

A Discourse of Diversity: Policy and Provision for the Teaching of English as an Additional Language in the UK*

Mike Beaumont**

<contents>

- I. Introduction
- II. The historical context
- III. The early 90s model of language support
- IV. The school context: developments since 2010
- V. EAL in initial teacher education
- VI. The gradual de-professionalisation of teaching
- VII. Conclusion

I. *Introduction*

The first main section of the paper is a historical overview of developments in the teaching of English as an Additional Language (EAL) as it relates to the UK school context, partly because I feel a diachronic perspective is needed in order to understand the current situation, but also

*

16

(2014. 10. 25.)

** Retired Professor, University of Manchester.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17313/jkorle.2014..34.89>

because it will allow me to discuss the diversity of approaches to the support of bilingual learners at both primary and secondary level. I refer to the next section as the ‘early 90s model of language support’, as this was the period when, in my view, the most effective collaboration was achieved between specialist language support teachers and subject teachers in school, and between schools and teacher educators in higher education. The subsequent section attempts to summarise the state of play at present with regard to EAL in schools, specifically the period since 2010, when the current coalition government came into power. This is followed by a brief section on EAL in initial teacher education (ITE). My final section is something of a polemic, to which I am perhaps entitled in my retirement years, where I set out the argument that for the last thirty years or so, more particularly since the Education Acts of the 1990s, government policies in the UK have chiselled away at the notion of teaching as a profession, equivalent, say, to medicine or law, and that this is part of a wider anti-intellectualism, particularly amongst politicians, whereby successive governments have shown scant regard for the views of those who have spent their professional lives attempting to understand complex phenomena and therefore have good grounds for claiming to know what they are talking about.

The text is punctuated by a series of case studies, which I hope will put a bit of flesh on the necessarily rather skeletal picture I am painting in this brief overview. As there was no space in the body of this paper to deal with the teaching of English in the further and higher education sectors in the UK, I include the final case study, of a Korean student studying English at the University of Manchester, in Appendix I. Finally, since the field of

English language teaching is notoriously riddled with abbreviations and acronyms, I have included an explanatory list in Appendix II.

II. *The historical context*

When I started writing this paper, I was unsure what kind of UK I would be referring to, whether it would be the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that I had always known and been a citizen of, or whether it would be a United Kingdom without Scotland, a different country consisting of just England, Wales and Northern Ireland. I was even unsure what such a country would be called. However, in the Referendum of September 18th 2014 the people of Scotland, or rather the people resident in Scotland (my youngest daughter is a student at Edinburgh University and was therefore, although English, entitled to vote), decided to stay with the four hundred year old union. This is relevant to my concerns in this paper as the education systems and policies of the four countries differ, the first kind of diversity to which my title alludes. In the case of Scotland, the Scotland Act of 1998, an act of the UK Parliament in Westminster, created a Scottish Parliament (*Pàrlamaid na h'Alba* in Scots Gaelic) and devolved a number of powers entirely to that body including education and training, and areas related to education such as health and social services, and local government. In fact, aspects of the education systems in Scotland and Northern Ireland have been different from that in England and Wales for decades. The Education Act of 1944 applied only to schools in England and

Wales, the later Education Acts for Scotland and Northern Ireland following in 1945 and 1947 respectively. There is now also a National Assembly of Wales (Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru in Welsh), also dating from 1998, although it had only limited law-making powers until 2011, meaning the education systems of England and Wales are more similar to each other than they are to that of Scotland. As my work and experience in the field of teaching English as an additional language (EAL) have been almost exclusively in England, I shall be referring in this paper principally to that context. But before developing the historical perspective, allow me to explain how my own career in English language teaching relates to the field.

Case Study 1: One Career in English Language Teaching

I began my teaching career as a teacher of English as a second language (ESL) in a secondary school in north India. After two years there I returned to the UK to take up a post as a language support teacher in a comprehensive school in inner city Manchester, where my job was to assist pupils whose first language was not English gain effective access to the school curriculum. I was appointed to this job (in 1972) just before a formal teacher training qualification became compulsory for graduates to teach in British secondary schools. At that time I only had a first degree, which was in languages, but not the English language. In these early years, therefore, I pretty much had to make my teaching up as I went along, although what Lortie (1975) calls ‘the apprenticeship of observation’, that is what learners learn about teaching (over thousands of hours) from the teachers who taught them, was no doubt an important factor. When I then did a training course, specialising in teaching English as a second and foreign language, I realised, somewhat to my horror, how little I knew about the nature of language, about the psychological, sociological and cultural dimensions of

effective teaching, and about language teaching methodology. It instilled in me a conviction, which I have never lost, that thorough training is as essential in preparing teachers as it is in preparing doctors, lawyers, engineers or any other group of people who wish to be considered professional in their chosen field of work.

After two more teaching jobs, one in a further education college in Greater Manchester, the other with the British Council in an immediately pre-revolutionary Iran, I completed a Masters in Linguistics and English Language Teaching, and was then appointed to the School of Education at the University of Manchester to teach on courses for English language teachers, a postgraduate initial training course and a Masters course for more experienced teachers. Both these courses brought me into contact with practising EAL teachers, whether visiting their schools to supervise our trainees teaching their classes, or engaging with them as part time students on the Masters course. Through dissertation and thesis supervision, incidentally, I also became familiar with the teaching of English in Korea, and was later fortunate enough to carry out a small research project in the country (see Beaumont & Chang 2011) with a former supervisee. After retiring from the University a few years ago I took on the role of Chair of the Northern Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (NATESOL), an association which I helped to found back in 1984. The Association serves the need of all teachers of English in the region, including teachers of EAL in local primary and secondary schools.

Most historical surveys (for example, Graf 2011 Chapter 1) see Section 11 of the Local Government Act of 1966 as the first significant policy development in the provision of support for learners of English as an additional language in British schools. At that time the term ‘English as a second language’ (ESL) was more current, to distinguish the learning

context more clearly from those where English was taught as a foreign language (EFL), that is, where English was not a local medium of communication. However, it was later recognised that for many learners in British schools English was perhaps their third, or even their fourth, means of communication. A child from a family originating in Pakistan, for example, may speak a regional language at home, say Kashmiri, be using Urdu as a wider language of communication in the Pakistani community, and be learning Qoranic Arabic at the mosque. The term English as an additional language was therefore adopted, and is still the one in use today. Section 11 provided funding directly from the Home Office, additional to that going to Local Education Authorities (LEAs) from the Department for Education, for the provision of language support with the specific aim of raising the educational achievement of children from the New Commonwealth and Pakistan. Language staff whose posts were funded by this money were quaintly termed ‘Section 11 teachers’ and to begin with were mostly employed in LEA Language Centres, teaching institutions which were physically separate from the schools which the pupils would later attend once their language skills were thought to be sufficient.

The next twenty years or so saw several significant reports, each of which had a direct but subtly different impact on the education of ethnic minority children. The first was the Bullock Report of 1975 (a good source for discussion of, and links to, this report, reports subsequently mentioned, and other government documents, is Gillard 2011). Entitled ‘A Language for Life’ and set up to consider and make recommendations on the teaching of all aspects of language in schools, the Bullock Report devoted a whole chapter (Chapter 20) to the education of ‘Children of Families of Overseas

Origin'. In general the report advocated the concept of 'language across the curriculum', implying that all teachers should be aware of the impact of the language demands of their own subject area on all children but, secondly, be particularly sensitive to those demands as they affected children whose first language was not English. More specifically in relation to those children, and in an oft-quoted section, it stated that 'no child should be expected to cast off the language and culture of the home as (s)he crosses the school threshold'. This prompted several developments. One was the recognition that the school environment, and approaches to teaching, should reflect the increasingly multicultural nature of the student body and the communities the pupils came from. A second, and one that was now supported by research evidence, was the importance of the maintenance of the mother tongue of pupils whose first language was not English, in other words the cognitive benefits of bilingualism and the dangers of its corollary, subtractive bilingualism, a lack of sufficient competence in either the first or the second language. Thirdly, language support teachers who had begun to realise that the disadvantages of language centres outweighed their advantages saw in the Bullock Report a justification for the argument that the language development of EAL learners would be better served by support in mainstream schools. Where this was already happening, the support was largely provided in what were termed withdrawal classes. Children newly arrived in the country would spend most of their time with the language support teacher, but be gradually encouraged to join mainstream classes, to begin with those perhaps with fewer language demands. Children with an already developed competence in English might spend most of their time in mainstream classes, but attend withdrawal

groups for added help in areas where it was particularly needed. Forward-thinking language support teachers were already beginning to work with subject teachers to analyse the nature of the language demands of a particular subject and in partnership develop strategies to help EAL pupils access that material in-class.

Increasingly, entitlement to language support was becoming a race issue. Following the Race Relations Act of 1976, and prompted by concerns about the educational achievement of children, particularly of West Indian origin, a committee was set up to review the attainments and needs of children of all ethnic minority groups. Published as the Rampton Report in 1981, it recommended, amongst other things, that LEAs should adopt a more systematic approach to setting out their policies on multicultural education, involve ethnic minority parents and communities more in school life, and ensure that the curriculum and the materials used in schools reflected the multicultural nature of the society as a whole. This was followed in 1985 by the Swann Report, entitled 'Education for All'. The committee which produced the report had a wider brief than that of Rampton, but many of its recommendations had implications for the education of ethnic minority children. One such was as follows:

'The needs of learners of English as a second language should be met by provision within the mainstream school as part of a comprehensive programme of language education for *all* children'. (p.771)

From then on most LEAs and their educational advisory teams regarded mainstreaming as their default policy with regard to the provision of

language support for EAL learners. Partnership teaching became the norm, where language support teachers and subject teachers collaborated to provide materials for such learners to better access the curriculum, and where the language support teacher would frequently be present in class, to facilitate the use of those materials and give face-to-face assistance to EAL pupils where necessary. Apparently powerful arguments from academia became increasingly influential, for example Krashen (1985 and elsewhere) and his persuasive notion of 'comprehensible input' and its role in helping second language learners to acquire the language 'naturally'. In the mainstream, of course, EAL learners were exposed to diverse kinds of input - from their subject teachers, from their language support teacher or teachers, and from their native English speaking peers - and for this reason mainstreaming was considered more beneficial than withdrawal.

Up to now policy and provision had been focussed on 'immigrant', that is newly arrived, children from the New Commonwealth and Pakistan. We have seen how Section 11 funding was ring-fenced for this purpose. However, two emerging trends were changing the picture. One was the rising numbers of second generation EAL learners in schools and the increasing number of schools where EAL learners were in the majority, particularly in primary schools, which served a more specific locality than secondary schools, although the trend was in evidence there too. A second was the increasingly diverse backgrounds from which ethnic minority pupils came, giving LEAs a dilemma with regard to how Section 11 funding was used. As a consequence, a government private member's bill was passed in 1993, extending Section 11 funding to all ethnic minority pupils, regardless of origin. This continued until 1999, when Section 11 funding was replaced

by the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG), which placed the responsibility for the achievement of ethnic minority pupils on to individual schools. On the face of it this may have seemed a relatively straightforward financial switch. However, there was a political undercurrent. From the early days of the Thatcher government, which came to power in 1979, until the Conservatives lost the election of 1997 to Tony Blair's New Labour, there had been a concerted attack on the influence and funding of Local Government. One reason for this was that councils in the large conurbations of the country (London, Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow, for example) were predominantly Labour-controlled. It was ironic, then, that it was under a Labour government that EMAG was introduced, beginning the trend towards the gradual reduction of funding for locally centralised support services, including those designed to facilitate the provision of effective EAL teaching.

Throughout the first decade of the new millennium, therefore, and enshrined in the 2002 Education Act, which allowed 85% of the budget of a school to be controlled by the head teacher, the extent of EAL provision in a particular school was increasingly decided by the senior management of that school, and therefore extremely variable. However, from the government's perspective, mainstreaming remained the preferred strategy:

Language support is best provided within the mainstream classroom wherever possible, as time out of subject lessons for additional language tuition may cause the learner to fall behind in the curriculum. (DfES 2005: 5)

DfES (2005) was one of a number of documents published during this

period which were aimed specifically at supporting teachers of EAL learners. For another example, see DCSF (2009). There were also several other government initiatives which sought to address the educational needs of EAL learners, albeit as incorporated in different categories of children. One such was the Excellence in Cities (EiC) scheme, a three year programme to improve the educational achievement of children in inner city schools, many of which, of course, had large numbers of EAL learners. For an evaluation, see DfES (2005). Another was the City Challenge programme, launched in 2008 by what was by then termed the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and aimed at disadvantaged children in three specific regions - London, Greater Manchester and the Black Country. Many of these children, again, would have been EAL learners. For an evaluation of this programme, see DfE (2012).

However, another Labour initiative was to have a major long term impact and that was the introduction of city academies. They were essentially an attempt to 'turn round' previously government maintained schools, usually in the inner cities, which were deemed to be underachieving or failing their pupils in some way. Gillard (2011: Chapter 10) describes them as follows:

City academies were to be public/private partnerships. Businesses, churches and voluntary groups would build and manage them, and they would be outside the control of local authorities. In return for a £2m donation towards the capital costs, sponsors would be allowed to rename the school, control the board of governors, and influence the curriculum.

Critics saw this not only as evidence of the creeping privatisation of the

state education system, but also as having the potential for creating a two-tier system, whereby, given the increasing choice that parents now had over which secondary school they wanted their child to attend, well-funded academies would attract better performing pupils, leaving schools that remained under state control with the less able and possibly more disadvantaged ones. In other words, it could be seen as selection by stealth, a policy that previous Labour administrations had resisted. There was also a concern that the particular interest group or individual that provided sponsorship might begin to exert an unhealthy influence over the curriculum, and one that in the broader society might prove divisive. As many of these academies were being set up in inner city areas, even greater uncertainties than before were felt over what support EAL learners might receive in them, and what level of expertise there might be to provide that support. However, by the time the coalition government came into power in 2010, there were nearly 200 such schools.

III. *The early 90s model of language support*

From the 1960s, there were in England and Wales five, later four, universities which ran Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) courses specialising in the teaching of English as a second language. One component of these courses provided training in teaching English as an additional language, with appropriate experience in local state schools; a second component provided training in teaching English as a foreign language, with appropriate school experience in a state school in a nearby European

country, for example Spain or Portugal. There was, therefore, for many years a steady supply of teachers fully trained to teach in British schools as language support teachers, or to work as teachers, later perhaps advisors, in overseas contexts. A number who chose to do the latter in the early stages of their career subsequently moved back to the British education system and brought with them that valuable intercultural experience.

At the same time, Section 11 funding had allowed a number of LEAs, whose schools had large numbers of EAL learners, to set up educational advisory services, or similar bodies, which had well qualified staff amongst whose duties were advising schools on good EAL classroom practice, and running or otherwise providing in-service sessions or courses for teachers who felt they needed to improve their knowledge and skills. Because of the funding, schools were able to build up teams of EAL specialists, either trained specifically in that area, or trained in a related area, for example the teaching of a foreign language or languages, from which their skills were transferrable to an EAL context. In urban areas in particular, therefore, there was ample scope for collaboration between these three parties - the universities who trained the teachers, the local authority who funded central support services, and the schools who taught the learners. An example of this kind of collaboration is Case Study 2.

Case Study 2: The Rochdale Action Research Project

(abridged, adapted and condensed from Beaumont, Coates & Jones 2000)

The Language for Educational Access Project (LEAP) and second language teacher educators from the University of Manchester began working together in 1989, when teachers from the LEAP service were invited to provide input on

language support for initial trainees on a PGCE course. A more substantial phase of co-operation began in 1992, when the LEAP service engaged university staff to run three in-service courses on different topics for all their support teachers. On completion of this phase in 1996, the LEAP management decided to request a further course on Classroom Research, based on the need to investigate the impact of staff development programmes, including the input from the university, and to evaluate how support staff had begun to translate new knowledge and techniques into classroom practice.

The classroom research project extended over a whole school year, and was in three phases corresponding to the three school terms, each phase consisting of two afternoon sessions. In the first (Planning) phase, models of action and classroom researched were considered, an agreed research model identified, and fifteen research groups were formed with two or three teachers in each group. In the second (Implementation) phase, research groups finalised their research projects, completed their planning, and carried out a pilot study. There were eight primary level investigations, six secondary, and one cross-phase. Between Phases 2 and 3, the fifteen research projects were carried out and each group wrote a preliminary report. In Phase 3 (Analysis and Evaluation), each group presented the findings of their research project and their preliminary report. Video recordings of four of the projects were shown and discussed, and university tutors provided further input on data analysis. The participants also filled in a questionnaire so that the whole project could be evaluated. Between the last two sessions of Phase 3, research groups submitted their final reports. In the final session of the project, university tutors provided feedback to participants on the results of the questionnaire and on the participants' final reports, and a final evaluation of the whole project was carried out.

Participants who wished could submit 4000 word assignments for each of the three in-service courses and for the Research Project, all of which could then be credited towards the university's Masters degree in TESOL.

Three of the research projects were written up and published in Part 1 of Beaumont & O'Brien (2000).

IV. *The school context: developments since 2010*

The current picture in British schools is one of extreme and increasing diversity. Across the UK,

(t)here are more than a million children between 5 and 16 years old in UK schools who speak in excess of 360 languages between them in addition to English. Currently there are 1,061,010 bilingual 5-16 year olds in English schools, 29,532 in Scotland, 10,357 'newcomer' pupils in Northern Ireland and 31,132 EAL learners in Wales. (NALDIC website, accessed 27.9.2014)

The percentage of primary school pupils whose first language is not English rose from 7.8% in 1997 to 18.1% in 2013. The equivalent figures for secondary schools are 7.3% and 13.6%. In each of those 16 years, the figure was higher than it was the year before. A report in the Daily Telegraph (23.3.2012) calculated that in England there were 1,363 primary schools, 224 secondary schools and 51 special schools where more than 50% of the pupils were learning EAL. The reasons for the rise are numerous but amongst them, probably, are the following: increasing numbers of immigrants from parts of the world where there is civil unrest or outright war; the increase in the number of countries in the European Union (EU), membership of which entitles their citizens to take advantage of the free movement of

labour within the community; economic migration within the EU as a result of the global financial crisis and a concomitant rise in unemployment rates in some member countries; and, within the UK, relatively higher birth rates among ethnic minority groups than other sectors of the population.

Conteh (2012: 12–13) lists the diverse groups of children subsumed under the umbrella term ‘EAL’:

- Learners who are second and third generation members of settled ethnic minority communities (advanced bilingual learners)
- Learners who are recent arrivals and new to English, some of whom have little or no experience of schooling, and others who are already literate in their first languages (children new to English)
- Learners whose education has been disrupted because of war and other traumatic experiences (asylum seekers and refugees)
- Learners who are in school settings with little prior experience of bilingual children (isolated learners)
- Learners whose parents are working and studying and are in England for short periods of time (sojourners).

Case Study 3 paints a typical picture of the situation in a secondary school in a major UK conurbation.

Case Study 3: A Secondary School in Greater Manchester

The school has upwards of 1200 pupils. 73% of these pupils are learners of English as an additional language, of whom about 40 have been in the UK for three years or less, meaning that many of them are still at the early stages of learning English. Some asylum seeker and refugee children have had no previous

schooling. Also, because of the frequently traumatic experiences which brought them to the UK, many have additional psychological and social needs, which the school attempts to address. 40 languages other than English are spoken in the school. Predominant amongst these are Mirpuri and Urdu, languages of Pakistan, Bengali and Sylheti, the languages of children of families originating in Bangla Desh, and Portuguese, spoken by children of families of African heritage from countries such as Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, São Tomé et Príncipe, and the Cape Verde Islands. There are children from Egypt, Iran and Iraq, also the Czech Republic and Slovakia, now part of the EU.

I interviewed three senior members of staff after the school day finished on Tuesday, October 7th 2014. All three had done postgraduate university courses in the early 1990s which specialised in the teaching of EAL. One was now Head of Special Educational Needs (SEN) and was no longer specifically involved in language support. A second led the EAL team in the school but was also sought after to conduct in-service sessions in schools where EAL expertise was lacking, and for Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) across the LEA. A third was an experienced EAL teacher but was currently on a temporary contract with the school as second in EAL, replacing a teacher who had recently left. I asked them to reflect on the way in which EAL provision had changed over the last 20 years or so. In the early 1990s they had all been members of a 40 plus EAL team funded by the LEA and managed by two experienced practitioners. Some were full time in the same school, at both primary and secondary levels, where the numbers of EAL pupils were higher. Others, where numbers were smaller, were peripatetic, moving from school to school as the need arose. After funding for EAL was largely devolved to individual schools in 1999, significant changes were observed. Many EAL staff, previously funded by the LEA, had to reapply for their own jobs. Others, sensing that some head teachers may choose to reduce their EAL staff, applied for jobs elsewhere. Others, who had moved into EAL from related subject areas, returned to mainstream teaching, for example in

English Language and Literature, or Modern Foreign Languages. Despite the fact that the case study school continued to be a model of good practice, being involved through the next two decades in a number of national and regional initiatives related to EAL, and despite the rising numbers of EAL pupils, it seemed that EAL had become less of a priority nationally, and over the same period specialist staff fell from a high of around 13 full timers to the current figure of 2.7 full time equivalent. Generally, one of my interviewees said, specialist provision in many schools had 'evaporated', and EAL teachers replaced by teaching assistants (TAs), many of whom had the advantage of being bilingual, and were conscientious, but were non-specialist, and untrained.

Despite this steady rise in the numbers of EAL pupils, there seems to be little will in the coalition government to address the issue:

The new national curriculum remains stubbornly silent on EAL learners, despite the NUT's response which showed that '71% of respondents did not agree that the proposals would meet the needs of pupils with English as an additional language, special needs or disabilities, with a further 26.5% unsure'. (Thompson, 2013: 3)

The current administration has also continued, indeed accelerated, the trend to devolve funding to individual schools. By November last year there were 3,444 academies, which may now be of three different types: sponsored academies, of the kind introduced by the previous Labour administration, that is, schools run by a government-approved sponsor; converter academies, which are formerly maintained schools that have voluntarily opted for academy status, and need not have a sponsor; and free schools,

that is schools set up by any interested parties (for example, parents, education charities, or religious groups) with the approval of the Secretary of State for Education. By June of this year there were 331 free schools, with more planned to open for the current school year. Without entering the fierce debate that these schools have created (a recent blog on the Guardian newspaper's Teacher Network site termed the academies model of education 'damaging, costly and unsustainable'), we highlight two features of these schools that are relevant to our concerns here. The first is that academies and free schools are free to appoint unqualified teachers. The second is the potential impact of yet more funding changes on support for EAL learners.

In the constantly changing educational climate, the once ring-fenced Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) is no longer available; funding to Local Authority central services has been reduced as money is paid directly to academies and free schools; EAL services have been diluted or even evaporated (*sic*) and changes have been made to Initial Teacher Training. (Excell & Conteh, 2014: 3)

In essence, then, it is difficult to be optimistic about the level of support that the rising numbers of EAL learners can expect. Specialist EAL teachers remain in the system, but they are fewer by far than they were, and many of them are coming towards the end of their teaching careers. Increasingly, support work is being done by untrained TAs, some of whom may speak the first language of some of their pupils, but who do not have experience or expertise comparable to the specialists. Ring-fenced funding for EAL has virtually disappeared. Preparing trainees to teach in such demanding and

complex circumstances is, therefore, a challenge, as the next section illustrates.

V. *EAL in initial teacher education*

In order to meet the national teaching standards for working with EAL pupils, trainee teachers of all curriculum subjects need to develop the following areas of competence, according to Bourne and Flewitt (2002). They should:

- be familiar with models of bilingualism and second language acquisition and current research evidence and how they relate to practice in the classroom;
- be familiar with good practice in inducting new arrivals into school;
- learn to become familiar with their pupils' social, cultural linguistic, religious and ethnic background and traditions;
- learn strategies for supporting the learning and literacy of developing bilinguals through speaking and listening, the use of first languages, visual aids and practical activities to embed teaching in a comprehensible context;
- learn to analyse the linguistic demands of a task in their subject area so as to extend and develop the English language skills of learners across the curriculum;
- know about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of first language to identity as well as to the development of English;
- know that bilingual pupils who have achieved fluency in spoken English may need support in developing written academic English;
- be aware of the pitfalls of assessing pupils from diverse backgrounds and

- be introduced to current models of assessing second language learning;
- learn to differentiate between EAL and SEN needs and to consider the effects of grouping;
 - know how to gain access to resources and further support when they need it;
 - have opportunities to work alongside specialist staff, and learn how to deploy other professionals and volunteers to support learning;
 - learn to manage the classroom and the grouping of children to maximise learning opportunities;
 - be familiar with research evidence that shows how monitoring data can be used to raise achievement;
 - learn how to build relationships and develop partnerships with families and carers, relevant community organisations and the complementary education sector.

This is a formidable list, given that there are many other curriculum areas in which they need to demonstrate competence. It is no surprise, therefore, that

NQTs persistently rate themselves least prepared for meeting the needs of EAL and minority ethnic pupils, compared to all other aspects of their ITE course including meeting the needs of SEN pupils and behaviour management. (Thompson 2011: 3)

If teachers in training are struggling to cover this ground, and there are fewer and fewer specialists to help them, it begs the question how untrained teachers are expected to acquire them.

VI. *The gradual de-professionalisation of teaching*

In 1969 the decision was made by the then Department for Education that formal training would be required for those wishing to teach in state primary schools who graduated after December of that year, and for those graduating after December 1973 who wished to teach in state secondary schools. The long term aim was that teaching would become an all-graduate profession, both at primary and secondary level. For many years, therefore, there were essentially two main routes into teaching. Trainees could either follow a four year Bachelor of Education (BEd) programme, integrating both subject knowledge and teacher training with regular periods of hands-on experience in school, or they could enter a one year PGCE course after graduating from university in their chosen subject, for example History or Physics. The PGCE courses also incorporated periods of school experience. Typically, but not exclusively, those training to be primary school teachers followed the former route, those training to be secondary school teachers the latter. And typically, but not exclusively, BEd programmes were run by Colleges of Higher Education, many of them subsequently incorporated into larger institutions which gained university status through the Further and Higher Education Act of 1992, and PGCE programmes were run by the older universities' Departments, or in some cases Faculties, of Education.

However, in the early 1990s the then Conservative government embarked on a substantial re-organisation of initial teacher training (ITT), two effects of which I wish to focus on here. The first relates to the PGCE courses which prepared EAL teachers, to which I refer earlier in the paper. The

review concluded that, as these courses did not prepare teachers specifically to teach a National Curriculum subject, and because a substantial part of the trainees' school experience was overseen by classroom teachers outside the UK, statutory funding for the courses would be withdrawn. This was a paradoxical position for at least two reasons. First, the courses trained teachers to work across the curriculum in partnership with subject teachers to help bilingual learners gain access to the content of that curriculum, which was delivered almost exclusively through the medium of English. Second, the decision demeaned the competence of state school teachers in other parts of the European Community, many of whom were highly skilled and experienced in the teaching of English as a foreign language. Be that as it may, the courses have not been reinstated by any subsequent government, despite the fact that, as we have seen, the numbers of bilingual pupils in British schools have continued to rise, year on year, since that time.

The second, and more general, consequence of the review was to change radically the amount of time trainees spent with teacher educators in the university, and the amount of time trainees spent observing and practising teaching in schools. The proportion changed from roughly three fifths of the course spent in the university, and two fifths in school, to, respectively, one third in the university and two thirds in school. The argument was that trainees would learn best how to teach by spending more time in school. On the face of it, this appears to be a plausible position to take. However, by implication it fundamentally challenged the route which the preparation of teachers had been taking for the last two decades or more, that was to produce members of a profession who had a sound understanding of the subject they were being trained to teach, and an equally sound grasp of the

theoretical bases of an effective teaching methodology. The new direction seemed to take us back to what Wallace (1991) terms the 'Craft Model' of teacher training, an apprenticeship model where trainees learn 'on the job' by watching and doing, and where theory and research have little place. Other routes into teaching have also been introduced over the last few years which give schools more control over recruitment and training. It is hard not to reach the conclusion that, in some political circles, there has been a determination to reduce fundamentally the influence which higher education institutions have over the training of teachers, with the intention perhaps of eventually removing it altogether.

VII. *Conclusion*

We have seen how UK schools, over the last fifteen years or so, have had to integrate into their classes continuously rising numbers of learners of English as an additional language. We have also seen how, over the same period, various changes in government policy, under both Labour and the coalition, have reduced the likelihood that those learners will receive support from teachers specialised and experienced in EAL. This is essentially for three reasons: firstly, the transfer of funds from LEAs to individual schools, decimating the centralised support services that previously existed; secondly, changes to teacher training, which have made it less likely that trainees are prepared effectively to teach EAL learners; and thirdly, the proliferation of types of school, increasingly fewer of them under the control of LEAs and

- Standards in Urban Schools 2000-2003 Research Report RR675A*
www.webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk (accessed 10. 10. 2014)
- DfES(2005), *Aiming High: Guidance on the Assessment of Pupils Learning English as an Additional Language*. London: DfES.
- Excell, D, & J. Conteh(2014), *Editorial*, NALDIC Quarterly 14-2, Reading: NALDIC, pp.3-4.
- Gillard, D.(2011), *Education in England: a brief history*.
www.educationengland.org.uk/history (accessed 29. 9. 2014)
- Graf, M.(2011), *Including and Supporting Learners of English as an Additional Language*, London: Continuum.
- Krashen, S.(1985), *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*, London: Longman.
- Lortie, D.(1975), *Schoolteacher: a sociological study*, Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- NALDIC www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information (accessed 27. 9. 2014)
- The Rampton Report(1981), *West Indian Children in our Schools*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- The Swann Report(1985), *Education for All*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Thompson, A.(2011), *View from the Chair*, NALDIC Quarterly 8-2, Reading: NALDIC.
- Thompson, A.(2013), *View from the Chair*, NALDIC Quarterly 13-3, Reading: NALDIC.
- Wallace, M.(1991), *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I: Case Study 4: A student in a university language centre

Jang, Saehyun from Hankuk University for Foreign Language Studies

Interviewed on 25th September 2014

Having completed his two-year military service, Saehyun is currently in his third year of a four year degree at HUFLS. He has elected to spend the term studying English at the University of Manchester Language Centre, for which he will receive credits towards his degree. His first major is in Serbian and Croatian, unique as a major in Korea he thinks, his second major being in Business Studies. He hopes to follow a career in a business related to the sports industry. One of the reasons he chose to study in the UK, and in Manchester in particular, is his passionate interest in football. He is very conscious of the need for Korean undergraduate students to continue their English studies after the first year of their degree, in which the study of the language is compulsory. 'All should study (English) continuously' he said, not least because a satisfactory TOIC score is necessary for all students to graduate.

Saehyun started studying English in elementary school, at the age of 8. This study continued through middle and high school, until the age of 19. Before coming to the UK, Saehyun had travelled in Thailand and Japan, where he had used some English, but he had experienced very little communication in English in Korea, outside his school and university classes.

When I interviewed him he had just finished the second week of a 13 week course focussing on English for Personal or Professional Purposes, a course which the University Language Centre offers throughout the year, including the summer. He is in a class of eight students, his fellow students coming from Kazakhstan, Japan, Latvia and Germany. He has four different teachers, and understands 'about 80% of what they say', he thought. He feels he has already made some improvement, particularly in the area of vocabulary. After the course, he hopes to spend some time travelling in other parts of Europe.

Appendix II: *Abbreviations*

BEd	Bachelor of Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Families
DfE	Department for Education
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
EAL	English as an Additional Language
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EMAG	Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant
ESL	English as a Second Language
EU	European Union
ITT(E)	Initial Teacher Training (Education)
LEA	Local Education Authority
NALDIC	National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum
NQT(s)	Newly Qualified Teacher(s)
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
SEN	Special Educational Needs
TA(s)	Teaching Assistant(s)
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages



다양성의 담론: 영국의 EAL 교육 정책과 규정

마이크 버몬트

10 가 1 가 가

가 50% 가

가 가

가

1990

2010 가

가

가

[주제어] 추가 언어로서의 영어, 영국의 언어 정책과 규정, 역사적이고 현대적인
관점, 언어 지원 모델, 직업으로서의 교수.

■ Abstract

A Discourse of Diversity: Policy and Provision for the Teaching of English as an Additional Language in the UK

Mike Beaumont

The number of pupils in UK schools whose first language is not English has increased year on year for at least the last decade. There has been an equivalent increase in the number of schools for which the provision of English language support had previously not been an issue, and in the number of schools in which learners of English as an additional language (EAL) now exceed 50% of the total number of pupils registered. However, over an even longer period, and for various reasons, there has been a decline in the number of teachers specifically trained to teach EAL.

In this paper, I begin by tracing the history of UK government policy with regard to the provision of language support for learners of EAL. I then describe a model of language support current in the 1990s, in which schools, local education authorities, and universities collaborated in the training and continuing professional development of specialist teachers of EAL. The next two sections outline, respectively, developments in the field since 2010, and the areas of competence in EAL all teachers in training are now required to demonstrate in order to qualify. Finally, I advance the broader argument that the current lack of specialised EAL teachers is one example of the gradual political undermining of the professionalism of teachers in the UK.

[Key words] English as an additional language(EAL), language policy and provision in the UK, historical and contemporary perspectives, models of language support, teaching as a profession.