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1. Introduction

Bilingualism or in a wider domain, multilingualism, in the UK can be considered from two perspectives: firstly, British people who learn languages other than English, and secondly asylum seekers / refugees and generally migrants who come to the UK for several reasons such as a better life, work (an occupation) and security. This leads to multiculturalism in society with regard to different backgrounds, religions, languages and cultures. The advantages that the government intends to pursue by providing language provisions for bilinguals are increasing worldwide contacts in business, improving language learning and teaching for British people, improving language skills, learning social skills, being familiar with government policies and social matters and in general promoting community cohesion for migrants.

The UK government has made different efforts to achieve these goals. There are several official reports that survey to what extent the related acts have been implemented in society in general as well as in schools and local authorities at a more local level. Furthermore, there are reports that show the weaknesses and positive points that these schools and authorities deal with in following the rules.

To clarify my viewpoint in this study about bilingual – or in a broader domain multilingual - education, following Baker (2001: 192), there are two types of bilingual education: “education that uses and promotes two languages and education for language minority children”. The emphasis in this study is on the second one “where bilingual children are present, but bilingualism is not fostered in the curriculum” (ibid).

The aim of this thesis is to study the Language Policy in the English education system for bilinguals by looking at texts such as official documents (Languages for All: Languages for Life A Strategy for England and Every Language Matters) and the inspection reports of several schools and identifying discourses and then considering the consequences of these discourses (what are these discourses reveal) for education. I have done discourse analysis by selecting several important passages in the texts and analyzing them according to four discourses, which I have identified in the texts, to find out what the dominant discourses are, how they are combined and what values are assigned to language.
There are paradoxes in the way official documents assign value to language education and the way language education is performed in reality, in schools.

Let us take a brief look at the background to the English education system as well as educational provision for bilinguals within the British education system in relation to multilingualism.

First, I provide a brief illustration of the English education system, which can help us to follow the rest of the text easier. “Schooling is compulsory for 12 years” (McDowall 1999:147) and it consists of primary, 5 to 11 years old, and secondary school, 11 to 16 years old. There are two voluntary years of schooling at the upper end of secondary school, for 16-18 year old pupils, which is named ‘the sixth form’, during which academic and vocational courses are provided.

Elementary schools were established from the 1870s by the local authorities and paid for by the local community for boys and girls up to the age of 13. Secondary schools were established by local authorities but they originally had a fee-paying system. “The 1944 Education Act introduced free compulsory secondary schools.” (McDowall 1999:148). There are two main kinds of schools at secondary education level in Britain: ‘comprehensive’, state-funded schools, to which most of the children go, and ‘public’, fee-paying private schools. There are two public academic examinations for pupils at secondary level: one of them is the GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education) at the end of compulsory education at 16 that was introduced in 1989 (McDowall 1999: 147); and the other is the ‘A level’ (advanced level) for voluntary education at 18. The latter is usually for university or college entry. GCSEs were introduced as an examination to include the whole ability range, not only class work and homework but also formal written examinations. It is a kind of exam that judges each subject separately.

In general, secondary school is very subject based; it is split into subjects and each teacher teaches their own subject and they are all subject specialists, whereas in primary school it is the same teacher basically the whole day and he/she teaches basically everything. Therefore, it is easier for primary school teachers to see the overall picture of a student. Since two educational reforms of the 1980s, the Education Act (1986) and the Education Reform Act (1988) brought about a ‘consumer choice’ reform that has the idea to publish examination results of pupils, GCSEs play an important role in making British
schools compete with each other. Accordingly, GCSE results can reveal the standard of a school for parents to choose the most successful school for their children. Therefore, it is important for secondary schools to have a positive and successful image. Another reform in the 1980s was the introduction of the National Curriculum, in which the learning of subjects such as science and one modern language were made compulsory. Moreover, it may be worth mentioning that the above-mentioned reforms of the 1980s were introduced in response to the low rate of pupils who stay on till age of 18 compared to international standards (Machin & Vignoles 2006: 3).

Since Britain is a multilingual and multicultural country, I also provide below a historical overview of changing language policies and the provisions that have arisen from these policies.

According to the Swan Report (1985: 387) from the late 1950s onward, the provision which was implemented in the English education system was “intensive English teaching” for children for whom English was not their first language. This provision was called “withdrawal” (Creese 2005: 30), according to which children were excluded from “either class or from the school and placed in a situation in which they [were] given a ‘special’ education that they [were] seen to need”. In short, the assimilationist policy of withdrawal provision can be defined in the way English was seen as a key for the minority language group to integrate into British society. Later on, in the 1970s, minority languages were seen as a problem for minority language pupils in that they prevented them from being assimilated into British society. That is, minority language pupils could access to majority culture only through learning the majority language, English. The critique that the Swan Report made of this education policy was that although withdrawal provision had the idea of helping pupils to reach the same level of fluency in English as their native speaker peers:

the thinking behind these centres can we believe in retrospect be seen as an example of institutional racism which, whilst not originally discriminatory in intent, is discriminatory in effect in that it denies an individual child access to the full range of educational opportunities available - in the case of full-time centres by withdrawing them totally from the mainstream school and with part-time provision by requiring them to miss a substantial part of the normal school curriculum (Swan Report 1985: 389 bolding in original)
According to Thompson (2004: 86) “this form of educational separation and isolation continued until the mid 1980s”. Furthermore, following Bourne (2003: 25) in separated provision “not providing any language support, however, would risk failure in the school system”. In 1960 the idea of “inclusion” began which aims “to empower and give general rights to those groups in society which had been denied them” (Creese 2005: 30). The educational policy that emerged in the 1980s from the inclusion ideology was “mainstreaming” which was in contrast with the policy of withdrawal and had the “aim to provide all children with access to the full and rich curriculum of the mainstream classroom” (ibid). Consequently, the mainstreaming policy introduced “the rationale of protecting equality of opportunity for language minority students” (Warshauer Freedman & Lee McKay 1990: 386). From the 1990s, the concept of ‘bilingual support’ (Martin-Jones: 2002 / 2003) evolved, that is, an educational programme in which the first language of minority language students can be used in the early years of primary schools to help in understanding and especially for acquiring the majority language, English. In other words, the child’s first language may play a transitional role in mainstreaming policy to make the acquisition of English easier for integration and assimilation into the dominant culture.

2. Methodology and Theoretical Background

I have singled out some theoretical frameworks about Discourse Analysis (DA); the way the data, on which this study is based, is analyzed. Moreover, as this is an analysis about bilingualism in England, it is also relevant to provide a brief background to the literature on bilingualism. Furthermore, since there are bilingual children in Britain, it is interesting to look at educational provision for bilinguals. There are some aspects within the English educational system which might be interesting to view and compare with a bilingual education. Finally, by mixing these two literatures, i.e. DA and bilingualism, I will infer the discourses that are in the documents under study. I have tried to make a comparison between primary schools and secondary schools and ascertain to what extent the discourses in the official documents are followed by the schools.
2. 1. Discourse Analysis

Language is a necessary medium for people to have contact with each other. Of course, understanding the correct meaning which a word carries in different contexts plays an important role in establishing a social relationship with each other in everyday life.

It is the discourse or as Blommaert (2005: 2) puts it: “meaningful symbolic behaviour” that is in focus in analyzing the world from different aspects, because “discourse is what transforms our environment into a socially and culturally meaningful one” (Blommaert 2005: 4). Discourse shapes or is shaped through social practices, so it is discourse that creates, reproduces or transforms our world. According to Fairclough (2004 [2003]: 124), discourses are:

ways of representing aspects of the world- the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the ‘mental world’ of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world. The particular aspects of the world may be represented differently, so we are generally in the position of having to consider the relationship between different discourses.

As it is understood from Fairclough’s definition, discourses not only manifest previous knowledge, thoughts or feelings but discourses can also produce them in new ways, which result in new discourses. Therefore, discourses both reproduce and change social relations in the world.

The similarity that may be shared by all definitions of discourse is that discourse both reproduces pre-existing knowledge and also creates new knowledge, which can result in a changing social world. Therefore, the analysis of discourse or the language that one uses to make contact with others is important in social research.

Discourse analysis (DA) is a ‘social constructionist’ approach, which is “an umbrella term for a range of new theories about culture and society” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 4). DA is a broad term that several different approaches are embedded in and it can be implemented in different social domains. In other words, discourse analysis is “a series of interdisciplinary approaches that can be used to explore many different social domains in many different types of studies” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 1). In order to identify different discourses in a specific context, for example concerning bilingualism
in this study, one should identify groups of features or characteristics which may consist of “particular words and the way in which they are combined in certain collocations or phrases” (Musk 2006: 130) for each discourse. Since the aim of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is “to explore the links between language use and social practice” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 69), I have drawn on Norman Fairclough’s framework for CDA which is a type of discourse analytical approach.

Discourse can be analyzed in two dimensions in CDA: the communicative event and the order of discourse (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 67). Fairclough proposes a three-dimensional model for the first dimension (communicative event):

1) Text, meaning the analysis of linguistic structure.

2) Discursive practice, meaning what discourses and genres are involved in the production and consumption of the text. Interdiscursivity, meaning “what discourses they [texts] draw on” and intertextuality, meaning “how they [texts] intertextually draw on other texts” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 82) are ways that are helpful in analyzing discursive practice. I have examined the relation between different texts through interdiscursivity in this regard.

3) Social practice, meaning whether a discursive practice reproduces or reconstructs the existing order of discourse.

The second dimension of discourse (the order of discourse) both constitutes and is constituted by specific instances of language use, meaning specific discourses and genres in a specific social domain. Thus the order of discourse is “open to change” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 72), meaning a specific social domain can consist of specific discourses and genres, which can be considered as the order of discourse of that specific social domain, or it can consist of discourses and genres from other social domains that change the characteristics of the order of discourse of that specific social domain.

Change is constructed through discursive practices and is limited by several factors, one of which is power, meaning “the access of different actors to different discourses” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 74). In other words, power plays a role in constructing ideological discourses, which are discourses that are more consensual or desirable for the
people in a society. Therefore, ideology may be viewed as a way of using language in everyday interactions or what we assume as “background knowledge or common sense” (Pennycook 2001: 81) that is produced by a particular power group. Ideology underlies social relations, as it is transparent in Fairclough’s (2004 [2003]: 9) definition of the concept of ideology:

Ideologies are representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation.

According to the above definition, ideologies can make, sustain or transform existent dominant relations in a society.

Pennycook (2001: 82) states the concepts of discourse from a CDA point of view as “language in use”; and ideology as “a particular framework of knowledge that is tied to social power and may be manifested in language”. By looking into discourse, one can find manifestations of ideology. Therefore, I examine language to find the ideologies underlying it.

2. 2. Education Provision for Bilinguals

According to Ruiz (1984); language in bilingual education can be considered in terms of three orientations for making language policy: 1) language as a problem, 2) language as a right and 3) language as a resource. These orientations towards language have led to different ideologies during the history of bilingual education.

As Pennycook (2001) states, power makes language policy; not just looking at language policy in terms of the documents that governments make. In other words, power goes through the whole system, meaning different people who are involved in the production of policy, from local authorities to head teachers to individual teachers to pupils, and all of them have to do with reordering power in the system. Accordingly, what ends up as language policy is more to do with “workings of power” (Pennycook 2001: 27) not just the official documents that governments formulate. Therefore, by looking at
language through one of the three orientations, which Ruiz suggests, power offers different ideological solutions and provisions for exercising its aims in a multilingual and multicultural society.

Baker (2001: 382) proposes two general opposing ideological positions, assimilationism and pluralism, which policy makers take in a multicultural society. Assimilationism insists on sticking to the majority language and culture and giving up ‘heritage’ culture in education. On the other hand, a pluralist vision believes “different language groups can live together in the same territory in relative harmony and without unjust domination of one group by another” (Baker 2001: 384).

However, there are other positions between these two poles in the history of analyzing bilingualism that are regarded as ideological solutions for solving conflict or achieving social cohesion. Tyack (1995: 9-10) advocates a broader analysis of education programmes, which include eight strategies, for linguistic and cultural diversity that can be illustrated concisely in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Separate and unequal schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Different provisions based on different needs of different linguistic and cultural groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Eradicate ethnic differences by adopting the same common characteristics as the majority society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>Secure full citizenship and educational rights for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore differences</td>
<td>Adopt a neutral stance to linguistic and cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Give special help to ethnic, linguistic and cultural minorities in order to correct faulty socialization or to make the transition to majority society fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td>Appreciate linguistic and cultural diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Maintain differences between linguistic and cultural groups by being separate but having equal rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, Tyack’s model
As we can see, the top end of the table refers to making a greater split between social groups. On the other hand, the bottom end involves a positive view towards multiculturalism and multilingualism by believing in keeping diversity between different groups of people. Some of these strategies have been used in the texts, which I have studied and I have pointed them out in my analysis.

2.3. Discourses

Since the analysis of discursive practice is how a text is produced and consumed, I have applied interdiscursivity to find out the discourses that the texts under study draw on. I have analyzed two official texts according to four different kinds of discourses related to the concept of bilingualism which emerged from the data in these particular documents. I describe each label by taking up key words and examples of each in the official texts. The following table illustrates the four discourses in a concise form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory 1</th>
<th>Subcategory 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commodification of language</strong></td>
<td>Business (marketization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globalization</strong></td>
<td>(Economic and international markets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pluralism</strong></td>
<td>Linguistic diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2, Discourses*

The first of these discourses is the *commodification of language discourse*. Monica Heller has taken the term, commodification discourse whereby it “renders language amenable to redefinition as a measurable skill” (2003: 474) in order to highlight language skills as a valuable commodity. I also use commodification discourse in my analysis in terms of language skills as a useful commodity in different domains and it is divided into two subcategories. The first is *marketization of language discourse*, which is about the usefulness of language skills as a commodity which aids access to more business,
employability and work opportunities. This view of language is like advertising a commodity to achieve success in a competitive market. The other is leisure discourse, which is related to travel and personal life.

As an example, the marketization discourse is very clear in the following passage of the text Languages for All: Languages for Life (LFA): “Employers and employees with language skills improve employability and economic competitiveness, enabling the country to prosper in the global economy.” (LFA: 13) The word “employability” directs our minds to business by emphasizing that language skills are an important factor in creating more work opportunities and also success in the competitive global market, although the latter is actually not part of the marketization discourse (see the second discourse discussion below).

The second aspect of the commodification discourse is leisure discourse, which points to the personal life of the individual. To exemplify the leisure discourse, I have chosen the following passage from LFA:

We must provide high quality teaching and learning opportunities to equip our young people with the skills they need to access opportunities in the world of travel and work (LFA: 4)

The leisure discourse can be identified by key words like “travel”. Here, having language skills is an important factor for having pleasure and comfort in life.

The second discourse is the globalization discourse. I put this discourse between the previous one and the next discourse because I believe that it is situated somewhere in-between these two discourses and somehow they all link and overlap each other. It refers to language as a commodity for economic and international communication with other countries in the world. Therefore, globalization discourse centers on the commodity of language for “multilingual communication” (Heller 2003: 474) and brings up concepts such as global / international economies. Thus such discourse involves both the commodification and communication discourses but they are global in scope. As it is implied from the example related to marketization discourse from LFA, employers and employees can benefit from the commodity of language skills to “prosper” or be a success in the “global economy”, which would be an example of the globalization discourse.

The third discourse is a communication discourse which, as the name of the label itself implies, refers to communication between people. There are two subcategories under
this umbrella term. One of them is the *external communication discourse* which means gaining access to other communities. It refers to wider or international relations, in other words, world-wide communications. The other smaller-scale category is the *internal communication discourse* which relates to communication (relations) between people in British society and suggests the importance of social cohesion and integration into the community. Social cohesion would be achieved through an assimilation strategy (c. f. table1) which is according to Marilyn Martin-Jones (2002 / 2003) “the imposition of dominant language and culture” and its aim is “preserving the status quo”. In the case of the UK, immigrants and non-English speakers are to be seen as implementing assimilation as they have to learn English and acquire British culture in order to take part in social interactions. To take an example of communication discourse, I have chosen a passage from LFA:

> Language skills are also vital in improving understanding between people here and in the wider world, and in supporting global citizenship by breaking down barriers of ignorance and suspicion between nations. (LFA: 13)

Here both kinds of communication discourse are emphasized. Language skills are considered as a necessary tool for internal communication discourse; the word “here” emphasizes relations between people in British society in this kind of communication. However, language skills are useful in getting access to the “wider world” or to more communities, which entails external communication discourse.

The fourth discourse is a *pluralism discourse*. Following Marilyn Martin-Jones’ (2002 / 2003) use of the term, pluralism refers to “accommodate[ing] different groups and changing attitudes”. Linguistic diversity is one of the results of promoting pluralism, which leads to bilingualism or multilingualism. The other consequence is promoting cultural diversity, which leads to multiculturalism. In order to give an example of pluralism discourse, I have chosen this passage from LFA which points to both multilingualism and multiculturalism:

> Learning other languages gives us insight into the people, culture and traditions of other countries, and helps us to understand our own language and culture. Drawing on the skills and expertise of those who speak community languages will promote citizenship and
complement the Government’s broader work on the promotion of social cohesion. (LFA: 12).

Since the passage begins with “learning other languages” which points to fostering multilingualism right from the beginning and it is followed by its advantages, it seems a recommendation. The first advantage that learning other languages offers is understanding people of “other countries” and their “culture and traditions”, which entails an external communication discourse, meaning that this understanding can be achieved by communication with other countries and their peoples. On the other hand, the words “insight” makes the expression “Learning other languages gives us insight” positive. It means by learning other languages we get to know and understand other people. This is also pluralist discourse.

The second sentence of the passage seems to address the majority society: “drawing on the skills and expertise of those who speak community languages”, which promotes “citizenship”. That whole of society needs to draw on the speakers of community languages means that British society should make use of these languages to promote citizenship. This, in turn, is something that can be seen as the government’s broader work in improving social cohesion. In addition, “promoting citizenship” expresses language skills and expertise in very positive terms. Therefore, it seems to be pluralist thinking as it suggests that citizenship is for everybody including community language speakers. This social cohesion could also be internal communication discourse.

3. Data

In order to acquire data, I looked at several official documents to find out the language policy of the English education system. I have chosen some to work on, based on the extent to which language is discussed. The source of these official documents is the web pages of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and Ofsted organization which is an organization that inspects and assesses individual schools’ academic achievement.
At the national level I have chosen two official documents. One of them is from the DfES and is a document proposing a language learning policy and how it should be carried out. The other one is an Ofsted report that is a critical report about community language provision, that is, educational provision for speakers of minority languages.

Although these documents are at a national level, I have also worked at the local level, Tower Hamlets, which is one local education authority in London. Nevertheless, it is still a national level organization, Ofsted, who writes these reports. Ofsted is a national organization but it inspects what is being done in individual schools. In other words, it follows up how policy has been put into practice in schools.

I have picked out the London Borough of Tower Hamlets because it is one of the most ethnic minority populated boroughs. I have the Ofsted reports of five primary and five secondary schools in Tower Hamlets. All my selections are based on the most recent reports. I have made searches in these reports based on key words such as ‘culture’, ‘language’ and ‘English’. I put the name of the schools together in a table with their publishing year and with the number of occurrences of these key words in front of them to compare them for selecting the most recurrent key words and the most recent documents. The other yardstick for selecting school documents is based on the schools being of mixed gender. All English state primary schools are basically mixed gender. That is, there are boys and girls in primary schools. Accordingly, I have also selected secondary schools based on mixed gender to make them comparable.

Another point worth making here is that the names of the schools have been kept anonymous. Therefore, I use the first letter “P” of the word primary and a number following the letter for each primary school and the letter “S”, which is the first letter in secondary and a number for each secondary school, e.g. P1 or S1.

4. Analysis

In this section, I analyze texts, first two official documents and then the Ofsted reports from primary and finally secondary schools, according to four discourses. However, first I
introduce briefly the content of each document. Then, I analyze them by mixing linguistic analysis (text) and discourse analysis (discursive practice) but with more emphasis on the latter.

4. 1. Official Documents

One of the official documents to be analyzed is called Languages for All: Languages for Life A Strategy for England (LFA), which was published in 2002. It was published by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to recommend a strategy to change the procedures and prospects of teaching and learning languages for the majority society, in response to the plans that had been settled in a previous document named Language Learning, which had been published by the DfES in February 2002 (LFA: 2). The earlier document (Language Learning) set out proposals and the current document (LFA) has suggested strategies for how to carry out the proposals. In addition, the Languages National Steering Group is introduced as a contributor to the creation of this strategy.

The title of the document, Languages for All: Languages for Life A Strategy for England, can be considered as a slogan for introducing a language learning strategy. On the surface it looks like a mirrored construction. In other words, “languages for” is the same on both sides but the last word: “all” has been changed to “life”. Conversely, it is a tricky expression if we look in depth because it is not as parallel as it looks to start with. There is “languages for”, on both sides but each prepositions answer different questions. This means that the first “for” answers “who it is for?” (for all) but there is ambiguity in the second one as it answers “how long it is for” (for life), which is to do with the length of time, and may also means “to live one’s life”. In other words, it can be for living one’s life as well as “for one’s whole life”. The latter meaning that refers to duration of life goes back to the idea of “lifelong language learning”, that is, the learning which occurs during the whole life of an individual person.

As we look in depth, several questions are inferred from the title that, as we go on, we can get answers to. The first one is about language. Language is mentioned 578 times in the document. Since meaning is essentially contextualized and not abstract, it shifts in different contexts and it can be inferred from the text that “language” in each case has a
different meaning depending on the context in which it occurs. As dialogism stresses “linguistic meanings are open potentials, rather than fixed coded meanings” (Linell 1998: 113), i.e. individuals can use linguistic meanings as resources and interpret or reproduce different meanings related to different situations. Every instance of “language” that appears is going to have special meaning in this very local context. For example, we find one answer to what “languages” are intended from the following quotation which is about the “recognition system” that there is a system at the school to “give people credit for their language skills” and recognize the language level of the learner or what provisions are needed for language teaching: “[our recognition system] recognizes a wide range of languages, including community languages” (LFA: 6). What languages are intended from “wide range of languages” in this quotation? It can be realized that this strategy involves so many languages that the community languages are included. Community language has 7 occurrences in the document two of which are a repetition of the same context. None of the remaining five refers to the process of developing community languages in the educational school context for pupils. Instead, they turn to “adult and community learning” in response to “local demand” (LFA: 31). To take an example, I have chosen the following quotation:

We will develop new training opportunities for Teaching a Foreign Language to support people with language skills, including community language skills, to gain additional teaching skills and recognition to work with teachers in classrooms. (LFA: 7)

Here language in foreign language is a facility to help people with language skills including community language speakers engaging in work. Thus, foreign languages are an aid to achieve vocational opportunities for community language speakers.

Another meaning of the “wide range of languages” is described in the following sentence:

For all these reasons the Government is determined to develop and implement a strategy which will achieve a step change in language competence and change the country’s attitude to teaching and learning foreign languages. (LFA: 12)

The idea can be implied that the strategy focuses on another way of “teaching and learning foreign languages” than the current one and that this strategy is trying to change the country’s attitudes to acquiring “foreign languages”. Hence, the other type of meaning that is included in the wide range of languages is foreign languages, which is mentioned 36
times. Furthermore, the question of what foreign languages are intended arises. “Language” in the collocation “foreign language” has several meanings in different contexts:

The Key Stage 2 language learning programme must include at least one of the working languages of the European Union and be delivered at least in part in class time. (15, italics in original)

Where the document emphasizes learning a foreign language through key stage 2 in primary school, the above-mentioned quotation implies that the languages which have been considered at this stage should include at least “one of the working languages of the European Union”. Here, foreign language refers to the language which is used officially within the European Union. As we go on, this document shows that its emphasis on foreign languages does not entail all foreign languages but stresses more “modern foreign languages”, which occurs 11 times, e.g.

The Initial Teacher Training places will support training to deliver French, Spanish and German lessons in primary schools. (LFA: 18)

The second meaning of language in foreign language relates to modern foreign languages as it has been unpacked here as three modern foreign languages at primary school level: French, Spanish and German.

Similarly, in the sentence, “Overall around 20 languages are offered by the existing Language Colleges” (LFA: 23), we can infer that all foreign languages may not be intended equally. In the sentence immediately after the previous quotation, it is made clear what languages are intended: French, German, Spanish, Japanese, Italian, Chinese and Russian are the languages that are named. Notably, none of the major community languages (apart from Chinese) are named. The meaning of the word “language” is therefore limited to the “20 languages” that are “offered” by Language Colleges. However, as it says later, only the first three of these 20 languages are offered in all the colleges and these are modern European languages. However, the seven named languages that are mentioned seem to be ones associated with economic and political power, whereas the other 13 languages are just included in the figure “20 languages”. Since they are not named, it seems that they are not quite so important. The first three of these seven named languages which have a history and status within the British school system are the typical modern foreign languages, which also are big languages as well as two of them being world languages.
The next question to ask ourselves of the title would be who is “all”? Let us examine the following sentence: “Language learning must be accessible and relevant to people of all social backgrounds, to people of all ages, to boys and to girls, to pupils in mainstream schools and in special schools.” (LFA: 6). Here, the word “all” is unpacked for us to show that it refers to people of both genders, of all social classes and in all schools.

Finally, the question of how long “life” it is intended for arises. As it says on page 4 of the document, there should be “lifelong language learning” for people “to access opportunities in the world of travel and work”. Thus languages are considered for both personal life and leisure, but also for people’s business and working life. In other words, language learning is about lifelong learning which will improve the individual’s whole life involving both pleasure and occupational opportunities.

There are several agents whom the DfES mention as having an important role in order to achieve the goal:

We all have an important part to play in transforming the country’s capability in languages – as learners, teachers, head teachers, lecturers, further and higher education institutions, employers, training providers, local and central Government, and language speakers within our communities. (LFA: 14)

As we can see, the word “we” is used to address people in British society to emphasize the importance of the partnership and also, to say that all British people should participate in the process as a group and perform their duties. This relates to the concept that Althusser has called interpellation or hailing, by means of which ideology “transforms’ the individuals into subjects” (1971: 118). Accordingly, in this document, the higher authority calls people or “subjected beings” (Althusser 1971: 123) to play their roles. These subjected beings not only consist of organizations such as LEAs or Specialist Language Colleges (SLCs) but also “a number of mechanisms and tools” such as Partnership and ICT (LFA: 7). These agents are grouped under the main heading “Moving towards Languages for All”. Each agent is addressed by headings naming each of them in turn under which their duties are explained. They are formatted (set out) as a “menu”. Thus interpellation can be seen in this document as assigning some duties to individuals, i.e. calling them to do their part by interpellating them as subjects.
Returning to the National Languages Strategy about changing language learning and teaching, which is set out in the whole document, this strategy can be achieved by transforming both the education system as regards teaching and learning language methods as well as through partnership by calling the subjects to do their jobs. As an example, in the following passage both these factors are taken into account:

Changing the country’s attitude to teaching and learning languages will demand a huge cultural change. It will rely on action from Government, schools, LEAs, colleges, universities, employers, parents and learners. Partnership is the key to making this strategy a reality. It is only if we work together on the implementation of this strategy that we will achieve real and lasting change for the future, for our young people, for adults, for business and for our society. (LFA: 4)

The responsible agents are mentioned in this order: from the macro level to the micro level in the first part and in the reverse order in the second part, which may suggest that this strategy involves all people and the changes cannot be achieved unless all of us cooperate together.

Since CDA emphasizes the fact that “discourse encompasses not only written and spoken language but also visual images” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2008 [2002]: 61), it is worth looking at the visual framework of the text to find “the relationship between language and images”. Regarding the general physical framework of the document, the first page consists of the title of the text and a picture that follows. In the picture, there are some boys and girls of different ages that refer to both genders, who are from different ethnic backgrounds with different color skin, which implies a multi-racial society. Some of them are working together at a computer which points to the importance of ICT and cooperation in educational learning. This picture is also repeated at the beginning of each page of the document in a smaller size.

The second official document that I wish to examine is an Ofsted report called *Every Language Matters* (ELM) which was published in February 2008. It is an evaluation of the initial training of postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE) courses for teaching a wider range of world languages. The reasons for the weak points in PGCE courses are not referred to in the previous inspection, which only indicates high results and strong points of the system (ELM: 5). However, the aim of this report (ELM) is to highlight the deficiencies. The title of the report implies a criticism of the status quo, i.e. right now not
every language matters. Thus it suggests a change to improve and encourage community language learning for British society to promote multilingualism.

Once again the question that arises from the title is: what languages are intended? As it says in the text, the community languages which matter in the inspection are introduced in this way:

In addition to French, German, Irish, Spanish and Welsh, it is possible to study any one of 16 other languages at GCSE and A level: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Dutch, Gujarati, Italian, Japanese, Modern Greek, Modern Hebrew, Panjabi, Persian, Portuguese, Polish, Russian, Turkish and Urdu. (ELM: 9)

This document is a critical one, which emphasizes the lack of provision or the low uptake of PGCE courses in community languages. The names of languages have been identified clearly at the beginning of this document through the discussion about teaching these languages on page 5. As a result, the reader can find out exactly which languages are emphasized in this document. Unlike ELM, LFA talks about languages in such general terms that the reader can not find out exactly what languages are being referred to until the middle of the text on page 23 in the general expression “20 languages”. As I argued before, the names of only 7 of these languages are listed, the first three of which are modern foreign languages and none of which are major community languages.

The report (ELM) was carried out in the academic year 2006/07 by visiting eight providers of initial teacher training, interviewing trainees and observing teaching in schools. The agents who are charged by this report to perform their roles are addressed individually under the heading of “Recommendations” (ELM: 7): the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) and the Providers of initial teacher training. As we can see, Althusser’s concept of interpellation is applicable in this document too. Let us take an example to argue this clearly:

The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) should:

provide a wider range of national web-based resources for languages beyond French, German and Spanish. (ELM: 7)

The above-mentioned agents such as the Department for Children, Schools and Families in this quotation are called as subjected beings to perform their assigned roles by verbs such
as “provide” (also in this example), “consider” and “ensure” and accompanied by the modal verb of obligation “should”. The word “should” is applied to give advice which is appropriate to improve the actions of these departments. All the verbs that follow “should” urge these organizations to act, i.e. exhort them to perform their roles, which are explained by following these action verbs.

I have selected several passages from these two documents to understand the relationship between the four discourses that I defined earlier to find out what types of discourses tend to be grouped together and finally to highlight the dominant discourses in each text. I also wish to show how the text describes the problems or solutions through these discourses. In other words, I intend to show how national level authorities formulate policies on language learning and teaching through discourses related to the context in which they are to be implemented at local level i.e. schools.

One of my selections is the first two paragraphs of LFA in the foreword of the document written by Catherine Ashton, Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for Early Years and School Standards, which is on page 4 of the document:

The ability to understand and communicate in other languages is increasingly important in our society and in the global economy. Languages contribute to the cultural and linguistic richness of our society, to personal fulfillment, mutual understanding, commercial success and international trade and global citizenship.

Our vision is clear – we must provide an opportunity for early language learning to harness children’s learning potential and enthusiasm; we must provide high quality teaching and learning opportunities to equip our young people with the skills they need to access opportunities in the world of travel and work; we must provide opportunities for lifelong language learning; we must recognize language skills as central to breaking down barriers both within this country and between our nation and others.

Both paragraphs have all the four discourses together. The first paragraph begins with the word “ability to understand and communicate in other languages” which hints at language skills. This ability is considered essential and influential for communication within British society through the internal communication discourse which has been denoted by the word “our”. Furthermore, the words “global economy” indicate accessing other economic communities, which refers to the globalization discourse. Thus, language skills have been
marketized as a commodity in terms of the marketization discourse to make internal communication and international business easier.

In the next sentence four functions of language are emphasized some of which are revealed in the next paragraph by mentioning their components through describing the way they can be accessed instead of repeating the labels. The first one is “the cultural and linguistic richness of our society”, which hints at both cultural and linguistic diversity respectively and constitutes a pluralism discourse.

The second function of language is “personal fulfillment”, which is explained as the opportunities in “the world of travel and work”, meaning both leisure and work together, as well as “lifelong language learning” which is discussed later. To express these two aspects of personal fulfillment there are two sentences that have a mirror construction by using the grammatical structure: “we” as the subject + “must provide” as the performative verb + “opportunities for” + the above-mentioned expressions as the object. This function of language is described in terms of commodification discourse and is related to the commodification of language skills in a way that people use language skills both in their business and leisure.

The third function, “mutual understanding”, entails further scope than the individuals themselves and refers to the communication discourse. This kind of understanding is expounded in the next paragraph which is “both within this country” meaning internal communication discourse, and “between our nation and others” meaning external communication discourse.

The last function is the usefulness of languages for “commercial success and international trade and global citizenship” which draws on language as a commodity for business on an international level, which entails the marketization discourse. Furthermore, it implies communication between the people in the global market which, refers to the globalization discourse. Therefore, language can be a helpful commodity for understanding others, but also for succeeding in a multilingual and multicultural society and world.

Now, one can argue that what “lifelong language learning” refers to, which is considered both as one of the elements of “personal fulfillment” and also, as I mentioned before, a notion that the title of the document contains this concept in itself when it says
“languages for life”. As it says in the first paragraph on page 5 which is under the heading of “Executive Summary” and the sub heading of “The Vision”:

Languages are a lifelong skill – to be used in business and for pleasure, to open up avenues of communication and exploration, and to promote, encourage and instill a broader cultural understanding.

Several discourses are included in the definition of this kind of language learning, and each one is considered as a characteristic of such learning; it is a kind of language learning that applies “in business and for pleasure” which exactly relates to the two subcategories of the commodification of language discourse, both work and leisure. The other characteristic is that languages “open up avenues of communication and exploration”. In other words, lifelong language learning makes it possible to develop communication and exploration; thus it refers to the communication discourse. The last discourse entails that the knowledge of a language is a kind of skill that improves “cultural understanding”, which implies cultural diversity, in other words, pluralism discourse.

The following is a passage about a case study of a community language teacher in ELM:

She had established links with the local complementary school which ran Saturday classes.
She had organised trips to the local temple and links with India and other schools teaching Panjabi, having established links with personal, social and health education (PSHE), geography and religious education. To promote community cohesion, Panjabi was offered to white pupils as beginners and a small number had taken this up. (ELM: 14)

This passage makes visible the communication discourse by the act of making links with other countries, such as India in this context, which refers to the external communication discourse. Furthermore, “links” with “local” or “other” schools that teach the same language points to the internal communication discourse, which is within the British society. In addition, links with other subjects such as “geography and religious education” are relevant to the commodification discourse, since this implies the usefulness of Panjabi language skills in other subject areas.
4. 2. Schools

Up to now, I have studied official documents of government policies which describe the higher authorities’ point of view. Since it is necessary to examine how these policies are carried out, I have surveyed several Ofsted reports, which inspect the process of teaching and learning in schools, to find out how the language policies are implemented in schools in terms of feedback from a higher authority.

I have taken a number of schools and tried to find patterns between them on comparing them. I have done some detailed analysis of each one to find common denominators and have also related these to the discourses which I have found. As I mentioned earlier, the schools are located in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets which is one of the highest ethnic minority population boroughs in the capital. I have looked at 10 schools in Tower Hamlets which are overwhelmingly populated by students of mostly Bangladeshi origin.

4. 2. 1. Primary schools

Firstly, I analyze the inspection reports of five primary schools. I studied two or three reports for each school to ascertain their strong and weak points, either how any problems are dealt with and / or how they reinforce any positive aspects. In the beginning of all the reports, there is some information about the schools, their geographical location and about where the students live, where they come from and their needs (disabilities), which are more or less the same in all of them. The vast majority of students, in all the schools, learn English as an additional language. By taking a brief look at the schools’ background, one can follow their Ofsted reports easier. The following excerpt is from the first paragraph of the primary school 1 (P1) inspection report, which is under the headline Part A: Summary of the report; Information about the school:

Nearly all of the pupils are from ethnic minority backgrounds, mainly Bangladeshi. Almost two-thirds of them are at an early stage of English acquisition which is a very high proportion when compared with most primary schools. (P1 2001: 8)
As it is inferred from the “ethnic minority background”, most of the pupils are from different cultural backgrounds though most are Bangladeshi both in this school and the other four schools. In addition, it points to the high number of pupils who are at the “early stage of English acquisition”, which also conveys that the majority of the pupils are from “ethnic minority backgrounds” and have languages other than English. Therefore, these schools are characterized by cultural and linguistic diversity. However, the languages that pupils speak as their first language have not been named in any of the schools, except in primary school 5 (P5), where the names of pupils’ spoken languages are given: Bengali, Sylheti, Turkish, Chinese and Vietnamese. (P5 2002: 6).

However, as we look in depth at the passage, expressions such as “two-thirds” and “very high proportion when compared with” are like a warning flag that there is a problem here, which the school has to cope with. These ethnic backgrounds at this point are being constructed as a problem for education and this comes up in other quotations as well. On the one hand they are describing really positive things to do with pupils’ backgrounds, but on the other this is a problem which has serious consequences for the school’s education. It is actually rather paradoxical that the first sentence is just a statement of fact, but when we come to the next one, this is then constructed in such a way that the first sentence is not good news for the schools but rather it is going to create problems. Thus, it is not framed in very positive terms.

Let us analyze these texts in terms of the discourses, starting with the pluralism discourse. Schools present their multicultural profile to improve pupils’ cultural horizons in different ways and this awareness comes at different levels: it might be language, and/or it might be religious background. In some schools there is evidence that they are aware of the languages that are related to their pupils’ ethnic backgrounds. The languages that are listed in P5 as was previously mentioned can be related to P5’s linguistic awareness that they are aware of their pupils’ linguistic background. The following paragraph describes the efforts that nearly all the schools have made to improve their pluralism:

The school provides very good opportunities for pupils to reflect upon their own culture and that of others. The school celebrates the cultural heritage of its many Bengali pupils. The inspection took place during the observance of Ramadan and the school took great care to
support its Muslim pupils in their religious observance. A place for prayer was provided during the week and this was led by a Muslim teacher. There are welcome notices around the school in different languages and posters indicating that all cultures are equally valued. Music and art make a good contribution to pupils’ cultural development. (P1 2001: 19)

From the first sentence, the cultural diversity of the pupils is evident by the expression “their own culture and that of others”. The school has done different things to show its respect for all the cultures such as: providing the opportunity “to reflect upon” different cultures and taking “great care to support” pupils’ “religious observance”. The school also celebrates the pupils’ “cultural heritage”, which means the school promotes or shows that they appreciate it, which portrays it as something very positive. There are “welcome notices” written in “different languages” pointing to the linguistic diversity, because if there are welcome notices then the school must have thought about what languages should be on these notices as regards what linguistic background their pupils come from. This is a step towards acknowledging diversity. This passage belongs to the pluralism discourse in that everything relating to linguistic and cultural awareness is in very positive terms. All these implementations have positive connotations which create a positive image for promoting the cultural and linguistic enrichment of pupils through the pluralism discourse.

There are also “posters” and as the text explains they reveal the multicultural image of the school and appreciate the cultural diversity of pupils. Since this school is in Britain and English is the main language of education but not the main language of the pupils, this is not a case of “all cultures [being] equally valued”. In other words, just putting up posters does not mean “all cultures are equally valued”. Therefore, its significance seems exaggerated in the Ofsted reports. Posters and welcome notices are just some signs to show the multicultural view of the school. This quotation can be taken as an appraisal and evaluation of the school. However, I should note that such welcome notices and posters are only mentioned in P1 and not in the other schools.

Other attempts that these schools have made to improve pluralism are through assemblies and religious education lessons, which are explained in the following:

The school has a well organised programme for assemblies in which themes provide opportunities for reflection in collective worship. There is sensitive recognition of deity with respect for the beliefs of different groups. Religious education lessons generate awareness
and understanding of the beliefs of others. Visits to the mosque, church and Buddhist centre enable pupils to think of the need to worship and the sharing of ideas with others of different beliefs. Relationships fostered in the school help to create harmony and the ability to resolve conflict. (P3 2002: 14)

School 3 tries to improve the cultural diversity of its pupils through performing “collective worship”, visiting religious places of different cultures such as the “mosque, church and Buddhist centre” and guiding them to show “respect for the beliefs of different groups”. The school aims to achieve “harmony” in its relations in all these ways, which relate to the internal communication discourse. This aim has been emphasized in all the five primary schools’ provision.

There is a paradox in the passage. On the one hand, there are lots of words such as “opportunities” and “sensitive” that show they are doing very positive things to develop cultural awareness, which reflects a pluralist perspective. On the other hand, there is a problem underlying it, as it implies that this cultural diversity brings about “conflict”.

In addition, based on the *Circular Number 1/94*, which is about the rules for Religious Education and Collective Worship in England that has been published by Department for Education, collective worship should be arranged ‘wholly or mainly of a broadly Christian character’. Although, the Circular mentions that the acts of other religions or acts of worship which contain elements of a number of beliefs can be used, it insists that the majority of acts should be “wholly or mainly of a broadly Christian character”. However, the P3 Ofsted report refers to the program for collective worship as “themes” with no reference to whether or not they are wholly or mainly Christian.

In spite of the Ofsted reports’ claim about the schools’ efforts to improve cultural diversity, there are signs in some schools that indicate the reverse. For instance, in school 5 inspection report in 2002, it is revealed that the girls of this school are prohibited to wear trousers, which is in contrast to their cultural awareness provisions:

> The decision to prevent girls from wearing trousers to school as part of the school uniform policy, directly contradicts the school policy for equal opportunities which states that each individual will be treated with equal respect and understanding regardless of gender, race or religious belief. (P5 2002: 15)
Expressions such as “equal opportunities” and “equal respect and understanding”, which connote positive meanings relate to improving pluralism as they are discussed in the context of multiculturalism, “regardless of gender, race or religious belief”. In other words, equal opportunity and respect have positive qualities, which mean ensuring that everybody has an equal chance to make something of their lives and this is related to gender, race and religious belief. On the other hand, “prevent[ing] girls from wearing trousers” is a sign of contrast with pluralism discourse since there are students of different religious beliefs and there are some beliefs that prefer girls to cover their legs. Therefore, improving cultural diversity policy and the decision of uniform policy in this school are not compatible with each other. Conversely, P3 has exactly opposite dress policy that each pupil has the freedom and “right” to choose their dress according to their “moral code of their own culture” (P3 2002: 14).

However, the next inspection of P5, which was carried out in 2006, says the “rich cultural diversity of the school population” has been “celebrated” and appreciated, but it has not mentioned directly whether the trousers prevention policy has been eliminated or not, which was criticized in the previous inspection.

The other discourse that can be found in the primary school texts is the commodification of language. To take an example, I have selected the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 9 of the inspection report of P1 from 2001:

The current pupils in Year 2 are attaining standards in English and science below that expected for their age group, mainly because a large proportion have not developed fluency in spoken or written English.

Here it says that having “spoken and written” English language skills are useful for learning other subjects such as “science”. For this reason, year 2 pupils’ lack of “fluency” in English is reflected as a problem leading to a low level of education. Accordingly, language skills are useful in “all subjects”, which constitutes the commodification of language discourse.

I have found two types of consequences regarding English language skills in English primary school contexts that I want to highlight. One of them is having and the other one is a lack of English language skills. In the first example, the benefits of having English language skills are emphasized:
Most pupils make at least good progress and achieve well over time and this progress escalates as pupils’ acquisition of spoken and written English improves. (P1 2001: 13)

Language skills improvement “escalates” pupils’ “progress”. Here, language skills are a commodity, which helps pupils to proceed in learning.

The second example refers to the effects of a lack of English language skills in the school 4 inspection report:

The school is cautious about differentiating the language and the learning needs of pupils. Where there is an overlap, there is no assumption made that children’s learning difficulties are resulting from not knowing English. There is a sensitive assessment of the children’s needs through using bilingual specialists, who are able to communicate with children in their first language. (P4 2005: 16)

It is discussed so obviously in this passage that the school is careful in distinguishing between “learning difficulties” and difficulties in English language learning. All the schools have the opinion in common that a lack of English language skills has a direct effect on the level of educational process. The other point that is inferred from the text is about the educational method of the school which is through the assessment of pupils’ understanding by changing language; that is, changing the dominant language, which is English in the UK context, to their first language or as the P1 report says the language which the pupils are “most comfortable with” (P1 2001: 16). This refers to a transitional program (Martin-Jones 2002 / 2003), which is the process of changing the language in the educational system such as in the above-mentioned example by “using bilingual specialists” who can speak to students in their first language to ease the learning process for minority group students, which all the five schools have in common. The concept that Cummins has applied for this term is:

…transitional programmes [which] are designed to provide a temporary bridge to instruction exclusively through the dominant language of the school and society. (Cummins 2003: 4)

By and large, Ofsted praises the school for having such an educational programme through positive terms such as “sensitive”, “specialists” and making a “relax[ing]” situation. On the other hand, the transitional system is criticized in the literature on bilingual education, e. g. Baker (2001: 194), as a ‘weak’ form of education for bilinguals,
which gives pupils help in their first language “until they are thought to be proficient enough in the majority language”. Schools have received praise for applying a weak form of bilingual education. Therefore, there is a paradox between the value of the praise that the school receives for the provision it offers and the real value that the provision, which the school offers, has in the literature.

To take another example regarding the commodification of English language skills, I have chosen the following:

Some pupils lack the vocabulary and knowledge of English to express fully what they are feeling and wanting to say. (P3 2002: 34)

Those pupils that have difficulties in English language also can not express their thoughts, beliefs and in general themselves, and this has the consequence of them being silent.

Moreover, there is an argument in the P3 report about the slow acquisition of English language learning for pupils whose first language is not English:

Most pupils whose first language is not English take longer than others to learn how things are expressed in English and longer to take in and use new words and phrases. Since these pupils, many of whom are learning Arabic at the mosque in the evening, do not speak English much out of school, progress in speaking and listening is delayed as they cannot always follow fully what teaching staff are saying. (P3 2002: 25)

This reveals that using languages, other than English here, Arabic, makes the learning of English slower in that it “take[s] longer”, since pupils do not have much opportunity to practice speaking English in their “out of school” communication. Hence, learning languages other than English is considered as creating a problem of decreasing the speed of English language learning because there is less opportunity to speak English for the learner as they use their native language or other languages for communication. Therefore, this is in contrast to the development of linguistic diversity from a pluralist viewpoint.

Moreover, among these primary schools, only P4 has any relation with business communities, which is considered as a resource for promoting pupils’ learning of English:

Links with local business and commerce supports pupils in English and their personal development. For example, Year 6 pupils work with the Newspaper Education Trust to produce their own newspapers. (P4 2005: 14-15)
Here, external communication of the school with “local business and commerce” has been emphasized as a useful provision for improving pupils’ English language acquisition. It can be inferred that the English language has a marketable characteristic for providing employability.

All the schools, except P1 and P5, provide the opportunity to have links with their local secondary schools to which most of the pupils will transfer:

Pupils also enjoy science lessons in a particularly useful bridging unit for literacy and numeracy in Years 6 and 7 with the secondary school, to which they transfer. Their Year 7 co-ordinator makes several visits to the school during the year and pupils from [P3] make a series of introductory visits to the school to which they transfer. French is taught to Year 6 pupils by a teacher from the secondary school. (P3 2002: 14)

Similarly, P3 is trying to have links with external communities to improve “literacy” by adapting it to the higher level and decreasing the gap between primary and secondary school literacy and making a “bridging unit”. Furthermore, French has been taught to pupils of P3 by a secondary school teacher. P3 is the only school which provides its pupils with the teaching of a language other than English.

Teachers have applied a teaching method that is somehow common to all these schools for improving pupils’ language acquisition, which is explained in the following:

Literacy is promoted very well, not just in English lessons but also in many other subjects. This is particularly successful in supporting early and more advanced learners of English as an additional language. All staff seek opportunities to support the development of reading, writing and the skills of speaking and listening. The correct use of subject-specific vocabulary is a common feature of most lessons, with definitions often displayed around each classroom. Extra time is devoted on a regular basis to reading and to extended writing sessions. Probing questioning, and the teachers’ expectations that pupils should answer in full sentences, is also effective in promoting the pupils' speaking skills. (P2 2001: 10)

Teachers are making every effort to deal with the students in the language learning process not only in English lessons but also “in many other subjects” by challenging the pupils through questioning and answering. As a result, English language learning takes “a much larger proportion of time than usual” as it is emphasized in P1 (2001: 17). Here, again, the usefulness of English language skills in the other subjects is emphasized through the commodification of language discourse. On the other hand, the school’s struggle to
improve English language skills through other subjects has an underlying implication that it tries to assimilate all the pupils through their acquisition of English. It seems that not having English language skills has been taken as a problem for the individual in British society.

All the schools point out the importance of partnership with parents, too:

The school has satisfactory links with parents, arranging interpreters, for example, for parents’ meetings and translations of letters home. (P3 2002: 19)

The school provides “interpreters” for meetings or correspondence with parents, which helps the parents to have a better understanding of their children’s progress in educational procedures. Moreover, the regular letters home are translated into home languages. Thereby the school can ensure that accurate information is passed on to parents. Thus, this bilingual support has also an important role in this mutual relationship between parents and school and pluralism has been promoted here, by translation or interpreters, which implies that the school respects other cultures and other languages.

However, the reverse circumstances for involving and informing parents about their children’s education have been found according to the P2 inspection report, which has been criticized:

There is no provision to involve parents of other cultures, particularly Bangladeshi parents, in the education of their children and the life of the school generally. The variety of different cultures represented by parents is not being used as a resource. Few documents are available translated into the main community languages, although the special educational needs co-ordinator can translate at meetings. (P2 2001: 17)

There is a problem in trying to involve the parents of minority groups to be aware of “the education of their children”. There is no pluralist view when multiculturalism is not considered as a “resource” in the provision. In addition, translation has not been provided regularly as in the other schools. However, in the inspection report in 2009 of the same school it is revealed that:

The well-organised parent liaison coordinator is adept at identifying opportunities to expand the already wide range of courses provided by the school. Parents from all of the diverse cultural and ethnic groups within the local community attend these sessions. (P2 2009: 1)
The school has solved the problem by making an arrangement to involve all the different minority group parents in providing a “wide range of courses”. As Cummins (2000: 32) states, “parental involvement” together with “the reinforcement of children’s sense of self as a result of the incorporation of their language and culture in the school programme, contributed to long-term academic growth”.

4. 2. 2 Secondary schools

Now let us see what similar things about multiculturalism and multilingualism are / are not to be found in the OFSTED reports from secondary schools. Furthermore, through what discourses, are these similarities or differences portrayed? I have chosen five secondary schools in Tower Hamlets according to the schools that have mixed gender and more arguments on language matters. All these five schools have students with different cultural backgrounds, which have been pointed out at the beginning of the documents. The similar point in all of them is that Bengali is the most common ethnic background, although other students are from different cultural backgrounds in different schools. As an example, I have singled out a passage from secondary school 1 (S1) to illustrate the diversity of the pupils in all these schools. Although the percentages might be different they are otherwise very similar:

The school is ethnically very diverse. The percentage of students’ first language not believed not to be English (76.4 per cent) is very high. The school has 49 refugees. The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) supports 1059 students. Thirty-two students are at an early stage of language acquisition. The most common first languages are Bengali, (Bangladeshi), Somali and Turkish. (S12005: 3)

This passage is a typical fact that appears in almost all the schools. All of these schools have a rather similar background in that the majority population is Bangladeshi and the minority is white English. All of the schools are the same but with different percentages, even though the highest percentage is for Bengali and then for other ethnic backgrounds. Since English is the second language for most of the pupils in these schools, most of them have problems in English language acquisition except S2, which is a little different because there are fewer pupils at an early stage of learning English and “many of these pupils [for
whom English is not their first language] speak two, three and even four languages fluently, including English” (2003: 3).

A point that is worth noting here is the definition of EMAG in the above-mentioned quotation. As it is mentioned in the web page of Multiverse (Article ID 291: 2004) which is an Initial Teacher Education Professional Resource Network to increase the achievements of pupils from diverse background, the purpose of this funding is to raise the achievements of ethnic minority and refugee pupils or in general EAL students by providing funding for schools and Local Authorities to support students and meet their needs. The amount of funding is based on the number of the entitled students. Therefore, the interest in accessing more EMAG funds may be a motive to make schools try to take more EAL students because of the higher proportion of funding (85%) distributed to school.

Elsewhere in the text we are told that all schools have a similar idea that because of their ethnic and cultural diversity, they need to work on conflict solving and make sure that they do not have conflicts. They should carry out measures to prevent the potential conflicts from arising:

New students from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds are very well integrated and the school’s arrangements to ensure that all students are fully included in its work are excellent.

(S3 2005: 11)

It seems that integration is a positive step for the school to solve the problem by the way it is phrased. There are positive appraisals in the passage. The expression “very well integrated” is framed in positive terms. The expression “to ensure” is something that the school should do to have pupils who “are fully integrated”, which has been praised by Ofsted report by the adjective “excellent”. As we can see, the school is trying to promote the cultural diversity of the students by integrating them in the school community as regards the internal communication discourse, which enables the school to have “an inclusive and harmonious atmosphere” (S3 2008:7).

Cummins (1996: 137) puts forward four overlapping dimensions of schools that are related to minority language students’ empowerment or “the collaborative creation of power”, which has an important effect on students’ academic success or failure: (a) incorporation of bilingual students’ language and culture; (b) community participation; (c)
orientation to pedagogy; and (d) assessment practices. Baker (2001: 395) explains that the first dimension or “inclusion” of the minority language and culture in the school curriculum may have positive effects on “personality (e.g. self-esteem), attitudes, social and emotional well-being”. Therefore, all the schools have considered some provisions to promote both the cultural and linguistic diversity of pupils. I have taken the following excerpt from S1 because it consists of explanations about both cultural and linguistic provisions:

- The provision for students’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development is excellent. The school is a faith school and this is reflected in its sensitivity to the diversity of faiths within its community and the focus on, and valuing of, the individual pupil and in developing mutual respect

- The provision for English as an additional language and the language college specialism have been very important factors in raising standards; particularly in the valuing of community languages, bilingualism and raising awareness of language and the need for language support across the curriculum and indeed the linkage between this valuing of language and self-esteem (S1 2005:7)

These are two points which are related to the heading: “the school’s main strengths and weaknesses”. The first point is about the high provision for “spiritual, moral, social and cultural development”, which has been praised in terms of the positive adjective “excellent”. Cultural development is achieved by “valuing” the differentiation of all the cultural backgrounds, which is identified by the expression: “its sensitivity to the diversity of faiths within its community”. The word “sensitivity” is a positively charged word which implies that the school respects the diversity of beliefs of each “individual pupil” in the internal community i.e. “within” the school. Moreover, “mutual respect”, meaning respecting each other and valuing different views, which is explained further on in the text as helping to make a “coherent community” (S1 2005: 18), is considered also as a sign that the school is promoting cultural awareness. Since the school values different beliefs through respect, here we find the pluralism discourse, which points to cultural awareness.

Each school has provided several opportunities to develop cultural awareness which might be similar in some schools but different in the others. I have picked out the following example from the S4 report because it is unique in that it offers nearly all of the provisions
that are considered in all schools whereas the other schools may only offer some of these things:

Cultural development is also very good. In modern foreign languages, pupils learn about the life and customs of French, Spanish and Bangladeshis peoples, and there are good displays to support learning. In ICT, there are very good links to the science museum and to local and international businesses. In religious education, pupils learn about the cultural traditions of six major religions, their sacred writings and sacred places. In geography, pupils study the multicultural aspects of their home region and the United Kingdom as a whole. As part of their art education, pupils visit London galleries and the study of other cultures forms part of their classwork. Multicultural awareness is promoted in English through the study of a range of literature, for example, Asian poetry. In physical education, pupils learn about dance routines from different parts of the world. In history, pupils compare Greek, Roman and Egyptian approaches to medicine and review patterns of immigration in England from Roman times. The International Women’s Day assembly celebrates the achievement of famous women through history. The school also organises biannual achievement assemblies, which include activities in music, dance and physical education as an additional opportunity to celebrate pupil achievement in a multicultural school. (S4 2003: 25)

By and large, all subjects can be constructive in cultural development by including some provisions for “multicultural awareness”. There are typical verbs which are used to describe educational activities and different aspects of learning such as “support” learning about other cultures, “compare” different cultures’ approaches, “review” the migration process to England, “celebrate” historical achievements and “organise” assemblies. All of these are trying to help the pupils learn something positive about cultural enrichment such as: life and customs, six major religions, a range of literature, multicultural aspects of the country, dance routines from different parts of the world, etc. For instance, according to the eight strategies that are suggested by Tyack (c. f. table 1) for linguistic and cultural diversity, “celebration” is one solution to improve cultural or linguistic diversity through which “the difference between groups are appreciated, proclaimed and celebrated”. Therefore, there is a pluralism discourse in this passage as regards cultural development, which is described using the verb “study” and different forms of the verb “learn” such as “learning” and “learn about”.

Let us now return to the second point in the example from S1 which is about two kinds of linguistic provision to improve linguistic diversity in the school. The first one is
the provision for learning the dominant language, English. The second one is the matter that the school is a specialist language college which entails offering the teaching of several languages to students. The sentence implies clearly that these provisions are intended to raise their language awareness and to improve their confidence and self esteem. On the one hand, it means that the school is trying to promote linguistic diversity by “the valuing of community languages, bilingualism and raising awareness of language” (S1 2005: 7). As a result, this provision points to the idea of a pluralist discourse that improves linguistic diversity by learning another language(s). On the other hand, as the text says, this language awareness promotes language confidence for the students because they learn more than one language. However, the text also implies that it is the learning of English that enhances “language confidence” (S1 2005: 8). In addition, it is mentioned that this self-esteem can be promoted “by valuing their contributions and treating them as responsible members of an extended family” (S1 2005: 18). In this manner, it is mentioned that “All subjects plan for students’ literacy development” (S1 2005: 34), meaning that improving their acquisition of English is central in all other subjects so that the school’s entire staff and the curriculum aim to promote the learning of English by prioritizing English in all subjects. Therefore, the way English is spoken about is in terms of skills as a step towards academic achievement. This is framed in the commodification discourse that language skills are a commodity for academic achievement. To take an example I have chosen the following to describe the utility of language skills in other subjects:

There is much small-group discussion in all subjects. Speaking and listening are given prominence in physical education, where older pupils coach the younger. In mathematics high standards of writing are required, and in science the skills of note-taking are specifically taught. Most pupils can understand the simpler technical terms used in each subject. (S2 2003: 26)

A knowledge of English language skills such as speaking, listening and writing is required in learning and “understanding” different subjects. As a result, it can be inferred that language is a commodity to facilitate learning other subjects. A knowledge of the English language has a direct link to the whole academic learning process, which refers to the commodification of language discourse. For instance, the effect of a lack of English on learning mathematics at S1 made very clear by saying that “For some, inadequate language
comprehension slows progress” (S1 2005:37). To take another example about the knowledge or lack of English in academic learning, the following passage from S4 explains the effects of both together:

Pupils with English as an additional language make slower progress in understanding concepts through the need to translate the information provided. This results in lack of time to complete tasks and move on to a higher level of analysis. Once the words are understood their progress is good. (S4 2003: 56-57)

EAL pupils have a lack of English language proficiency which makes their learning acquisition “slower”. On the other hand, their learning improves and they make “good” progress, as their language deficiency has been amended. Therefore, English is a commodity for educational progress.

Schools have applied different educational programmes to help the pupils in understanding and increasing their level of English. One of them is using minority languages when there is a need to be sure that the student understands the lesson well:

Where appropriate, the support teacher gave explanations in Bengali and students were encouraged to use bilingual dictionaries. (S1 2005: 34)

The kind of educational provision that is in S1 refers to bilingual education, in which Bengali explanations and a Bengali - English, or vice versa, dictionary are to facilitate learning. Here, there is a commodification discourse in terms of Bengali being a useful commodity to make learning easier.

As the above-mentioned examples about the acquisition or lack of acquisition of English imply, the success or problems of the pupils are referred to in terms of having or not having English language skills. Another example of one of the schools that is in contrast with the pluralism discourse is from S4:

The Induction Class is a continuous feature on the timetable and all beginners spend five hours a week in a withdrawal situation concentrating on English language work. The aim is to help them join mainstream classes as soon as possible with in-class support. The length of time they spend in the induction class depends on need. The work is organised as individual tasks which focus on each pupil’s level of language development and shared reading with the teacher and recall of information from the text with more competent readers contributed to their understanding. (S4 2003: 34)
This example obviously reveals the implementation of an assimilation program, which by means of the “Induction Class” helps students who are at “beginners” level to learn English, in order to prepare them to be in “mainstream classes as soon as possible”. According to Baker (2001: 383), if we want to make a detailed analysis of this kind of program, we can say that this kind of assimilation is implied assimilation which offers “compensatory forms of education program” for students with ‘special needs’. Such “compensation” provision can “provide a fast transition into mainstream education” (Baker 2001: 388).

To take another example about the support that students receive in class, I have taken the following passage from the S4 report:

Another good example of best practice was when the Bengali speaking EAL teacher used bilingual skills to help access the maths and science curriculum to beginner English learners. In a Year 8 lesson on atoms and elements, differentiated work sheets with Bengali translations were provided for a beginner EAL pupil who was able to use his prior knowledge, which he understood in his own language, and then transfer to English and enhance his learning. In mathematics an EAL pupil had a similar experience as the teacher explained the concept in Bengali and she was able to grasp the intricacies of co-ordinates.

(S4 2003: 34)

In this passage the teachers use the home language of the students to ease their understanding through a “translation” provision. The students get help from their first language to understand the lesson in a second language. This provision is encouraged by the Ofsted report through very positive expressions such as “another good example of best practice”.

To get help from the first language for the acquisition of a second language can also be referred to Cummins’ “interdependence hypothesis”. He explains that since there is a “common underlying proficiency” (Cummins 2003: 8) between different languages, using the first language skills proficiency of the students, here Bengali, for improving academic proficiency of the majority language, in this context English, makes this transferring from one language to the other possible and creates “exposure and motivation to learn the language” (Colin 2001: 394) for the individual student. As Cummins (2000: 39) states:

…spending instructional time partly through the minority language will not result in lower levels of academic performance in the majority language…because at deeper levels of
conceptual and academic functioning, there is considerable overlap or interdependence across languages. Conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps to make input in the other language comprehensible.

On the other hand, students learn languages other than English, which helps to raise “the self-esteem and aspirations of students from ethnic minorities” (S1 2005: 25) and also shows the respect which the school has for students in such a way that all cultures and languages are equal. Now let us see what languages are actually intended:

Students in the school have the opportunity to study eight European and Asian languages, either as one of the main school languages (Bengali, French and Spanish) or in twilight lessons. (S1 2005: 25)

Bilingualism has been emphasized in the above quotation by stating that students have the “opportunity” to learn eight languages other than English, which consist of “European and Asian” languages meaning both modern foreign languages such as French and Spanish and community languages such as Bengali. The school promotes the linguistic diversity of students by offering different types of languages through the pluralism discourse. There are also other language learning systems in the school like “twilight lessons” which is explained later in the text as lessons in which “parents and the local community” can participate. The other five languages that are offered by the school are Urdu, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian and Turkish (ibid: 26).

Another school that has a wide range of languages in its provision is S2. The difference between this school and the other ones is its “international” situation:

The school's new international status has brought a strong emphasis on languages. Students may study two languages in Years 7 to 9 and three in Year 10 and 11, and there are clubs for French, Spanish, Bengali, Japanese, Italian and Mandarin. (S2 2007: 5)

As we can see, in S2 students can learn two or three languages together. The “international status” of the school plays a marketable role for the school and this places the school in an international context and compels the school to consider a vast range of languages in its curriculum for external relations. Therefore, language is a commodity to promote the school’s international status through the commodification discourse.
Furthermore, provisions for the implementation of bilingualism are mentioned and to illustrate this I have selected the first two sentences of a paragraph on page 36 in S1 (2005):

Students have very good opportunities for enrichment. Through the languages college students have the opportunity to visit partner schools in Paris, to take part in internet and video-conferencing links with schools abroad and enrichment activities organised in conjunction with local schools.

This hints at “opportunities” for utilizing language in communicating both “with local schools” i.e. internal communication in the context of British and with “schools abroad” i.e. external communication through technological means or “visit[ing] partner schools in Paris”. These provisions are described through the communication discourse. As Baker argues, “authentic language practice” takes place through internet links, which increase “motivation to acquire a language via contact with real students in other countries and accessing authentic language sources to complete curriculum activity” (Baker 2001: 425). The following example of S5 reveals other provisions that are provided for improving bilingualism through using language for real purposes:

The department uses assessment information well to identify gifted linguists and makes it possible for them to take GCSE examinations early so that they can take a second language in Years 10 and 11. Pupils also benefit from well-established trips and exchanges to France and Spain and from frequent contact with native speakers in all three languages. In addition to this effective links have been created with schools and colleges to broaden pupils’ experience, for example in teaching small groups of pupils in primary schools. Another feature is that former pupils provide extra support for current pupils in lessons. (S5 2004: 23)

S5 provides early GCSE examinations for “gifted” pupils who can “take a second language”. The language department provides trips abroad and “exchanges” for the pupils to have contact with “native speakers”, which can be related to the external communication discourse. The other opportunity that the school provides for the students is teaching experience in primary schools which relates to internal communication discourse because it takes place between local schools in British society. All these 5 secondary schools that I have selected provide internal communication through teaching experience. Therefore, language skills acquisition contributes to “broadening pupils’ experience”, in other words language skills are a commodity to acquire professional experience such as teaching, which
refers to the marketization discourse, meaning language is a useful commodity in business. Therefore, there is an emphasis on the importance of language learning i.e. bilingualism, in accessing vocational opportunities:

Some pupils take the opportunity to support their language studies by accepting work experience placements in Europe. (S4 2003: 21)

This example indicates that language acquisition is applicable to business affairs, which refers to the marketization discourse, which is a subcategory of the commodification discourse. Language skills are marketized at an international level here as a commodity to provide job opportunities abroad for learners. The pupils have the opportunity to acquire work experience abroad, which means promoting global relations with other countries through developing language skills which are useful in worldwide business. Moreover, language skills are useful in getting job opportunities in British society too:

Every opportunity is taken to reinforce the idea that languages are an important skill. For example: local businesses are invited to illustrate how languages can be used at work. (S2 2008: 4)

Professional opportunities that are provided in British society through language learning are introduced to pupils by inviting “local businesses” to explain the usefulness of the languages at work. Here, again, the commodity of language as “an important skill” in business has been defined through the marketization discourse at societal level.

The other similarity between these schools is about religious education; though it is not an object of praise:

All statutory curriculum requirements are in place apart from in religious education since insufficient time is allocated to the teaching of religious education in Years 7 to 9 to cover the requirements of the locally agreed syllabus. The school does not have a daily act of collective worship (or its equivalent). (S5 2004: 15)

All the school reports except S1, which says nothing, mention the lack of “collective worship”. However, it is surprising that there are no more discussions about this issue, not only in the S5 Ofsted report in 2004 but also in the following reports which examined the school’s deficiencies in the previous Ofsted reports. It is just pointed out that there is such a weakness but not more than that. Thus, this is in contradiction to improving cultural diversity.
There is also support that is being provided in meetings with parents that “an interpreter is available when required” (S1 2005: 29). Here, language is a useful commodity that has been used to help parents of different cultures to better understand children’s academic progress. Another example of language commodification discourse in the relationship with parents is through newsletters:

There is a good weekly newsletter, which keeps most parents in touch with school activities, as it is partly produced in the main community languages. (S5 2004: 16)

As it is inferred, the “weekly newsletter” has been written in the “main community languages” that most parents speak. Here the commodification discourse of language in making parents-school liaison easier is evident. Moreover, there is the programme, which encourages students’ family to participate in their children’s educational procedure:

A number of qualified teaching assistants and learning mentors are parents, ex parents or siblings. They have undergone training through the school’s professional development programme to work more effectively in the classroom with individuals or small groups of students. The school has recognised that it needs to monitor the deployment of parents/teaching assistants in the classroom, to ensure that they are used more effectively to improve pupils’ learning. (S3 2007: 2)

As the passage mentions, “parents, ex parents or siblings” are trained to help the school in improving the educational system. This is relevant to the “collaborative” concept that Cummins (2001: 666) suggests in that minority language parents’ participation in pupils’ learning helps to empower their children.

5. Quantitative Analysis of Keywords

In this section, first I discuss the dominant discourses in the official documents. Then I discuss and compare the identifying discourses in the schools to find the dominant ones.

The four discourses, which I have identified in my text, have different contours in both official documents. To find out the most dominant discourse in each one, I have
counted the most recurrent key words in each one. The following graph illustrates the iterative key words in LFA better. This is then followed by a conclusion:
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**Figure 1** LFA’s key words

In LFA, the relevant key words and their derivatives for the commodification of language discourse are “work”, “business”, “employ”, “profession”, “skill”, “job”, “travel” and pleasure” each being repeated 115, 58, 43, 33, 8, 7, 5 and 1 time respectively. As it is shown in the graph the most recurrent word is “work”. This word has 166 occurrences in the text. Out of this number, 115 of these are relevant to business discourse; that is, they appear in collocations or derivatives such as “workforce” and “working” which have a high rate.

The other key words are “global” (6 times), “economic” (5 times) and “economy” (5 times), all referring to the globalization discourse. The other key word for this category is “international” which has 17 occurrences and is followed by words such as “trade”, “business”, “links”, “opportunities” and “placement” all of which see language as a commodity for international communication in business and work affairs.

The communication discourse is identified by key words such as “communication” (6 times), “within [a community or country]” (9 times) which refer to internal
communication discourse and “other countries” (11 times), which refer to external communication discourse.

The key words of the pluralism discourse consist of “cultural” (18 times) and “culture” (6 occurrences), which refer to cultural diversity, whereas “diverse language” (2 times) and “other language” (4 times) refer to linguistic diversity.

Accordingly, as it is inferred from the graph, regarding the numbers of key words which refer to each discourse, it is obvious that the first one, the commodification of language discourse, has a higher rate of key words than the three others. However, it is worth mentioning that the business subcategory of this discourse has occurred most times, and it is the only dominant discourse of the text. It seems the other subcategory of commodification discourse, i.e. leisure discourse, is tokenistic. After the leisure discourse is cited just at the beginning of the document through the key word “pleasure” which has one case, it is not mentioned again in the rest of the text and nothing is being done to support it; it seems it is not so important. It is significant that although lip service is paid to “pleasure”, “work” is the most important thing. The next most frequent discourse is globalization with the “international” key word as the most recurrent one, which also refers to business and economic communications with other countries at a global level.

Now let us look at ELM to find the discourses illustrated by the following graph:

![Figure 2 ELM's key words](image-url)
The key words of the commodification discourse are “language skill” with 2 occurrences whereby language is considered as a useful commodity for finding teaching opportunities, and “job” which occurred once in a context which refers to the commodification discourse in a quotation of a modern language trainee. Another key word for commodification discourse is “link” which occurred just once for the concept of taking language skills as a commodity in relation to other subject lessons. In addition, two occurrences of the word “link” relate to the communication discourse, which shows how people utilize the language for communication within a society and also outside of the society with other countries. Likewise, pluralism has some keywords such as “world languages” that occurred 5 times in terms of promoting the learning of other languages in the world, which relates to improving linguistic diversity through the pluralism discourse. There is no trace of the globalization discourse in the text. As we can see, the occurrences of the key words of discourses are one or two times in each context meaning that they are not so different to each other quantitatively, although the pluralism discourse occurs most.

Moreover, there is a paradox in the ELM document. Collocations such as “lower status”, “isolation”, “undervalued”, “marginal”; “economic lower power” and “political lower power”, which are combined with “community languages” throughout the text (ELM), are not positive ones. When collocations like these are combined with “community languages”, it constructs a negative attitude towards community languages in that when community languages are mentioned they tend to appear in these collocations. The effect of all these collocations with negative adjectives is that they construct a negative orientation towards community languages. Even in this document where they are trying to do positive things about community languages, they also reproduce this negative discourse about community languages. ELM is trying to say that community languages are not being given the attention they actually warrant or need and it tries to criticize this issue but at the same time the paradox is that, in fact, by naming the issue they are reiterating the problem that needs to be changed. Therefore, ELM criticizes the problem but at the same time it is repeating the problem too.

Now, first I discuss the analysis of all the primary schools together and then all the secondary schools. The interesting point that is significant in all the primary school reports is the reiteration of the words “support”, “fluency”, and “confidence” and their derivations.
The primary schools’ policy is to support the pupils in speaking English fluently. In this way pupils can speak confidently with everyone about themselves and their world. This also allows them to have the confidence to ask for help when they need it. Consequently, it belongs to the communication discourse that language is essential for communicating with others. Moreover, this points to the language commodification discourse in that language is a useful commodity in society. The commodity of language skills is also useful in parent-school relations. As the word “support” is applied to supporting pupils from the minority language group, it constitutes the pluralism discourse, which hints at improving English language acquisition to achieve social cohesion between all ethnic groups, referring to the community’s internal relations. Furthermore, supporting cultural enrichment leads to harmony in relations between groups in society.

Overall, all the secondary schools have more or less all four discourses. Secondary schools have the most focus on teaching English and a transitional programme. As regards other languages more emphasis is placed on modern foreign languages. By creating contacts with local or other countries’ schools and companies, they invoke internal and external communication. Focusing on learning modern foreign languages can be referred to as marketization and globalization discourses, because the aim of learning these languages is increasing the opportunity of having more international contact with other countries and finding job positions for students, which is also related to the commodification discourse that language learning is a useful commodity for these purposes. Thus multilingualism seems to have “become a marketable ability”, which can “bridge languages and cultures, securing trade and the delivery of services” (Baker 2001: 420). In addition, language is a commodity for relations between school and parents too. Moreover, another type of language commodification is mentioned in secondary schools reports, in which English is treated as a commodity in making the understanding of other subject lessons easier for the students. As a result, according to Heller and Martin-Jones (2001: 16), such a policy of considering English as important in students’ learning of the curriculum, helps to “reinforce the symbolic dominance of English” which is obviously in contrast to the pluralism discourse. As the Ofsted reports say, all these five secondary schools are trying to promote the pluralism discourse by insisting on improving language and cultural diversity through the provisions that are considered in each school. On the
other hand, there is a paradox to the cultural awareness claim, which proposes the respect to faith, when there is not so much provision for religious education. Moreover, while reports praised schools for transitional and assimilation education, in which the minority language is an aid to learning the majority language or dominant language, through such positive words as “best practice” or “excellent” (S4), one can argue that this is a paradox to linguistic awareness.

6. Conclusions and Discussion:

Applying Ruiz’s theory about the orientation to language in educational provision for bilinguals, policy makers in LFA have seen language as a resource in terms of “economic bridge building potential” (Baker 2001: 373) and “world influence” (ibid.: 374). In other words, they call on educational organizations to encourage people to learn modern foreign languages to promote international trade relations. There is an interesting twist to this, because this is related to language as a resource and a commodity in itself.

By and large, the orientation towards language in ELM is that language is a social and cultural resource. This is a critical text on the failure to promote the learning of community languages. Thus, ELM reflects there are not so many people who want to learn minority languages.

From a CDA viewpoint, three dimensions of the communicative event of the data which this study is based on are as follows: they are written reports and documents and the four discourses (commodification, globalization, communication and pluralism discourse), which are identified in them, refer to discursive practice. From the point of view of social practice, ELM criticizes language provision, but on the other hand it reproduces the problem, even though it is trying to make a change. LFA is trying to make a change in language provision and claims that learning languages is beneficial in all dimensions of individuals’ lives but the underlying focus is on the business dimension and improving business and economic matters.
Referring back to the order of discourse, which has to do with ‘discourses and genres in particular social domains’ the domain which is found is the educational one. What is interesting here, though, is the fact that this is connected with another domain which is not to do with education but it has to do with the realm of business. Therefore, there are both the educational and business orders of discourse. The texts contain literature on the educational system and rules but also entail some changes regarding success in the business order of discourse through educational language provision.

In the next step, I compare the primary school Ofsted reports with those of secondary schools. Here, there seems to be a different message.

On the whole, by comparing primary and secondary schools the outcome is that most of the efforts made by secondary schools are on teaching English as well as in primary schools. However, the reason for this effort may be different at different levels. In primary schools, as I mentioned before, the acquisition of English is more emphasized to have internal communication by being assimilated into society. In secondary schools, an insistence on the English learning project may be related somehow to how each school is assessed, since it is important for a secondary school to compare favorably with other schools by having the best GCSE or exam results:

Regulatory frameworks are accompanied by enforcement strategies, which include Ofsted inspection, national systems of testing, and the stipulation of targets for student attainment that schools are expected to achieve or else face various kinds of additional supervision and penalty. (Kress et al. 2005: 15)

And of course if students have problems with their English, they are not going to succeed in their subjects and as a result the school is not going to succeed in the Ofsted reports. The focus is on these pupils having to achieve academically as well. In primary school it is a little easier; they are acquiring English. In secondary school on the other hand, it is serious business; their academic success is going to be dependent on their skills in English.

The second point according to the primary and secondary schools’ Ofsted reports is that if there is any provision for multilingual pupils, they are very small and according to the literature on British educational provision, e.g. Martin-Jones and Saxena (2003), this is geared up towards providing ‘bilingual support’, which means “the learner’s first language
is used to facilitate the transition to monolingual English-medium education” (Martin-Jones & Saxena 2003: 267). Moreover, bilingual support is a “minimal form of transitional bilingual education” (Martin-Jones & Saxena 2003: 280), which is a ‘weak’ form of provision for bilinguals (Baker 2001: 194). In other words, even though Ofsted reports talk about maintaining cultures, schools are not doing much, and at least linguistically they are not doing anything to foster or maintain pupils’ languages outside school. It is really left to the home and external agencies of various sorts. Sometimes schools even criticize these agencies, such as in the case of children who go to the mosque in P3, which is seen as a negative thing because it reduces their chances of learning English.

Therefore, the orientation towards language in these schools involves the idea of language as a problem, which is a dominant orientation. Languages that students possess as their native language have been seen as causing difficulties and problems. For having social cohesion and harmony and removing differences, the English language should be learnt to acquire the dominant language and culture to achieve a cohesive society. Home languages have only been used, in both primary and secondary schools, to develop English language skills in minority language students through educational programmes such as induction and intervention programmes. In secondary schools, there is also an orientation to language as a resource in terms of foreign relations and trade. Modern European languages, however, are the only languages considered as the resource.

In conclusion, I compare the analysis on official documents and the schools, to demonstrate frequent discourses that come together and to find out what language education provision for multilingual pupils is mostly provided in these local contexts and through what discourses. I illustrate the dominant discourses, which are recurrent in all documents that I have analyzed, in the following table to explain what values each document assigns to language:
As the above table shows, LFA emphasizes learning languages as a useful commodity in business to have international trade and economic success through the dominant discourses, marketization and globalization discourse. However, as I have mentioned before, the languages that are most prominent in LFA are modern European languages. The emphasis in ELM is on learning all world languages including community languages for improving linguistic and cultural diversity in terms of the pluralism discourse. Primary schools focus on learning English language skills as a useful commodity, which facilitates integration into the majority society, for making internal communication. Studying secondary schools reveals their focal points: firstly, English language skills are marketized as a useful commodity to master the National Curriculum. Secondly, learning modern European languages is a useful commodity to find an occupation (the marketization discourse), and have international relations at global level (the globalization discourse), which makes the external communication with other countries possible (external communication discourse). Therefore, secondary school highlights the same discourses as LFA (marketization and globalization discourses). However, there is more stress in secondary schools on the first value of language, meaning commodification discourse in terms of learning English to succeed in academic education.

In sum, by comparing dominant discourses of schools to official documents at national level, it reveals that the way discourses evaluate what language provision for
bilinguals should be doing (the four discourses which are drawn from official documents) is quite different from how it actually being carried out (the schools’ discourses). The education in these schools is being evaluated by Ofsted reports, yet the discourses do not match each other. In other words, sometimes the words match but in fact the reality beneath them does not. The discourses may be similar but in reality what they are describing is different, e.g. as in S1, the high population of minority language speakers compared to other schools seems to be valued positively. On the other hand, the underlying fact beneath this is that a high minority language speaker population may be a problem for the school.
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