupil involved has considerable potential but the only way of getting extra help is to treat her as a potential special educational needs pupil. I am sure that despite continuing to access these resources the schools would welcome a coherent method of funding and would work together if it was possible.

7. Possibilities

1. Continue with adhoc flexible funding. This does have the advantage of being flexible but
a)leads to competition between schools rather than collaboration
b) leads to the likelihood of funds being used in a separatist rather than an integrative way. It is of course possible for NTA's to work in the classroom providing support for all children and thus for the bilingual children to benefit.

2. Continuing to ask for special educational needs help. It is tempting to consider 'taking the money and running'. Schools know that money is available for special educational needs and however much it is said "we know the difference between language needs and learning difficulties" it can create problems in the long term
a) if used for language development rather than learning difficulty then it shifts responsibility for language development onto the special needs department or special needs teachers rather than sharing the responsibility across the school
b)if bilingual children are labelled special educational needs and thus taught by special education department or special education teachers they can be seen as remedial, this can become a self fulfilling prophecy or the children get an unrealistic idea of the level required if they are to achieve when it gets to exams; despite the tremendous work done by special educational needs teachers bilingual children need to be learning at their own conceptual level. It may be felt that bilingual children slow down others but every class, however tightly streamed, is a mixed ability class and all children will have times when they need to learn from others and when they can give to others. Bilingual children if in mainstream classes may do a lot of taking at early stages but it would be a lot more at a later stage with more academic work to catch up on.

This is not to say that there are no bilingual learners with special educational needs. But the numbers of slow learners should be in proportion to the number of bilingual children. It is hoped that if a class teacher suspects learning difficulty there will be a thorough collection of evidence (Ann Robson's guidelines are invaluable here) and consultation with EP and parents and that then special educational needs funding will be called on.

3. It is also tempting to consider applying for Section 11 funding. Traditionally applications have usually been put in from inner city areas in Treeshire. Strictly speaking there is no lower Home Office limit in terms of numbers. However Section 11 is also take and run money. All children should have access to the mainstream National Curriculum and if some don't because of language or

whatever other reason then that access should be provided by the local authority as part and parcel of provision. The need is access. By setting up a separate fund for ethnic minority pupils it again shifts responsibility away from the school and authority. Pragmatically it is also difficult to work when for educational reasons bilingual children should be in the mainstream but Section 11 workers must spend the majority of their time with those pupils. In addition section 11 currently does not cover bilingual pupils not from the new Commonwealth or Pakistan. A proportion of the children in Copperbeech schools for whom help is sought are not covered. (check)
If Section 11 is considered then it is a Home Office requirement to consult fully with members of the community. The project members have made some contacts with parents of bilingual children and have also begun to set up an interpreters/translators network. Section 11 is obviously worth considering particularly as some kind of Section 11 is likely to be in existence when spending is devolved to schools under LMS.

4. Allocation of hours from existing staffing in a school. This is obviously worth considering when there are one or two bilinguals in a school as there is already an established teacher who knows the school. That teacher should not be a special educational needs teacher for the reasons mentioned above and withdrawal, obviously tempting given probably limited hours, should be avoided. If the staff member worked with other colleagues rather than the child/children that might be more productive in the long term.
A proportion of one staff salary might still be possible under LMS. Obviously at that stage schools will have to work out how much time they're prepared to allocate.

5. Mainstream funding of a full time specialist ESL post.
It is very unlikely that a school in Beech would be allocated a full time specialist now or would choose to employ one come LMS but a shared specialist is an option to be considered.
Any specialist post of carries with it the danger of shifting responsibility to that person. But if that specialist's main aim was to work with teachers mainly and to block the work with children, i.e. to work within one school for say half a tem and then move on so that there was a direct input to class teachers with a watching brief for other schools in the pyramid or indeed the area if necessary then the original aims of creating the expertise in the school would be fulfilled in a way that the project is trying to but in a much more systematic but at the same time still flexible way. If mainstream funding was allocated on a patch basis then under LMS the schools could contribute to a salary on a joint basis if provision for bilingual pupils apart from Section 11 does not come under the central 7% of county services. Schools in the patch would still have to allocate a faire way of sharing the resource of that one person. In the Walker pyramid given the experience of working together in the project on these issues I am confident schools would be willing to share the teacher and consequently the INSET and the materials development. It would definitely cut down the current uncertainty and consequent bureaucracy concerning provision and there is no reason why such a

specialist should not be involved with others in different divisions for her/his own professional development.

Whichever option is chosen it should be one that concentrates on the school and the teachers rather than the individual child. Thus any teacher with time allocation with funding from whatever source should have time to work with teachers and to work on policy development built into the contract.

## Appendix 5.2 Section 11 proposal (excluding pupil details) submitted to Treeshire

Appendix 5.2 Section 11 proposal (excluding pupil details) submitted to Treeshire

## Walker Pyramid Section 11 submission

The following proposal describes a project which would employ 3 staff-an E.S.L. specialist, a home school liaison teacher and a bilingual assistant to meet needs of ethnic minority pupils at Walker (secondary), Morrison (primary), Gunn Allen Infant, Gunn Allen Junior, and Morgan (primary) schools in Ash division. The proposal will cover needs,tasks,policy,consultation,objectives/targets and measurement/monitoring.

### 1. Needs

**a. The particular Commonwealth community to be served.**

The 5 schools cater for pupils whose families come mainly from Bangladesh,India and Hong Kong.

**b. The variety and degree of local need.**

The number of pupils in the 5 schools is small in total overall (numbers shown in Appendix 1) but the number of pupils not born in this country is increasing. For instance in one school the first Bengali speaking family arrived in 1984. There are now 11 children from 4 families at that school. Evidence would suggest that the number of Commonwealth families will continue to grow. In the secondary school ethnic minority pupils account for only 4% in the 4th year but 7% in 1st, 2nd and 3rd years. It is important to note that there is very little opportunity for pupils to benefit within school by being supported in the early stages of learning English by other pupils speaking the same first language.

**c. Evidence of the needs specific to the local Commonwealth community and their scale.**

A pilot project in these 5 schools (Sept. 88-Mar. 89 and Jan. -Apr.90) with the aim of working with teachers to help them support isolated bilingual pupils has identified through observation and discussions with teachers and heads the need for initial and continuing language support for these children across the curriculum. In some cases class teachers do not feel they can meet the needs of bilingual learners without taking from other children. The larger the class the more of a problem this becomes (2 classes of 37 in junior school seen). Needs are related both to oracy particularly in the case of new entrants and new arrivals and also literacy where pupils who appear orally fluent find difficulties coping with written work in a variety of subject areas.There is a need both to give bilingual school children a command of English as far as possible equal to that of their peers and to achieve at the same level as their peers in all areas of the curriculum.

The pilot project has also identified pupils who would benefit from bilingual support to assist access to the curriculum e.g. in explanations of tasks, concepts and skills. There is a need to provide first language support for bilingual pupils particularly at the early stages of learning.

Concern has been expressed by teachers about low participation in outings, patchy parental attendance at parents' evenings. Some parents are concerned and bring their own interpreters to parents' evenings, others have no involvement. There has been a limited initiative to increase parental partnership within the pilot project in terms of establishing personal links with families in one school. There is a need to strengthen ties between schools and the parents of ethnic minority pupils.

There is a need to investigate current provision for pre-school, take up of pre-school provision amongst ethnic minority families and provide language and learning support for pupils in pre-schools. Contacts made with parents at the pre-school stage will facilitate later contact when children are at school.

**d. Why mainstream services cannot redress the stated needs.**

There has never been Q.T. language support provided by the area education office. Support that has been provided has been ad hoc and has been used to employ N.T.A. help on a limited basis. Schools themselves have had to take hours from teachers of pupils with learning difficulties to provide additional language support. Such support has largely been used to provide individual or small group help rather than tackling access to curriculum within mainstream classes. It is recognized that there will be a certain percentage of ethnic minority pupils with special educational needs but using special educational resources is in any event no longer an option as a result of current assessment of special needs on the basis of free school meals;such a measure excludes ethnic minority pupils for the most part from receiving special educational funding because in this area the majority go home for dinner. The only extra funding is therefore the additional formula funding for bilingual pupils.

Although the 5 schools have been served by a County language resources Centre this has not had the remit to provide support for individual pupils. Under Treeshire reorganization of Jan. 90 this area of the county is still not served by either of the two peripatetic ESL teams or by any of the home-school liaison teachers in Rowan or Poplar.

The 5 schools' involvement in the pilot project has raised awareness of teachers and has identified ways of supporting bilingual pupils in mainstream classes which need to be implemented. Lack of access to bilingual support has meant that there has been no mechanism to provide first language support for pupils in accessing the curriculum particularly at early stages of learning English.

Lack of bilingual support has also limited the development of parental partnership. There is no mechanism for establishing amount of access of ethnic minority under-fives to pre-school and increasing access.

## 2. Tasks

a. The practical tasks to be undertaken by the project in each year and the proportion of time spent on each.

The project will undertake to give bilingual school children a command of English as far as possible equal to that of their peers and to enable them to achieve at the same level as their peers in all areas of the curriculum.

The needs of developing bilingual pupils will be monitored in relation to the National Curriculum each year.

Class and subject teachers will work towards identifying areas of the curriculum where individual bilingual learners are failing to achieve at the levels of other pupils and will target these areas for support.

Class and subject teachers will take over responsibility for providing full access for developing bilingual pupils across the curriculum with priority being given to National Curriculum subjects in the order in which they come into force throughout the project. Language demands of programmes of study,tasks and materials will be analyzed. Additional support will be provided through use of visuals, further explanation, specific collaborative mechanisms, effective staging of tasks, first language support and resources. Resources will be developed.

Bilingual pupils will be assessed by all class and subject teachers by the end of the project. Their assessments, records of achievement,profiles will include bilingual, bicultural achievement.

Guidelines will be written to ensure that bilingual pupils are placed appropriately i.e. according to age in mixed ability classes and implementation of these guidelines in schools and transition between schools will be checked.

INSET on supporting bilingual pupils in mainstream classrooms in 5 schools will be carried out.

Action research on the effects of the project on achievement of bilingual pupils in 5 schools using research diary, observation, assessment and profile records, interviews and questionnaires will be carried out.

Schools will be supported in early identification of bilingual pupils with special educational needs in conjunction with EP's and Special Education Advisory teachers. Bilingual pupils with special educational needs will be given appropriate support within the mainstream.

Ethnic minority pupils and parents will have full access to information on option choices and career counselling with interpretation/translation if necessary in conjunction with the careers service. Work experience placements will be monitored.

The project will strengthen ties between schools and parents of ethnic minority pupils.

An interpreters/translators network will be set up in collaboration with volunteers in year 1.

Needs of ethnic minority parents in relation to the National Curriculum and wider involvement in the education of their children will be monitored.

Parents will have access to National Curriculum related assessment procedures and arrangements e.g. information about records of achievement, be involved in parental conferencing.

Interpretation and translation as needed for schools' events, information sheets, standard home-school letters etc. will be carried out.

Parents will be centrally involved in school life. They will be contacted before events, meetings will be organized to discuss educational issues.

Parents will be centrally involved in home-school literacy schemes through workshop sessions, multilingual information.

Ethnic minority pupils will be inducted into school on a consistent basis and parents will be fully informed of the procedures.

The current provision for under-5s will be investigated and parents will be fully informed about and involved in pre-school provision. Language support will be provided in pre-school where necessary. Profiles will be compiled prior to school entry.

Parents will have information on school routines, (e.g. explanatory notes about absences) and the pastoral system.

Parents of 'new arrivals' will have information about other services e.g. adult education classes, toy libraries, community language classes, health services etc.

Action research on the effects of the project on strengthening ties between schools and parents of ethnic minority pupils in the 5 schools using research diary, observation, assessment and profile records and questionnaires will be carried out.

Inset on strengthening ties between schools and parents of ethnic minority pupils for staff in the 5 schools will be carried out.

The project will endeavour to get an ethnic minority parent onto the governing body of one of the 5 schools.

There will be a pyramid policy on whole school support of ethnic minority pupils by the end of the project.

**b. The proportion of staff and funding targeted at administrative and management duties within the proposal.**

.2 of the E.S.L. specialist post will be targeted at administrative, management and training duties within the proposal. A percentage of both E.S.L. and Home-School Liaison posts will be allocated to liaison with the bilingual assistant.

**d. The structure of the project and its exact locations.**

E.S.L. specialist, Home-School Liaison teacher and bilingual assistant will act as a team responsible to one head from the 5 schools for day to day management, to the divisional inspector for line management and to the county general inspector with responsibility for ethnic minority pupils for professional guidance.

The two teachers will plan the day to day management of their work i.e. prioritizing amongst the schools and children.

The teachers and bilingual assistant will be based at one of the 5 schools.

**e. The extent to which the project is based in the voluntary sector.**

The Home-School Liaison teacher will make contact with the classes run at the week-end for Punjabi and Hindi speaking pupils in the area and consult with community language class teachers about rate of progress in first language situation.

Volunteers will be involved in the interpreters/translation network; contacts will be made with Copperbeech Volunteer Bureau.

**f. The relationship to mainstream provision and other services.**

The project will aim to ensure that language learning needs are met within mainstream provision. An important aspect of the E.S.L. specialist's brief will be working alongside colleagues to encourage them to meet those needs themselves.

The project will aim to ensure that parents are fully involved in the mainstream life of the school. The Home-School Liaison teacher will work towards all parents being centrally included in the life of the school by ensuring appropriate access.

**g. The activities designed to improve delivery of mainstream services.**

The ESL specialist will team teach in supporting individual pupils and will share aspects of good practice with mainstream colleagues both informally and on an 'official' schools' INSET basis.

The ESL specialist will also provide appropriate resources which enable language development to proceed in all areas of the curriculum. This means that the responsibility for supporting language development of ethnic minorities will shift to class and subject teachers. The teacher's time will be blocked to allow a substantial period of time in each school i.e. targets for children and work with teachers will be carried out together in one school, the teacher will then move on to the next school returning to each school each year. The amount of time allocated to each school will be determined on a pro rata basis.

## 3. Policy

The proposals seek to further the aims as outlined in Annex B (ii).

1. to enable ethnic minority pupils aged under 5,particularly those whose mother tongue is not English to gain the langauge competence and learning skills necessary for the early years of primary education.

2. to give school age children whose mother tongue is not English a command of English which, as far as possible, is equal to that of their peers.

3. to help school age children from ethnic minorities to achieve at the same level as their peers in all areas of the curriculum.

4. to strengthen ties between schools and the parents of ethnic minority pupils, where those ties are hard to establish because of parents' lack of English or because of cultural or social factors, involved in the education of their children and in the work of the schools.

5. to extend the scope and sharpen the focus of careers education and guidance for young people of ethnic minority communities, so widening awareness of educational, vocational and employment opportunities available to them.

## 4. Consultation

**a. Consultation carried out prior to the submission of the proposal.**

Headteachers in 5 schools have been concerned about not being able to meet needs of ethnic minority pupils. Pilot project co-ordinator has consulted with them at many stages since Sept. 89.

Headteachers of the 5 schools have consulted with area education office about obtaining funding to meet individual needs.

Teachers and pupils have been consulted during the pilot project. A sample of pupils have been shadowed for 1/2 -1 day each during the pilot project and have been asked about language learning.

A number of parents have been contacted formally through the pilot project to strengthen links with one school but not on the basis of this proposal.

**c. How client groups will be consulted about the effectiveness of the provision and their role in monitoring and direction of the project.**

Although the consultation meeting held in June 90 to discuss this proposal with parents was a one-off exercise it is envisaged that it will become easier to consult about effectiveness of provision when the crucial part of the project relating to home-school links with steering group is in place.

**5 b. Measurement/Monitoring**

**a. The recording system by which the project is to be monitored.**

The project will be monitored through twice annual meetings of the steering group. An annual report compiled by the ESL specialist and the Home-School Liaison teacher outlining progression of bilingual learners in relation to their peers each year,to what extent class and subject teachers have responded to meeting the needs of bilingual learners in class and to what extent parents are involved in the life and work of the schools. This report will draw on action research results,statistics and assessment findings. It will be presented to the county Section 11 steering group, after consultation with the project steering group. Feedback will be expected. As a result of the feedback the E.S.L. specialist and the Home-school liaison teacher will re-assess the targets for the following year in conjunction with the steering group.

**Job descriptions**

**ESL Specialist**

The ESL specialist will have taken or will agree to take the Diploma in Teaching English across the Curriculum in Multilingual Schools.

The E.S.L. specialist will be responsible for monitoring needs of ethnic minority children in relation to the National Curriculum and the children's own language development needs.

The E.S.L. specialist will be responsible for working alongside class teachers to provide language development for ethnic minority pupils across the curriculum with priority being given to National Curriculum subjects in the order in which they come into force.

The E.S.L. specialist will be responsible for liaising with class teachers over assessment of bilingual pupils and be involved in recording progress. In the first year the ESL specialist will make the assessments, in the second year the ESL specialist and the class or subject teacher will jointly make the assessments and in the third year the class teacher or subject teacher will make the assessments.

The E.S.L. specialist will be responsible for advising on placement and appropriate support throughout the schools.

The E.S.L. specialist will be responsible for providing INSET on supporting ethnic minority learners in the classroom.

The E.S.L. Specialist will carry out action research on effects of the project on achievement of bilingual pupils in 5 schools using research diary, observation, assessment and the E.S.L. teacher will work closely with the home-school liaison teacher.profile records, interviews and questionnaires in 5 schools.

**Home-school liaison teacher**

The Home-School liaison teacher will be responsible for setting up and sustaining an interpreters/translators network in collaboration with volunteers.

The Home-school liaison teacher will be responsible for monitoring needs of ethnic minority parents in relation the National Curriculum and more widely involvement in the education of their children.

The home-school liaison teacher will be responsible for arranging interpretation and translation as needed for schools' events, information sheets etc.

The home-school liaison teacher will be responsible for involving parents in school life by making personal contact before events, by organizing meetings to discuss educational issues.

The Home-School liaison teacher will be responsible alongside senior staff for induction of bilingual children into school and for arranging 1st language support where necessary.

The Home-School liaison teacher will investigate current provision for under-5's and work with pre-school and parents to involve parents and arrange language support where necessary.

The Home-School liaison teacher will advise on issues of first language and culture in specific cases and advise colleagues on providing appropriate pastoral support.

The Home-school teacher will make sure that e.g. dietary requirements are correctly recorded on pupils' files in the first year, will work with class teachers and tutors to do this in the second year and will monitor that class teachers are doing this in the third year.

The Home-School teacher will carry out action research on effects of the project on strengthening ties between schools and parents of ethnic minority pupils in the 5 schools using research diary, observation, assessment and profile records and questionnaires.

The Home-School Liaison teacher will be responsible for providing INSET around the above areas for staff in the 5 schools.

The Home-School Liaison teacher will endeavour to get a parent onto the governing body of one of the project schools.

The Home-School Liaison teacher will be released with the agreement of her/his line manager to respond to requests for advice and information (e.g. about interpreter network) from other schools in Ash Division in relation to isolated ethnic minority pupils.

The E.S.L. specialist and Home-School Liaison teacher will be supported by the bilingual assistant.

**The bilingual assistant.**

The bilingual assistant will give support to class teachers and the ESL specialist when requested i.e. when a pupil is having difficulty understanding instructions, concepts, particular aspects of language which make it difficult to understand the learning required in class and therefore to develop English through learning.

The bilingual assistant will contribute to the recording of bilingual children's achievement across the curriculum.

The bilingual assistant will be asked to give priority to new arrivals at early stages of learning English and children in pre-school.

The bilingual assistant will be asked to assist in the production of materials as needed by home-school liaison teacher and ESL specialist.

# Appendix 5.3 Observation notes on Sukhjinder

Appendix 5.3 Observation notes on Sukhjinder

8.2.91

C.= pupil Sukhjinder was working with

Obviously very brief conversation with/observation of Sukhjinder but-
He could read the reading book (The Black Dog) easily (he said it had got easier).

He had a good attempt at reading the writing that had been transcribed by Lucy from what he and C. had told her orally. Got confused with plane and place (above each other in writing) but once plane sorted out could cope with cars, lorries etc. as in context.

He could discuss measurements for safety features with C. and he did the counting up of the measurements. Neither of them were sure how to proceed so they asked the NTA.

He was enthusiastic to write down a personal story and was asking if it could get printed out (would he risk battle to get his topic chosen by others if not??)

He was very fluent telling me about his other schools and the teachers,, how he (and C.) thought they did interesting things at Morrison.

He could describe how he is faced with racist beating up and name calling which hadn't happened before. He could also describes how he retaliates.

He was able to explain that he spoke Punjabi to his Mum and Dad but that Mum and Dad don't write Punjabi. He had just started Punjabi lessons at his school in Rowan.

Further
Observations using Primary Language or Learning Record would be very useful. Would NTA be able to? Teacher Morrison should have copy. Or Morrison's own record-keeping system?

Suggestions 8.2.91

1. Link between spoken and written as much as possible
e.g. reading write ups e.g. of experiments, active reading
e.g. sequencing e.g. sound experiments process
matching (e.g. definitions matched with writing from other group
prediction (e.g. from illustrations)
underlining (e.g. all words to do with particular aspect-different groups/pairs, different aspects of topic)
matrix/ticksheet on reading before writing

2. As much repetition as possible

e.g. reading same material in different ways as above chance to tell someone else, read to someone else even when on individual work
chance to hear about topic from different people
chance for NTA to watch Science T.V. with small group again-specific language work on it e.g. get gist/matrix/sequence a small part

3. If possible easy non fiction related to topic for home reading (often doesn't seem as babyish as easy fiction)

4. As many stories with tape as possible so can make link between story and written work.

5. Other pupils scribing/drafting with S.

Probably other things would be triggered by particular topic.

## Appendix 5.4 Shadowing and collaborative teaching Spring Term 1991, Walker

Appendix 5.4 Shadowing and collaborative teaching Spring Term 1991, Walker

Shadowing.
Vu

-involved in all classes. 11/1/91 English-working on humour. Class asked to think about what made them laugh. Reference made to people from different cultures laughing at different things. Asked to note different kinds of humour shown in Middle English Programme. Art-talking about drawing, using different textures, picking out shapes/faces from the patterns. Science-boomerang display, working on observations, inferences and predictions in relation to weather.

-opportunity to get support from adults; on individual basis as teachers moved round the room

-opportunity to get support from peers; nearly all individual work in morning of 11/1/91, chance to co-operate in science when putting up the display. Co-operation on 25/1/91 in science when making parachutes.

-use of language; clearly able to understand everything required and to produce required writing-did not have opportunity to see reading, of complex passages. Would be able to contribute valuably to discussions about humour e.g. in Chinese not possible to make jokes from double meanings-not sure he would do so without staged oral work in groups. Told me about thinking that the Chinese version of mutant teenage turtles sounded funny-not sure if he would tell the class.

-perception of learning; he said he liked writing,liked experiments, was able to explain which boomerangs went better i.e. strength, shape and was able to make the connection between air and boomerangs. He was able to say he'd learnt about different textures in Art and discussed sense of humour.

'Team Teaching'

Planning.
I couldn't take specific lesson partly because Lesley only knew a few days before what was going to be covered in the lesson, partly also I wasn't confident in the scientific principles. Aimed for me to do particularly 'language' sections and Lesley to do science.

Actual lessons.
1/2/91-breathing
-pupils had chance to talk to each other about why breathing is important, in pairs and in groups later about smoking

-groupings-pupils had reservations about being paired off especially girl/boy-not used to random groupings in science. Some pupils in larger groups did all the work; more staging needed in group work.

-able to find information fairly quickly on smoking because information pre-selected; could also draw on own experience-got the idea of debate.

-mixture of group work and listening/discussing how breathing works and watching demonstration of smoking seemed effective.

-timing-just about packed everything in. ?Possible because some pupils had learnt about breathing before and were able to contribute. ?Did others learn.

15/2/91
-Pupils had chance to talk to each other, working out hearing test, no chance to talk to each other about reading (planned group activity).

-groupings; all individual responses

-timing; not nearly enough time; too long 'lead-in', extra test demonstration on hearing, long discussion about sound vibrations.

-materials; would have been interested to see how group reading activity worked out, Liz left materials but not sure if Lesley used later.

Reflection
Planning-more time, knowledge of overall scheme would have meant more possibility of me leading lesson with Lesley observing. We didn't build in how lessons could be assessed, realized later that they had end of module test. ?Other assessment. Didn't talk through aims e.g. for Vu in detail.

Actual lessons-Liz aimed to build in language aspects through collaborative work. Started on collaborative work in talking but not able to carry this through with reading and writing. Lead-in discussion clearly a luxury given limited time. Seems that for some pupils they're repeating items but this time at break-neck speed. Text books used do give excellent reading/writing tasks e.g. matching, completion. These need to be discussed together so that principles can be understood, issues talked through. Little chance to develop extended reading,writing tasks ?build up later.

Reflection- We were able to have quick words about content and activities and about timing problems and luxury of 'lead-ins' but not really about opportunity to discuss scientific principles and language extension.

## Appendix 5.5 Resume of work at Walker for Walker management team

**Appendix 5.5. Resume of work at Walker for Walker Management Team.**

Bilingual Learners in Beech Pilot Project.
Paper for Walker Management Team, 12/2/91

Jan- March 90
L.S. shadowed bilingual pupils in 5 schools; 4 at Walker
Recommendations:

- build in as much collaborative work as possible
- place bilingual pupils in mixed ability classes
- make stronger links between language and humanities
- provide support for Punjabi GCSE
- include information on L1 on school records
- tackle racism

Recommendations discussed with Head and Deputy Head in June 1990. Deputy Head highlighted issues with staff at time.

April-July 1990
L.S. drafted Section 11 bid for project schools. Section 11 due to come on stream April 1992. Plan for Ash to have 2 teachers, 1 bilingual assistant, 1 team leader.

Jan-March 1991
L.S. working 1 day a week in Walker and Morrison shadowing and teaching.

*Shadowing*

- Two first year pupils: Vu and Jatinder
- One second year pupil: Makesh (shadowed 1990)
- Would be interested in following up Najmun
- Will shadow Abdul 15/2/91

*Teaching*

- with Margaret- English/Jatinder (set)
- with Lesley- Science/Vu (mixed ability)

L.S. has been able to discuss issues "on the run" and feed back on shadowing informally but teachers have also given own time. Project money used to release Margaret and Lesley for planning and hopefully reflection.

*Aims*

- To support bilingual learners in mainstream mixed ability classes
- To establish a precedent for team teaching when section 11 comes on stream, albeit extremely limited precedent i.e. joint planning, cooperative teaching and reflection.
- To feed back information on shadowing
- To reflect on implementation of mixed ability process

General Comments

L.S. liaised with teacher Walker re implementation of multicultural resources scheme.

# Appendix 5.6 Morrison reflections

Appendix 5.6 Morrison reflections

Shadowing-notes on Sukhjinder given to Lucy.

Team teaching-
Planning. Opportunity to find out from Lucy Summer 90 the area the year would be working on in Summer 91-one world. Head at Morrison keen on me getting to know bilingual pupils and families. I was keen,as a result of previous shadowing, to contribute to support of bilingual pupils' learning, particularly on developing collaborative work and linking language work to tasks. 3 out of the 4 kids interviewed in 1990 had mentioned racist incidents and so I hoped I could help find a way in to discussing that. Suggested using Heartstone Odyssey to Lucy as way of combining these aims. Lucy read it and felt it would prepare pupils for physical geography work as well as multicultural aspects of religion that were going to be worked on. We were able to discuss which aspects of the story to take up i.e. to concentrate on emotions; not to go into detail about making, using quill pens; how much detail to go into about Indian temples; clarify that astronomy came into one world topic; if the pupils would be able to do research in class or at home; if they were used to using atlases etc. At first I felt that I should not tackle racism issues dealt with in the story until I knew that the school would be able to deal with any incidents that arose. I said I hoped I would be able to contribute to assessment. We were able to discuss my plans for 2 sessions. Stephanie and Anne agreed to participating. We were able to plan time slots for 2 sessions in Lucy and Stephanie's classes and 1 session in Anne's. Planning took place at break, lunch and while the pupils were watching science programmes.

Actual lessons.
1. Lucy's 1.(circle-sharing what known about mice, astronomy;listening to first Chapter, retelling to partner; drama, mixed groups numbered off-precious thing destroyed; circle-things pupils would like to find out more about; small groups with me retelling and re-writing the story). 4 bilinguals in class;3 there that day. Sufia whom I'd shadowed in 1990, was absent. Sukhjinder, Imran and Nazrine were in the class. Sukhjinder I'd talked to the previous week.

-pupils had to listen and talk, some found it very difficult to retell to partner, all involved in drama, could 'pass' on sharing contributions to circle but encouraged by Lucy to contribute and the NTA and she encouraged them to say what they'd felt about the drama i.e. how they'd laughed when really they wanted to express anger. In the drama, group got idea of still pictures; easier with concrete objects i.e. bike that had got destroyed than person i.e. in Gulf War. I found it difficult to handle those scenes and would stick to objects in future to begin with. Made sure that we debriefed properly.

-pupils were able to draw on their own experience. One girl knew all about the stars because she'd read Swallows and Amazons. Sukhjinder said he'd heard the story from a cousin "up there"-he was definitely clear on the story line, understood that the 'baddies' had cancelled the show and not that the Indians were bad, he

couldn't say all the 'big' words e.g. telescope and observatory but was clear about what they were.
Sukhjinder said he had done Bangra dancing but would be shy about showing people. Nazrine, very quiet in small group ?because she was unsure about me or unsure about being in a small group with Sukhjinder, was keen to follow up on dance. Imran keen to say that his Mum wore a sari sometimes like the dancer on the cover. Opportunity for information about families to come naturally out of involvement in the story.

-we were able to follow up on what they would like to know more about subsequently; mice/animal communication, dance, astronomy/planetarium, more of the story in the next session.

Lucy's 2. (circle-someone new so retell story; recall predictions about what would happen next; picture dance;listen to story Chapter 2; make dance gestures for e.g. moon, stars, mice; in pairs give instructions from bus stop to Observatory: mark on map places mentioned in world so far using atlas; in small groups with me retell/re-write story)

-drawing on involvement in the story was possible when the NTA related that when she'd gone home the previous Friday she'd had real communication with her cat who wanted her to be with her when she had her babies.

-chance to talk again in pairs giving instructions and also in groups sorting out how to use the atlas.

-Imran able to draw on dance experience, producing exquisite gestures, not put on the spot because everyone was having a go. Feel if you'd told boys they were going to do dance they'd have left! Natural part of story.

-Sufia in 1 of the small groups made it clear that she knew the next part of the story would tackle racism and was keen to move on.

Stephanie's 1.
Brief discussion beforehand. Moral themes, respect for others main thing to work on. No experience of group work before this year. Still difficulties with girl/boy groupings. 1 bilingual Pankiz, "thought of as 1 of them" e.g. pupil who said "why have we not got any brown faces in this class?" had forgotten about Pankiz. In fact speaks Hindi at home, goes to the Hindu temple.
-session 1 similar to Lucy's 1.

-more difficult for mixed groups to work but pupils all had a chance to talk, one boy identified racism as one of the things to find out more about so clearly had grasped right from the beginning what the story was about. 3 of the 5 groups took destroyed to mean death of someone in the drama work. Virtually all small groups assumed that the first mouse the dancer met was a 'he' (it wasn't clear in the first chapter) e.g Hugbundle sounds like a boy's name.

-Pankiz contributed most to the small group he was in. In fact he re-told so fast that the scribes couldn't keep up. A natural discussion about languages spoken emerged in the small group work and one boy showed that he could speak quite a bit of German. Perhaps less involvement in the story than in Lucy's class but in the small groups we also discussed incidents when you're not believed. A wealth of stories that could be the basis for writing emerged e.g. a deer landing on a motor bike.

-session 2 similar to Lucy's 2 with the NTA coming in to describe her animal communication experience

-class found it difficult to re-tell, enjoyed guessing what the dance gestures were and sorted themselves out in groups as regards the map work, plenty of discussion about using the atlases.-able to feed back information to Stephanie about how pupils had contributed in small groups in terms of talking and writing.

Anne's 1.
-session similar to Lucy's 1 but very short as there was a long assembly. 3 bilinguals in class. Kowsor I'd shadowed in 1990, he'd made great strides orally and would now talk with others but not with Anne. Charanjit was away in India. Gurprit, receptive bilingual. Class used to doing drama.
- class had excellent things to share about mice and astronomy. Restless in story, some couldn't retell at all, others got into it. They got into the drama very quickly. Alison commented that the quiet ones spoke.
- Kowsor contributed to the retelling in a small group. He was able to explain why the show had been cancelled. Gurprit was very quiet in the group but did contribute.
-like Stephanie's class most kids thought Hugbundle was a he.
-most comments on pupils' contribution in a small group seemed to match up with Anne's perceptions.

Lucy's 3.
I felt after the second session with Lucy's class that the issues of racism would have to be tackled. Sufia, in her class, had realized what the story was about and wanted to discuss it. It had been brought up in front of the whole of Stephanie's class. Lucy and I discussed ways of approaching i.e. through story or through real incidents. Through the story seemed the best way and Lucy got the class to retell the story. In doing so they weren't sure what to call Chandra and looked at what the policeman had called her 'Asian' woman. Then they discussed how they felt about women not being able to go into a park at night and how they felt about Asians not being able to do everything. When they said it was unfair and made them angry she said it was easy to say. At break she said the kids with blonde hair had to stay in longer because she made the rules and asked them how they felt afterwards.

Reflection.
Planning. Time to talk through what was wanted to key into project preparation and chance to readjust following session in light of what happened.

Actual lessons. Confident that we followed up on some of the interests expressed, that they had opportunities to listen, talk and review in small groups. No real possibilities of contributing to profiles. Stephanie mentioned that language checklists and profiles would be tried out next term. Not sure that my brief comments on pupils would be useful or recorded. Crunch emotional issues e.g. death not handled well but chance for kids to talk about how they felt about being involved in drama.Definitely a chance for issues of drawing on kids' experience, either cultural or facing racism to come up 'naturally' in the context of a story and for language work to be linked in to the topic. Bilingual pupils could contribute and learn at many levels; understanding, retelling, discussing previous experience, contributing to discussion, showing skills that have perhaps not been seen before e.g. dance.