This literature review focuses on EAL provision in England, as well as other relevant national and international research. It has been written by Dr Dina Mehmedbegovic, Lecturer in Education at University College London’s Institute of Education (IOE). Dr Mehmedbegovic’s main area of research is sociolinguistics and the positioning of languages in education. She led the development of the new PGCE-level module – English as an Additional Language Pathway, and works at the IOE as a module leader, tutor and graduate supervisor. She is an active contributor to the IOE’s London Centre for Leadership in Learning (LCLL) and the Research and Development Network (RDN). This is the second literature review Dr Mehmedbegovic has prepared for ACS International Schools. Working with bilingual and plurilingual learners was published in March 2015, and is available on the Centre for Inspiring Minds’ website.

ACS is an international school for students (ages 3-18) with a diverse population of more than 70 nationalities and home languages. In spring 2015, a four-campus Professional Learning Community was formed to review effective EAL frameworks and models and to explore ideas for further developing the EAL proposition at our Cobham campus, where space is potentially available for expanding the EAL provision. The strategic rationale is that we are seeing a long-term diversification in the nationality profiles of UK applicants, resulting in greater demand for EAL provision. Ten years ago, US students made up 47% of the enrolment; today it is 30%. The growth in enrolment has been fuelled by other nationalities, many of which don’t have English as their national language.

This shift is reflected in EAL waitlists that are becoming more common across all ACS schools, as our existing teaching resource and teaching model is unable to service the volume of EAL students who want to attend our schools.

Although this review has been written to specifically support EAL development at the ACS UK campuses; it may also inform EAL development at the ACS Doha campus or in other international schools. This literature review is the first step towards developing a model of EAL provision which will allow ACS Schools to effectively meet the needs and recognise the talents of a growing number of culturally and linguistically diverse students.
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About this literature review

The following research questions served as the starting point for this literature review:

- What are the trends in cultural and linguistic diversity in the wider education sector in the London area?
- What EAL models and frameworks are being used and what effect do they have on long-term learner outcomes (positive/neutral/negative)?
- What is the role of the following EAL elements in program effectiveness as evidenced in previous research?
  - Initial screening methods and progress reporting
  - Mother Tongue support (dual-language learning)
  - Data-driven differentiated instruction (based on 1st and 2nd language skill level and academic level)
  - Structured English Immersion (limited period of intensive English learning)
  - Social and emotional support
  - Identification and support of EAL students with Learning Support or Special Educational Needs (SEN)
  - All teachers skilled in addressing the needs of EAL students
  - Meeting the needs of students who need different and more intensive instruction in an alternative setting.

The main parts of this literature review are based on academic research papers, which have been published in peer-reviewed journals. In addition they have been assessed for the weight of evidence provided. Only studies that have been judged to fall within the range of medium to high weight of evidence are included in the systematic reviews published in 2009 and 2015. These two systematic reviews have been taken as the main sources for interventions that have been evaluated and measured in terms of impact on learners and practice. For better understanding of the evaluated interventions, a brief overview of key policy and practice developments in England is also provided.

While all international schools have an EAL provision, most of the peer-reviewed published research is based on the practice and interventions of the government-supported schools sector (mainstream schools) and much of it addresses the needs of disadvantaged populations. Although the studies presented here have been mostly conducted in mainstream schools in England, the challenge is the same across both the mainstream and independent sectors: the number of EAL students is consistently growing and the workforce needs to be equipped to accommodate that growth.
These studies have also been contextualised in terms of available statistics on children and adults and their ethnic and language diversity. Statistics that are in the public domain, unfortunately, only include children from mainstream schools. Therefore it is important to engage with the statistics available on adult populations also presented in this document. The data on children in international and independent schools will be available to staff working in those schools.

Not all the research questions, which served as the starting points, are covered by the research available, and gaps in available research are identified in several places. These gaps might be covered in other types of reports and publications that the reader may be familiar with, but they are not classed as academic peer-reviewed research studies. For this reason they do not appear in this review. However, engagement with these other types of publications is recommended while taking this project further. For example, engagement with individual case studies of good practice, especially from international schools, provides important insights at the descriptive level. Engagement with other types of competitor analysis, which may be accessed through websites or networking rather than published literature, is also essential for ensuring the development of a successful ACS model.

This document is structured in four parts:

- **Part 1. Cultural and linguistic diversity trends**

- **Part 2. A brief historical overview of EAL provision**

- **Part 3. Key research evidence**

- **Part 4. Conclusions and next steps**

For easier use of this document, relevant references will be listed after each part. The bibliographies of two recent systematic reviews of EAL in schools appears at the end of the document.
Part 1. Cultural and linguistic diversity trends

This part of the literature review focuses on cultural and linguistic diversity trends in the wider education sector in the London area.

Key terms
The term ‘English as an Additional Language’ (EAL) is used in mainstream schools in England, for learners who use a language/s other than English at home and in their communities. These learners are also identified as bilingual learners. The ‘existence’ of two languages is defined as ‘exposure to two languages; living in two languages’ (Eversley at al, 2010). This is a very inclusive definition that avoids complex and in some cases hard to measure aspects of language use: competency, proficiency, fluency and literacy. The reasons for which it is essential for schools to have a broad, inclusive definition of bilingualism are explored below.

The criterion of ‘living in two languages’ allows for the inclusion of a variety of profiles of EAL or bilingual pupils. These different profiles can be divided into three main categories, discussed here in the context of England and mainstream education.

First are bilinguals born and educated in England. They are children from well established immigrant communities, mainly originating from the Commonwealth countries: India, Bangladesh and Pakistan. Second are recent immigrant bilinguals. They come from many different European, Asian, African and South American countries. They are mainly new to English and have various degrees of literacy in their first language. The third group consists of settled immigrant bilinguals. These children were not born here, but have been immersed in an English-speaking environment for different lengths of time. They are at different stages of developing bilingualism depending on their backgrounds, support and abilities. They differ from bilinguals born here mainly by having had some of their formal education in a language other than English. Therefore, in many cases they have higher levels of literacy and background knowledge in that other language (Mehmedbegovic, 2011).

Having a definition that enables teachers and practitioners in mainstream education to identify all these different cases as types of bilingualism is essential in order to:

- Collect data that accurately reflect the full range of societal bilingualism
- Recognise experiences and language practices that children engage with outside school
• Identify a variety of needs in terms of language development and language support that these children may have, and to allocate funds available for language development, either in English or in their home language.

It needs to be highlighted that the division between EAL and ESL field – English as an additional and English as a second language – is related to the age of learners. EAL is used for learners in the compulsory education 3 – 18, whereas ESL is used in adult education. Although there are many overlaps and similarities between these two fields, EAL has a specific focus in terms of equipping learners to access the National Curriculum. Also, the dominance of languages used may change during formative years and although a child starts school as a first language speaker of Bengali or Portuguese, s/he may leave school with English as the dominant or first language – in terms of use. Therefore, positioning English as an additional language accommodates all the different profiles discussed above, but also shifts in language use which may occur during schooling.

Understanding language development of EAL learners
Cummins (1979) makes the distinction between two different kinds of language proficiency: BICS and CALP.

• BICS are Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills. These are the "surface" skills of listening, comprehension and speaking that are typically acquired quickly (approximately over two years) by many students; particularly by those from language backgrounds similar to English who spend a lot of their school time interacting with English speakers.

• CALP is Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, and it is essential for engagement with the academic task across the curriculum. Cummins states that while many children develop a high level of BICS within two years of immersion in the target language (English), it takes between 5-7 years for a child to be working at the expected level as far as academic language and literacy are concerned.

Implications for mainstream teachers
It should not be assumed that EAL speakers who have attained a high degree of fluency and accuracy in everyday spoken English have the corresponding academic language proficiency. This may help to avoid seeing children who exhibit this disparity as having special educational needs, when what they need is more explicit academic literacy teaching.
London area cultural and linguistic diversity

According to the latest census, carried out in 2011, London has a total population of just fewer than 8.2 million inhabitants, who live in 3.27 million households. The figures also show that almost 3 million Londoners were born outside the UK, and that nearly half of these migrants arrived in the capital during the last decade. Compared to 1987, when just under a fifth of all London residents had been born abroad, the relative size of London’s immigrants has more than doubled from 18% to 37% of the total population of the city.

While London historically has seen significant periods of immigration not only, but mainly from colonies and former colonies of the British Empire, its population has become increasingly ethnically and linguistically diverse over the last thirty years. From the 1980s onwards, new groups of immigrants arrived, including labour migrants and refugees from countries with little or no historical links to Britain.

The process of European integration, and specifically the creation of a common European market, which led to the increasingly free movement of EU workers and citizens, also contributed significantly to an increase in London’s immigrant population. In 2011 nearly 9% of London’s population was born in an EU member state other than the UK or Ireland. The UK’s decision to open its labour market to migrants from the ‘A8’ accession states that joined the EU in 2004, created another wave of migration, demonstrated by the fact that 4.5% of today’s London residents were born in these countries, nearly half of them in Poland.

However, the most significant aspect of recent migration to London is its diversity and the fact that no particular global region or country dominates. Of the nearly 3 million Londoners not born in the UK, nearly 1 million were born in Europe, almost 970,000 in Asia and the Middle East, 620,000 in Africa, more than 325,000 in the Americas and the Caribbean, and more than 84,000 in Australasia and Oceania.

A closer look at the quarter of households in London where English is not the main language reveals the current degree of linguistic diversity in the capital. More than 1.7 million Londoners over the age of three speak a language other than English as their main language. Figure 2 shows the 15 largest community languages/language groups in London.

![Figure 2. The 15 largest community languages/language groups in London. From Eversley, J., Mehmedbegovic, D., Sanderson, A., Tinsley, T. and Von Ahn, M. (2010). Language Capital: Mapping the Languages.](image)

This set of 15 languages can be divided into groups of:

- Very large community languages (more than 100,000 speakers): *Polish, Bengali (with Sylheti and Chatgaya)* and *Gujarati*,
- Large community languages with 68,000 to 84,000 speakers: *French, Urdu, Portuguese, Turkish, Spanish, Arabic, Tamil, Panjabi*
- Sizeable community languages with around 50,000 resident speakers: *Somali, Chinese languages* (including *Mandarin, Cantonese & others*) and *Italian*.

Together these 15 languages account for 64% of residents who do not have English as their main language. The remaining 58 languages named in the data account for 33% of community language speakers, while the last 3% of numerically very small languages spoken by London are not named in the published census data.
If we compare these figures with the data on school population there are interesting differences to be observed. The top 3 languages in schools are: Bengali (46,681 speakers), Urdu (29,354) and Somali (27,126), followed by Panjabi, Gujarati, Arabic, Turkish, Tamil, Yoruba and French (between 21,000 and 13,000 speakers). Other sizeable groups are: Portuguese, Polish, Spanish, Albanian, Akan, Persian and Chinese languages (between 12,000 and 6,000).

One of the possible explanations for the differences between adult and school populations can be that the new waves of immigrants, from countries such as Poland, are predominantly adults looking for work, often arriving as single men or women. On the other hand Bengali is very high up in both sets of data, reflecting a settled community with a consistent presence in both the adult and school populations.

One group that goes against these trends are Somali speakers. Although they are a recent and growing immigrant group, there is a higher ratio of children in comparison to adults. This can be explained by the fact that Somali women typically have children earlier in life, and very often more than two children. Also, because of the conflict in Somalia a significant number of Somali school-age children arrived in the UK as unaccompanied minors, having lost their parents in the war. This shows that having insights into the background of each individual community is essential in order to understand trends and differences in data sets.

Looking outside the group of 15 large or very large languages, the next 20 languages listed in Figure 3 below have between 10,000 and 40,000 speakers and account for a quarter of all residents reporting that English is not their main language.

It is important to highlight that the school data only refers to children in mainstream schools. Specific to the context of London is a growing number of international and bilingual schools, supported either by the European Union or national governments. The International Schools England Directory (http://www.independentschools.com/england/international_schools.php) lists 42 schools in England, while LISA (The London International School Association, http://www.lisa.org.uk/) lists 14 international schools dotted around London.

Other searches also reveal a number of bilingual schools: the heavily oversubscribed and well established French Lycée in South Kensington, supported by a local network of bilingual French primary schools; the German Grammar School in Richmond; the Swedish School; the Norwegian School; a number of American Schools; the Spanish School and the more recently established Italian School. Some of these schools have over 1,000 pupils on roll and offer exposure to and learning in more than one language.

Profiles of students in international schools globally have been identified as children from families of professionals working for international organisations, diplomats and local communities who want an international school education for their children. The range of nationalities represented in an international school can be as few as five or as high as 90 or more (Carder, 2007). Linguistic profiles cover a variety of monolingual, bilingual and multilingual speakers, depending on their age, family circumstances (parents from different linguistic backgrounds) and the trans-national mobility of their families (Carder, 2013).

Bilingualism and plurilingualism in European international schools are highly valued and strategically developed. In terms of the way the workforce in international schools is equipped to support the language development of their pupils, requirements are very high.

According to ECI Schools (http://www.ecis.org), international schools committed to delivering a quality international education learning experience should encourage teachers to earn an International Teacher Certificate (ITC). The ITC was developed by the European Council of International Schools, working in partnership with Cambridge International Examinations. Its aim is to ‘equip teachers with the global mind-set necessary for successful teaching in the 21st century’.

The ITC has five standards, and one of them focuses on the ‘language dimension’ of teaching and learning. The intercultural aspect of education
in international schools is also addressed by the standards. These schools are committed to developing ‘able communicators’ through English, foreign languages and home languages.

Relevant teacher training and professional development have been identified as the main priorities for accommodating the growing numbers of EAL learners and developing appropriate teaching and learning approaches across the curriculum. Therefore, we proceed by reviewing the key initiatives for skilling up the workforce in the mainstream sector.
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Part 2. A brief historical overview of EAL provision

This part of the literature review presents a brief historical overview of EAL provision and focuses on key developments in England in the period 2007-2009, the current situation in England, and key principles and models.

History of EAL provision in England
As a country with high rates of immigration, England has been addressing the issue of English as an Additional Language (EAL) since the mid-1960s. The 1966 Education Act provided funding to Local Authorities, enabling them to address the additional needs of children arriving during the waves of immigration from the Commonwealth countries. Over time, Section 11 of the Education Act has been used to fund very different pedagogical and organisational models such as the physical dispersal of EAL children in the 1960s, known as 'bussing,' and the establishment of separate language centres in the 1970s.

The Swann report (1985) criticised these centres as a way of ghettoising immigrant children and they were therefore closed down. This resulted in creation of EAL centres/departments within schools. Although physically in schools, it had taken some time before these departments became fully integrated in school life.

The Education Act was reviewed in 1999, and this led to the rebranding and restructuring of Section 11. It then became the Ethnic Minority and Travellers Achievement Grant (EMTAG). In the year 2000, travellers were given a separate grant and the ring-fenced funding known as EMAG (Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant) was distributed to schools according to a formula. This formula took on board the number of new arrivals and level of needs of EAL children according to the nationally agreed assessment criteria and EAL stages. The grant, which originally had been supervised and distributed by the Home Office was, in 1999, placed under the supervision and administration of the Department of Education and Science. After 64 years of targeted and protected funding for EAL provision, in 2010 ring-fenced funding for EAL provision was discontinued. The impact of this decision is explored further in this section.

Key developments in England in the period 2007-2009
The growing numbers of EAL learners in schools resulted in requests by a range of key agencies and professional associations for a new strategic approach. In 2007 the Training and Development Agency for Schools commissioned the Institute of Education, working with the Learning and
Skills Network, to develop a National Teaching Workforce Strategy for EAL. This strategy was meant to set out a vision for the approach that would support every EAL learner in achieving their full potential, and prepare every member of the teaching workforce to deliver this vision. For all schools, and especially for highly multilingual London schools, this strategy was set to make a tangible difference.

At that time the population of EAL learners in England had been consistently increasing and with it demand for different types of EAL provision linked to new patterns of immigration. According to NALDIC (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum), the 2008 census indicated that EAL pupil numbers rose by approximately 25% between 2004 and 2008 to stand at 824,380, while the number of specialist EAL/EMA (Ethnic Minority Achievement) teachers increased only by 8% during the same period. These figures demonstrate the mismatch between demand and the available specialist workforce. This discrepancy resulted in additional pressures for the teaching workforce at all levels and undermined the principles of inclusion and equality of opportunity for EAL learners.

One of the key distinctions of this strategy, in comparison to the previous policy responses, was its intent to challenge deficit models of bilingual learners, made very prominent in its publicity and consultation documents. The strategy stated that, “This should not be a strategy being put in place to address a problem.” It had ambitious goals – “to support the language and curriculum learning of EAL learners at every level, including the most gifted and talented, across the breadth of the curriculum and throughout their school lives.”(p. 2, IOE, 2008). The evidence for the development of this strategy was collected in a research exercise carried out by the project team from November 2007 to April 2008.

After three years of investment and effort into developing a National EAL Workforce Strategy, this job remains unfinished. The legacy of what has been developed and achieved so far is uncertain. The strategy was envisaged as enhancing initial teacher training and all stages of continuing professional development, encompassing all members of the teaching workforce across all key stages, including classroom teachers, EAL specialists, mainstream staff and school leaders.

In 2010, with changes in the government’s education strategy and the education budget, work on the strategy was put on hold. In the following academic year, (2010/2011), only one aspect of developmental ITT (Initial Teacher Training) work was funded. Two pilots titled: Additional
Experience in EAL, one for primary PGCE students and one for secondary PGCE students, were developed in consultation with an advisory board. These pilots were offered to two small cohorts of 15 students (30 in total), one at the University of Leeds and one at the Institute of Education, University of London. The purpose of these pilots was to widen the current ITT provision addressing EAL learners and offer optional additional training to teacher trainees across primary and secondary stages and subject specialisms. These pilots received a lot of interest from students and staff and their evaluation demonstrated that this small group of students was evidently better equipped than their peers for the school population they would be engaging with. The IOE continues to run the EAL Pathway for Secondary PGCE students course and annual evaluations show that around one third of students doing the Pathway selects the IOE because it is the only ITT provider in England offering the EAL Pathway.

To provide the evidence base for the development of the EAL strategy, extensive research was carried out by the project team in the period of November 2008 to April 2009. Its four strands used a range of methods and approaches:

- Mapping of the national and international relevant research since 2000 (a systematic review)
- Ten case studies collected in a variety of settings, three of them in London
- Interviews with a group of experts in education and a written consultation with a group of EAL specialists
- A survey-style consultation open to everybody in the school workforce nationally.

**Current situation**

According to the Department for Education (DfE) in 2015, EAL remains a priority on the official agenda for education. However, with significant funding pressures, the loss of relevant EAL specialist expertise continues – especially at the Local Authority level. This is highly concerning as research (IOE, 2008) identified EAL expertise at the Local Authority level as a characteristic of good practice and the driver of professional development and good practice dissemination in schools.

A 2011 NALDIC (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum) survey revealed that 80% of respondents had experienced the reduction of EAL support posts through forced or voluntary redundancies. Common negative impacts identified by respondents included: a reduction in pupil support; a reduction in the availability of knowledgeable specialists; and fragility of the current arrangements. The biggest deterioration was in the quality or availability of support for EAL
and bilingual pupils and students. Over 60% of respondents reported that support for EAL and bilingual pupils had deteriorated over the previous 6 months.

The most pressing concern remains for bilingual learners. The latest evidence provided by the secondary PGCE students, who participated in the above outlined pilot in 2010/2011, confirms that concerns raised by experts a few years ago still remain. The students in the pilot were charged with a task of shadowing a bilingual learner in order to understand the experiences of bilingual children. All of them reported that in their placement secondary schools’ bilingual children were placed in low ability sets even when they outperformed students in one or even two sets up.

They also reported a lack of recognition of skills and knowledge that bilingual children had in their first languages. In some cases schools had stated, ‘we do not have EAL issues,’ whereas OfSTED reports were describing learners of these schools as multilingual children who spoke up to 50 different languages. Academies styled as focusing on languages were not interested in linguistic competencies of their students beyond French and Spanish.

This evidence suggests that the good EAL practice that exists in isolated pockets is not being disseminated. Development and dissemination of good practice increasingly depends on individual practitioners, institutions and professional association, and is not currently facilitated by national Education policies and practices.

One opportunity for enhancing EAL expertise and provision is the Department for Education’s Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011). Organisations such as NALDIC are doing excellent work in filling gaps in the system in terms of guidance, dissemination of relevant research and supporting practitioners to enhance and enlarge their ‘pockets of good practice’. A positive impact that an individual practitioner can make is evident even with teacher trainees, who report increased engagement of all learners when developing approaches based on principles of good EAL practice (Pilot 2010/11). Developing excellence at the individual level has probably never been more important for this field and learner experience.

**EAL provision: Key principles and models**
The development of EAL provision in England over fifty years has produced several different models. A recent audit of the EAL practice conducted by the British Council (2014), summarised below, provides
insights into the key features of these models. Each has been applied with varied degrees of success, depending on available resources and time allocation for EAL support.

It is important to highlight that the development of the EAL provision in England has been based around these key principles:

- Every child has a right to access full curriculum
- Every teacher is a teacher of language too
- Every teacher has a responsibility (according to teachers’ standards) to support his/her pupils to acquire relevant subject specific academic literacy skills
- No child should be expected to leave their culture and/or language at the school’s door. School environment and curriculum should affirm the linguistic and cultural capital of each child and family within the school community
- Teaching and learning needs to be always cognitively and age appropriate regardless of the level of English pupils may have
- Language barriers should not be obstacles for recognising talents, potential and prior knowledge (acquired in other languages) of children who are at the early stages of developing skills in English.

Models of EAL provision
The EAL Nexus audit carried out in autumn 2013 and spring 2014 identified various models of local authority provision in use across the UK. Some or all of the following may be in place in a local area. In about 40 local authorities there is no EAL specific provision at all (https://eal.britishcouncil.org/eal-sector/different-models-eal-provision):

- **School improvement focus**
  Senior leaders and EAL consultants work together to look at current and historic school attainment data to identify underperforming groups of learners from specific ethnic or linguistic backgrounds. They jointly set improvement objectives and manage implementation. The focus of consultant work is mostly training and coaching teachers and middle managers. For example, an inner London Local Authority found that Turkish pupils lagged behind white British peers in KS2 Mathematics, so the EMA service developed a project which used bilingual assistants to work with Turkish pupils and parents to practice key numeracy skills and introduce collaborative games. Within 2 years, the attainment gap narrowed dramatically in the target schools.
• **Peripatetic EAL specialist team**  
A small team works across a Local Authority providing advice and support to schools. They may also conduct EAL assessment for newly arrived pupils. Sometimes they offer school-based training courses for teachers. These teams may be a mixture of consultants, teachers and/or teaching assistants.

• **Expertise hubs**  
In some rural authorities with widely spread EAL learner populations, EAL specialist teams have been distributed to hub schools. For example a teacher and bilingual assistant might be based on one primary school, but provide pupil support and teacher training to a cluster of schools in the local area.

• **Bilingual support staff**  
The authority employs bilingual staff members who speak the relevant community languages and can be deployed to schools to provide support for new pupils and help liaise with parents and communities. This model is common in urban communities with more settled populations where it is easy to recruit and retain staff with the relevant experience and languages.

• **Single consultant for EAL or vulnerable groups**  
A specialist EAL consultant works alongside school-based learning support specialists to provide advice and support to schools about individual EAL learners. The focus of the support is usually child-centred, but also involves parents. This approach is common in more rural authorities with a lower density of EAL learners. It is often very difficult for the consultant to offer any whole school training because of the range of settings covered.

• **Translation and interpreting services**  
Some areas still offer a translation and interpreting service. This helps schools communicate with parents from new communities, but does not have much impact on teaching and learning.

• **Resource providers**  
In areas where there are a few specialist EAL staff, sometimes a high quality website or handbook has been produced as an effective way of supporting teachers and school leaders.
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Part 3. Key research evidence

The key research evidence presented is based on two systematic reviews of EAL in schools, conducted in 2009 and 2015.

2009 systematic review
The source of the 2009 review is as follows:

The aims of the 2009 systematic review were:
• To identify research that has been undertaken with regard to EAL provision and the teacher workforce
• To identify gaps in research (and where possible, gaps in provision).

Studies selected for the review included those published between 2000 and 2008, written in the English language and focusing on the impact of EAL provision in the school sector (ages 3 – 18).

The initial search used several international electronic databases of academic literature. A screening exercise based on titles and abstracts was undertaken, erring on the side of inclusion. A hand search was also conducted, based on the expertise and advice of those within the project team and within NALDIC. Following screening, a map of the field was drawn up and gaps in the literature were identified.

Key findings
The review yielded 54 studies completed during the period from 2000 to 2008. The studies suggested several major areas that need to be addressed. They are summarised below.

Policy responses
• A policy framework that sets out curricular and assessment standards and requirements for EAL development (Butcher et al., 2007, Christensen and Stanat, 2007; Murakami 2008, Wallen and Kelly-Holmes, 2006)
• A knowledge base for teachers that includes cultural, linguistic and cognitive dimensions (Christensen and Stanat, 2007; Dresser, 2007; Flynn, 2007; Karabenick and Noda, 2004; Leung Creese, 2008) including:
  • Language proficiency (Paneque and Barbetta, 2006)
An understanding that many of the language strategies used for EAL teaching are good for English as a mother tongue learners too (Facella et al., 2005; Yoon, 2007)

• Training in the distinctions between EAL and EAL with special needs, (Layton et al., 2002).

Staff awareness and practice improvements

• Bridging the divide between schools and the community (Conteh et al.; 2007, Guo and Mohan 2008; Karabenick and Noda, 2004) so that:
  • There is a move away from a deficit model of EAL (Conteh et al., 2007; Parke et al., 2002) towards high expectations (Olson and Land, 2007)
  • The full range of linguistic and cultural competence is taken into account in designing literacy interventions in classrooms (Wallace, 2005)
  • There is recognition that national policy needs to be interpreted locally (Creese, 2003; Leung and Creese, 2008).

• Bilingualism needs to be encouraged from an early age (Kenner 2004) where possible, and the fact that bilingual pupils are better at some aspects of English than others needs to be recognised and built upon (Cameron and Besser, 2004; Robertson, 2006; Wiese, 2004).

• There needs to be a move towards developing a plurilingual approach in policy and practice, where plurilingualism is defined as the development of effective communication skills which draw on all of our linguistic and cultural experiences in an interactive way.

This is promoted as a life-long activity, a process of learning the language of home, society, other peoples; developing communicative competencies throughout our life time; and in different situations flexibly calling upon different parts of this competence in order to achieve effective communication. Plurilingualism recognises an all encompassing communication competence that is made up of different languages that one person has been exposed to and acknowledges the partial nature of the knowledge anyone can have of one language, be it their mother tongue or not.

Therefore plurilingualism removes the ideal of the native speaker as the ultimate achievement and replaces it with the aim of an effective pluralistic communicator who draws on his/her varied
repertoire of linguistic and cultural knowledge in a flexible, creative and individual way (Council of Europe, 2001, Mehmedbegovic 2007).

**Key elements of good practice**

- Mainstreaming of EAL pupils must be retained as a principle (Hite and Evans 2006) with high expectations and sufficient language support (Chen, 2007).

- Models of partnership between EAL specialists and curriculum content specialists need to be developed, moving from support through transmitter/explainer and interpreter modes to a full partnership model (Creese, 2004, 2006; Gardner, 2006).

- The importance of oral communication must be recognised and encouraged, in more than one language (Conteh, 2007; Estrada 2005; Fumoto et al, 2007).

- The importance of developing academic registers specific to academic success for EAL pupils must be recognised and explicitly supported (Kotler et al, 2001).

**Key features of assessment**

- Assessment frameworks for EAL development and achievement are needed (Rea-Dickins, 2001), with:
  - Distinctions between summative and formative assessment clearly made (Leung and Rea-Dickins, 2007)
  - More sensitivity to context (Teasdale and Leung, 2000; Walters, 2007)
  - Awareness of the potential for learning of assessment models and encounters (Rea-Dickins, 2006)
  - Distinctions between language learning needs, special educational needs and curriculum content needs made (Rea-Dickins, 2001).

**Gaps in the research**

- Although there is plenty of policy analysis, there is little research that addresses pedagogic practices in EAL teaching. Most classroom-based research is small-scale, based on teacher perceptions, and/or anecdotal.

While there is a place for such research, there is a distinct lack of:

- Larger-scale studies
- Longitudinal studies
• Studies with a balance of qualitative and quantitative data
• Comparative studies.

• As a reflection of the preceding point, there are few accounts of learning other than individual case studies. Again, with regard to learning, there is a distinct lack of:
  • Larger-scale studies
  • Longitudinal studies
  • Studies with a balance of qualitative and quantitative data
  • Comparative studies.

• Most of the research appears to be focused on the early years and on primary education. There is a gap in studies of the 11-18 age group.

• There is little or no research or analysis on routes into EAL teaching, or on the continuing professional development needs of teachers in this respect.

• Because it is a relatively new field, there is little research on plurilingualism and its practices and/or policies.

2015 systematic review
The source of the 2009 review is as follows:

This systematic review was conducted by University of Oxford, funded by Education Endowment Foundation, with the aim of providing a resource for schools looking to develop effective support for EAL speakers.

The review is based on a search of several databases: British, Australian and North American, which identified 975 relevant studies in the period from 2000 - 2014. However, only 29 studies satisfied the criteria for inclusion in this review. Out of 29 studies, 27 were carried out in the US, one in the UK and one in Canada. The lack of research in the UK echoes the concerns related to the lack of funding for EAL support in mainstream schools and professional development for specialist and mainstream staff.

Twelve (12) studies included in this review focused on instructional activities aimed at improving English language skills, 10 focused
specifically on enhancing literacy, five (5) researched the impact of professional development and only two (2) family literacy. Most studies were conducted in primary schools and only one in a setting towards the end of secondary schooling. This imbalance of studies at different stages of compulsory education is not ideal and leaves a gap in terms of insights into interventions that can prepare students better for the end of secondary schooling exams.

What follows is a summary of key findings. All of the studies included have been ranked in terms of ‘weight of evidence’ as low, medium and high, based on the robustness of their methodology and sample size. The discussion related to ranking is not included in this digest and can be accessed in the full report as given above.

**Key language skill and literacy intervention findings**

- The in-depth analysis of the 12 studies focusing on general vocabulary, listening comprehension and verbal interaction confirms the importance of pedagogical approaches which encourage development of oral skills as an important strategy to support reading and writing (Genesee et al., 2006, Murphy, 2014).
- Evaluation of specific strategies such as Word Generation (explicit teaching of academic vocabulary – five words each session), and Academic Language Instruction for All Students (similar focus on academic vocabulary and metalinguistic skills) showed that students used more of the targeted words in their writing with additional progress in terms of general vocabulary and word awareness skills (Lawrence et al., 2012; Snow et al., 2009; Mancilla-Martinez, 2010; Kiefer and Lesaux, 2012; Lesaux et al., 2010, Greenfader and Brouillette, 2013).
- Two studies which focused on explicit phonics and decoding instruction with early years children showed positive effects in terms of: reading, spelling and reading comprehension (Vadasy and Sanders, 2010; Vadasy and Sanders, 2013; Ehri et al., 2011; Proctor et al., 2011; Almague, 2005; Solan and Gerber, 2008; Tong, at al., 2010; Graves, at al., 2011).
- Reading Master, Early Interventions in Reading and Read Well, all of which are strategies integrated in the curriculum using teacher modelling and repeated practice to teach literacy skills through guided reading activities, show positive effects in terms of reading comprehension and fluency (Kamps et al., 2007).
- Reading Recovery scheme has shown particularly positive effects on EAL and non-EAL children in terms of early literacy (Clancy, 2009, 2010).
• Reading in mixed ability pairs intervention has demonstrated benefits for both higher and lower level readers, and as particularly beneficial for EAL children who are reluctant to contribute in the class (Almaguer, 2005; Lugo-Neris, et al; 2010).
• Positive transfer of knowledge between language one (L1) and language two (L2) – in this case Spanish and English – was recorded in a study using both languages in storybook reading sessions. Another study using software with Spanish translation also showed positive L1 to L2 transfer and higher rate of activity completion.

Professional development intervention findings
• A professional development intervention which included biweekly staff sessions and ongoing workshops with teachers focusing on integrating language and literacy development in the science curriculum proved beneficial in terms of children’s understanding of science concepts, as well as subject specific vocabulary and literacy (Lara-Alecio, et al, 2012; Kim, et al, 2011; Matsumura, et al, 2010).
• An intervention focused on lesson planning and delivery based on best practices for teaching academic English used Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model. It provided evidence of higher achievement in reading, writing and oral proficiency in comparison to classes where teachers did not have this professional development (Short, at al, 2012).
• Talking Partners strategy developed in the UK is also focused on developing students’ oral skills and developing better interaction in classrooms. The effect size is not reported, but it is widely used. (Kotler at al, 2001)

Family literacy intervention findings
• A nine-week programme developed in Canada for early years EAL and non-EAL children and their parents provided parents with ideas for creative and meaningful ways to support their children’s literacy development. The results show positive effects for EAL children in comparison to EAL children who did not participate and also in comparison with non-EAL children (Harper, et al, 2011).
• A strategy to encourage independent reading during school breaks, which included sending books home and organising family literacy events, showed a positive effect when accompanied by literacy events and training for parents (Kim and Guryan, 2010).
Part 4. Conclusions and next steps

Developing a model of EAL provision that will equip ACS International Schools to effectively meet the needs and recognise the talents of a growing number of culturally and linguistically diverse students could start by considering the models presented in the audit of practice and adapting them to suit the school’s context. Specific strategies presented in the summaries of the systematic reviews could be selected to be piloted in specific subject areas in order to build a portfolio of exemplary approaches that can be adapted to different ages and subject areas.

It is highly recommended that the development of EAL expertise and provision is based on the principles of developing plurilingual communication competencies, which build on and include competencies in home languages as an integral part of an international school education.
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