

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Cunningham, Clare ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3767-7624> (2019) "The Inappropriateness of Language": discourses of power and control over languages beyond English in primary schools. *Language and Education*, 33 (4). pp. 285-301.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3555/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09500782.2018.1545787>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk

“The Inappropriateness of Language”: discourses of power and control over *languages beyond English* in primary schools

Clare Cunningham

School of Languages and Linguistics, York St John University, York, UK

This is a pre-published version of this paper. First submitted: 15th March 2018.

Accepted for publication in *Language and Education* on 4th November 2018.

Teachers’ attitudes towards children’s languages and culture have been shown to be instrumental in children’s developing self-esteem and academic achievement. Attitudes and the frequently attendant local policies about languages beyond English in schools therefore need to be clear for children, as negative or contradictory discourses can distract from positive work that has been done on increasing inclusivity and embracing multilingualism.

This paper reports on to the extent to which teachers’ discourses reveal power and control over children’s linguistic repertoires in school. This study is part of a broader project investigating educators’ attitudes towards children who speak languages beyond English conducted in six northern English primary schools. Interviews from 31 participants were systematically analysed by applying APPRAISAL theory framework.

Analysis suggested home language use *is* controlled by teachers, and genuine opportunities for languages beyond English in participating schools seem limited. This was seen both in schools where an overtly welcoming message for languages beyond English was communicated and in schools that were more muted in their appreciation of children’s home languages as part of their ‘funds of knowledge’. Furthermore, a close linguistic analysis of the participants’ responses revealed contradictions and potentially confusing messages for children about the value of their languages.

Keywords: multilingualism; monolingual ideology; appraisal; English as an Additional Language; teacher attitudes; home languages

Introduction and context

As key figures in these children's educational lives, the attitudes held and expressed by teachers about children's linguistic and cultural backgrounds are formative for the children in developing their own attitudes, both positive and negative, towards their cultural and linguistic heritage (Conteh and Brock 2011; Gkaintartzi and Tsokalidou 2011; Horenczyk and Tatar 2002; Lee and Oxelson 2006). Teachers have an important role as filters of the discourses of the wider world for the child therefore it is useful for the education field to be aware of the discourses of the teachers themselves (both inside and outside the classroom) and the attitudes that they espouse. This study focuses on educators' discourses *outside* the classroom about the multilingual students in their schools (and their languages) through research interviews with a fellow education professional.

The Department of Education in the UK states that 'a pupil is recorded to have English as an additional language [EAL] if they are exposed to a language at home that is known or believed to be other than English' (2017, 10). The population of children in UK primary schools classified under this very broad umbrella term has increased steadily from under 8% before the turn of the century to 20.6% in 2017 (Department of Education 2017). This steady growth led to linguistic diversity moving beyond the highly urban areas of the country into most regions and an increase in the governmental guidance documents on working with children from varying cultural and linguistic backgrounds (eg. Department for Education and Skills 2006; 2007; Cameron and Besser 2004; Primary National Strategies 2009).

Although there are exceptions to the rule, as discussed in Sharples (2017) for example, most EAL children are educated in the mainstream classroom, as part of an inclusive approach to education that has its roots in the 1970s and 1980s (Franson

1999). Governmental ring-fenced funding for the provision of support for EAL children that was directed towards local education authorities was devolved to schools in 2011/2012 and has led to the loss of expertise and the ‘strategic oversight of provision’ at the local level in many areas (NASUWT The Teachers' Union 2012, 4). This means that class teachers and teaching assistants are now more often working directly with EAL children without the support of more specialised teachers. Whilst these particular funding arrangements are specific to the UK context, mainstream teachers in other countries with a highly dominant language, such as France (Helot and Young 2002), Australia (Eisenclas, Schalley, and Guillemin 2013), Canada (Cummins 2014) and elsewhere, are also dealing with similar issues.

Terminology

The label ‘EAL’ is beginning to be problematised in the UK (V. Murphy 2018; Cunningham 2018), just as it is being adopted in Canada (Cummins 2014). Describing those labelled this way as a user or speaker of ‘languages beyond English’ (LBE) is not currently a term used in research or pedagogical literature. It is my preferred term, and I suggest that it would be a strong candidate to replace the variety of terms that have been used in this discipline. This denotation is useful in that it does not imply any particular number of languages and also avoids deficit-model-thinking through a positive focus on the languages that children do speak rather than simply *not* speaking English (see Cunningham, 2018 for more on this discussion). In this paper, I also adopt the term ‘home languages’ and make reference to ‘first languages’ and ‘heritage languages’ when they are the terms used in the particular settings under discussion.

Conceptual framework

Teachers have the power to mitigate some of the worst excesses of modern-day

discourse (Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokalidou 2015; Van Dijk 2008) but this capacity is dependent on those individuals being aware of their own attitudes and ideologies and being willing to challenge them. Most members of any given society are so surrounded by and often embedded in ideologies about language, immigration, and education that individuals would not necessarily question the assumptions made about languages or realise that particular modes of expression stem from ideologically driven roots as part of the *capital* that is gained as a result of being embedded in the *habitus* of the particular *field*, to adopt Bourdieu's theory of practice constructs (1977).

Bourdieu's constructs have been variously and increasingly applied in educational research, as they are considered to be 'valuable interpretative instruments' (Flynn 2015a, 20). Flynn noted the very potent effect of the *habitus* of the education *field* on teachers' perspectives on working with bilingual children (2013, 2015a, 2015b). For the purposes of this study, we can consider the *field* to mean the mainstream education system of the UK, whilst acknowledging that "fields may rest within fields" (Flynn 2013, 227) in that different educational stages, and geographical locations can change the nature of the *field*.

The construct of *habitus* has been applied well beyond Bourdieu's original intentions, and particularly effectively in an extension that is very relevant to this study, that of the monolingual *habitus* proposed by Gogolin (1994, as cited in Gogolin, 1997). *Doxa* refers to the interaction between *habitus* and *field*, which produces a set of assumptions that dictate behaviours and beliefs that come to be seen as normal and natural and therefore remain uncontested (Flynn 2013). In the education *field*, for example, the notion of accepted classroom interactions and ritualised, authorised forms of language use in that space are relevant for our understanding of *doxa* (Bourdieu 1991). The uncontested belief in the classroom is that the teacher has been given the

authority and power to command the space and control language use within it. The last of the four constructs is that of *capital*, which can be cultural, economic, social or linguistic. *Capital* is often seen in analytical terms to refer to what people know, betraying a mindset or *habitus*, as Flynn (2015b) discovered, and they are therefore useful constructs to work with concurrently.

Language attitudes in schools

Flynn's (2013) study highlighted that teachers are focused on trying to offer children who speak languages beyond English the same opportunities as their monolingual peers although as she says, "wanting to 'do the right thing' is not the same as knowing how to do the right thing or even being in a position to do the right thing" (Flynn 2013, 238). A number of studies have reported that language learning experiences and direct experience working with English language learners has increased confidence and effectiveness of teaching for multilingual children (Youngs and Youngs 2001; Byrnes, Deborah, Kiger, and Manning 1997; Flores and Smith 2009; Coady, Harper, and Jong 2011). Most research in this area has found that teachers are rhetorically supportive of working with children who speak languages beyond English (Karabenick and Clemens 2004; Gkaintartzi and Tsokalidou 2011; Nielikäinen 2014; Dillon 2010), but in practice find it more challenging, often due to lack of experience (Coady, Harper, and Jong 2011; Dillon 2010) and knowledge about exactly what to do to in practical terms in the classroom (Murakami 2008; Kearney 2014).

The *habitus* and *doxa* of the education *field* in the UK, the USA, and other global regions working with increasing linguistic and cultural diversity, has been shown to have espoused a (neo)liberal approach to multiculturalism, and to have not questioned the inherent assumptions behind it (May 2010). A growing number of scholars are now problematising this as uncritically essentialising and individualistic

(Kubota 2016) and noting that liberal multiculturalism continues to privilege the *capital* of the dominant groups in society (Piller 2017) and perpetuates racism (Kubota 2016). This kind of well-meaning essentialism plays out in the tokenistic displays of celebration and ‘banal nationalism’ (Billig 1995) that Bourne (2001) discusses at the turn of the century that remain very much in evidence in schools. Piller (2017) also usefully discusses the ‘hidden curriculum’ with regards to the commonly-seen conflation between class and culture.

Teachers’ attitudes towards multilingualism and the home languages of school-children have been the subject of only limited attention and remain under-explored in the research literature, especially in the UK, although Flynn (2013; 2015a; 2015b), Bailey and Marsden (2017) and Cunningham (2017) are recent exceptions to this. Where attitudinal studies have taken place internationally, they have tended to take the form of surveys (Byrnes, Deborah, Kiger, and Manning 1997; Youngs and Youngs 2001; Flores and Smith 2009 *inter alia*) which does not allow for the focus on the way individuals actually *talk* about the issues related to multilingualism and languages beyond English. This paper focuses on precisely this aspect, investigating educators’ discourses from outside the classroom.

To explore discourse that evaluates and appraises individuals effectively we need a framework that systematically and critically allows us to consider these appraisals and the linguistic choices made by speakers. A critical discourse analytical/ studies approach (Van Dijk 2008; Fairclough 2015) is well-suited to this type of social justice focused research endeavour and the way that CDS and Bourdieu’s theory of practice constructs have been theorised here as interacting with each other can be seen visually in figure 1 below.




Figure 1: *The interplay between Van Dijk’s triangle model for critical discourse studies (2008) and Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice constructs*

Adopting a Bourdieusian focus on the *doxa* and the *habitus* of a particular *field* seems to allow for and afford a re-conceptualisation of the contextual factors that Van Dijk considered to be missing from his triangle model of CDS. The dimensions of history and culture posited by Van Dijk to be required for a full understanding of context can equally be understood as forming part of the *habitus* of a particular *field*. We can also see the social power of the discursive practice as conferring or denying *capital* through attitude expressions, as well as other devices.

Noting that the endowment (or otherwise) of capital happens and is perpetuated through discourse, we can now consider the linguistic processes involved, here by adopting a systematic tool for research interview analysis (Appraisal) ideally matched to the aim of investigating attitudes in educators’ discourses about home language use and multilingual students. The APPRAISAL analytical framework that here seeks to shed light on the expression of *doxa* that are held as a result of *habitus* through discourses that confer (or deny) capital is now introduced below.

Appraisal analytical framework

APPRAISAL theory is an extension of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday 1978), which has long had connections with critical discourse studies. APPRAISAL has been defined as a social constructivist approach to analysing evaluative language by examining the “semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgements, and valuations, alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations” (Martin 2000, 145). In APPRAISAL terms, this negotiation can be analysed under the ATTITUDE category, with amplification of expressed evaluations being dealt with by the attendant GRADUATION subsystem, and issues of positioning covered by the ENGAGEMENT system.

APPRAISAL and especially the JUDGEMENT categories of ATTITUDE are therefore very useful for exploring discourses about what people do (or should do), can (or cannot do), and the notion of *legitimate behaviours* (Bourdieu 1991; Heller 1996), which stem from ideologies about normative behaviour, cultural and linguistic capital and appropriate standards (JUDGEMENTS of NORMALITY, CAPACITY and PROPRIETY, as discussed further below).

This paper offers an original and significant contribution to the field in that teachers’ discourses about these perceived *legitimate behaviours* and their power and control over the use of other languages have not been studied to date. Exploring these discourses is particularly valuable given the mixed messages of previous governmental guidelines (a series of publications seemingly now defunct following the most recent in 2009), the current governmental more *laissez-faire* approach to educating of those with languages beyond English (2010-2018), and prevailing societal ideologies about language and multiculturalism (as seen above), and related issues such as immigration. It is valuable in trying to prevent the potential for social alienation as well as personal and educational issues related to an undeveloped social and ethnic identity on the part of

children and young adults caused in part by language attrition or negative attitudes towards their linguistic repertoires. Teachers' appraisals of students' languages beyond English also unwittingly legitimise and further entrench social structures that privilege dominant groups (Grainger and Jones 2013). These issues are as relevant in many contexts globally as they are in the UK, where the study took place.

This paper, as part of a broader project, aims to fill this gap by addressing the following research question:

To what extent do teachers' discourses reveal ways in which languages beyond English are dealt with in schools?

Research design

This paper reports on some of the findings of a multiple instrumental case study constructed to explore teachers' experiences with and attitudes towards working with multilingual children. The study was undertaken in six schools across the north of England with 31 participants. These included two schools (a primary and a junior school) in the North East, both with a very low EAL population (0.9% and 4.6%) by local authority during the time period of the study, two primary schools in West Yorkshire, each in a region with a much higher EAL percentage (16.2% and 43.5%), and two primary schools in the North-West from the same local authority area with a 14.9% of EAL (statistics available on the NALDIC website following the 2011 school census). The schools in the North East were approached through a local authority contact in one of the LA areas, the two schools in the North West were approached following meeting their Local Authority specialist teacher at a NALDIC conference and the two schools in West Yorkshire were approached through personal contacts. Participants within the schools were then identified by the key contact at the school, generally the EAL coordinator but, on some occasions, the head teacher or deputy. The

participants in this study represented a wide range of the roles within schools and more information on the participants and their roles in the schools can be seen in the appendix. All but three of the participants were female and all but five identified as White British and were monolingual English speakers.

Two stages of research interviews were conducted by the same researcher (the author), across two academic years. Interviews were all audio recorded and were semi-structured during the first stage, using an interview guide covering four areas: the practical provision of support, the use of home languages, attitudes to bilingualism and bilingual children and knowledge about familial situations. The second stage involved the same schools and interviews were largely unstructured, adopting what Spradley (1979, cited in Richards 2003) referred to as a ‘grand tour’ question, prompting participants to update the researcher on the intervening year.

Transcription was undertaken that was somewhere around the mid-point between naturalised and denaturalised, in order to be able to capture some of the nuances of the participants’ discourse, without becoming too focused on the minutiae. It was with that in mind that the particular notation conventions I adopted in my transcriptions are adapted from conversation analysts Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998).

Drawing on Brown (2012) and earlier seminal work on the importance of linguistic landscapes (Landry and Bourhis 1997) for language vitality in particular locales, I also made informal observations in research journal field notes about the languages visible and audible in schools. This afforded the opportunity to reflect on the prominence of and role for languages beyond English in the environments of the schools and also served to enhance the possibilities for a ‘thick’ description (Geertz 1973) of the settings.

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using the APPRAISAL theory framework (Martin and White 2005). For the purposes of this paper, the key subsystems for analysis of interview talk that pertains to discourses of power and control over children's languages can be found within the JUDGEMENT subsystem of the ATTITUDE category. This subsystem holds five different types of JUDGEMENT, as classified by Martin and White (2005): VERACITY, TENACITY, CAPACITY, NORMALITY and PROPRIETY. It is the final three of these that are most common across the broader set of data, but this paper focuses principally on PROPRIETY. This JUDGEMENT category helps us to see how educators' discourses reveal explicit and hidden language policies of power and control.

The rigorous application of a systematic framework like APPRAISAL is important for this study, as it allows for an in-depth look at the linguistic choices made by participants and the ability to look, for example, at nuances and grading of expressed attitudes through the attendant systems of GRADUATION and ENGAGEMENT in a way that can be difficult to do adopting a more thematic approach. It is also of value in terms of allowing teachers in professional development to use discourse analysis to focus on the aspects that matter most to them in their work.

Findings and Discussion

The key findings to be discussed in this paper fall into four broad categories, with excerpts presented that lie on a continuum with regards to an approach towards multilingualism. The first section discusses the discourses that suggest a very positive stance, both rhetorically and in terms of the clear work that has been undertaken in some schools to *encourage* home language use. There were examples of good practice going on in some schools with regards to the employment of bilingual teachers (school

1), the establishment of lunchtime clubs for particularly language groups (school 2), the use of buddy systems (schools 2 and 6), and the use of bilingual books (schools 1 and 2).

However, it was notable that discourses that were ostensibly positive about languages beyond English were often revealed to be underpinned by a focus on the transition to English, and predicated, therefore, on a ‘monolingual fallacy’ (Phillipson 1992) of the primacy of the dominant language. This suggested languages beyond English were often *accepted* or *tolerated* rather than truly welcomed and the second section below considers this further. This brings us to the final two sections of findings and discussion, which focus in on discourses that suggest a more negative stance towards languages beyond English, varying from discourses that suggest clear domains of use for children’s languages to those that seem to lead to *prohibition* of parts of their linguistic repertoires.

“There are people who are keen and eager to learn”

Whilst in most schools in this study, the languages of the children seem to have an extremely limited place in the classroom itself, the way that working with multilingual children is discussed often has a very different and open tone to the discourse:

Lucy: I have to say (.) there’s no	[judge: capacity-]
specialists here at all (.) but there are people	[high force graduation] [judge:
who are keen and eager to learn	tenacity+ / attributed affect: desire+]

The disjoint in the excerpt above is notable. Whilst this excerpt is part of an interview in a school with very limited experience of issues pertaining to multilingualism (6), the direct negative APPRAISALS of capacity and appreciation in terms of resourcing is rather offset by the positive AFFECT about wanting to learn how best to work with children who use languages beyond English.

This desire to do the right thing in ensuring that good provision is on offer for multilingual children is sometimes mixed with a sense of awkwardness around the use of home languages in the classroom and fear of the teacher not understanding the children. Sarah in school 3, for example, expressed an ATTITUDE (negative AFFECT attributed to her colleagues) that teachers would be very insecure, which corroborates previous work about why teachers don't tend to encourage home languages (Wardman, Bell, and Sharp 2012). Other participants are more confident in stating that there is no sense of fear, with Kelly insisting that that was no longer a problem in school 2 where the increase in working multilingually (between the first and second interviews during this study) seems to be seen positively throughout the school. However, Kelly reflects on the fact the 'language buddies' approach doesn't always work, and it can be hard to work out why children in one class respond well and those in another may not:

Kelly: my partner in year five has been
doing **a lot of** (.) multilingual work in class
(.) I've tried doing it in my class it's not(.)
I've got a different cohort with different
behaviour (Researcher:(laughs))
Kelly: and **it's very difficult** because when
you (.) have people working in language
buddies which **we tried** to do (.) you have
to move people around (.) and **it doesn't**
work as well in my class because **of the**
children I've got in my (Researcher: o:k
yeah) **they will actually**
(.) **er respond** in Japanese or Urdu Punjabi
Pashto

[judgement: tenacity+]

[evoked judge propriety-]

[appreciation: composition-]

[judgement: tenacity+]

[appreciation: composition-]

[evoked judge: propriety-]

[judgement: propriety+]

[appreciation: composition-]

Kelly is careful in her subtle blaming of the children for the 'language buddies' scheme not being as successful in her classroom as in her colleague's. She avoids direct accusations of bad behaviour, adopting the euphemistic adjective 'different' instead, and almost blames the setting up and methods of the 'language buddies' approach, when she says that it does not work because she needs to be able to move people around. The reason is prefaced with 'because' as any listener would expect but instead of something more directly attributing blame like 'but the children refuse to move' or 'but the children talk too much between themselves', she simply says 'because of the children I've got' leaving it to her interlocutor to do the work of working out where the blame for the lack of success of the project lay.

The excerpt above also contained an implied message that children were being held responsible for the failure of an innovation in using home languages in the classroom. Interestingly, we can see a picture building up of children being the target of negative PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS whether they are about using or *not using* LBE. Although some of the negative PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS made across the data set were about classic behavioural issues, such as being boisterous, bitchy, silly or unkind, the majority were related to language use. We have seen above those judgements pertaining to using LBE inappropriately in order to exclude, or to be rude. However, other negative JUDGEMENTS are related to participants being displeased when children do not use the LBE, on the occasions they are encouraged. This mixed picture, coupled with similarly confused messages communicated to families about the use of English in the home, may well lead to the children being somewhat unsure about what is expected of them and doubts about how encouraged and nurtured their LBE is. This can result in poor self-esteem (Cummins 2000) and accordingly to underperformance academically (García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005), which can then potentially lead to social

alienation through lack of conferred social and cultural *capital*. Concerns about the societal impact of such alienation of youths in the future were expressed by a number of participants in this current study.

“We respect all languages”

The idea of celebrating LBE and other cultures is very embedded in the current educational ideology, as can be seen in a number of educational documents and media discourse (Department for Education and Skills 2006 for example). References to celebrating cultural diversity and linguistic heritage appear across research interviews from a number of the participating schools, chiming in with the research literature (May 2010; Piller 2017) about the prevalence and unchallenged adoption of a liberal multicultural model as a good thing that has become part of the *habitus* of the education *field*.

A participant (the EAL coordinator) from school 2 (North-West England) discusses this notion of respect for the languages spoken by the children in the school, in an excerpt that is almost entirely discursively matched by the deputy head in school 5 as well as eluded to by a number of other participants (see Cunningham 2017) for more on these excerpts).

Kelly: yeah (.) um (.) but we are trying to do more multilingual signage (..) this is not necessarily because the children need it (.) or they can read it coz a lot of them can't read it but **its about showing that we respect** (CC: mmm) **all** languages that **all** languages are (.) **acceptable** in our school and (CC: yeah) that **it's ok** to speak in your own language in the classroom (CC: yeah) (.) which (.) **children find difficult** I thin- a lot of the teachers are now are- are (.) **quite willing** to let people use first language in the classroom (CC: okay) **particularly** when they have new children

[judgement: propriety+]
 [judgement: propriety+ in appreciation: valuation+] [high force graduation: quantification] [high force graduation: quantification] [judgement: propriety+ in appreciation: composition+] [judgement: propriety+]
 [judgement: capacity- /attributed affect: security-]
 [low force graduation: intensification]
 [attributed affect: security+]
 [high force graduation: intensification]

In this excerpt, we can see a rhetorical reiteration of the notion of respect for LBE and celebration of diversity. This message of ‘respect’ and almost ‘evangelical’ use of ‘value’ (Bourne 2001, 251) is one that has echoes of the various governmental guidance documents for working with children with EAL, in which teachers are encouraged to learn a few words of the languages of the children in their classes in order to demonstrate their respect (Department for Children, Schools and Families 2007; Department for Education and Skills 2006), in order, for example, to show a ‘civilised respect’ towards other languages (Kingman 1988, 43). However, an analysis of the discourse following these rhetorical claims of respect is interesting in that they can often go on to demonstrate something of the power of the participants in controlling the use of other languages, both that of children and parents.

In this case, this demonstrative construction is mitigated by a series of caveats through the ever-lowering force of the adjectives chosen regarding the

children using their languages at school. Ultimately, the attitude expressed seems to be that children should have to be given permission to use their own language, and that it is only really to be encouraged when the children are new to the school and new to English. The positivity with regards to the use of home languages is caveated to such an extent that it seems that the languages of the multilingual children are only really welcomed and considered appropriate (positive PROPRIETY) when they are associated with negative CAPACITY JUDGEMENTS of the children concerned, This thereby creates a sense of temporariness and reflects an ideology subscribing to the deficit/ transition model stemming from the monolingual *habitus* of the participants (Gogolin 1997).

Moreover, the overtly positive but perhaps somewhat clichéd expression ‘we respect all languages’ is prefaced by a phrase that further suggests that this may be little more than a rhetorical stance: ‘it’s about showing that...’ This idea of a demonstration of doing the right thing (PROPRIETY) is present in a number of the participants’ interviews, some being more explicit than others about the affordances of demonstrations of multilingual and multicultural awareness (for example, being useful for visits by the national schools’ inspectors, Ofsted, as explicitly mentioned in school 4).

The sense that the children have an educational problem leads to discourses about what specifically teachers should do in the classroom with regards to home language use, as well as discussion on pedagogical practices designed to improve the children’s educational chances. Therefore, it is useful to consider the expressed attitudes of the participants with regards to how they see their role in managing the linguistic repertoires of the children in their care. A critical discourse analytical approach is often based around explorations of power in discourse (Fairclough 2015; Maftoon and Shakouri 2012; Van Dijk 2008 *inter alia*) and it is with

reference to the PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS in the discourse on how teachers should manage children who speak LBE in the school environment that the participants in this study can be seen to wield their power most explicitly.

“There isn’t a culture of children being allowed to use home languages”

Unsurprisingly, an analysis of the research interviews with a focus on the use of LBE in the classroom reveals marked difference in attitudes depending on the school under consideration. Participants working in schools where children’s home languages are less encouraged tend to adopt a more negative tone than the discourses seen in the previous section, for example. However, this topic and context could be seen as a classic site of ideological struggle (Heller 1996) which leads to participants across *all* schools presenting a confused rhetoric about LBE, as we will see below.

Field notes on the linguistic landscape of one of the classrooms in school 4 made note of the content of a sign on the back of one of the classroom doors which read:

We use our first language in school to:

- *Improve our English and extend our vocabulary*
- *Become more confident in speaking our first language*
- *Improve and extend our first language*
- *Learn new ideas through using our first language*

From reading this sign, one might expect that the classroom in question would be adopting a range of multilingual strategies (in the manner of the suggestions proffered by Bourne 2002 for example) but this proved not to be the case as the classroom operated on an entirely English-only basis during the researcher’s visit, at least. This tale of rhetorical positivity about first/ home languages is, however, one that is echoed within many of the schools in the current study.

This interview with Kelly in which she was asked about how extensively home languages were used in the school (school 2) offers a useful starting point for reflections around this rhetoric/ practice divide. Given the location in the local authority area with the strongest provision in the study and given the presence of bilingual learning assistants in the school and a general sense of positivity towards other languages, her response was perhaps a little surprising:

Kelly: So I'm all for it [home language use in the classroom] and I believe in it but if it's not encouraged and used from Foundation upwards it's difficult in Year 5 cos they're a bit **embarrassed** using it. And then **they've got to learn to use it appropriately**, so in our school at the moment there **isn't a culture of it**, of children being *allowed* to use it without there being a bilingual member of staff there to sort of oversee it.

[affect: security-]

[irrealis judge: propriety-]

[appreciation: valuation-]

The power of the discourse with regards to language use here is of significance. Children are construed as not being able to be trusted to use their own language appropriately and almost as needing a chaperone to do so. This gives the impression of the teaching staff adopting a very powerful position with regards to the creation of a culture in which the ownership of the children's languages seems to lie with the teachers.

“It’s about the inappropriateness of language”

In the very different setting of school 5, Helen explicitly acknowledges that, generally speaking, home languages are not encouraged in the classroom. Perhaps one reason for this can be seen in the following excerpt in which we see that the concern for excluding others through using home languages (which is also seen as a concern in school 6 – the North-Eastern primary). Below, Kate utilises the ATTITUDE resources of PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS to suggest that children may be deliberately excluding others, along with the high force GRADUATION of ‘only’, which gives the impression in the discourse that this would be the chosen *modus operandi* of the children if they were allowed free rein in using their home language:

Researcher: you hear no (..) heritage languages	[high force graduation]
Kate: only when they want to:	[judgement: propriety-]
be rude uhm (.) whether (..) when they want to uh:m (..) exclude anybody from the group including the teacher (.) from the group	[judgement: propriety-]
<i>[15 lines of transcript excised]</i>	[appreciation: reaction-]
but it’s the- it’s this communicating	[judgement: capacity-]
(.) uhm (.) to- to stop other people understanding that we do frown upon	[judgement: propriety-]

Kate is perhaps the participant most at the nexus of the ideological struggle on this issue, because of her recent transition from a much more diverse school. She talks (in common with a number of other participants) of allowing for LBE mainly in the context of answering the register of attendance, claiming that it is a way for the children to share their culture with her. This potentially positive message about the intertwined nature of

culture and language is, of course, negated by the tokenistic nature of what is on offer in the discourse here (i.e. that saying ‘yes, Miss/ Mrs/ Mr x’ or ‘Hello’ in the language of your choosing is a somewhat limited way of sharing your culture). Tokenism of this type is critiqued in earlier governmental guidance as being a ‘pernicious form of bias’, along with omission and stereotyping of linguistic and multicultural differences (DES 2006).

However, she then goes on to express a more ideologically monolingual stance with LBE being construed purely in negative terms in her discourse:

Kate: but any other language	[judgement: propriety-]
we actually give them a warning for	[judgement: propriety-]
because they’re using it (..) in (.) in an inappropriate way (.) I mean obviously if it was a lesson where you (.) you know in RE or whatever if we’re asking for technical terms or whatever then no problem at all	[judgement: propriety+]
<i>[12 lines of transcript deleted as irrelevant]</i>	[judgement: propriety+]
I would encourage it an’ encourage what they have got (.) but it’s about (.) it’s about the inappropriateness of language an’ just as you’d say to a child (.) I mean at my previous school we never (.) told a child that swearing was wrong because actually	[judgement: propriety-]
(.) you’re criticising what they hear at home all the time (.) and therefore so what we would say is we don’t swear in school (CC: yeah) an’ in a similar way here	[irrealis judge: propriety-]
(.) we don’t speak in Punjabi we don’t speak in Urdu or whatever in school because we need to make it so that everyone can understand it	[irrealis judge: propriety-] [judgement: capacity+]

Although concerns about exclusion of others through the use of home languages can be

seen again, it is possibly the equivalence drawn between home languages and taboo language that has the strongest impact. Situating these two together in this discourse about a hypothetical situation (hence the *irrealis* JUDGMENTS) suggests a very negative ideological stance towards LBE.

It is important to note that the position adopted in schools 4 and particularly 5 are not representative of the situation across the remaining schools in the study. However, it is highly likely they are representative of other similar schools in the UK, in which this level of control and prohibition has been noted and is discussed anecdotally at numerous events for EAL teachers and specialists, in other European countries such as Belgium, as discussed by Sierens and Van Avermaet (2014), where children can be punished for speaking their language at the ‘wrong’ time, as well as in many other contexts internationally.

Conclusions and implications

We have observed that teachers’ discourses about LBE are predicated to a great extent on exerting power and control over the children’s own linguistic repertoires. The discourse is connected strongly to what children can do and should do and, in this regard, we saw that participants’ negative PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS in this study were often connected to using or *not* using their LBE. The equating of home language with bad behaviour or a taboo has numerous implications for the children whose identity is intertwined with its use, including but not limited to lowering of self-esteem (Cummins 1984), and the perpetuating of English monolingual *habitus*, with the knowledge that a *habitus* established at a young and impressionable age carries ‘a disproportionate weight’ (Bourdieu, 1990, 60 cited in Weininger 2005).

Discourses of prohibition and discouragement were present across multiple schools, despite contradicting rhetoric at the school policy level and earlier

governmental guidance documentation (DCSF 2007; Ofsted 2009). However, implied criticism of the children was also sparked in narratives pertaining to efforts to bring home languages in to the classroom, due to what was interpreted as the children often choosing not to use their LBE when it was deemed legitimate to do so by teachers. The potential confusion for children over when their own languages might be welcome, highlighted through the lens of the PROPRIETY JUDGEMENTS analysed, may also be a factor that schools find it is worth being more explicit about.

Teachers investigating teachers' discourse in professional development

Discourses of teachers relating to attitudes towards LBE (or any other dominant language of education in other contexts globally) and towards language maintenance and shift are worthy of further research. The role of the teacher is a powerful one insofar as control of children's linguistic repertoires is concerned, which may be problematic if this power is not wielded for positive impact given the importance of the teacher's role in encouraging additive multilingualism.

As part of a process of working for the kind of change to discourses and practices that arguably would be beneficial to teachers and students, I propose that situating practitioners and trainee teachers as discourse analysts in professional development and teacher education programmes could be a valuable way to increase awareness of the importance of individual discourses and making steps to adapt them more effectively to the local context. This would situate teachers, local policy-makers and other stake-holders as independent agents of social change (Van Dijk 2013; Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokalidou 2015) and as instrumental in shifting the *habitus* of their *field* towards a more critical multiculturalism and a more open approach to languages beyond English. This would be a very valuable role, particularly in a political

landscape of a decentralised approach to education for children with languages beyond English.

There are no declaration of interests to note.

References:

Bailey, Elizabeth G, and Emma Marsden. 2017. "Teachers' Views on Recognising and Using Home Languages in Predominantly Monolingual Primary Schools." *Language and Education* 31 (4). Taylor & Francis: 283–206.
doi:10.1080/09500782.2017.1295981.

Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=WvhSEMrNWHAC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_atb#v=onepage&q&f=false.

———. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John Thompson. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=u2ZIGBiJntAC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_atb#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Bourne, Jill. 2001. "Doing 'What Comes Naturally': How the Discourses and Routines of Teachers' Practice Constrain Opportunities for Bilingual Support in UK Primary Schools." *Language and Education* 15 (4): 250–68.

———. 2002. "Home Languages in the Literacy Hour." Southampton.

Brown, Kara D. 2012. "The Linguistic Landscape of Educational Spaces: Language Revitalization and Schools in Southeastern Estonia." In *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*, edited by Durk Gorter, Heiko F Marten, and Luk Van Mensel, 281–98. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
doi:10.1057/9780230360235_16.

Byrnes, Deborah, A., Gary Kiger, and M. Lee Manning. 1997. "Teachers' Attitudes

- about Language Diversity.” *Teaching and Teacher Education* 13 (6): 637–44.
- Cameron, Lynne, and Sharon Besser. 2004. “Writing in English as an Additional Language at Key Stage 2.” Leeds.
- Coady, Maria, Candace Harper, and Ester De Jong. 2011. “From Preservice to Practice: Mainstream Elementary Teacher Beliefs of Preparation and Efficacy with English Language Learners in the State of Florida.” *Bilingual Research Journal : The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 34 (2): 223–39. doi:10.1080/15235882.2011.597823.
- Conteh, Jean, and Avril Brock. 2011. “‘Safe Spaces’? Sites of Bilingualism for Young Learners in Home, School and Community.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14 (3): 347–60. doi:10.1080/13670050.2010.486850.
- Cummins, Jim. 1984. *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . 2014. “Teaching through a Multilingual Lens: The Evolution of EAL Policy and Practice in Canada.” *Education Matters* 2 (1): 3–40.
- Cunningham, Clare. 2017. “Saying More than You Realise about ‘EAL’: Discourses of Educators about Children Who Speak Languages beyond English.” University of York.
- . 2018. “Terminological Tussles: Taking Issue with ‘EAL’ and ‘Languages Other than English.’” *Power and Education*. doi:10.1177/1757743818806919.
- DCSF. 2007. “Supporting Children Learning English as an Additional Language.” London.
- Department of Education. 2017. “Schools, Pupils, and Their Characteristics: January 2017.” London. doi:https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/schools-pupils-and-their-characteristics-january-2012.
- DES. 2006. “Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and Teaching for Bilingual Children in the Primary Years.” London.
- DfES. 2007. “New Arrivals Excellence Programme Guidance.”

- Dillon, Anna Marie. 2010. "Supporting Home Language Maintenance among Children with English as an Additional Language in Irish Primary Schools." *WPEL* 27 (2): 76–94.
- Eisenclas, Susana A, Andrea C Schalley, and Diana Guillemin. 2013. "The Importance of Literacy in the Home Language: The View From Australia." *SAGE Open* 3 (4). SAGE Publications: 2158244013507270. doi:10.1177/2158244013507270.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2015. *Language and Power*. 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Flores, Belinda Bustos, and Howard L Smith. 2009. "Teachers' Characteristics and Attitudinal Beliefs About Linguistic and Cultural Diversity." *Bilingual Research Journal : The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 31 (1–2): 323–58. doi:10.1080/15235880802640789.
- Flynn, Naomi. 2013. "Linguistic Capital and the Linguistic Field for Teachers Unaccustomed to Linguistic Difference." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34 (2): 225–42. doi:10.2307/23356980.
- . 2015a. "Disambiguating with Bourdieu: Unravelling Policy from Practice in the Teaching of Children with English as an Additional Language." *Literacy* 49 (1): 20–27. doi:10.1111/lit.12049.
- . 2015b. "Turning a Bourdieuan Lens on English Teaching in Primary Schools: Linguistic Field, Linguistic Habitus and Linguistic Capital." In *Theory as Method in Research: On Bourdieu, Social Theory and Education*, edited by Mark Murphy and Cristina Costa, 155–70. London: Routledge.
- Franson, Charlotte. 1999. "Mainstreaming Learners of English as an Additional Language: The Class Teacher's Perspective." *Language Culture And Curriculum* 12 (1): 59–71.
- García-Nevarez, Ana G, Mary E Stafford, and Beatriz Arias. 2005. "Arizona Elementary Teachers' Attitudes Toward English Language Learners and the Use of Spanish in Classroom Instruction." *Bilingual Research Journal : The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 29 (2): 295–317. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162837.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gkaintartzi, Anastasia, Angeliki Kiliari, and Roula Tsokalidou. 2015. "'Invisible'

- Bilingualism – ‘Invisible’ Language Ideologies: Greek Teachers’ Attitudes towards Immigrant Pupils’ Heritage Languages.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18 (1). Taylor & Francis: 60–72.
doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.877418.
- Gkaintartzi, Anastasia, and Roula Tsokalidou. 2011. ““She Is a Very Good Child but She Doesn’t Speak”: The Invisibility of Children’s Bilingualism and Teacher Ideology.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (2): 588–601.
doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.014.
- Gogolin, Ingrid. 1994. *Der Monolinguale Habitus Der Multilingualen Schule*. Munster: Waxmann Verlag.
- . 1997. “The " Monolingual Habitus " as the Common Feature in Teaching in the Language of the Majority in Different Countries.” *Per Linguam* 13 (2): 38–49.
- Grainger, Karen, and Peter E Jones. 2013. “The ‘Language Deficit’ Argument and Beyond.” *Language and Education* 27 (2): 95–98.
doi:10.1080/09500782.2012.760582.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Heller, Monica. 1996. “Legitimate Language in a Multilingual School.” *Linguistics and Education* 8 (2): 139–57. doi:10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90011-X.
- Helot, Christine, and Andrea Young. 2002. “Bilingualism and Language Education in French Primary Schools: Why and How Should Migrant Languages Be Valued?” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 5 (2): 96–112.
- Horenczyk, Gabriel, and Moshe Tatar. 2002. “Teachers’ Attitudes toward Multiculturalism and Their Perceptions of the School Organizational Culture.” *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18 (4): 435–45. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00008-2.
- Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt. 1998. *Converstion Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Karabenick, Stuart, and Phyllis Clemens. 2004. “Professional Development Implications of Teachers’ Beliefs and Attitudes Toward English Language Learners.” *Bilingual Research Journal* 28 (1): 55–75.
doi:10.1080/15235882.2004.10162612.

- Kearney, Fiona. 2014. "Inclusion or Invasion? How Irish Post-Primary Teachers View Newcomer Students in the Mainstream Classroom." In *Managing Diversity in Education: Languages, Policies, Pedagogies*, edited by David Little, Constant Leung, and Piet Van Avermaet, 73–96. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kingman. 1988. "Kingman Report." London.
- Kubota, Ryuko. 2016. "The Multi/Plural Turn, Postcolonial Theory, and Neoliberal Multiculturalism: Complicities and Implications for Applied Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics* 37 (4): 474–94. doi:10.1093/applin/amu045.
- Landry, R., and R. Y. Bourhis. 1997. "Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16 (1): 23–49.
- Lee, Jin Sook, and Eva Oxelson. 2006. "'It's Not My Job': K–12 Teacher Attitudes Toward Students' Heritage Language Maintenance." *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 30 (2): 453–77.
- Maftoon, Parviz, and Nima Shakouri. 2012. "The Concept of Power in Teacher Talk: A Critical Discourse Analysis." *World Applied Sciences Journal* 19 (8): 1208–15. doi:10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.08.1894.
- Martin, J. R. 2000. "Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English." In *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, edited by S. Hunston and G. Thompson, 142–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, James R., and Peter R.R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: APPRAISAL in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230511910.
- May, Stephen. 2010. "Introduction: Critical Multiculturalism." In *Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis*, edited by Stephen May and Christine E. Sleeter. London: Routledge.
- Murakami, Charlotte. 2008. "'Everybody Is Just Fumbling Along': An Investigation of Views Regarding EAL Training and Support Provisions in a Rural Area." *Language and Education* 22 (4): 265. doi:10.2167/le767.0.
- Murphy, Victoria. 2018. "Why Using the Term EAL Can Be 'Reckless.'" *TES*, May. <https://www.tes.com/news/why-using-term-eal-can-be-reckless>.

- NASUWT. 2012. "Ethnic Minority Achievement." Birmingham.
- Nielikäinen, Justiina. 2014. "Rikkaus? A Survey of Primary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Multiculturalism." University of Eastern Finland.
- Ofsted. 2009. "Twenty Outstanding Primary Schools Excelling against the Odds." London.
- Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piller, Ingrid. 2017. *Intercultural Communication: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Primary National Strategies. 2009. "Developing Language in the Primary School : Literacy and Primary Languages." London.
- Richards, Keith. 2003. *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sharples, Robert. 2017. "Local Practice, Translocal People: Conflicting Identities in the Multilingual Classroom." *Language and Education* 31 (2). Taylor & Francis: 169–83. doi:10.1080/09500782.2017.1295980.
- Sierens, Sven, and Piet Van Avermaet. 2014. "Language Diversity in Education: Evolving from Multilingual Education to Functional Multilingual Learning." In *Managing Diversity in Education: Languages, Policies, Pedagogies*, edited by David Little, Constant Leung, and Piet Van Avermaet, 204–22. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2013. "Ideology and Discourse." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies.*, edited by Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, 175–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2008. *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wardman, Clare, Judith Bell, and Emma Sharp. 2012. "Valuing Home Languages." In *Innovations in English Language Teaching for Migrants and Refugees*, edited by David Mallows, 37–48. London: British Council.
- Weininger, Elliot B. 2005. "Pierre Bourdieu on Social Class and Symbolic Violence." In *Approaches to Class Analysis*, edited by E. O. Wright, 116–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Youngs, Cheryl Stanosheck, and George A Youngs. 2001. "Predictors of Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Toward ESL Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 35 (1): 97–120.

Appendix: Participants

School	Participant pseudonym	Role	Langs.	Age	Interview duration
1	Thomas	Head teacher	Eng.	50+	43m01s (Stage 2) 53m38s (Stage 1)
	Jenna	EAL Coordinator	Eng./ Urdu	20-30	27m15s (Stage 1)
2	Kelly	EAL Coordinator	Eng.	40-50	31m05s (Stage 2) 33m43s (Stage 1)
	Taliba	BLA*	Eng./	20-30	28m51s (Stage 2)
	Habib	BLA*	Panjabi	20-30	27m37s (Stage 1)
	Oraiba	BLA*		30-40	
	Caroline	Deputy head	Eng.	40-50	7m40s (Stage 2)
	Marie	Class teacher	Eng.	30-40	26m21s (Stage 2)
	Sheila	Head teacher	Eng.	50+	18m18s (Stage 2) 20m12s (Stage 1)
	Tessa	Class teacher	Eng.	20-30	24m38s (Stage 1)
*BLA=Bilingual Learning Assistant					
3	Sarah	Deputy head	Eng.	30-40	42m33s (Stage 2)
	Katherine/ Keely	Class teachers	Eng.	30-40	20m54s (Stage 1)
	Katrina	Head teacher	Eng.	40-50	21m40s (Stage 1)
		Teaching assistant group (4)	Eng.	30-50	43m46s (Stage 1)
4	Irene	Head teacher	Eng.	50+	29m03s (Stage 2) 28m01s (Stage 1)
	Ida	Class teacher	Eng.	20-30	21m00s (Stage 1)
5	Luke	Deputy head	Eng.	50+	26m02s (Stage 2)

6

Karen	SEN Coordinator	Eng.	40-50	19m17s (Stage 2)
Helen	Family Liaison	Eng.	40-50	21m02s (Stage 2)
Kate	Class teacher	Eng.	30-40	42m32s (Stage 2)
Lucy	HLTA/ EAL Coordinator	Eng.	30-40	53m55s (Stage 2)
Fiona	Nursery teacher	Eng.	40-50	15m27s (Stage 1)
Melanie	Class teacher	Eng.	20-30	9m08s (Stage 1)
Linda	Class teacher	Eng.	20-30	9m44s (Stage 1)
Louise	Class teacher	Eng.	30-40	6m51s (Stage 1)

Corresponding author:

Clare Cunningham, School of Languages and Linguistics, York St John University, Lord
Mayor's Walk, York, YO31 7EX
01904 876753, c.cunningham@yorks.ac.uk
ORCID iD: [0000-0003-3767-7624](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3767-7624)
Twitter: @CCunninghamyork