Responding to Individual Needs or Inclusion for All:

Dilemmas of Practice in Provision for Young People with English as an

Additional Language

Joanne Hynie, BA, Dip.Ed, Adv.Dip in Special Needs

June 2022

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of Doctor of Philosophy.

Department of Educational Research,

Lancaster University, UK.

This thesis results entirely from my own work and has not been offered previously for any other degree or diploma.

The word length is 46,316, which does not exceed the permitted maximum.

Abstract

The inclusion of young people with English as an additional language (EAL) requires practitioners in schools to both respond to individual needs and provide an inclusive environment. These requirements create a dilemma which is causing teachers to question whether inclusion is possible, as the first seeks to highlight difference, while the second seeks to remove difference. While the dilemma has been studied from the perspective of policy and of young people with EAL, few studies have examined it from the perspective of practitioners themselves as mediators between policy and practice. To examine how practitioners negotiate the dilemma of inclusion, and the claim of inclusive provision to be socially just, this study used the theoretical tool of parity of participation. Practitioners' beliefs, experiences and attitudes provided data on the norms and values of inclusive practice, and a discourse analysis of the key inclusion documents contributed data regarding the influences on practitioners' views.

The findings indicate that inclusion for all is a valid underpinning of EAL education. However, the notion is not clearly unpacked, and thus teachers are unsure how to deliver it. Secondly, its current configuration is problematic for EAL pupils as it does not meet all their needs. Thirdly, inclusion policy is determined without the contribution of insights from teachers. It is proposed that, within an overarching system of shared and inclusive values, a framework of parity of participation can ensure that teachers have the tools to recognise the needs of their EAL pupils, to represent them, and to redistribute resources appropriately. In their capacity to cushion the dilemma of EAL

inclusive practice, and strengthen the inclusion ideal, the findings contribute to developing EAL inclusive practice in secondary schools, and demonstrate that EAL inclusion can make a positive contribution to the policy of inclusion for all.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor who has supported me throughout the research process with patient advice and guidance. I would also like to thank the teachers who generously gave their time to take part in interviews.

Chapter 1: Inclusion in a Changing Demographic

1.1 Including young people with English as an additional language

The impact of current changes in the process of globalisation on school populations has profound implications for the teachers of young people for whom English is an additional language (Thomson and Walker, 2010, 336). The changing demographic in schools has prompted debate about the inclusiveness of schools and presents challenges for the role of teaching in diverse classrooms. In view of future immigration patterns these challenges are likely to continue to intensify (Leung et al., 2014, 3; Pantic et al., 2019, 2020).

While recognition of the role of schooling in the inclusion of immigrant young people is growing globally (Pinson and Arnot, 2007; UNESCO, 2020), most of the literature on inclusive education for ethnic minorities is focused on language acquisition. The global hegemony of English language and culture accentuates this focus for teachers in the UK, and raises issues for the provision of an inclusive environment for an ethnically diverse school population.

Inclusion is generally defined as provision of equal resources and opportunities, and a commitment to 'social equity' through the reduction of 'avoidable or remediable differences among groups of people' (World Health Organisation, n.d.). In current educational contexts this is generally interpreted as horizontal equity, treating people who are already assumed to be equal the same way. While the concept of horizontal equity is useful in

homogeneous schools, in most schools pupils come from a variety of backgrounds. In this context the notion of vertical equity is more useful as it assumes that pupils have different needs. This study aims to examine how the different needs of pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) are met while simultaneously providing an inclusive environment. These two foci can have conflicting purposes. The first is to acknowledge difference, while the second seeks to remove difference. The challenge for practitioners of responding concurrently to both an agenda of individual needs, which seeks to acknowledge difference, and of inclusion for all, which seeks to remove difference, has prompted debate about wider social justice issues, and provides the focus for this study.

The concept of inclusion in mainstream schools is challenging, not least because there is uncertainty over its meaning both nationally and in individual schools (Booth and Ainscow, 1998). Its adoption as a key education policy in Scotland has generally been met with support from teachers on the grounds of social justice, but it has also encountered resistance on the grounds that it is increasingly difficult to 'do' inclusion (Allan, 2010, 199). For EAL inclusive practice, this lack of clarity intensifies the dilemmas of difference.

These dilemmas are most acute at the intersection between the theoretical expression of inclusion and its pragmatic interpretation, namely between policy and practice. In negotiating this intersection between policy and practice, the teacher's role is key. The main issue for teachers can be framed as whether to acknowledge or not acknowledge difference, as both options have negative risks (Norwich, 2005). This prompts the question:

***How does EAL provision respond to both inclusion for all and the
individual needs of EAL pupils?***

As teachers' beliefs, attitudes and experiences form the basis of their
response to inclusion, the question can be interrogated by examining
teachers' interpretation of, response to, and engagement with inclusion.
Specifically, the study aims to answer the following questions:

a) How do practitioners interpret EAL inclusion policy?

- How does EAL inclusion policy correlate with practitioners'
  understanding of EAL inclusion

- How does EAL inclusion policy inform teachers' practice?

b) How do practitioners respond to the needs of EAL pupils?

- How do practitioners understand EAL pupils' needs?

- How do practitioners consider that they meet EAL pupils'
  needs?

c) How does EAL provision engage with a socially just conception of inclusion
for all?

- How can teachers provide a socially just education for EAL
  pupils?

- How does EAL provision impact on inclusion for all?

The main issue centres on balancing the tensions between the needs of an increasingly heterogeneous pupil population and the priorities of inclusion policy. The traditionally homogeneous curriculum has framed the current hegemonic response (Mohan et al., 2001, 2-3), which requires that EAL pupils acquire linguistic competence. In aiming to make good what is *in*-competent or lacking, this deficit model has generated opposing views as to whether it should be the main or only provision.

These concerns are reflected in calls for a more holistic view of EAL inclusion (Ainscow and Sandill, 2010; Allan, 2010; Keddie, 2012; Rhamie et al., 2012; Sleeter, 2013; Foley et al., 2013). Alongside calls for a more holistic education for EAL pupils, there are appeals for an education for all pupils to develop the skills required 'in a society that needs to come to grips with the presence of people who differ by ethnicity, caste and religion' (Nussbaum, 2006, 388). Where the deficit view focuses on EAL pupils' differences as remediable, or not part of the norm, a more holistic view focuses on all pupils' need to respond justly to difference. The dilemma, then, becomes how best to respond to difference.

The question has been widely debated, in particular within the recognition, redistribution and values discourses. The contribution of these debates to the discussion on EAL pupils' inclusion informs the collection of data, in the light of which a resolution to the dilemmas of difference is offered.

Dilemmas of difference with respect to EAL pupils have been explored mainly in the context of primary education and from the perspective of the pupil.

However there are few studies of provision for adolescents. Adolescents, in particular adolescents with EAL, have particular developmental needs which require consideration of the role of inclusion in their well-being (Morrison et al., 2012). They present teachers in secondary schools (for 11-18 year olds) with specific issues resulting from the pressure to balance different worlds, ethnic cultures and languages (Anderson et al., 2016). To address the issues from this perspective, this study is located in secondary schools.

Other foci in the literature have examined the role of head teachers in promoting inclusion (Ainscow and Sandill, 2010), the development of new competences in newly qualified teachers (NQT) in initial teacher training (ITT) (Florian and Linklater, 2010; Anderson et al., 2016), and curricular developments in diverse classrooms (Sleeter, 2013). While these studies have helped develop strategies for EAL education, there is a dearth of studies internationally which address the issue from the practitioners' perspective, as the key agents in interpreting inclusion policy and implementing it as inclusive practice (Allan, 2010, 199). This study recognises the unique role of teachers as agents in translating inclusion policy into practice.

1.2 Conceptualising provision for EAL young people

To understand how teachers interpret and apply the contested notion of inclusion in their practice, the study examines how they make meaning of its dilemmas. This requires a hermeneutic approach which can interpret the experience of inclusion. But for a holistic understanding of inclusive practice, it is important to critically examine what lies behind this meaning making. To

this end, the study examines inclusive practice through the lens of dilemmas of difference (Norwich, 2005), using Fraser's model of parity of participation (Fraser, 2009) as a framework. Fraser, a critical theorist in the Frankfurt School tradition committed to emancipatory change, offers a model that, by valuing both autonomy and cooperation (McArthur, 2016, 21, P6), can effectively engage with the dilemmas of difference.

While parity of participation was designed to be applied in political contexts, theorising EAL inclusion as parity of participation offers a substantive principle of justice to examine its social justice claims, that is, how young people with EAL can be said to participate equally with their peers in education. Its definition in terms of redistribution, recognition and representation also offers a procedural standard to examine the norms of inclusion (Fraser, 2009), that is, in what way inclusive provision can be said to be legitimate. Thus, it is able to 'problematize substance and procedure' (Fraser, 2005, 29). It provides both a means of examining how practitioners interpret, implement and conceive inclusion for EAL young people, and a means of drawing conclusions about the socially just credentials of EAL inclusion.

While there is much that distinguishes the interpretive hermeneutic approach from the critical theory approach in terms of analytic focus and consequences drawn from analysis, there is also much that links the two approaches. They have come to be associated respectively by Gadamer and Habermas, both of whom place language centrally in their investigations (Bernstein, 2002). Habermas proposes that hermeneutics' interest is in practical knowledge, while critical theory is interested in emancipatory knowledge, and claims each

to be a distinctive cognitive domain. Gadamer, on the other hand, insists that there is an implicit emancipatory interest in practical knowledge, and criticises Habermas' view that emancipatory knowledge is independent of other types of knowledge. For Habermas, Gadamer's 'fusion of horizons' that arises through dialogue, to enlarge our own horizons and minimise prejudice, presupposes a willingness to address prejudice and therefore cannot effectively address pathologies in society (Bernstein, 2002, 274). Each can however 'serve as a corrective to the other' (Bernstein, 2002, 275). The application of the two approaches to examining teachers' opinions, attitudes and beliefs is discussed further in the next chapter.

While 'the field is riddled with uncertainties, disputes and contradictions' (Ainscow and Sandill, 2010), there is consensus that inclusive practice is about more effective educational responses for all children, and that these should be implemented in the mainstream. Scottish guidelines for provision for EAL pupils reflect this trend, with the national curriculum explicitly claiming to promote education for social justice through inclusion (Scottish Executive, 2004).

Locating the study in a policy context which claims "a clear commitment to equality and positive attitudes to diversity" (Florian and Rouse, 2009; OECD, 2015), and a curriculum which is underpinned by inclusion (Riddell, 2009, 1), allows an interrogation of inclusion in practice. Specifically, it allows an examination of the fundamental contradictions in provision for both inclusion and individual needs by applying the concepts of redistribution and recognition (Fraser, 1997), where the former seeks to remove differences

between groups and the latter seeks to celebrate them (Riddell 2009). In addition, the high level of social deprivation in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2016b) allows an examination of practitioners' response to EAL where there is a range of imbricating needs which are illustrative of those elsewhere in the developed world. Scottish teachers' response to EAL is itself illustrative of other contexts, with confusion in knowing how best to respond to EAL pupils' diverse needs (Florian and Rouse, 2009; Foley et al., 2013; Pantic et al, 2019) being experienced among teachers internationally. Thus, Scotland is a context where the intersection of inclusion policy, practices which engage with a wide range of needs, and teacher attitudes which are widely shared, make the study potentially relevant to a range of contexts.

Focussing on teachers' responses allows the study to examine 'the situated knowledges on which teachers draw in interpreting and adapting policy to their daily working practices' (Saunders, 2000, 2). This 'powerful knowledge' (Saunders, 2000, 1) determines the dissonances between what policy statements intend and what practitioners can provide, and is given prominence in the study as the practitioner's voice.

1.3 Examining the dilemmas of provision

In order to acknowledge the ideological impurity of the concept of inclusion implicit in the dilemma outlined above, a dilemmatic stance is adopted. This approach has the capacity to represent the different, and at times conflicting, interpretations of inclusion and of inclusive practice presented by practitioners. Consistent with this stance, a phenomenological approach in the

8

hermeneutic tradition, capable of foregrounding experience as it is subjectively lived, is adopted as an appropriate means of examining inclusive practice as a socially constructed phenomenon. This interpretive approach to deriving meaning from the data requires a qualitative methodology.

To capture the practitioner voice, data are derived from interviews with practitioners. However, to acknowledge that inclusive practice is not sealed from external influences, a pragmatic approach is required. Accordingly, the structural influences on practice of the three key policy documents which provide the guidelines for practice are also examined. The interviews are thematically analysed according to the conceptual framework of parity of participation that guides the study, while a critical discourse analysis of the texts allows examination of their power to shape practitioners' responses.

In this study, inclusion refers to the inclusion of pupils with English as an additional language in mainstream education. English as an additional language is defined as English learned after primary socialisation and not yet mastered to native level. It does not include the notion of bilingualism. This clarification is to resolve the potential for confusion, where some local educational authorities in Scotland and elsewhere have adopted the label of 'bilingual' for young people who are learning English, in an effort to dispel the negative connotations of EAL as constituting 'other'. Secondary education refers to the education of young people between the ages of 11 and 18.

The study proposes that provision which responds to the dilemmas of EAL inclusion can offer a framework which contributes to the future direction of

inclusion for all. By proposing an overarching principle which supports the inclusion of EAL pupils, it offers a framework for practitioners to provide an educational environment where young people with different linguistic, social and cultural norms can learn together. By this means, the study can contribute to the debate on inclusion in a globalising world.

In the following chapters, the study first identifies how themes in the literature engage with the dilemmas raised above. This is followed by a discussion of the conceptual framework. Then the results are presented and discussed. To begin, in the next chapter, the contribution of three major discourses to EAL inclusive practice are discussed. The first section discusses the recognition discourse, which in Scotland is underpinned by rights-based provision for young people with EAL. The second section explores the redistributive implications of working with difference, in particular how the redistribution discourse influences allocation of resources. The third is the notion of values, which defines the principles underpinning inclusive practice. These themes highlight the features that guide teachers' interpretation of inclusion, set the parameters of their response to EAL needs, and frame their conception of socially just provision. As such, they provide a basis for examining the dilemma of EAL provision.

Chapter 2: Unravelling Notions of Inclusive Practice

Teaching transforms education policy into practice. As such, inclusive practice arrangements for young people with EAL are contingent on how practitioners interpret national policy and implement practice locally. But practice is not only influenced by policy. It also has the potential to directly influence policy (Clough and Corbett, 2004, 4 in Wright, 2010, 155). The interrelation of policy and practice renders a universally accepted definition of inclusion which is independent of context almost impossible (Shusterman, 1999, 221). It is context that determines how policy and practice take shape (Wright, 2010, 154). Thus, while there is general philosophical agreement about what inclusion is, contextual influences cause a great deal of divergence in practice (Pantić et al, 2021, 29).

While such contextual variability challenges the universality of the notion of inclusion, the durability of the inclusion ideal is further threatened by the short-term nature of policy. Across Europe the competing understandings of inclusion (Riddell, 2009, 5) that have emerged over the last two decades have largely been driven by an expansion of inclusion programs preoccupied with reducing social exclusion as opposed to increasing inclusion. But if the policy of inclusion is to succeed in the longer term, it needs to be more than 'a globally topical issue' (Wright, 2010, 159), as such top-down policies lack the durability and resilience that can come from longer term collaboration between policy makers and practitioners. These differing views of what constitutes effective inclusion policy and practice merit further examination to establish their capacity to respond to the challenges of EAL inclusion.

Accordingly, three main discourses which guide inclusive practice in western developed countries - recognising difference, distributing for difference, and values – are interrogated, to determine their capacity to shape socially just provision within the changing demographic in schools. The following sections explore how these discourses influence practitioners engaged in implementing a practical, socially just vision of EAL inclusion.

2.1 Recognising Difference

Inclusion is recognised internationally as a major principle of education, due to its capacity to incorporate many of the fundamental rights of the child (UNICEF, 2014). Thus, inclusion can be said to be underpinned by policy which is enshrined in rights. Rights-based education policy has a high profile in United Nations policy documents and the documents of other international organisations, and is the basis for policy decisions regarding young people with English as an additional language. Given its key role in inclusion policy, its influence on practitioners' interpretation of, and implementation of inclusion merits further examination.

- **Legal versus moral rights**

As a theory of inclusion, the rights-based approach focuses on legal rights. This approach has undoubtedly been successful in challenging social injustice, and has ensured access to the existing curriculum. But it has also been criticised for overlooking moral rights (Robeyns, 2006), for example, in its assumption of the sufficiency of access, that is, in its assumption that access to the curriculum meets EAL needs. The criticism suggests that while

legal rights encourage curricular acceptance, moral rights require curricular change. In addition, while legal rights insulate pupils against some aspects of exclusion, the approach also promotes an 'atomistic' perception of pupils which can fail to recognise the wider socio-cultural contexts of pupils' lives (Tikly, 2011). The capacity of the approach to be more holistic is limited, however, given that it is generally applied in western contexts where, as Apple maintains, there is widespread 'monocultural homogenisation of educational policies and practices', which are 'neoliberal, neoconservative and managerial' (Apple, 2004, 223). In these contexts the maintenance of the status quo can reinforce the view that EAL pupils as a group should be integrated into existing practices.

Without recognition of the wider perspectives of pupils' lives, rights can equate to normative assumptions which interpret EAL pupils' needs as deficits. This interpretation of needs, as exists in some parts of Europe including Scotland, releases resources tied to a particular 'defect', and assumes that 'support provides the necessary scaffold to make good this deficit' (Watson, 2009, 162 in Allan, 2010, 203). This deficit model can define what constitutes an appropriate educational environment, and this can restrict teachers' capacity to provide a socially just inclusive education for their EAL pupils. The good intentions can lead to a view that inclusion is 'about a discrete population of children who require special help' (Allan, 2010, 203), restricting the notion that inclusion is about all children. In the case of EAL pupils the notion that they require special help allows teachers who do not

consider they have the skills to deliver the support EAL pupils need to abdicate responsibility for them to specialists.

Thus, within a political and policy context, a rights-based approach to EAL inclusion can be linked more to special education than to education for all. Riddell argues that 'there needs to be a far better articulation and implementation of a rights discourse in schools, so that teachers and administrators accord much greater respect to children with additional support needs and their parents, rather than treating them as unwelcome customers' (Riddell, 2009, 294).

The tension between legal and moral rights is made more complex by the need to contend with multiple rights which may not always be compatible (Norwich, 2005), such as emerge where there are immigration and population flows from one nation to another. The migration of values and the conflicting practices that they generate have a significant impact on existing practices, notably, 'tremendous impacts on what counts as official knowledge, what counts as a responsive and effective education, and what counts as appropriate teaching' (Apple, 2011, 223).

The fact that society holds multiple values about education that do not share a common currency leads to policy and practice dilemmas which a focus on rights does not resolve. While the human rights lobby works to reduce the distinction between national citizens and outsiders, and while there is certainly a case for minimum standards of human rights, beyond those minimum standards, the human rights approach can 'unwittingly undermine the national

solidarity on which most rights continue to be based' (Goodhart 2017, p114). Rights are jeopardised when there is a failure to establish a consensus of common values by which these rights can be enabled.

In this way, the rights discourse struggles to resolve the tension between legal and moral rights. It has failed to provide 'a clear, shared, national definition of what inclusion means', and has prompted teachers to question why they should include and at what cost (Allan, 2010, 200).

More clarity about what defines inclusion, and what constitutes an inclusive pedagogy, may be gained by untangling the two frames of reference to which EAL rights can be applied, namely difference and sameness, reframing the issue in terms of recognition. Like inclusion itself, recognition is not an uncontested notion. Using the frames of reference above, it can be considered through the lens of diversity and homogeneity.

- **Issues of diversity and homogeneity**

Responding to the criticisms of the human rights perspective, Ainscow and Sandill present 'diversity as a concept, rather than reducing it to categories of differences' (Ainscow and Sandill, 2010, 402-6). Conceptualising diversity in this way allows it to be applied to all equally, and allows consideration of the impact of socio-cultural influences on teachers' perceptions of EAL pupils' needs.

Fraser's notion of recognition does indeed go further than legal rights. Based on a critical theoretical approach, rooted in historical realism, it asserts a

constructed reality shaped by power dynamics. As such, it offers a means to critically assess the impact of rights on the individual, at the same time offering space for a structural critique of the impact of socio-cultural influences.

While for Fraser, the critique of recognitional parity cannot be made without also considering distributional parity, Honneth (McArthur, 2016, 977) proposes that distributional parity is included within the concept of recognition, that is, issues of distribution are in essence issues of recognition. Both, however, have as a common aim a society inclusive of everyone as both flourishing individuals and members of that society (McArthur, 2021).

In terms of recognition, a wider conception of diversity is required to engage with the wider diversity in school population. Recognising diversity, however, raises two issues regarding the frame. A wider conception of diversity, framed as a common vision, is criticised by Rhamie, Bhopal and Bhatti (2012), who question whether a common vision, for example in the form of citizenship education, can be assumed to be ethnically and socially inclusive. The notion of an "inclusive sense of Britishness", for example, has remained nebulous and contested (Menzies and Chiong, 2016), not least because it fails to define precisely what "Britishness" is and how EAL pupils who have a different identity fit into it.

A different view of diversity is one that recognises diversity as multicultural education, aimed at supporting linguistic and cultural diversity. This perspective presents different issues for inclusion. It can be criticised as both

emphasising cultural differences (Leung et al., 2014), and at the same time diverting efforts directed towards inclusion (Cummins, 2015, 456-457).

Thus, while the current conception of citizenship is too narrow to be able to encompass the range of identities which share the national space, multiculturalism on the other hand cannot provide a unifying framework for sharing that space. These issues, arising as they do within a context of increasingly homogenising languages and cultures, indicate that finding a way of recognising the diversity of linguistic and cultural traditions while simultaneously developing a sense of belonging has become a matter of social justice.

The pace of change makes an evolutionary response which could negotiate contested issues of difference and sameness problematic. Instead, it creates crises of change, where responses to the dilemmas of diversity can be reductionary. Here, diversity is no more than its perceived parts, each with its own solution. There is little scope in the reductionary view for diversity as a phenomenon from which can emerge a practice of inclusion which is more than its parts. The atomistic view of diversity raises issues that are discernible in the disparity between the rhetoric of diversity and its translation into practice in concrete settings like schools. The disparity is evident in teacher attitudes, where the lack of congruity in practitioners' mental maps between the politics of diversity on the one hand and the practice of inclusion on the other compromises the effectiveness of inclusive practice. How teachers have attempted to resolve the dilemma has, however, prompted criticism. For example, Horenczyk notes that 'although teachers … seem to espouse

pluralistic attitudes to some extent, many still appear to view education as the primary means for transforming the immigrant into an (integrated national), and the school as the most appropriate setting to attain this goal' (Horenczyk in Kaur, 2012, 442).

How, then, can teachers cultivate a sense of belonging in an educational context which comprises diverse ways of being? A sense of belonging fosters the cooperative, altruistic behaviour which underpins positive social interaction, a major goal of education. But such behaviour is directed only towards those who can be identified as part of one's group (Haidt, 2006). Yet the markers previously used to identify who belongs no longer apply in a world where the demographic is constantly changing. It is no longer a simple matter to recognise who belongs by identifying a shared language or culture.

The experiment in which we are now engaged is to establish whether we have the capacity to extend the linguistic and cultural markers of belonging to include the multiple identities of diasporic people. This requires that schools, as microcosms of wider society, ensure that EAL pupils and their families, 'who have demonstrated their commitment to their new life through their great efforts to achieve it' (Apple, 2011, 224), have the capability to belong to the linguistic and cultural community in which they now live.

Large linguistic and cultural differences need not prevent recognition of shared human capabilities. As Haidt (2006) argues, there are more differences within groups than between them. However a major impediment to the EAL inclusion enterprise in schools has been the persistence of the view

of human differences from the perspective of the dominant culture. This has 'perpetuated a belief that human differences are predictive of difficulties in learning' (Kaur, 2012, 490) instead of being seen as 'a normal variation in the human condition' (Florian & Rouse, 2009). If differences are viewed as normal rather than exceptional, extending what is 'generally available' reduces the need to provide support that is 'different from' or 'additional to' that which is otherwise available (Florian and Rouse, 2009). Individual differences can then be considered a central concept of human development, a part of the human condition rather than a mark of deficiency. This approach espouses a socio-cultural view of learning where teachers take responsibility for teaching *all* children, and where 'specialist interventions are called upon to assist the teacher to teach effectively instead of the teacher relinquishing his/her responsibility for hard-to-teach children' (Kaur, 2012, 490). Apple, for one, is emphatic on this point: 'Any future or current teachers who wish to take the issue of teaching in a global world seriously need to understand global realities *much* better than they often do today' (Apple, 2011, 225).

In a school community with a fast-changing demographic this is a major challenge. But despite the concept of inclusion being widely contested, there is consensus that inclusion should be in the mainstream (Ainscow and Sandill, 2010). The basic premise is that all children, regardless of ability or additional needs, have a right to be educated alongside their peers in their local school (UNESCO, 2020).There are, however, issues with regard to the capacity of this interpretation of the inclusion principle to support a socially just notion of inclusive practice.

- **Mainstreaming as inclusive practice**

The consensus on mainstreaming 'allows policy makers and teachers to make the claim that equality of access to educational provision has been achieved' (Mohan et al., 2001, 161). This effectively removes the need to commit curriculum space and resources explicitly to address the specific language, learning and wider needs of EAL pupils. Where access is all that is required to achieve an inclusive education for EAL pupils, there is no compulsion for mainstream curricula or practices to change to accommodate the new demographic. Where equity is defined as equality of access, integration into mainstream classes is generally supported by additional language classes where EAL pupils are extracted from their mainstream class. The assimilative orientation implies that EAL pupils require specialist support in order to be included, and this can strengthen subject teachers' view of pupils with additional needs as outside the "norm". It allows teachers and policy makers to apply the crude mathematical formula: Equity [E] is achieved when you add Additional Resources [AR] to the EAL pupil, thus E=AR+EAL (Allan, 2010, 203). By focusing on the identity of the disadvantaged group *as a separate group* rather than re-evaluating inclusion for all for a wider demographic, extracted language provision becomes a response to the needs of the EAL pupil *in order that* s/he can fit into the mainstream.

So it is important to clarify whether inclusion means having access to the opportunities provided by the school, or having membership of the social and learning groups within the school. If inclusion remains at the organisational level of the school, it can both replicate and reinforce the isolating and

excluding forces of a wider society where differently identified groups can remain separate and disadvantaged. On the other hand, if inclusion is to be on the level of the lived daily environment of the classroom, it is then incumbent on teachers to be much more critical in examining what constitutes an inclusive environment.

In the Scottish educational context, recognition of linguistic and cultural difference is quite thin, limited to conditions of universal hospitality, rather than to a more expanded definition that 'there is a duty to act towards all human beings with truth, respect and beneficence with strictly limited moral significance of political boundaries', (Brown, 1998, in Boucher and Kelly, 1998). This requires examining what content is embedded in the curriculum, and what knowledge is extracted from it. Apple suggests how this might be done: 'Having a much more detailed sense of and sensibility toward the complexities of the regions from which students come, and the political and cultural movements and struggles there, would be absolutely essential in creating curricular and teaching practices that are culturally relevant' (Apple, 2011, 224).

Such a change of direction would require investment in professional development, teacher training and classroom support. However provision for additional needs has become particularly vulnerable to economic constraints (Scottish Parliament, 2019), and recent policy decisions have led to the reduction or withdrawal of specialist support. HMIE noted "it is no longer only the responsibility of specialist staff to support the wide range of learning needs of children and young people. This support is now regarded as being

everyone's job" (HMIE, 2007, 4). It is several years since this report, and colleagues do not consider their skills set to have developed sufficiently to accommodate additional needs (Allan, 2010, 202).

While mainstreaming is widely seen as the answer to inclusion, overall there has been inadequate resourcing to support its implementation, and 'little progress has been made despite it having become the policy orthodoxy' (Riddell, 2009, 283).

Fraser, however, does not accept Honneth's view that recognition encompasses issues of redistribution. While redistribution and recognition are imbricated, it is not clear that redistribution can be subsumed into the notion of recognition because each can impact the other. While redistribution can be considered redistributional recognition, that is, a particular form of recognition, recognition can equally be considered recognitive redistribution. It is more helpful in the case of EAL pupils who experience both to consider each separately, as redistribution can affect recognition as well as be affected by it. Something caused by misrecognition is likely to need a different solution to something caused by maldistribution. For this reason, the next section separately considers issues of redistribution.

2.2 Working with Difference

A more helpful approach to mainstreaming might be considered to be about the process rather than the product, about 'the agency of practitioners in constructing policy at the local level' (Wright, 2010, 160), and thus focusing on what works. This understanding requires that practitioners do 'not just

recognise difference but also value, work and deal with such differences' (Wright, 2010, 160). However, this approach takes for granted that policy makers and practitioners share the same notion of inclusion. It does not take account of the different understandings of policy and practice, of the role of the state and of individual practitioners, that stem from different, competing 'social fields' with different 'logics of practice' (Scholten et al., 2017, 298). The practice in schools is different to, and at times in conflict with, the practice of policy (Shusterman, 1999). Due to practitioners' position at the intersection between policy and practice, and thus their commitment to both fields, the conflict can emerge in their beliefs and actions as two competing theories of action: theories in use, which are implicit in what we do as practitioners, and espoused theories, those that we use to describe and justify our actions to others (Wright, 2010, 160). The effectiveness of teachers' practice depends on the congruity of these two mental maps. Such congruity can best be achieved by replacing a top-down, populist approach with more democratic decision-making.

The Scottish curriculum provides an example of democratic decision-making in the development of its 'Curriculum for Excellence' from age 3 to 18. A ten year consultation period, from 2002 to 2012, involved all the principle stakeholders with active contribution by teachers, and resulted in a curriculum based on capacities and outcomes, a notion resonant of Sen's capabiltities approach, where capabilities are potential functionings. Sen describes a person's capability set as their opportunities to achieve well-being, defined as a life that one has reason to value (Sen, 1992), while functionings are the

realisation of these capabilities. But despite this large-scale democratic exercise that is consonant with Sen's justice approach, issues remain concerning the gap between the ideal and the practice (OECD, 2021).

- **Inclusion as parity**

Resolving the dilemmas of diversity and inclusivity is arguably the biggest challenge facing today's teachers, and can be framed by asking 'how can schools be made to work effectively and equitably for *all* learners in ever more diverse classrooms?' (Kaur, 2012, 485). The assumption here is that EAL pupils' needs are embraced by the common currency of inclusion. Where the currency is capacities and outcomes, there is space between capacities and outcomes where the influence of other social and political factors on achievement is recognised. This allows consideration of the role of other forces in enabling capacities to become outcomes, and recognises that the actualisation of capacities depends also on social and educational conditions and contexts. However the unit of justice is firmly at the level of the individual, inferring that actions should be judged by their effects on individual human beings and that individuals are the primary objects of moral concern (Robeyns, 2006).

However the focus of the approach on needs which are interpreted at the local level has the potential to weaken the case for more widely recognised rights. Riddell (Riddell, 2009, 11) claims that 'one of the greatest barriers to systemic change … is the continued adherence to a discourse of individual needs, determined by professionals, with little development of a rights

discourse'. The approach can be criticised for not taking enough account of social power and social constraints (Norwich, 2014). For example, budget constraints, rapid reform and responses to international comparisons of attainment are undermining efforts to promote a social inclusion agenda and actively contributing to inequalities (Allan, 2010, 202). Illustrating these concerns are recent reforms which have prioritised accountability and performability and reduced targeted support. By not taking account of these factors there can be an over-emphasis on individual agency, and under-emphasis on the immense power of structural forces which reproduce a range of social inequalities. This means that the impact of an approach which focuses on the individual can be, in Riddell's words, 'on a scale which does not seriously undermine the general tendency of education to reproduce, rather than undermine, existing inequalities' (Riddell, 2009, 294). Hence, it can compromise the ability of practitioners to respond to the challenges of including EAL young people in mainstream classes.

Such difficulties with the 'transformation from ideal into practice' (Haug, n.d., in Allan, 2010, 201) are widespread in Europe. They are further intensified by the proposal that provision for EAL pupils should be partly dependent on their capacity to 'maintain their own cultural forms and cultural space' (Rutter, 2006, 12). While the freedom to choose one's individual identity is an important element of inclusion, it is also important to acknowledge the complementary roles that both chosen and given identities play in developing well-being. A weak conception of collective identity can fail to support the range of individual identities that this freedom to choose permits, causing

teachers to be ambivalent about 'whether it is possible for schools to be fully embracing…of pupils from diverse backgrounds' (Rhamie et al., 2012, 188), and to question whether inclusion is possible (Foley et al., 2013, 203; Allan, 2010, 200-201).

Nonetheless, the focus on individual agency in recent decades has prompted the notion that identity is not a concept that is fixed, and this has enabled recognition of EAL young people's 'multiple, differing and changing identities' (Rhamie et al., 2012, 174). This view of identity as flexible allows EAL pupils to be much less constrained by conflict between the values of their original and adopted nationality.

But it is important not to overemphasise the malleability of identity. The notion that identity can be flexible is challenged by others, for example Friedman, who claims that identity is founded on 'an enduring matrix of sensibilities flowing from primary socialization' (Friedman, 2016, 130). This suggests that identity is much less flexible than Rhamie proposes. It highlights the importance of primary socialisation in establishing identity. It challenges the assumption that the sense of belonging which is framed by the school experience is experienced in the same way by different pupils. It suggests that change can be traumatic for EAL pupils, particularly if the destination constitutes a different set of social and cultural values, covers large distances, is rapid, and is on a downward economic trajectory. Taking account of the formative nature of primary socialisation, adaptation to change can only be partial, making cultural and personal ties to the new social environment uncertain, and disrupting the formative process of socialisation. By

recognising that the process can 'produce a painfully fragmented self, (Friedman 2016, 132), teachers can act to mitigate its impact.

In addition to working to minimise the impact of change on EAL pupils, teachers need also to be aware that issues with coherence between their identity and their new environment can lead to uneasy social and cultural relationships. A school experience which is embedded in the dominant culture can lead to bias, such that 'those burdened with negative stereotypes are especially likely to be seen as having limited ability' (Steele, 1999, 47). Steele notes the implications of such an assumption: 'groups not stereotyped in this way don't experience this extra intimidation. And it is a serious intimidation, implying as it does that they may not belong in walks of life where the tested abilities are important' (Steele, 1999, 47). The new norms may not only fail to include EAL pupils in the collective identity, but can also constrain EAL pupils' freedom to make choices, and thus impact their capacity to identify opportunities that they have reason to value.

But learning to manage the threat presented by new norms can promote resilience to the stress of change. While this is particularly important for EAL pupils, 'the concept of resilience is very relevant for educationalists of all children who are experiencing great change in the settings they live in' (Rutter, 2006, 42). Acknowledging that 'notions of resilience draw on ecological models of children's development' (Rutter, 2006, 39), Rutter presents the concept of a relationship web, a notion which can help schools reconstruct the anchors at the centre of the web: for example, establish new friendships and re-establish language links. By adopting a more ecological

approach to EAL pupils' needs, teachers can mitigate against the formation of adapted preferences by their ethnically different pupils, whose choices can reflect perceived reality rather than their capacity to enhance well-being.

Notions such as Rutter's offer a way of redressing the balance between responding to both individual needs and an inclusive environment, and of enhancing the current pedagogical relationship between teachers and their EAL pupils which can be characterised, according to Cummins (Cummins, 2015) as 'benign neglect'. Teachers who adopt 'a benign neglect orientation to students' languages and cultures tend to pay little attention to the linguistic and cultural resources that students and communities bring into the classroom' (Cummins, 2015, 459). Apple points out that the alternative approach is a propensity for educators to alleviate the negative perception with 'an almost missionary sense that pervades teachers' perspectives on global immigrants: they are passive, less intelligent and need to be saved' (Apple, 2011, 227). Without a way of moderating these extreme responses, the influence of these norms on the pedagogical relationship between teacher and pupil can compromise EAL pupils' capacity to participate in education as a process that enhances agency and well-being.

In its capacity to address 'the all-too-general stereotypes' (Apple, 2011, 223) that teachers and teacher educators have about their EAL pupils, Fraser's notion of parity of participation has the capacity to address issues of misrecognition and maldistribution that reinforce such stereotypes.

But practitioners' capacity to identify misrecognition and maldistribution is partly contingent on them recognising the innateness of 'tribalistic' tendencies (Greene, 2015, 61), that is, the ways in which we divide the world into Us and Them. As pupils 'form their understanding of their world and their identities at least in part through the knowledges and narratives available to them in the curriculum' (Thomson, 1999, 11 in Walker, 2006, 178), the process of inclusion can be perceived as the imposition primarily of dominant modes of expression and ways of seeing the world (Bohman in Shusterman, 1999, 137).

Linguistic cues are no longer 'reliable markers of group membership' (Greene, 2015, 54-55), but a linguistically and culturally diverse school community may not be sufficient for the wider socio-cultural inclusion of EAL pupils in a curriculum where EAL pupils' needs are interpreted by others. Teachers, who have day-to-day responsibility for interpreting their needs, need to be aware that the dispositions that develop from the process of socialisation are not just internalised norms or rules. Rather than regulate what one does, they define who one is. It is a process where 'the rules of the game are, quite literally, *incorporated* (sic), made into a second nature' (Butler, 1999, 116). That EAL pupils have little choice but to submit to this process makes the practice of teaching one of the fundamental agencies of the maintenance of social order (James, 2015, 101).

- **Practitioners and parity**

If teacher expectation is to be aligned with a socially just education, it is critical to examine the knowledge that frames their expectations and drives their actions. It is therefore important to examine how their actions manifest in recognition of EAL needs and aptitudes, and redistribution of the resources required to respond to these. Apple goes as far as to claim that 'superficial knowledge (of the context of EAL pupils' lives) may not be much better than no knowledge at all' (Apple, 2011, 223). The question then is how teachers and teacher educators provide the conditions in which their EAL pupils can thrive.

If teachers are to challenge unjust norms, they need to be able 'to identify disadvantage, marginalisation and exclusion' among EAL pupils (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007, 5), and the parents and communities of EAL pupils need to be recognised as 'powerfully resilient and creative,---constantly struggling to assist their children to have a better life' (Apple, 2011, 227). To this end, Apple calls for teacher educators to have 'an enlarged sense of our intellectual and political responsibilities' (Apple, 2011, 229). In order to respond to the changing classroom demographic, they need to create 'curricular and teaching practices that are culturally relevant, and, moreover, educationally legitimate (Apple, 2011, 229).

This, however, is not a simple, short-term goal. Both the knowledge and the action required to enable equity in terms of recognition and redistribution require evolution rather than revolution. Across a range of studies a significant finding has been that changing teachers' perspectives on diverse others is a long and labour-intensive process and that 'a lot depends on the attitudes and

understandings and the existing moral commitments the prospective teachers bring into their teacher education programs' (Kaur, 2012, 5). It is important to acknowledge, too, that this process does not inevitably lead to action. What is also required is support to act on these perspectives, as teachers can 'evince self-awareness and openness to diversity without challenging unfair practices and assumptions of meritocracy' (Horenczyk and Tatar, 2002, 443 in Kaur, 2012, 488).

However there are few guidelines that demonstrate how teachers should engage with linguistic diversity (Cummins, 2015, 459). EAL pupils are typically viewed in problem-oriented ways, and home languages are typically seen as largely irrelevant to the process of becoming proficient in English. As Cummins (2015) notes, 'this implicit devaluation of diverse cultures and languages within the school reflects the status and power relations within wider society, where knowledge of languages and cultures other than those considered 'equal', is not highly valued' (Cummins, 2015, 459). In this way, teachers reproduce rather than challenge the bias in wider society.

- **School as cultural transformer**

Interventions purporting to change teachers' beliefs about diversity might be more effective if they 'aimed at changing the school's approach from one of cultural transmitter to one of cultural mediator and ultimately to one of cultural transformer' (Horenczyk, 2002, 433 in Kaur, 2012,488). A holistic approach, in its capacity to minimise the risk of the unforeseen consequences of intervention, requires consideration of multiple measures which can contribute

to producing a coherent course of action. Three such arguments for creating transformative conditions, with potential to work together, are recognition of the hallmarks of inclusive practice, a triangular whole school approach, and an intercultural perspective.

The first defines what teaching for social justice in diverse classrooms looks like in terms of acknowledging difference. Sleeter's four hallmarks offer a useful framework, advocating explicitly recognising and working with pupils' culture, content and examples from more than one cultural group, structured dialoguing across differences, and being prepared to act collaboratively (Sleeter, 2013, 6).

Secondly, these pedagogical elements can be placed within a triangular whole school approach that promotes inclusiveness, such as that proposed by Liu (Liu et al., 2017), which promotes language development, social integration and educational achievement. Underpinning this approach are the core values of social inclusion as mainstreaming and equal opportunities as needs-based targeted support, where pupils 'are placed at the centre of the teaching and learning process and individuals' needs are valued and accommodated' (Mohan et al., 2001, 5).

The third approach, proposed by Cummins (Cummins, 2015), addresses obstacles to a socially just curriculum by focusing on challenging unequal power relations. It is an intercultural approach, which views education on a continuum from societal through educational to interpersonal, and can present teachers with 'considerable power to resist and challenge coercive power

relations operating at both educational (eg curriculum content) and interpersonal (eg classroom interactions) dimensions of the continuum' (Cummins, 2015, 455). It promotes 'knowledge, understanding and respect for diverse cultural traditions and beliefs, to the extent that these traditions and beliefs are consistent with social justice and human rights, as operationally defined in documents such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, n.d.). It takes seriously generally accepted pedagogical notions such as teaching the whole child and connecting curriculum to students' background knowledge, but acknowledges that there is active debate in societies around the world about the extent to which particular cultural practices are consistent with human rights and merit protection under the law' (Cummins, 2015, 456).

In proposing ways to create the transformative conditions for inclusion, these approaches offer ways to promote human flourishing. That 'the central purpose of education is to promote human flourishing' (Brighouse, 2006, 42 in Smith, 2018, 13), is a widely held view among contemporary philosophers of education. It places emphasis on the role of schools in helping shape the next generation of socially and morally responsible citizens. But it also positions education as an unambiguous good. This claim is contentious, as well-being can be diminished as well as enhanced through education: 'our experiences of formal education… affect how we navigate our futures', and the most impactful of these experiences is 'whether or not all students are equally valued and respected' (Walker and Unterhalter, 2010, 11).

The capacity of schools to construct inclusive values which actualise the potential of EAL pupils shape their capacity to become citizens. Ensuring that they are equally valued and respected is therefore crucial to the social justice claims of education. Values go beyond minimising the exclusion of the individual, to supporting an inclusive environment to which the individual contributes. In this sense, it addresses not only issues of distributive justice, but also of contributive justice (Sandel, 2022, 197). An environment in which EAL pupils are not just recognised but in which there are expectations of contribution allows not just that some of its members are tolerated, but that all of its members are indispensable. To examine how practitioners' values foster contributive justice, two issues are key: how practitioners' values support EAL pupils' needs, and how these values map onto a conception of wider moral values.

2.3 Inclusive Values

While recognition of needs and redistribution of resources offer a curricular basis for EAL inclusion, neither is sufficient to resolve the dilemmas of practice which wrestle with provision for both individual needs and an inclusive environment. The work of participative parity to widen the scope of who should belong simultaneously weakens the bonds of belonging. Recognition can indeed include a sense of recognising sameness, but does not build duty to one another, what we owe one another. Duty to one another is diluted. And this weakens the sense in which EAL pupils are a constituent part of the school community, not simply as recipients but also as contributors. This requires a wider debate about the value basis of education,

a debate that Tikly suggests is 'often reduced to a technical or top-down element of policy making'. Such a debate about the ethical basis of education is more than simply an ideal. It is 'about the central importance of the moral dimension in schooling ' (Tikly, 2011, 18).

- **The role of values**

Placing the moral dimension centrally infers that there is a widely agreed value system that underpins education. Values are the criteria by which people agree to behave. To determine our capacity to agree these criteria, and to determine their claim to be socially just, it is helpful to examine the innate drivers that guide our choices.

One view is that a system of values is determined by costs (Dawkins, 2017), where what is valued is the minimum cost with the maximum benefit. In pursuit of this goal, what is of most value for people is cooperation, as those who cooperate turn out to be those who are likely to prosper. But people do not cooperate indiscriminately. Cooperation is built on 'swift identification, and punishment of defection', in other words 'suspicious trust' (Dawkins, 2017, 58), which can provide the basis for moral behaviour. In this sense, it can be concluded that our capacity for moral values is innate. But there remains the question of the universality of moral values. Dawkins suggests that it would be 'tidy' if different cultures the world over shared the same idea of natural justice. But he asserts that 'there are some disconcerting differences , and that at least in detail our sense of natural justice is flexible and variable' (Dawkins, 2017, 55-56). This brings into question whether there is any

common ground for defining inclusion in terms of values which can be defended both from the perspective of individual need and of inclusion for all.

- **Us and them**

If we can assume that a capacity for cooperation, and therefore for a values system, can transcend cultural, ethnic and linguistic differences, it appears that this is *only with some people.* Morality enables cooperation, but only *cooperation within groups,* not *between groups* (Greene, 2015, 23).

Crucially it is the perception of the 'group' in terms of its size and composition that is key, suggesting that there is potential for reimagining groups, and thus the criteria for inclusion. But our capacity to do so is compromised by the fast 'rule of thumb' processing of *us* and *them* identification, which can lead to the formation of biases (Greene, 2015). Such biases are evident in our use of the texts we adopt to establish a moral framework, where we have always chosen which parts to obey and which to ignore (Dawkins, 2017, 64). A shift to liberal values of equity and choice in Scotland and other developed countries has attempted to correct the text-influenced biases which perpetuate inequalities, but it has also eroded faith in text-defined traditional moral frameworks. By discarding the texts as metanarratives, it has become almost impossible to justify any particular idea of the good, which can guide educational values.

While it can be said that current education policy, modelled on a vision that foregrounds choice, geographic mobility and higher education (Goodhart, 2017), has loosened the tyranny of the texts and tackled inequalities, 'the pluralism of society, the different values and viewpoints …create …huge

difficulties' (Waghid and Smeyers, 2010, 197). The moral pluralism that emerges from this process can be valued for its own sake, from the perspective that it is good to explore different ways of being human, and good for individuals to determine their own way in the world. But diversity is not an unquestioned good. It has failed to recognise that society is not simply a collection of individuals who happen to live in the same place. As a result, values that can foster a sense of belonging have become side-lined. The rhetoric of pluralism and choice has contributed to underestimating the contribution of a sense of community and a shared moral code to the well-being of EAL pupils. The importance of their contribution to well-being requires that we reassess assumptions of pluralism which undermine them.

Firstly, the assumption that demographic and moral diversity are the same thing needs to be challenged (Haidt et al., 2003, 33). While demographic diversity is largely considered to enhance well-being, moral diversity can be said to be a lack of consensus on moral norms and values (Haidt, 2006, 178) that creates anomie, rootlessness and anxiety. Minimising these effects requires that 'everyone who cares about education should remember that the motto of e pluribus, unum (from many, one) has two parts. 'The celebration of *pluribus* should be balanced by policies that strengthen the *unum'* (Haidt, 2006, 178). What is certain is that at least some mutually shared idea of the good is needed to provide the framework 'for the decisions about content and method that are required in educational contexts' (Waghid and Smeyers, 2010, 198), and that it has moral significance for all those affected. As such, it

can provide a measure of what **should** happen against which to judge what **does** happen in an increasingly diverse school context.

Where, traditionally, educational values which have done so have been tied up in our national values, the inclusion of EAL young people, who generally experience a more fluid notion of nationhood, requires a different set of values. Rather than widening the basis for a moral code by expanding the diversity of values, this suggests that contesting values where they are found wanting, 'throwing off the tyranny of the texts' (Dawkins, 2017, 64), may be a better approach. But this should not be done lightly, as texts allow us to make collective meaning of the world. They offer a dimension of meaning that allows us to be part of something larger than ourselves. As Haidt notes, 'the loss of a language of virtue, grounded in a particular tradition, makes it difficult for us to find meaning, coherence and purpose in life' (Haidt, 2006, 167). Critically, our distancing from traditional texts that guide our moral direction cannot be countered by conjuring up or imposing new texts. They need to grow from the roots of current trends and directions. In this way, 'a moral system that can resolve disagreements between groups with different moral ideals' (Greene, 2015, 26) can help resolve the dilemmas that underlie EAL pedagogy.

- **An inclusive morality**

Thus, there is a need for a new kind of morality, which extends beyond national borders and religious doctrine, and at the same time encompasses a range of individual rights and needs. It raises the question of whose morality

is to be promoted in schools. What is clear is that, while neither national identity nor pluralism is sufficient, each does offer distinct, if partial, solutions to the dilemmas of EAL inclusion.

What is less clear is how they can work together as a framework for inclusive practice. Where morality is bound up with strong cultural attachments to national identities, the hegemonic culture ends up defining morality for the "others". This has particular implications for the teachers of EAL children, whose primary attachment can be to a different cultural identity. Nussbaum suggests that the implications are serious, as "the denial of our attachments leaves life empty of meaning for most of us" (Nussbaum,2008, 80 in Papastephanou, 2013, 168). Nussbaum proposes that positioning EAL pupils' heritage firmly within the scope of what counts as morality is "a more achievable goal and might lead to greater fairness, justice, equity and quality." (Foskett and Maringe, 2010, 32).

Yet the question is not just who is represented by the moral code, but also the parity of their participation, specifically the equality of the opportunity to build social capital. Social capital is built through a sense of trust, cooperation and common interest. It seems that a strong national identity can achieve this by 'creating a template for discussion which assumes certain shared norms and common interests' (Goodhart, 2017, 111). In addition, many rights depend on national funding to enable the conditions for their exercise. But citizenship based on national identity can identify some members as needing and others as providing, some whose rights are to be enabled by others whose rights are

assumed. This understanding correlates with the deficit view of young people with EAL, and thus fails to provide a socially just basis for EAL inclusion.

It can, however, be claimed that a moral code needs to be larger than our attachments, that it 'should not be based in our local communities or our conditioned identities, but should be associated with our humanity' (Roth and Burbules, 2011, 207). The question, then, is 'not whether a particular form of difference is valuable as such, rather it is whether a particular form of difference ought to be regarded as of such moral significance as to justify its protection' (Thatcher, 2015; Brown, 1998, in Boucher and Kelly, 1998, 112).

There are two ways to consider the question. One is that teachers need to be cognisant that, while "customs and mores may differ from locality to locality, the requirements of morality are the same always and everywhere" (Boucher and Kelly, 1998, 108). From this perspective of a universal morality, privileging the dominant view cannot be sustained morally.

On the other hand, a more moderated globalist approach does not mean that societal members' obligations to one another cannot be qualitatively different from those they have to everyone else. That is, 'national citizens should be ahead of non-citizens in the queue for public goods' (Goodhart 2017). In this view, while the moral equality of all humans is accepted, this does not mean that we have the same obligations to all humans. Such moral particularism can be defended as certainly being 'not inferior to a universalist view where love of all humanity dilutes obligations to individual others to the point that they fail to make a difference' (Goodhart, 2017, 109).

Nussbaum attempts to resolve the dilemma of whose morality should guide inclusive practice by proposing that the principles of a socially just, inclusive education are consistent with three main characteristics that she associates with education. The first is critical thinking or 'the examined life', the second is the ideal of the world citizen, and third is the development of the narrative imagination (Nussbaum, 2006). Where the first is at the level of the individual, the second implies a universal capacity for morality, and the third can establish a local, context-dependent, school-based metanarrative. While linking the three capabilities, Nussbaum presents critical thinking in particular as a way for young citizens to create an inclusive story. Critical thinking is, therefore, 'particularly crucial for good citizenship in a society that needs to come to grips with the presence of people who differ by ethnicity, caste and religion' (Nussbaum, 2006, 387-388). The reach of this model goes beyond school when one considers that throughout their education, while at a crucial age, young people form habits of mind that will be with them all through their lives (Papastephanou, 2013).

In presenting this model, Nussbaum makes the case for understanding the 'other', and thus for tolerance, as a consequence of a shared humanity. In her view, 'we will only have a chance at an adequate dialogue across cultural boundaries if young citizens know how to engage in dialogue and deliberation in the first place. It allows (young people) to see themselves not simply as citizens of some local region or group, but also, and above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern' (Nussbaum, 2006, 389). However, by placing the ties of recognition and

concern for all humanity in general above others in particular, she engages in a notion of moral generalism, which dilutes the notion of inclusion and belonging, and stops short of engaging with the dilemmas that beset the practice of inclusion. She does not address the need to work with the differences that make understanding difficult between groups, and the shared needs and interests that bind groups, at the lived level of communal life.

Nussbaum advocates that an adequate education for living in a pluralistic democracy must be a multicultural education, as 'there is no easier source of disdain and neglect than ignorance and the sense of the inevitable naturalness of one's own way' (Nussbaum, 2006, 390). For Nussbaum, inclusion will inevitably follow the acquisition of knowledge and understanding of others. But this can only be part of the solution, if living in a pluralistic society is to mean more than tolerance of other cultures. If society, and its reflection in schools, is to be truly inclusive, tolerance of other cultures is not enough. It appears, then, that without an overarching moral code neither tolerance nor shared experiences and interests are enough to 'promote interaction and a common in-group identity' (Goodhart, 2017, 133).

In conclusion, it seems that the dilemmas of EAL inclusion cannot be resolved through an ethnocentric approach nor through a multicultural model, nor through an appeal to our common interests and experiences alone. While each of the discourses of recognition, redistribution and values have helped shape inclusive practice, each is limited in its capacity to respond to the dilemmas of EAL inclusion. In the case of redistribution, underpinned by a rights agenda, EAL pupils are protected against exclusion, but are subject to a

deficit interpretation of inclusion requiring specialist help, which mainstream teachers do not consider they can provide. On the other hand, recognition emphasises individual agency but underestimates the influence of structural forces on teachers' practice. In both cases there is little consideration of the role of collective identity. The values discourse places the moral dimension of education centrally, but in practice the values basis of education is weakened through the erosion of the old text-based frameworks and a failure to establish a values system suitable for the new demographic.

There is, therefore, a need to establish a conception of inclusive practice that can more effectively support teachers to include EAL young people in their mainstream classes. The framework presented in the next chapter offers a means of examining how teachers can provide for both the requirement that EAL young people have parity of participation and the requirement that the values system goes beyond co-existence to support interdependence, by interrogating how inclusion defines, is defined by, and can be redefined through practitioners' opinions, attitudes and actions.

Chapter 3: Conceptualising Inclusive Practice

Given the potentially conflicting notions that define inclusion, it can be concluded that there is no one ideological position that can represent inclusion. Inclusion needs to respond to *both* individual needs which have the potential to be exclusive *and* an inclusive environment which has the potential to deny needs. But where provision for individual needs has come to be recognised as the basis for western educational endeavours, efforts to build an inclusive environment have diminished as the diversity of pupils has increased. The inclusive response is typically tolerance, a position of non-aggression, not active inclusion. A different approach to difference is needed for a diverse society, which can respond to both increasingly diverse needs and an extended notion of belonging. A conceptual framework for examining inclusive practice needs to be able to negotiate between these two divergent notions. It needs to be able to negotiate the policy-practice gap, guide inclusive practice, and offer a socially just vision of inclusion.

3.1 Framing EAL inclusion

An inclusive school is defined by Unicef as a 'childseeking school' that 'actively seeks out all eligible children for enrolment' (UNCRC, 2009, 9). The child-centred principle, arguably the most important principle of inclusion, is described as making the interests of the child central to all decision-making in education (UNCRC, 2009, 12; Scottish Government, 2021).Thus, the appropriate parameters for the framing of inclusion are child-centred.

- **Needs and rights**

In schools with diverse populations, recognition of individual rights has provided the tool to identify the increasingly diverse needs of young people, but the question of which rights has become problematic. As the diversity of needs has increased, there has been a reduced focus on collective needs. The atomistic or "ontologically individualistic'' (Robeyns, 2003, 65; Robeyns, 2006) view of learners implicit in the rights-based approach means that rights which are applicable to some can be in conflict with the rights of others (Tikly, 2011, 6). For example, redistribution of limited educational resources can compromise the rights of some in order to equalise opportunities for others.

A more just redistribution of limited resources requires that different groups within a society recognise their interconnectedness. But rights, by working to reduce the distinction between national citizens and outsiders in order to promote global citizenship, can undermine this interconnectedness, and at the same time the national solidarity on which most rights continue to rely for their enactment. It can be said that once rights 'move beyond minimum standards, they run up against the reality of quite sharp national value differences' (Goodhart, 2017, 113). While rights can require EAL young people's difference to be recognised, what they share with others is unclear. Support for global citizenship cannot be at the expense of a sense of belonging, as most people still want meaningful communities. While Fraser (2005) proposes that fair distribution of resources and mutual respect offers a basis for bridging the divisions in the rights approach, it is less clear how it resolves this dilemma.

- **Redistribution and recognition**

Fraser's two conceptual tools, redistribution and recognition correlate with the two conflicting notions of EAL inclusive practice, namely meeting individual needs (distribution) and promoting inclusion (recognition), acknowledging both as important educational values (Norwich, 2002, 494). Redistribution relates to the notion of a more socially just assignment of existing resources and provision of additional resources in order to meet individual needs, and moves away from one-size-fits-all provision. Recognition on the other hand is an acknowledgement of the range of human difference, as opposed to an understanding of difference as Us and Them. Where the two concepts were originally proposed as tools to examine issues of class and race, the concepts can usefully be applied to examine EAL inclusion issues in terms of the redistribution of resources and the recognition of difference.

Redistribution of resources for EAL young people is currently directed towards language acquisition, on the basis that it offers a just distribution of educational resources. Recognition of difference refers to a school and classroom environment where ethnic differences are respected, on the basis that this provision offers recognitional justice. Together they can frame an examination of curricular and teaching and learning processes for a diverse population.

However the dilemmas of distribution and recognition that are exposed by the ethnicity of young people with EAL indicate that they are unlikely to resolve EAL inclusion issues on their own. In the case of redistribution, the logic of the remedy is to redistribute resources so that EAL pupils no longer exist as a

group. In the case of recognition, on the contrary, it is to valorise the differences that make EAL pupils an exclusive group. For practitioners the tensions lie in efforts to both redistribute resources to provide access for EAL pupils to the mainstream curriculum, and to recognise a wider range of perspectives by widening the curriculum. These tensions correlate with Fraser's assertion that 'the politics of redistribution and recognition are fundamentally contradictory, the former seeking to remove differences between groups, and the latter seeking to celebrate them' (Fraser, 1997). Fraser refers to redistribution and recognition as 'a bivalent mode of collectivity with both a political-economic face and a cultural-valuational face' (Fraser, 1997). Both can have negative outcomes, and thus are remedies that can generate further injustices.

In the case of redistribution, the acquisition of the dominant language is generally perceived as essential as a means of enabling communication and interaction. But linguistic proficiency is not enough to achieve inclusion, as both Freire and Bourdieu, among others, argue. For Freire (Freire, 1970), while linguistic proficiency is necessary, it is not sufficient for ethnic minority children, who regularly suffer economic marginalisation. For Bourdieu, linguistic proficiency itself is problematic, as access to economic gains is automatically enhanced or restricted by having the right sort of linguistic proficiency (Bourdieu and Thompson, 1991, 55). Thus, while language provision can be a means of extending opportunity in the education and labour market, it may not by itself solve wider issues of maldistribution which affect EAL pupils and their families.

Others, like Honneth, have attempted to resolve this issue by maintaining that recognition is the fundamental concept of justice and can encompass redistribution (Honneth and Farrell, 1997). Honneth's concept of recognition is one of plural recognition, which comprises care, rights and esteem recognition. These for Honneth encompass issues of distribution. On the other hand, Fraser insists that redistributional justice cannot be achieved solely through recognition (J McArthur, 2021). Individual recognition, applicable to all human beings equally, leads to a dilution of recognition rather than a tool that can be applied in practical contexts. It thus fails to address group claims of maldistribution, and cannot, alone, address the collective issues of specific groups such as young people with EAL. Conceptualising parity as both recognition and redistribution, on the other hand, allows issues which can otherwise be invisible to be addressed. Equally, rather than assuming that all maldistribution is a form of misrecognition, it allows for bi-directional influences, acknowledging the potential for maldistribution to give rise to misrecognition.

While Fraser's dual notion of parity resolves this problem, it raises other issues. Valuing the diversity of languages and cultures by recognising the exclusiveness of EAL pupils as a group is problematic. Placing EAL pupils together as a group in order to resolve justice issues can create further injustices because the needs of EAL pupils from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds can themselves be incompatible.

Even the needs of EAL pupils from the same background struggle to be coherent. Languages and their cultures are not unchanged by displacement.

Diverse languages, and the diverse cultures they represent, are given coherence and meaning by being situated within their own geo-socio-political space. However their coherence and meaning are disrupted when the languages and cultures are displaced. They become qualitatively different. They no longer structure communication and interaction between citizens.

In addition, recognition of difference as a group can create less rather than more cohesion, and undermine the justice requirements of other pupils. For example, Keddie's (2012) application of Fraser's conceptual tools focuses on recognition of the curricular and assessment needs of EAL pupils. However Keddie looks only at remedies to barriers for EAL pupils and not at the impact of these remedies on other pupils. For example, adjusting the pace and content of the curriculum to meet the justice claims of EAL pupils can be inappropriate for non-EAL pupils.

In attempting to use recognition and redistribution to dismantle linguistic and cultural injustices, the potential for other injustices may be ignored. Neither recognition nor redistribution alone cannot be presumed just. While they have the potential to enrich, each also has the potential to fragment. There is then a need to balance concerns with redistribution with those of recognition.

- **Representation as a means of changing the frame**

Fraser proposes that a social justice approach, which can resolve the tension between the redistributive and recognitional elements of inclusive practice, needs to include all social actors. This requirement allows for redistributive and recognitional change not only to redress areas of disadvantage for EAL

pupils, but also to consider the impact on all pupils. It recognises that changes that positively impact one disadvantaged group have the potential to negatively impact others. What counts as 'a just ordering of social relations within a society' is that 'all citizens gain access to the resources and respect they need in order to be able to participate on a par with others' (Fraser, 2009, 19).

By extending the reach of redistribution and recognition to all citizens, Fraser's approach touches on a point of particular salience for EAL pupils and their families. The definition of 'citizenship' has become problematic. It is no longer beyond dispute who should be counted as citizens. But Fraser proposes that 'above and beyond questions of …how much redistribution is required according to what principle, and what kinds of differences merit public recognition and how', there is now a meta-level question: 'what is the proper frame to consider … who are the relevant subjects entitled to a just distribution or reciprocal recognition' (Fraser, 2009, 18). For Fraser, 'rather than what is owed to community members, arguments now are about who should count as a member and which is the relevant community' (Fraser, 2009, 18).

The all-affected principle coincided until recently with the national principle, but interpreting inclusion from this perspective is no longer possible 'as one's chances to live a good life do not depend wholly on the internal political constitution of the (nation) in which one resides' (Fraser, 2009, 26). In Fraser's view, the all-affected principle now needs to be applied 'directly to the framing of justice without going through the detour of (nationality)' (Fraser,

2009, 26). This implies that it is not only a matter of reconfiguring the principle of who is included, but also the process of how the frame is set. By acknowledging that some structural causes of injustice are not national-territorial, because they are insulated from the reach of national-territorial justice, Fraser's categorisation of them as 'not the space of places but the space of flows' (Fraser, 2009, 25) offers a means of examining the representation of young people with EAL in schools. Schools are national institutions (the space of places), whose EAL pupils are nonetheless affected by trans-national influences (the space of flows). Deciding the 'who' of representation, sets the frame for deciding the 'how' of recognition and the 'what' of distribution. These three dimensions constitute parity of participation, an approach which offers a framework to consider three analytically distinct dimensions of inclusive practice: the political (representative), the cultural (recognitive) and the socio-economic (redistributive).

Parity of participation takes account of the interpersonal character of inclusion by stating that 'what turns a collection of people into fellow subjects of justice is not geographical proximity, but their co-imbrication in a common structural or institutional framework' (Fraser, 2009, 26). It is a radical-democratic interpretation of the principle of equal moral worth, where 'justice requires social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers' (Fraser, 2009, 26) in the social life of the school. Where the hierarchical structure of the education system can work against the capacity of teachers to represent their EAL pupils, parity of participation offers a tool for examining the capacity of practitioners for democratic decision–making in matters of pedagogy.

Thus, justice as participatory parity has an inherent reflexivity. It can problematise both substance and procedure. It can expose both unjust background conditions and undemocratic procedures (Fraser, 2005, 87). As such it can provide a framework for examining the justice claims of EAL inclusion policy and practice.

3.2 An interpretive approach

Using parity of participation as a framework allows a critique of the parity of EAL pupils. However, to fully address the questions posed by the study, an approach is required that acknowledges the ideological impurity inherent in EAL inclusion. A dilemmatic position is key to establishing a vision for inclusion which takes account of its conflicting features.

- **Contextualising inclusion**

Acknowledging that there is no ideological purity in EAL education, as single value positions undermine other important values, a dilemmatic stance calls for acknowledgement of these potentially conflicting perspectives and how they act on all those affected. In this regard, Norwich proposes that 'the most inclusive conceptual approach is to talk about education where common rights and fairness are inherent and explicit in the general concept. 'What is good about education is good for all irrespective of social background or individual characteristics' (Norwich, 2002, 494). The dilemmatic stance offers an approach to examining inclusive practice that is inherently able to accommodate the dilemma of responding to needs and building an inclusive environment.

Practitioners, at the interface between those who frame inclusion policy and the young people it is intended to shape, are tasked with synthesising the two sides of the dilemma. Their beliefs, which are framed by their interpretation of policy, and their attitudes, which frame their actioned responses, inform their role as both interpreters and executors of inclusive practice. Their views thus offer a unique insight into how the concept of EAL inclusion can be actualised.

In order to access this knowledge, the norms, values and experiences of those who mediate between policy input and practice output are examined. While western approaches to knowledge generally emphasise forms of reasoning that are objective and capable of being broken down into discreet steps, the dichotomous, objective account of knowledge does not in itself offer a method of accessing this knowledge. Instead, this study acknowledges that, in complex arrangements like inclusion, 'knowledge is also an experiential affair which can be achieved and honed through practice rather than reason alone' (Baggini, 2018, 20).

In seeking to explore practitioners' norms, values and experiences, the study is based within an epistemologically interpretivist framework (Grix, 2004), which positions schools within a wider social context, and takes account of the lived experiences of teachers. This contextual approach to making meaning of teacher's experiences calls for a qualitative methodology.

- **The inside perspective**

A frequent criticism of the qualitative enquiry is its lack of objectivity. However, Tuffour points out that 'the uniqueness of the qualitative enquiry is its

experiential understanding of the complex interrelationships among phenomena and its direct interpretation of events' (Tuffour, 2017, 2). The emphasis is not on revealing universal statements about EAL inclusion through identifying cause-and-effect relationships, but on establishing patterns through identifying the complex interactions of factors. This approach avoids "essentialising", that is, claiming that there are unique and homogeneous essences that EAL pupils share and that inclusion should respond to. It is much more about nuance and weight, about what aspects of EAL inclusion are emphasised, enhanced and preserved as central to the inclusion of all young people. Therefore the emphasis is on 'seeking to explore the patterns of relationships' (Tuffour, 2017, 2) between teachers' interpretation of the concept and its practical implementation. The emic nature of the study seeks 'to understand the inside perspectives of the participants from the participants themselves' (Tuffour, 2017, 2). While the study explores the properties shared by secondary teachers of EAL young people, the emphasis is not idiographic. Rather it uses their individual perspectives to generate the properties that characterise EAL inclusive practice. This approach can both enhance understanding of inclusive practice through a range of individual perspectives, and identify shared properties of the phenomenon.

There is a danger that the interpretive approach can become 'hermetically sealed from the world outside the participants' theatre of activity' through its 'relative neglect of the power of external, structural, forces to shape behaviour and events' (Cohen et al., 2011, 21). However, in this study, it is acknowledged that in their role as practitioners teachers are not wholly

agential. While the social structure of inclusion can be seen as a consequence of the ways in which we perceive social relations, as Cohen and Mannion suggest, it is more than this (Cohen et al., 2011, 21). The role of practitioner has rules, which are bound in a discourse that has the power to impose its definition of inclusive practice on teachers. To understand these rules and thus have a fuller understanding of the phenomenon, a pragmatic approach to the collection and analysis of data is taken, which can provide a more comprehensive perspective of teachers' interpretation of policy, their response to EAL pupils' needs, and their conception of inclusion for all.

To this end, the study emphasises situated practice as a key dimension in understanding the phenomenon. The approach recognises that, rather than being mere 'recipients' of policy, practitioners mediate and adapt policy messages relative to their situated experience and the "goodness of fit" between the policy and their own concerns.

Thus, the study does not seek to identify general laws, but to propose, through the lens of individual perspectives of a common experience, the representative properties of a socially just concept of EAL inclusion and EAL inclusive practice.

To examine the individual perspectives of participants' norms, beliefs, and experiences, inclusion is considered a phenomenon which both shapes and is shaped by its environment. In this way meaning is contextualised, by the role of the individual teacher, by the school environment, and by wider society.

- **The interpretivist stance**

To make sense of such meaning, this study employs an interpretivist approach (Grix, 2004). This approach calls for the adoption of a phenomenological methodology in the hermeneutic tradition (Cohen et al., 2011, 291), 'suitable when a detailed in-depth view of a phenomenon is needed to explore a complex process and to illuminate the multifaceted nature of human experience' (Tuffour, 2017, 2). The hermeneutic tradition in phenomenology proposes that human experience is inter-related and inter-connected, and therefore 'we are embedded in the world of languages and social relationships…one is thrown into a world of people and objects, language and culture, and cannot be meaningfully detached from it' (Tuffour, 2017, 3). In the study of individuals' lived experience of the world, it is particularly useful for exploring the interaction between reality, beliefs and experiences (Liu et al., 2017, 389). Examining experiences as they are lived allows 'new meanings and appreciations … to inform, or even re-orient, how we understand complex phenomena… involved in learning, behaviour, and communication' (Neubauer et al., 2019, 92). Specifically, it proposes that 'individuals are free to make choices but their freedom is not absolute - it is circumscribed by the specific conditions of their daily lives' (Neubauer et al., 2019, 92), their 'lifeworld' (Gadamer, 2013). The term 'lifeworld' refers to the notion that individuals' realities are invariably influenced by the world in which they live. An individual's conscious experience of a phenomenon 'is not separate from the world, nor from the individual's personal history. Consciousness is, instead, a formation of historically lived experiences including a person's individual history and the culture in which he/she was raised' (Neubauer et al., 2019, 95). The focus on the relationship between an

individual and his/her lifeworld allows EAL inclusion to be positioned within a wider social context that takes account of teachers' lived experiences.

There is, however, a double hermeneutic, where teachers' interpretation of events is then interpreted by the researcher, and this requires that the researcher be explicit about the factors influencing that interpretation. In this study, an important factor is the common elements in the worldview of both participants and researcher, which include the theory and literature that underpin the shared notion of inclusion, and the Scottish policy and practice context. Due to sharing the cultural and theoretical influences of the participants as a former practitioner, but not having taught in any of the participating schools, the researcher in this study, as former secondary mainstream teacher, was able to adopt an inside-outsider position. The benefits of this position were threefold: the common background allowed the understanding of the practical and theoretical aspects of inclusive practice to be assumed, thus reducing interruptions to the flow of discussion that the need for explanation would otherwise demand; the shared experience of mainstream teaching reduced the risk of misinterpretation of meaning, thus increasing confidence in talking freely; the 'outside' role of the researcher reduced the fear of a negative response where views might differ from policy impacting on the participant's career, thus helping ensure that the views expressed were authentic.

However, there are two criticisms of the first person interpretive approach which need to be addressed. The first is that hermeneutic, contextual analysis does not explore the conditions that trigger experiences – past events,

histories or the socio-cultural domain. This criticism can be applied to methods which focus on exploring single cases, and establishing from these a hierarchy of themes, such as interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). But in this study a reflexive thematic analysis is instead used to analyse the interview data. Its compatibility with the phenomenological research model, together with its flexibility with regard to theoretical considerations, and its focus on how the parts contribute to the whole, make it more responsive to contextual considerations (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

The second criticism is that the approach produces data that can be criticised as subjective and therefore not generalisable. This presupposes both that a third person approach is not subjective, and that only generalisable knowledge is legitimate. However, the phenomenological perspective proposes that the third person approach is less objective than is presumed, as the selection and presentation of data is always subject to first person interpretation. The third person approach can make sense only as a human activity whose structure is fundamentally in the first person. The phenomenological perspective proposes that there is no entirely objective stance, as the presentation of all data is to some extent subjective. This implies that, by accounting for the subjective influences, data from an explicitly relativist perspective can claim to be relevant to comparable contexts.

In addition to these considerations, the study further consolidates its claim to relevance by examining the influence of key texts that shape EAL inclusion discourse on teachers' views. By acknowledging that EAL inclusive practice is

discursively shaped and enacted (Dunne, 2009), teachers' experiences are placed within the Scottish inclusion discourse, which is illustrative of inclusion discourses elsewhere in the developed world. Examining the influence of the texts on teachers' interpretation of inclusive practice can shed light on the capacity of the discourse to respond to the dilemma of individual needs and inclusion for all, and thus to enhance well-being. Critical analysis, in its capacity to identify how and why discourses prevent, limit and facilitate human well-being and flourishing (Fairclough, 2010), offers a means of examining the discourses which frame the interpretation of, and practice of inclusion, and the conception of a socially just inclusive practice, and therefore of contributing to answering the key questions of the study.

All discourse can be said to be shaped by language (Dunne, 2009). As inclusion discourse is mainly encased in text, it can be assumed to be linguistically analysable. Textually oriented critical discourse analysis offers a method of connecting aspects of language use in the key texts with teachers' practices themselves (Fairclough, 2010). Fairclough's approach allows an assessment of what should be, what might be and what actually is, and can thus highlight the gap between the claim to be socially just and the practice. Hence, analysis of the texts can highlight the relationships between policy makers who provide the texts and practitioners who use them. Textually oriented discourse analysis allows a focus on the structuring of relations between policy makers and practitioners (Fairclough, 2010), and as such is an appropriate method for examining the relationship between inclusion policy and practice.

The relativist underpinnings of the phenomenological approach, where knowledge is assumed to be constructed, has potential to be in conflict with the realist position of the critical theoretical approach of discourse analysis. Despite this, each produces data which identify key issues in the dilemma of inclusion. While a critique of the texts reveals the influences on teachers, teachers' views are not shaped by the texts alone. It is shaped by the work teachers do in interpreting the texts. A critique of the texts is appropriate in allowing the intention of the texts to emerge. Equally, to understand teachers' interpretation, adaptation, and application of that knowledge, and its contribution to their opinions and beliefs, is to acknowledge that their views are not solely derived from policy texts, but are shaped by a complex range of factors which teachers use to interpret the inclusion phenomenon and inform their practice.

Teachers' agency and practice may be constrained by powerful forces. But by identifying and engaging with these forces, teachers are not just influenced by, but can also influence them. It points to the potential for a symbiotic relationship between critical analysis and hermeneutic interpretation, which can engage with both sides of the dilemma. While a critical analysis of the texts can reveal the power imbalance that misrecognises needs and causes issues of maldistribution, the interpretive approach can reveal the space for, and creative possibilities of shared enterprise.

The data from the critical discourse analysis of the three key texts thus contribute to the data from the thematic analysis of participants' interviews.

The synthesis of the two data sources provides a rounder picture of inclusive practice and allows a more robust analysis of the dilemmas it presents.

3.3 Research tools

Accordingly, to answer the research question, an interpretive phenomenological approach to data selection, collection and analysis provided the means to access teachers' beliefs, attitudes and opinions, and a critical discourse analysis examined the influence of the texts, as described below. The hermeneutic approach to the analysis of dialogue between researcher and interviewees presupposes a willingness to extend horizons, while the critical approach to the textual discourse analysis provides a method of taking account of the power differential between teachers and policy makers.

- **Selection of data sources**

Focus: The data are contained within a Scottish context (Cohen et al., 2011, 291), which was selected for two reasons. First, Scotland is illustrative of other western education systems in its experience of EAL inclusion (Liu et al., 2017, 390). While it is recognised that education systems are required to respond to specific conditions and challenges, global influences on western education systems, for example human rights (UNICEF, 2014), curriculum (Leung et al., 2014) and assessment (Scottish government, 2016c), suggest that western European democracies and Anglophone countries share similar issues of transformation from the ideal to the practical in the field of EAL inclusion (Haug, n.d. in Allan, 2010, 201). In noting the gap between broad

educational goals and educational practice, Mohan and Leung contend that 'the general features of this discrepancy are rather similar, not only in England, Australia and Canada… but also in the USA…and suggest that EAL in these English-speaking countries is grappling with major policy and practice issues' (Mohan et al., 2001, 3). The Scottish perspective, while sharing these features, offers a small scale context where teachers from most of the 32 local authorities (Scottish Government, 2019a) contribute interview data. These data were obtained from 25 of the 32 local authorities.

The second reason for selecting a Scottish perspective is that the Scottish education system claims to base its curriculum and pedagogy on a justice-oriented notion of capacities. As it was implemented more than a decade ago, and became the model for the curricula in several countries (OECD, 2021), the issues it raises are potentially relevant to these contexts undergoing their own implementation process, and offers a means of examining aspects of transforming the ideal into practice through the lens of Fraser's theory.

In terms of the relative salience of EAL needs, the percentage of secondary school pupils from ethnic minority backgrounds in Scottish schools is currently between 6 and 12%, which is representative of the UK as a whole (9.5%) (European Commission, 2018). In addition, the Scottish perspective allows an exploration of inclusive practice in a context where there is a wide range of needs (Scottish Government, 2018c), and thus of the role of EAL within the complex interrelationship of needs. The convergence of representativeness,

pedagogical underpinnings and range of needs in the Scottish system point to it being a uniquely appropriate context for the study of EAL inclusive practice.

Participant selection: In view of the epistemological position that data are contained within the perspective of those at the interface between policy and practice, data are offered by practitioners in mainstream schools involved in teaching adolescent EAL pupils. The significance of adolescence, as a transition period where young people develop independence characterized by significant physical, psychological, and social transitions, makes it 'a period that requires special attention and protection' (UNICEF, 2011, 12). Young people 'venture beyond their families to form powerful connections with peers. They search for ways to stand out and belong, to find their place in society and make a difference in their world' (UNICEF, n.d.-a). Responding to the needs of EAL adolescents is therefore key to effective EAL inclusion.

In recognising the role of teachers as key stakeholders in negotiating the implementation gap between national policy and classroom practice, the teachers' voice is made prominent. Specifically, the study draws on data emerging from interviews of Scottish secondary school teachers of young people aged 11 to 18. The study explores 'the situated knowledges on which teachers draw in interpreting and adapting policy to their daily working practices' (Saunders, 2000, 9). This powerful knowledge (Saunders, 2000, 7) is expressed as opinions, attitudes and experience, and is a helpful notion in examining the dissonances between what policy statements intend as descriptions of desired practice and the situated experience of policy recipients.

The participants were located in 30 secondary schools across the country, from the north-east to the south-west. Participant schools have average to high numbers of EAL pupils, and approximate the national ratio of non-denominational to Catholic schools (5:1). In addition, schools were selected from both urban and some rural areas, to reflect the demographic of Scottish secondary schools and the current demographic of migrant families who traditionally find work both in urban areas and in agricultural communities. In all other respects the schools are alike, being mixed comprehensives with a socially mixed intake and roughly average attainment.

In order to ensure a representative range of views, interviews were conducted with teachers at the extreme ends and in the middle of their teaching career: Principle Teachers (PT) as the heads of subject departments (10), experienced teachers with more than three years of teaching experience (10), and Newly Qualified Teachers (NQT) who are in their first year of teaching (10). All participants were trained in Scotland, employed by their local authority which allocates schools non-selectively except at PT level, and all follow the national curriculum. Subjects taught included Sciences, Social Subjects, Languages, English, Maths, Philosophy, Business Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Home Economics.

Participants were identified by purposive sampling. The sample was based on ensuring a range of experience, subject and type of school, in and around each of the four major cities in Scotland. These factors prompted the initial selection of eight Principle Teachers from a range of subjects, who have had experience of teaching EAL pupils (Groenewald, 2004, 45), across the range

of school denomination and geographical location. In order to expand the sample, additional participants were recruited using snowball sampling. Initial participants were asked to recommend experienced teachers and NQTs, based in the same local authority area, who they had verified were willing to participate. From these recommendations, participants were selected whose teaching experience and subject expertise expanded the initial sample, and whose school denomination and geographical location matched the ratio requirements of the study. The final sample comprised 30 participants.

Text selection: The second source of data was three texts which define EAL inclusive practice in the Scottish context. These texts were selected because their intention is to influence teachers' views on how EAL inclusion should be implemented, how it should be enacted, and how it should be conceived. As such, they offer data which contribute to answering the key questions in the study. The first text presents the guidelines for inclusion in Scotland. The text offers a means of examining the relationship between the intentions of inclusion policy and practitioners' interpretation of the policy. The second text presents guidelines for responding to the additional needs of EAL pupils, and offers a means of examining the coherence of policy and practitioner views with regard to practice. The third text presents the 'Getting it right for every child' concept which guides provision for the well-being of all young people in Scottish schools, and thus presents the policy conception of inclusive practice, allowing an examination of how it engages with teachers' own conception of inclusion. Thus, the analysis of the texts seeks to 'uncover the interests at work in EAL inclusive policy and practice, interrogate the

legitimacy of those interests, and identify the extent to which they are legitimate in their service of equality and democracy' (Cohen et al., 2011, 31).

Ethical considerations: To ensure the research met ethical standards, information was supplied to participants regarding the purpose of the research, procedures of the interview process, the risks and benefits of taking part, the voluntary nature of participation, and the procedures used to protect confidentiality (Groenewald, 2004). A specific informed consent agreement was developed, covering all the above areas. The BERA ethical guidelines were followed at all times.

Attention was also given before, during, and after the interviews to 'ethics in practice' (Warin, 2011), in particular in issues of gaining consent, providing a positive experience which participants considered worthwhile, and being available for further discussion. Interviews were conducted through a reflexive process of 'interdependent awareness', with recognition of my 'relational involvement' in the discussions (Warin, 2011). This involvement prompted 'an interdependent awareness of how I, as a researcher, influenced the participants' perceptions and a simultaneous and interdependent awareness of how they influenced me' (Warin, 2011, 807). First, I declared my position as a former teacher, and thereby as an interviewer who understood the educational environment being discussed. Second, my independence of the education authority was made clear. Both helped ensure that the relationship between participant and researcher was perceived by the participant to be equal. This approach to the interview process was, as Warin advocates, 'not

only to fulfil the intentions of the study but also to ensure that (the interviews) would be experienced as positive and participatory' (Warin, 2011, 809).

- **Data collection and analysis**

Data collection: Data were collected through qualitative semi-structured interviews with the selected PTs, experienced teachers and NQTs, teaching a range of subjects. The purpose of triangulating the collection of data from three different kinds of participant was to allow the data to be validated where they yielded similar findings across the spectrum (Groenewald, 2004, 47) and at the same time to allow divergent opinions to be recognised. The range of teacher experience provided access to both accumulated knowledge and experience, and recent experience of current developments in initial teacher training programmes.

Interview questions were themed around the three research questions, and structured using the three domains of parity of participation: redistribution, recognition and representation. Interviews focused on the opinions, values and experiences of teaching staff responsible for implementing the inclusion of pupils with English as an additional language.

Taking account of both researcher and participant subjectivity, there were two assumptions in structuring the interview process. The first was that participants would feel it their duty to put forward a professional view of EAL inclusion which reflected policy requirements. Three strategies were applied to encourage participants to adopt a more personal, reflective response to the interview questions. First, the interview setting (the time and place) was

determined by the participant, and was generally, though not always, after school in the participant's own classroom. Secondly, the semi-structured nature of the questions provided a framework for the discussion while allowing space to discuss individual concerns and interests. Thirdly, the style of the interview was relaxed and informal with the researcher adopting a neutral stance of focused engagement with the participant's views.

The second assumption was that, while teachers have opportunities at school level (and sometimes at inter-school level) to discuss good practice, they have limited opportunity to discuss educational ideas, policies and strategies. This limits the impact of their expertise. The interviews offered participants an opportunity to clarify their ideas, critically examine aspects of EAL policy and engage in discussion of pedagogic responses.

The interview questions allowed reflection on the essential themes of the phenomenon while simultaneously allowing participants to develop or introduce issues that they considered important. The questions were of a phenomenological orientation, "directed to the participants' experiences, feelings, beliefs and convictions" (Groenewald, 2004, 47). The principle questions reflected key points aimed at eliciting information relevant to the research questions, while follow up questions were asked to elaborate on points made.

A criticism of this form of data collection is that the researcher cannot avoid influencing the data (Braun and Clarke, 2019). As this is true of any data collection method which is controlled by the researcher, it is important to

recognise and make transparent the researcher's influence. This researcher's subjectivity in the process of data collection is considered to have influenced the identification of the research questions, the interview method and the interview questions. It informs the interpretive stance taken both in the data collection and data analysis processes. As a former mainstream teacher, this researcher shares with participants the training, educational, social, cultural and experiential influences on their role as mediators between policy and practice. However the researcher had no direct knowledge of the schools or pupils forming the context for discussions.

A further criticism of this method is that it relies on the interviewee having the requisite communication skills to convey his/her ideas, convey the nuances of experiences, and evoke understanding in others (Tuffour, 2017, 4). That these skills form the basis of the participants' function as teachers suggests that this method is appropriate as a means of gathering data from the participant sample. The interviews lasted between 40 minutes and an hour, and were digitally recorded and fully transcribed for analysis.

Analysis of the interviews: The interpretive, hermeneutic approach was used to examine both the unique aspects of participants' accounts and the important commonalities of participants' shared experience. This social constructionist perspective accepts multiple perceptions of EAL inclusion, and the fundamental role of language and communication in establishing a shared vision.

As a result of these considerations, a thematic analysis (TA) of the interview data was conducted, which allowed patterns to be identified across the dataset. A thematic analysis, by generating patterns of meaning across the dataset, allows the analysis of a larger sample than would be appropriate for an interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) where the focus is on the uniqueness of the accounts of individual participants (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Codes were generated from the data, and then themes were developed from the codes.

Reflecting the concerns of the main question, the key questions asked of the data were: a) how according to teachers are the potentially mutually exclusive processes of responding to individual needs and building an inclusive environment reconciled, b) how does this provision correspond to the notion of participatory parity, c) to what extent does it contribute to just provision for EAL young people (Fraser, 1997; Fraser, 2009). With reference to the dimensions of Fraser's model, it seeks to understand the inside perspectives of the participants from the participants themselves (Tuffour, 2017, 2).

A thematic analysis of the participant data was applied to full transcriptions of the interviews. The process included transcribing all spoken material. Full transcripts were considered appropriate, to ensure that items of meaning were not missed in the coding process. As the analysis aimed to identify themes across interviews as well as divergent themes between individual interviews, it required an examination of content but not of form, a focus on what was said rather than how it was said.

When data collection was complete, transcripts were checked for accuracy against the recordings. Then familiarisation with the data was conducted by reading the transcripts several times, summarising and making initial observations about each data item. Units of meaning relating to the research questions were identified in the transcripts, and these initial codes were assigned identifying labels.

Coding evolved throughout the process using a flexible, organic approach. Once initial codes were generated, observations were then made about the entire dataset, resulting in a streamlining of the initial codes where codes significantly overlapped or repeated. The strength of repetition or overlap of each code was noted. Significant isolated codes were also noted. Reflections on the subjectivity of code selection were simultaneously noted, to aid the transparency of the interpretation process. These reflections centred around the influence of empathy with the participant's concerns, identification with the stance taken by the participant, and the perceived salience of data (Braun and Clarke, 2019). The data relevant to each code were then collated across all the data items.

In a phenomenological study, the use of CAQDAS programmes for the coding of text is problematic, as it does not aid interpretation of the data. As Kelle (1995, 3 in Groenewald, 2004, 51) notes, the understanding of the meaning of phenomena "cannot be computerized because it is not an algorithmic process". However, while the identification of the codes was conducted by the researcher, the CAQDAS programme NVivo was used to support the recording and organisation of the codes. Limiting the use of NVivo in this way

ensured that the selection of items of meaning was not restricted to key words, and allowed variations in participants' expressions of meaning to be identified. It also ensured that the researcher's position in the analysis was consistent with a phenomenological approach where the researcher's role in interpreting the data is transparent (Braun and Clarke, 2019), and the researcher's past experiences and knowledge are recognised as 'valuable guides to the inquiry' (Neubauer et al., 2019, 95).

Patterns of meaning (themes) were then identified in the codes, focusing on the norms, values and experiences underlying the opinions and attitudes of participants. Theme titles captured common, recurring patterns across the dataset, or salient points that are important to the understanding of the phenomenon and relevant to the research question (Braun and Clarke, 2019; Groenewald, 2004). The unique or minority views, generated by the semi-structured nature of the data collection method, allowed important counterpoints to recurring or repeated themes to be explored. The prevalent, recurring, or salient points were then clustered around the central organising concept of these latent themes, in order to express underlying ideas, patterns, and assumptions.

Themes were meaning-making, and as such were selected according to patterns of shared meaning under a uniting idea. They were not descriptive summaries of domains, which are more concerned with the diversity of opinion in relation to the topic. Thus theme development took place late in the analysis process, as it took into account all of the data pieces.

While Braun and Clarke (2019) are insistent that a reflexive thematic analysis, as a method of meaning-making, should present data according to themes derived directly from the interview data, this does not allow consideration of the discursive influences on teachers' beliefs and actions, nor does it allow consideration of the theoretical underpinnings of the teachers' role as enactors of inclusion policy. Taking into account these considerations, the theoretical concepts of parity of participation which structured the interview questions, that is, redistribution, recognition and representation, provided a priori themes around which the themes generating from the interview data were grouped.

Analysis of the Texts: In considering the discursive influences on teachers' understanding of EAL inclusion, it is important to consider the discursive events which influence inclusive practice. Participants' views are partly constructed by engaging with various discourses which inform their beliefs and values and contribute to framing their experiences of EAL inclusive practice. Analysis of teachers' views was therefore complemented by analysis of these discourses, in terms of how they influence and are influenced by teachers' interpretation of, practice of and engagement with EAL inclusion, in order to fully answer how provision engages with EAL inclusion. To this end, a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of three texts - guidelines for the curriculum as they relate to EAL (Scottish Government, 2016a), guidelines for additional needs (Scottish Government, 2020b), and guidelines for inclusive practice (Scottish Government, 2018a) – was conducted using Fairclough's three-dimensional approach (Fairclough, 2010; Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002)

connecting text, discourse practice and socio-cultural practice. In their role as guides to EAL inclusion, the texts have the power to define what EAL inclusion is and how teachers should enact it. Fairclough's approach to CDA provides a tool for uncovering the underlying ideologies in the texts, and examining the role of the texts in the reproduction of, or resistance against inequality. Fairclough's own definition of the approach is 'analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power, and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony' (Fairclough, 1995, 132-33). Thus, the approach seeks to 'uncover the interests at work in policy and practice, interrogate the legitimacy of those interests, and identify the extent to which they are legitimate in their service of equality and democracy' (Cohen et al., 2011, 31).

Each text was analysed at the three levels proposed by Fairclough: textual, discursive and social. These levels were interdependent, that is, connections were established between the findings from the textual analysis, the interpretation of the discourse, and the explanation of the socio-cultural practices. First, the textual analysis sought to establish initial patterns in the text by using Fairclough's key points of interrogation for text analysis (Fairclough, 1989, 110 -111; Janks, 1997, 335). These comprise the following:

1. lexicalisation

2. patterns of transitivity

3. the use of active and passive voice

4. the use of nominalisation

5. choices of mood

6. choices of modality or polarity

7. the thematic structure of the text

8. the information focus

9. cohesion devices

The patterns that were disclosed through the initial analysis showed that, given the focus of the selected texts on actioned themes, a subsequent systematic examination of transitivity patterns would allow underlying patterns to be identified. Halliday (1985) describes transitivity in the following way: 'a fundamental property of language is that it enables human beings to build a mental picture of reality, to make sense of their experience of what goes on around them and inside them ... Our most powerful conception of reality is that it consists of 'goings-on': of doing, happening, feeling, being. These goings on are sorted out in the semantic system of the language, and expressed through the grammar of the clause' (Halliday, 1985, 101). All verbal phrases were coded according to the six different kinds of transitivity identified by Fairclough (1995). These comprise the following: mental (perceiving), material (doing/making), relational (having a thing or characteristic), behavioural (behaving physiologically or psychologically), verbal (saying/reporting) and existential (being). As very few, or no phrases were

assigned to the last three, only data regarding the first three were included in the analysis. These data were then added to the data derived from the initial analysis, and patterns across the linguistic functions were sought.

Second, the patterns in the findings were used to identify 'a body of rules' (Hall, 2001) which gives the text the authority to guide the way teachers engage with inclusion. This body of rules constitutes a discursive practice, which is interpreted with reference to its situational context and its intertextual context. Thirdly, the analysis of the discursive practice was used to explain the socio-cultural practice of EAL inclusion, by considering the choice of discourse, the use of elements from different discourses, and how these discourses influence EAL inclusion.

The focus of each text is aligned with an element of parity of participation, and the data are presented accordingly: the data from the curriculum document identify issues of redistribution, those from the additional needs document align with issues of recognition, and those from the GIRFEC document raise issues of representation. The data for each text are presented according to Fairclough's three methods of enquiry: text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation), and social analysis (explanation). This allows the relationship between the text, inclusion discourse and inclusive practice to be examined. In this way, the textual analysis, together with the interview data, can shed light on the capacity of parity of participation to respond to the dilemmas of inclusive practice.

A mixed method approach: The discourse analysis provides both breadth and depth to the thematic analysis of interview data. It provides breadth through the complementary perspective of the linguistic analysis of the texts, and depth by means of an explanatory critique of the role of the texts in inclusive practice. This approach to critical discourse analysis, along with the thematic analysis of the interviews, allows an exploration of the consequences of the guidance in the texts for inclusion practices. Each approach, with the thematic analysis focusing on meaning-making while the critical discourse analysis focuses on social change, provides a different and complementary perspective of inclusive practice, 'seeking to elucidate, or make explicit, our understanding of human behaviours and actions' (Mayoh and Onwuegbuzie, 2015, 97), and thus sharing compatible methodological approaches.

Mayoh and Onwuegbuzie (2015, 102) note that the flexibility and adaptability of phenomenological methodology is one of its greatest strengths. This adaptability allows for two (or more) qualitative approaches with different epistemological and ontological assumptions to be considered mixed methods phenomenological research (MMPR). They also note the significant benefits to adopting this approach which can analyse data from multiple viewpoints in order to explore contradictions as well as to provide confirmations. MMPR allowed a fuller interpretation of the phenomenon through a method of meaning-making which recognised dilemmatic contradictions.

While Mayoh and Onwuegbuzie (2015, 103) note the debate surrounding the conceptualisation of mixed methods research that combine different forms of qualitative methods, MMPR reflects the pragmatism inherent in both TA and

in CDA which allows for flexibility in methodology in order to best address the issues at hand. By considering the discourses which inform teachers' understanding of EAL inclusion, CDA can contribute to the examination of participants' interpretation of, response to, and engagement with EAL inclusive practice, and can thus complement the TA in addressing all three research questions.

The themes derived from the sequential mixed-methods design of the data collection and analysis are mapped onto Fraser's three dimensions, that is, redistribution, recognition and representation, allowing inclusion to be examined from the perspective of parity of participation, according to the table below. The first column lists the themes derived from the thematic analysis, the second column from the critical discourse analysis, and the third lists the dimensions of parity of participation. The rows illustrate the connections between the themes of the TA and the CDA and the dimensions, and guide the presentation of the data in the next chapter.

Themes derived from the thematic analysis	Themes derived from the critical discourse analysis	Related dimensions of participative parity
Curriculum Mainstreaming Teacher preparedness	Redistribution for attainment (excellence) Redistribution for mainstreaming (equity)	Redistribution

Identification of needs Recognition of difference Transformative capacity of teachers	Recognition of the role of the practitioner in meeting additional needs	Recognition
Local decision making Representation of EAL needs The role of values	Representation of additional needs within the framework of the needs of all children	Representation

Figure 1: Organisation of themes

3.4 Validation

There are three aspects of the validity of the results that merit further discussion: the subjectivity of the participant and the researcher, the choice of data sources, and the size of the sample. Through the cycles of engagement with the data, a rigorous understanding of the lived experience of the participants was constructed (Neubauer et al., 2019, 97). In capturing the experience, and the meaning of the experience rather than just the opinion of it, the analysis process considered participants as educational practitioners who are trained to present information reflectively and meaningfully. For this reason it was presupposed that they could reflect meaningfully on their own knowledge and experience in a way that could explain their engagement with inclusion.

While no study of opinion and experience can be fully objective, the method applied in this study indicates that the subjectivity of both participant and researcher is a resource which can help to shed light on why EAL inclusive practice happens as it does. As Neubauer (Neubauer et al., 2019, 6) notes, 'The researcher, like the research subject, cannot be rid of his/her lifeworld. Instead, the researcher's past experiences and knowledge are valuable guides to the inquiry'. In this way the researcher's subjectivity is part of the analysis process. Rather than a threat to reliability, it can be viewed as a resource (Groenewald 2004).

The reliability of the data has been strengthened by using three data sources in the interviews: principle teachers who lead departments, experienced teachers with more than three years of teaching, and newly qualified teachers who bring new pedagogic thinking to their roles. By examining the data from these three viewpoints, the study was able to highlight the richness and complexity of the phenomenon, and give a more detailed and balanced picture of the dilemmas of EAL inclusive practice.

While the sample size of 30 is relatively small, there is a high degree of homogeneity among the participants. Two areas where the group was not homogeneous were geographically and experientially. To ensure a representative range of locations, participants were recruited from all four main Scottish cities and surrounding urban and rural areas. To ensure a representative range of experience, participants were selected in roughly equal numbers in each of three groups: new teachers, those with more than three years of experience, and those with experience of leading a subject

department. The graph below lists further variables and their impact on the study.

Variables	Validity considerations
Training	National guidelines on initial training and in-service training ensure training is common to all teachers.
Experience	Experience varies widely. Teachers were recruited with a range of experience.
Geographical location	Location varies widely. Teachers were recruited from a range of locations.
Type of school	The type of schools correspond to the ratio of faith schools to non-denominational schools.
Educational background	Entry requirements define educational standard.
Cultural background	In Scotland, the cultural background of teachers is roughly homogeneous.

Figure 2: Variables and validity considerations

The use of two complimentary methods, thematic analysis and discourse analysis, presents the findings from two different perspectives, reducing bias and strengthening the claims made of the data. While the methods have different underpinnings, weaknesses of incompatibility are minimised through

sharing linguistic, contextual and emancipatory interests, albeit with different emphases. This pragmatic approach to data collection and analysis enables a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon to be obtained.

In the next chapter the findings of both the discourse analysis and the interview analysis are presented. First, the conceptualisation of EAL inclusion in the texts and its influence on practice is presented. Then the interview themes frame the presentation of how practitioners interpret, implement and conceive inclusion.

Chapter 4: Policy Discourse and Practitioner Perspectives

Inclusion is a rather nebulous notion. Internationally it is implemented as excellence and equity (OECD, 2007), which is operationalised in the Scottish guidelines as attainment, respect for difference and social inclusion (Scottish Government, 2018b). While the ambiguity of the inclusion ideal allows some flexibility in its interpretation and implementation, each of these priorities presents dilemmas for teachers of young people with EAL.

With reference to the three policy documents which establish the priorities for inclusion and guide inclusive practice in Scotland, and to the views of participants, this chapter examines how teachers try to make sense of the dilemmas. It examines how practitioners interpret, respond to, and engage with inclusion, by investigating how they distribute resources, how they recognise difference, and how they represent the needs of their EAL pupils. These foci relate to the three pillars of participatory parity – redistribution, recognition and representation – allowing consideration of the claim of the national curriculum to promote education for social justice through inclusion (Scottish Executive, 2004) with respect to EAL young people.

First, a critical discourse analysis of the policy documents presents the policy conceptualisation, and its intended influence on teachers' practice. The data are presented in three parts, and present the intended redistributive, recognitional and representative influence of the texts on inclusive practice, that is, on a curriculum for all (Curriculum for Excellence statement) (Scottish Government, 2016a), on recognition of difference (Scottish Government, 2020b) and on EAL pupils' representation (Scottish Government, 2018a).

Then participants' understanding of 'what should be', and their perceptions of how this relates to 'what is', are presented under the headings of working with policy, negotiating dilemmas and implementing inclusion.

4.1 The power of the text

- **A curriculum for all: redistribution of curricular resources**

Text 1: Findings from the analysis of the text

The Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) Statement (Scottish Government, 2016a), which is the response to the OECD review of the inclusion curriculum (OECD, 2015), is predicated on two strands of inclusion: redistribution for excellence and redistribution for equity. Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) 'provides flexibility for schools and settings to plan learning suitable for their own context', while 'teachers and practitioners identify what will be taught… and how to best meet the needs of all learners'. In this way it identifies flexibility and agency as key to enabling the two strands. The analysis examined the claim that inclusion, as excellence and equity, is delivered flexibly, by contextualising the learning environment for all pupils, and is delivered agentially, by devolving decision-making about the content of the curriculum to individual practitioners.

Responding to the OECD report (OECD, 2015), which was critical of the bureaucratic language of CfE, the text highlights the central importance of clarity of its message. It is important, therefore, to examine the function of clarity in the text, and, specifically, how clarity is used to define a flexible and

agential approach to practice. The findings of the analysis of the linguistic functions show that the introductory section makes use of multiple superlative descriptive adjectives, for example: transforming/ greater than ever before/ very positive/ the best possible. Although the text is addressed to practitioners, these adjectives describe policy successes rather than practice achievements, suggesting that the intention of the text is to persuade rather than to clarify, and to promote trust in the addresser rather than agency of the addressee, with a view to practitioners approaching the rest of the document positively.

Where the text moves to informative descriptions of actions, the findings identified regular use of the command form, for example: use x3/ keep x2/ group/ take/ work/ plan x3. There is an assumption here of unquestioned acceptance by the addressee, suggesting the purpose of this central section of the text is indeed to clarify, but to clarify "what" rather than "why". Rather than defining the nature of flexibility and agency, this message would appear to define their parameters. The purpose of clarity in the text thus appears less to support objectivity, and more to achieve fuller compliance with the policy view. It is more about reinforcing the asymmetry between addresser and addressee than empowering practitioners to be flexible and agential.

The use of pronouns also demonstrates this asymmetry. In the first paragraph, 'we' is presented as an inclusive pronoun, referring to both policy makers and practitioners: 'we can continue to build...'. But its use then changes as the policy approach is made clear: 'we are taking action'. From here 'we' refers only to policy makers, polarising the addresser and the

addressee. The ambiguity of the pronoun appears to be aimed at establishing the support of practitioner addressees, who might not otherwise accept the conditions imposed on them. In terms of text cohesion, it suggests an unstable reference system, influenced by two conflicting ideologies, one more liberal and the other more authoritative.

In the central section of the document, the information is divided into positive and negative points, which aim to achieve clarity by using both visual cues and unambiguous language. This positive/negative polarisation is conveyed by the shape, colour and position of the positive and negative lists, as well as the modality of the verbs. The positive actions, positioned on the left, and thus placed first in the left to right reading direction, draw the reader's eye. The positive actions are further enhanced by blue highlighting (blue/green normally associated with positive action) while pink highlighting (pink/red more associated with negative action) marks the negative actions. The strong polarity of the message unambiguously identifies what should be done, in other words right and wrong practice, and thus achieves clarity. But it contrasts strongly with the message of 'flexibility' and 'empowerment' which implies that right and wrong practice is a matter for negotiation with practitioners. This duality in the message again displays a tension in the conception of inclusive practice unpacked in the text, between a more paternalistic relationship between policy makers and teachers, and a more liberal, democratic approach.

The findings from the classification of verb clauses (Fairclough, 2010) points to the first of these approaches being foregrounded in the text. All verb

clauses were assigned to three agents: policy makers, practitioners and unnamed. This last group was identified by the passive construction of clauses with no named agent. The verbs in this group were predominantly mental/ organisational (planning must focus…; discussion should highlight…; support material is contributing…) conveying ambiguity about who is responsible for the action. On the other hand, verbs assigned to practitioners were almost all material/doing verbs while verbs assigned to policy and policy makers were almost all mental/thinking verbs. The verb clauses thus point to a demarcation of role where the thinking defines the doing, where thinkers/ policy makers define practice for the doers/ practitioners. Space for flexibility and agency is restricted to the ambiguously actioned mental/organisational verbs. In summary, the clarity of the message, while resolving issues of bureaucracy, restricts, rather than promotes, flexibility and agency.

Text 1: Orienting the findings within the discourse

The ambiguity of the message lies, then, in adopting an authoritative stance while appearing to recognise teacher agency and flexibility, and is best considered with reference to its role in responding to the OECD recommendations (OECD, 2015). The purpose of the text is to respond to the two main OECD recommendations, namely for less bureaucratised practice and practice which is more focused on attainment, in particular, of those from economically challenged backgrounds. This limits the scope of the text to respond to the educational challenges of EAL young people who fall outside this remit, and limits its capacity to support practitioners to provide for EAL needs.

With regard to resolving issues of redistribution for EAL pupils, three assumptions are made. The first is that reducing bureaucracy will improve attainment. In this view, 'ensuring progression' and 'closing the attainment gap' are to be achieved by 'taking action to significantly streamline all our support guidance and materials', and this is to be done by 'taking action…about what teachers are expected to do'. The requirement to reduce bureaucracy is used to justify a single authoritative stance, restricting teacher agency.

The second assumption is that economic equity can incorporate other kinds of equity, for example equity of cultural and social capital. For EAL pupils, economic factors constitute one among other important elements, such as cultural and social equity where EAL pupils can find themselves less equal.

The third assumption is that the written guidance and materials provide all that teachers require in terms of resources to ensure progression and close the attainment gap for all their pupils, including their EAL pupils. Teachers are expected to deliver the curriculum to their EAL pupils within the parameters of economically determined attainment goals, and without recourse to additional resources. These assumptions can reduce teachers' capacity to recognise and support EAL needs.

Text 1: Positioning the findings within the wider context

It is important to acknowledge that both parties are constrained by the available discourses, and that the discourse of attainment is a powerful international force, which can co-opt local policy makers, as text producers, to

override other considerations. While the OECD review identified many positives in the curriculum, it identified that attainment relative to other OECD countries was falling. In its stance as intermediary between the OECD review and practitioners, the text restates the inclusive underpinnings of the curriculum, oriented towards 'excellence and equity for all children', as the twin goals of attainment in general, and attainment for poorer children, positioning assessment as a curricular priority. These goals are, arguably, insecurely imbricated with other agendas of flourishing and well-being. By reducing teacher agency, prioritising economic inequality above other injustices, and failing to engage with resourcing issues, they frame teachers as reproducers rather than reformers, and can hinder a just redistribution of educational resources for EAL pupils.

- **Additional needs: the practitioner's role in recognising EAL needs**

Text 2: Findings from the analysis of the text

The Additional Support for Learning Action Plan (Scottish Government, 2020b) is the response to a review of the implementation of additional support for learning (Scottish Government, 2020a). The textual analysis sought to examine how the action plan interprets and defines the recognition of difference in inclusive practice. The findings from the visual messages are presented first, followed by the findings from the linguistic data.

The visual design of the action plan presents seven headings, and 43 sub-headings, which state each recommendation, response and timescale in identical format. The presentation of the response takes into account that

additional needs stakeholders include all services for young people, and not just schools, and achieves transparency by ensuring that each recommendation is considered. On the other hand, the wide range of recommendations applied to a large number of stakeholders, along with the lack of visual markers to aid identification of relevant sections, hinders access and relevance for practitioners.

The naming conventions reinforce the perception that the applicability of the responses is obscured. Actors are frequently acronyms of groups, for example ADES, ASLIG, YAI, NIF, COSLA, SOLACE, UNCRC, GTCS, ITE, CLPL, SPR, SFR, ASL, and there is an assumption of familiarity in references to the measures, for example National Improvement Framework, Milestones to Support Learners, Supporting Learners Code of Practice, My Rights My Say, Review of Curriculum for Excellence, Doran Review, Additional Support for Learning Code of Practice, Children and Young People Board. As in the visual perception, the advantage to the number of stakeholder names and measures is that it ensures they are comprehensively included. However, the range of groups and measures can obscure the intentions of the action plan and reduce its accessibility.

The relevance of the action plan for practitioners is also limited with regard to the linguistic functions. Significant patterns across mood, the use of active and passive verbs, and transitivity point to limited recognition of additional needs issues in schools. The mood and tense of the majority of verbs is indicative future, conveying the power of the addresser, and represented stakeholders, to enact the intentions. At the same time, the verb roots are

overwhelmingly mental cognitive (thinking) rather than material (doing), placing value on the thinking processes of policy making rather than the actions of practitioners, for example, 'will develop', 'will shape', 'will recognise', 'will consider', 'will ensure', 'will explore'.

The passive verbs also display a pattern of future tense with mental cognitive roots, for example, (actions) will be aligned, (refresh) will be undertaken, (progress) will be monitored, will be included, will be established, will be provided. Here, the actors, or agents, of the passive verbs are generally not specified, which has the effect of anonymising the actions of these verbs. As the number of passive verbs is high, approximately a third, the impact of anonymisation is significant, in that the communication path between agent and addressee is less transparent. As recognition of the teacher's role in provision for additional needs is restricted to ITT, the significance of the response for educational practice is limited.

Text 2: Orienting the findings within the discourse

The action plan is the response to a review commissioned due to 'concern from schools and families about the availability and effectiveness of support for all children and young people', and focuses on 'the experience of children and young people during primary and secondary school years'. The wide focus of the action plan, where only one of the seven sections focuses on education, and here with reference only to initial teacher training, is therefore surprising.

The language of the action plan also contrasts with that of the review. The mood and tone of the presentation of evidence in the review is frequently emotive. The review makes regular use of adjectives of affect, such as 'extremely difficult', 'stressful', 'demoralising'. These qualifiers reflect the negative experiences of young people with additional support needs (ASN), and these are further reflected in the frequent use of nominalisations of affect, such as 'disappointment', 'scepticism', 'confusion', 'misunderstanding', and 'frustration'. Emotive language can diminish trust. However, here alongside objective evidence, it conveys the experiential context of ASN, the extent of the issues and the commitment to highlight areas of concern.

The unconventional tone of the review can be considered in the light of two factors. The first is the need to repeat recommendations made in an earlier review (Scottish Parliament, 2017), regarding issues of mainstreaming and resourcing, where undertakings were not fulfilled. The second is the requirement to exclude issues of mainstreaming and resourcing from the 2020 review. The action plan's restricted engagement with practitioners, its limited focus on school-based issues, and its lack of response to mainstreaming and resourcing issues suggests that its success in resolving issues of recognition of difference for EAL young people may be limited.

Text 2: Positioning the findings within the wider context

The vulnerability of the recognition of EAL needs can be understood in the light of the categorisation of the recognition of EAL difference. The principle of support that underpins the action plan is that all children require support while

some require additional support (Scottish Government, 2017). There are three types of support in the Scottish system. Support can be universal (for all children), protected (legally enforced), or targeted ('tailored to individual circumstances') (Scottish Government, 2018c). EAL is positioned as a need which requires 'targeted support'. This categorisation was intended to reflect the variable nature of EAL, where needs are dependent on several individual variables including length of time in the country and stage of education.

In the first two categories support is required to be matched to need, either by its universal or by its legal status. But in the third category there is no such recourse, as there are no criteria against which targeted support can be measured. The action plan frequently highlights recognition of additional need but without reference to categories, for example, 'further recognise, value and celebrate children and young people with additional support needs' (1:4); 'focus on all children, affording equity to those with additional support needs' (2:1); 'seek to raise the profile of children and young people with additional support needs' (3:2); 'continue to involve and value the contribution of children and young people' (3:2). As a result, the vulnerability of EAL to the availability of local resources such as time, funding and training remains unaddressed. The implication for EAL is that support can be less defined by need and more dependent on a range of local considerations.

Defining targeted support as 'usually, but not exclusively, delivered by staff with additional training and expertise' (Scottish Parliament, 2019) has two consequences. First, it allows 'additional' to be interpreted as 'optional', where, in the absence of trained staff, subject teachers are required to deliver

the targeted support without additional training or resources. Second, it assumes that the training and resources available to teachers in mainstream are sufficient to provide support. As considerations of mainstreaming were excluded from the remit of the review and the action plan, and the implications of targeted support were not considered, it can be concluded that the action plan accepts as a 'flexible response to diversity' (Scottish Parliament, 2019) the placing of EAL pupils full-time in mainstream classrooms with no additional support. This understanding of a flexible response conflicts with the results of a survey of practitioners, reported in the action plan (5:1:7), where over 50% of respondents expressed 'education for all' as their key area of need.

The ethos of Education for All holds 'meeting individual needs' as the foundation for support (Scottish Parliament, 2019). To this end, the review recommends 'including achievement measures which go beyond the current narrow parameters of attainment and qualifications' (1:2:5), and that practitioners' 'learning and development at local level must include where and how to access specialist expertise and support' (5.1.4). In the light of the findings, it remains to be seen whether the ethos can come to define, rather than be defined by, political and economic concerns, in an educational environment where assessment is prioritised regardless of its suitability for EAL pupils, and mainstreaming is implemented regardless of the availability of additional support for EAL pupils.

- **Getting it right for every child: representing EAL needs within the framework of inclusion for all**

Text 3: Findings from the analysis of the text

Alongside the Curriculum for Excellence Statement and the Additional Support Needs Action Plan, 'Getting it right for every child' (GIRFEC) principles and values (Scottish Government, 2018a) provide the third pillar that guides inclusive practice. It defines inclusion and has been a foundation for all policies for young people since 2006. Based on children's rights, it requires that all their needs be met. Specifically, it defines inclusion as something that applies to all children, and support as available for all children according to need.

Data from analysis of the linguistic functions identified four themes that are used to illustrate the GIRFEC proposition that support is 'for all children and young people because it is impossible to predict if or when they might need support'. These are 'the young person', 'wider influences', 'needs' and 'services'. These are developed by rhemes which connect the themes to notions of centrality, contextualising well-being, early intervention, and coordination by means of relational verb processes (Fairclough, 2010). The use of relational verbs, where the subject can be described in terms of the object, allows the themes to be interpreted in terms of the rhemes, for example, the theme 'is at the centre', 'is based on', 'is about', and thus allows an ideological interpretation of "inclusion for all" to be presented to practitioners.

The perception that the child should be at the centre of support decisions is widely accepted, and is supported by eight 'SHANARRI' principles of well-being (Scottish Government, 2018a) which demonstrate how well-being

should 'look'. However, despite wide acceptance of the principles, each of the rhemes present challenges for practice.

First, the central focus of the child in terms of support assumes that practitioners have the means of identifying the child's needs and the capacity to engage appropriate support. The use of the passive mood to present the active verbs, for example, 'the right support can be offered', 'needs are identified', 'the support available', reinforces this assumption.

Secondly, practitioners' capability to assess well-being is key to the centrality of the young person in educational support decisions. However, contextualising young people's needs 'in their current situation' assumes that practitioners can develop knowledge and understanding of the wider contexts of children's lives. Thirdly, a capacity for the fast identification of well-being issues is assumed. Lastly, there is an assumption of practitioners' participation in a structure that supports effective communication.

Text 3: Orienting the findings within the discourse

Thus, in the school context, teachers are required to assess well-being, develop knowledge and understanding of wider contexts, identify issues early and communicate effectively with others. Some support for practitioners in terms of developing these capabilities and skills is available for early years, for example, in a recent review (Scottish Government, 2019). However, for mainstream teachers of young people, the question of support is not addressed.

Text 3: Positioning the findings within the wider context

Thus, the rights of EAL young people, as exemplified in the GIRFEC principles, are conditional, being dependent on a range of contextual requirements. It is important to acknowledge that, in defining inclusion in terms of entitlements, the guidance stops short of determining the inclusive context in which the entitlements are valid.

The entitlements have three consequences for EAL inclusive practice. EAL young people are not required to be labelled to get support. But without a label it is much more difficult to get support. Secondly, supporting EAL children within mainstream is unnegotiable. But the capacity for supporting them is limited. Thirdly, where inclusion is something that applies to all children, the special needs of EAL children can be hidden.

The entitlements can be said to constitute a currency which confers the right not to be excluded. The purpose of inclusive support is to reject exclusion, rather than to enable inclusion. By defining support in terms of entitlements, the GIRFEC approach offers limited opportunity for considering the space between the right to be included, and the right not to be excluded, and thus stops short of understanding EAL inclusion as a process that can extend beyond legal rights.

- **Enabling and constraining mechanisms**

The guidance in the three documents examined above both enable and constrain practitioners' interpretation, practice and socially just conception of inclusion. The table below summarises the findings in terms of these mechanisms.

Enabling principles	Constraining conditions
Teacher agency is key in identifying what will be taught	Attainment goals influence what is taught
Teacher agency is key in identifying EAL pupils' needs	There is limited recognition of teachers' role in identifying needs
Teacher flexibility is key to meeting EAL needs	There is limited provision for training, resources and specialist support to develop skills
Teachers implement targeted support as required	Provision for targeted support depends on local resources
Teachers are responsible for both the learning process and outcomes	Teachers are accountable for EAL attainment outcomes but have limited agency with regard to additional support
Teachers support all children including EAL children	Specific EAL support needs are subsumed under support needs for all children
Teachers construct an inclusive environment through provision for individual needs	Recognition of and support for practitioners in constructing an inclusive environment for EAL is limited

Figure 3: Enabling and constraining mechanisms

The table demonstrates how the mechanisms correlate with two different approaches to EAL inclusion, the enabling mechanisms correlating with an ethical stance and the constraining mechanisms representing a political stance. The enabling mechanisms are largely ethical principles, while the

political concerns impose constraints. In a discourse of enablement, the constraints can be concealed, and their covert power to divert the purpose and direction of inclusion can make issues of distribution, recognition and representation difficult to address. The table demonstrates the power imbalance between policy makers who define the principles of inclusion, and practitioners tasked with their enactment, and raises issues which are further examined in the interview data below. The three components of participative parity structure the presentation of the interview data, by providing a frame to examine how practitioners work with policy, negotiate dilemmas and establish an inclusive environment, according to the table below.

Thematic analysis	Parity of participation component	Overarching principle
Curriculum Mainstreaming Teacher preparedness	Redistribution	Working with policy
Identification of needs Recognition of difference Transformative capacity of teachers	Recognition	Negotiating dilemmas
Local decision making Representation of EAL needs The role of values	Representation	Establishing an inclusive environment

Figure 4: Thematic headings

4.2 Working with policy

The interview data foregrounded several issues with regard to the redistribution of resources for EAL pupils, which centre round three themes: whether mainstreaming is the appropriate framework for responding to these needs, how the curriculum should adapt to EAL needs, and how prepared mainstream teachers are to provide for them. The data are presented below under headings reflecting these themes. Interviewees are referred to by their role: PT (principle teacher/ head of department), ET (experienced teacher) and NQT (newly qualified teacher).

- **Issues of additionality**

The view of almost all teachers regarding EAL provision was that resources required to meet EAL needs were best distributed additionally rather than in the mainstream classroom. Thus, 'EAL pupils normally need to fit with what's there' (ET), and 'what we've done, we've got extracted classes to help them with their language and any barriers' (PT). This allows the curriculum to remain relatively unchanged, while extracted classes are expected to compensate for deficient language skills and to resolve other barriers to being able to fit in. While this arrangement was generally considered appropriate for EAL pupils, there was acknowledgement by all participants that additional provision is being rapidly phased out, and subject teachers are increasingly expected to meet all of EAL pupils' needs including developing EAL pupils' language skills.

The almost unanimous response to this move from additionality towards mainstreaming was expressed most explicitly by NQTs: 'Yes, we need to

differentiate, but usually what happens is: here's two sets of work, so it's either the easier one or the hardest one. There's no… I don't think it's possible to differentiate for every single need' (NQT). Subject teachers found they could not effectively compensate for additionality, and this led them to question the practicality of differentiating according to need.

The challenge was particularly acute where the need included linguistic support: 'I think it's very poor. I think sometimes they are put into the class with no means of anyone translating. You can tell they are lost just by the looks on their faces' (PT). Few teachers were comfortable with the responsibility for developing EAL pupils' language and literacy skills, particularly of those pupils with little English. Most expressed the view that additionality, in the form of English language provision, was essential in order to access the curriculum: 'if you have a bilingual student, whose English is very poor, if they don't have a translator, it can be almost impossible to include them' (ET). For NQTs, with limited experience and with arguably fewer strategies, it compromised the benefit of their presence in class: 'what's the point in them being in class if they don't understand it. That's not necessarily going to be helpful to them or for me or for anybody else that they are working with' (NQT). One teacher's own experience as an EAL pupil supported these views : 'I think subjects where it's just talking, group work and talking in a foreign language, you just don't understand, it's mind-numbing because it's just gobbledegook' (ET). One PT noted that 'in the last count there was something like 28 or 29 different groups of young people who have English as a second language. So that's 29 different languages' (PT). The range of

languages reflected the scale of the challenge of differentiating for EAL pupils. All participants expressed an awareness of the range of EAL pupils' individual needs: 'I find it really difficult because I don't think there's a one size fits all for this' (PT). But differentiation was considered idealistic, and by some, impossible.

Despite the challenges of providing for EAL needs, the validity of the mainstreaming ideal, where EAL pupils' needs are met in the mainstream classroom, was acknowledged by participants at all three levels of experience. Teachers did think that the subject classroom was, ultimately, the best environment for EAL pupils, but were confused about how to support EAL pupils. This led most ETs and some NQTs to express confusion about what the curriculum was meant to do for EAL pupils. Some suggested, for example: 'I suppose it's are we preparing them for being adaptable, flexible, have a broad skill set, to allow them to be competitive, to access these jobs?' (ET). But most PTs, along with some ETs and a few NQTs, also raised the question of whether this was the right way to frame curricular issues: 'Education is now a business and it should never be a business, it should never be about final results only, it should be about that journey' (PT). The educational purpose of unsupported provision for EAL pupils was seen by most participants as a matter for debate.

Across the groups some teachers who had personal experience of, or direct responsibility for, EAL proposed that, alongside language acquisition, job skills development and the journey to results, the curriculum should have the capacity to foster a sense of belonging, as EAL pupils generally had to bridge

not just a linguistic but a cultural and social divide. One PT found that her experience of school leadership had caused her opinion to evolve: 'six months ago I would've said 'learn English, learn English' but I think my experience over time and dealing with a lot more EAL families is, actually, the need is to be involved in the community, and just, and not have EAL as a label on their heads to make them different' (PT). In essence, notions of additionality, mainstreaming, and a sense of belonging were considered important aspects of a curriculum that was inclusive of EAL pupils, although each held challenges for practice.

- **A fit-for-purpose curriculum**

In terms of the knowledge content of the curriculum, all participants expressed satisfaction that it was valid for all pupils in terms of whose and what knowledge counts, and therefore required no change. However, this satisfaction only applied to other subjects than participants' own, with almost all participants exempting their own subject, on the grounds that either the content or the learning strategies were intrinsically inappropriate for EAL pupils. As participants across the subjects cited reasons against the inclusion of EAL pupils in their own subject, this unwillingness may reflect participants' lack of power to effect the changes that would render their subject appropriate.

In any case, it prompted several participants across the groups to suggest a restricted curriculum for EAL pupils. With the exception of Physical Education, arguments were made against all other subjects by the subject specialists

themselves, including Music, language-based subjects such as English and Politics, and concept-dependent subjects such as Maths. For example, one ET with experience of being an EAL pupil studying Maths noted: 'because you're trying to learn maths concepts, it's impossible …I think maths is not just a common language, you're excluded out of all of it really'. This led participants to disagree on what constituted appropriate knowledge. For example, participants who were not Science teachers generally considered Science appropriate for the EAL curriculum, claiming that 'in science, because it's more based about facts, those facts are universal, it doesn't matter which country you come from' (NQT). But Science teachers themselves supported restricted access to Science on the grounds that imparting safety messages, for example, in Science was very difficult.

These arguments presented certain facts and concepts as inappropriate for EAL pupils, particularly socially constructed knowledge. While this was considered to be an element in all subjects, practitioners saw social subjects in particular as more contextual and less appropriate for EAL pupils. For example, 'they will arrive in this country where people already have some knowledge of the history of Scotland, well, they won't have any,…. even like Home Economics, whatever they are cooking in Home Economics, that's all Scottish things. I've seen the cooking books – mince and tatties and all the rest, so that's really specific to Scotland' (NQT). Thus, the perception that EAL pupils did not belong in this context prompted participants to consider the Scottish context as inappropriate for these pupils. Proposing the exclusion of EAL pupils from this knowledge may be a pragmatic response to the inability

to adapt the curriculum to meet EAL needs, but the consequence of this view can be restricted access to the curriculum for EAL pupils: 'I don't really think it (the curriculum) is shaped for them to be honest… I think they just have to come and fit in. That's a very old-fashioned and untrendy way of thinking but I don't think the reality is… you know, we're struggling to buy printer paper. The reality is they're coming in and they have to slot into the curriculum' (ET).

While the flexible nature of the curriculum allows teachers, in theory, to choose content to suit their pupils, lack of empowerment and support appeared to underlie the lack of consensus on what a curriculum for EAL pupils should look like. The absence of a shared vision for EAL education meant that participants struggled to use the notion of curricular flexibility to respond to the real practical limitations on what teachers could do. Flexibility was considered limited to curriculum delivery and not content: 'so I would say for me personally the curriculum hasn't really changed…. I think teachers have become more tolerant, and I would say accepting, and as a result you adapt your curriculum. I don't think the curriculum has changed. I think it's the way it's being taught that's maybe…encouraging, allowing…' (PT).

In the light of these criticisms, the apparent acceptance that EAL pupils simply have to integrate as best they can is more akin to resignation. However, some PTs and ETs were more openly critical: 'And the Scottish government will pay lip service to all the "oh you know we're inclusive". No you're not, you've given us exactly the same thing, you just want us to be inclusive when we are delivering it' (ET). Policy phrasing was considered to misrepresent

practitioners' capacity to build an inclusive environment, by claiming to enable such an environment without recognising the constraints it imposed.

Acknowledging the difficulties in developing an EAL-friendly curriculum, most participants proposed that inclusive practice for EAL pupils involved more than simply redistribution of resources to dismantle language barriers, and believed that breaking down cultural barriers was also important. Again, like language, this was understood by most practitioners across the groups to be best delivered through additionality, through adding to curriculum content, but, as with language, the practical obstacles of additionality were found to be overwhelming: 'with curriculum for excellence I thought it was a wonderful thing, because you can do, it's really very flexible, but …I think it would be really nice if we were given some resources, because the whole Curriculum for Excellence I don't think anyone's given us anything, and it's very, very time consuming, it takes a huge amount of time' (PT). Overwhelming demands on time were a concern for all participants: 'we don't have time to … there's too much content to cover in the curriculum…you feel pressure to squeeze all of the content from the curriculum' (NQT). The responsibility of individual teachers to add curricular content to meet individual needs in an already content-heavy curriculum presented huge pressures, and being overwhelmed generally was a theme in all the participants' responses.

Despite these criticisms of the feasibility of responding to EAL needs, there was at all levels of experience an acknowledgement of the inclusive aims of the curriculum: 'I think the curriculum when you look at it there is – you see what it's trying to be for everyone, it's trying to be as inclusive as possible. It's

hard to put into words, it has the capacity, but it is very difficult' (NQT). All the PTs who had experience of school leadership called for 'more of a national steer', to help resolve the challenges of implementation.

Perceived to be frequently at odds with inclusive practice, the national steer was considered to promote too much flexibility and too little common purpose. Participants were particularly critical that the ultimate purpose of the curriculum was considered to be attainment. The emphasis on national attainment above other aspects of inclusion was found to conflict with inclusive practice and restrict the capacity of the curriculum to respond to dilemmas: 'you cannot change all the curriculum, because at the end of the day the exam results is what the pupil needs for their job or their study or college. So there is always the same issue …there is pressure on school and society for pupils to have results. So there are some small adaptations possible, but at the end of the day, there is a specific curriculum we need to meet' (ET). In summary, the requirements of attainment were not considered to be always compatible with those of inclusion, and attainment was considered to be promoted as predominant. Thus, inclusion does not define attainment, but is defined by it. It raises the issue of whether attainment can be more inclusive.

- **Attainment or achievement**

The 'Improving Schools in Scotland' document (OED+CD, 2015,) to which the CfE Statement responds, describes educational qualifications as the gold standard of social esteem. Some ETs maintained that it was their job to

acknowledge attainment as the policy interpretation of the purpose of education, but the majority of participants did not agree that linking social esteem to attainment represented an inclusive ethos. For example: 'you know people think now if you don't go to university you're not very good. But no, I don't believe that, there's so many other routes for people.....the demographic we have, the society we're living in is very different' (ET). However, these participants did accept that the power of the attainment discourse imposed 'definitely a huge restraint on what you can do because of that, because the results of the exams are so important for pupils' future' (ET). They expressed the contradictions between inclusion and attainment, where, for example, 'whether we like it or not, and whether or not it's a politically correct thing to say, we absolutely are governed by what the young people need to know in order to pass the exams that are set and that's the first priority' (PT). The strain on the compatibility of attainment and inclusion was considered to reduce teachers' capacity to implement inclusion, 'because no matter how much, as professionals, we say that we should not be judged based on our exam results, that is the fact. The fact is that schools are judged on their exam performance' (PT).

In the view of most participants, attainment, rather than inclusion, had become the primary focus: 'you know I think it's come away from the pupils' ability and the pupils'.... just their lives. You know some of these kids here have got incredible lives that I can't imagine' (ET). Attainment with respect to point-in-time success, as opposed to distance-travelled success, was considered to present particular barriers for EAL, because the capacity of attainment to

bestow social esteem for EAL pupils could be limited. It is worth noting here that data can present EAL attainment as equal to, or better than, non-EAL attainment. However, it is equally important to note that these data can use different interpretations of EAL which can include bi-lingual young people for whom English is their first language (Strand and Hessel, 2018). In this study's definition of EAL, the imperative to raise attainment was considered to work against practitioners' efforts to make inclusion about all children, and EAL young people were considered particularly vulnerable.

As with language acquisition and curriculum development, the additionality model was problematic in minimising disadvantage in attainment. For examinations and assessments EAL pupils are entitled to extra time, a reader and a scribe. But several teachers noted that their EAL pupils frequently refused to accept the additional arrangements provided for them. Some teachers, having investigated why, reported that EAL pupils did not always find the arrangements helpful, and what they considered more important was being seen to have the same arrangements as everyone else. One teacher, a former EAL pupil herself, used her own experience to illustrate this: 'you just want to fit in, as long as there's not the expectation that you're going to perform in tests, like I didn't mind so long as I wasn't expected to perform and achieve the same results as the other kids in the class..... All I wanted was just to have a different standard of expectation' (ET). However, it is the exam arrangement which is different, while the expectation remains the same for all. Almost all participants agreed that redistribution of resources to promote a

sense of belonging was at least as valuable as redistribution for equal opportunity.

The pressure to get results has meant that a way round the difficulty of attaining for EAL young people is often sought. For example, Modern Language qualifications, meant for additional language learners, are sometimes awarded to pupils for their native language, in addition to an award for English as an additional language. Such practices are accepted as a necessary evil in the drive to raise attainment for EAL pupils: 'these things go on in all schools because, you know what, teachers do it with the best intentions because they think "if I get this kid a National 3 Literacy, then maybe it will help her get to college or something". I do get it' (PT). While well-meaning, a consequence is that some qualifications risk being devalued by the desire to make qualifications accessible for EAL pupils. Faced with prioritising attainment over belonging, teachers found pragmatic ways of correcting the imbalance, which better aligned with their belief that a sense of belonging was also important.

While all participants acknowledged that attainment had a role, achievement was considered to be more imbricated with the inclusion ideal: 'It's not just attainment, it's about recognising wider achievement. Do they go in parallel or are they polar opposite forces that work against each other? They shouldn't be opposite forces, attainment and achievement should be, you know, a marriage, they should work together' (PT). Several participants found they did not. Many participants noted that the focus on attainment drew attention from focusing on the whole child and identifying the child's strengths.

For some participants, the inclusion of EAL young people depended on how schools managed to integrate attainment with a more child-centred focus. One PT gave the example of her own school: 'a lot of schools are very focused on academic performance and that's how they measure themselves. But here there is a much broader understanding of what schooling is about: a focus on the whole child, supporting academic, social, emotional and spiritual capacities, and on 'learning to be' (PT).

The focus on the whole child was widely thought to enhance attainment, rather than diminish it, as one PT proclaimed: 'certainly in our school, our exam results are good. And that's because of teachers who go beyond, who look beyond what the curriculum is demanding, and support young people in other ways. And that support that young people receive in other ways tends to encourage them or facilitate them to respond better academically as well' (PT). Where attainment did not define inclusive practice, but was defined by it, both could be enhanced: 'The children want to be socially integrated more than anything. And once they have that and they have that sense of community and belonging, the learning will take care of itself. It truly will if they're in a happy place' (ET).

On the other hand, the relentless pressure for results was more often found to diminish the child-centred education promoted in the curriculum: 'the workload, there is a lot, a lot. Even five, six years ago …you could go and get pupils to investigate this and investigate that. However I really feel that's all changing and we're basically teaching to pass an exam quite often, trying to fit everything in as much as we can, it's a lot of pressure' (PT). PTs and ETs

were critical about the value of the attainment drive: 'these league tables I think put undue pressure for schools to say there's '*Natalia*', we need to get her in National 3 Literacy come hell or high water, with a teacher doing her very best, don't get me wrong, but really just ticking boxes' (ET). Not only was the pressure to improve results seen to reduce the capacity for child-centred provision, but the majority of PTs and ETs also considered that there was less educational value in an approach centred on high-stakes testing. The perspective of participants thus differed markedly from policy concerns, with the child-centred approach in conflict with the more powerful attainment agenda. While both approaches were acknowledged as having a role in inclusive practice, strengthening, rather than diminishing, the contribution of each depended partly on how EAL need was perceived.

4.3 Negotiating dilemmas

- **Identifying needs**

While the perspective of the school can be alien to EAL pupils, it can be invisible, in the sense of taken for granted, to teachers. Therefore, an awareness that the school's perspective is a perspective is a prerequisite for the recognition of difference that allows teachers to respond to the needs of their EAL pupils. In the view of those participants for whom English was not their first language, awareness of the challenges for EAL pupils meant more than empathy with EAL issues: 'It's really just little things and I think it's hard to know them. For people here, well it's logic, it's normal, it's always been like that, but there are so many little things that change from one country to another…' (NQT). The confusion highlighted the potential for a disconnect

between EAL pupils and their classmates and teachers, a disconnect caused not just by misrecognising the nature of the gap, but in misrecognising EAL pupils' efforts to bridge the gap: 'I don't think other teachers realise the effort required in mastering another language' (NQT).

However, all participants recognised EAL as a barrier to learning, albeit one that they felt poorly equipped to address. But lack of an explicit definition of the conditions that cause EAL to be a barrier left participants unsure how it should be approached. For some participants this was expressed as frustration about their struggle to find ways to meet EAL needs: 'She's from Brazil, so she speaks Portuguese and she speaks no English whatsoever, she doesn't have any skills, and that's very, very difficult because I've got no idea what she's understanding, I can't teach her anything, because I can't explain anything to her' (PT). Other participants recognised the difficulty from the perspective of the EAL pupil: 'he was Chinese and I was talking about Christianity in Scotland, and I'm actually thinking, not just that he can't understand what I'm saying, but the images that I'm putting up, he can't possibly have any idea what's going on here' (PT).

Despite the issues of incomprehension on both sides, for some participants, embracing an inclusive agenda meant making at times great efforts to identify and sometimes overcome barriers for EAL pupils: 'One girl was Muslim, she really wanted to go to art college - part of the requirement for art college was life drawing, drawing naked models, so her parents were absolutely dead set, that's not happening.. the teacher at the time, what she did was contact the

university and she said, would it be possible for this pupil, this is her circumstance, can she submit drawings of clothed models?'(ET).

These responses, from the frustrations and difficulties in responding to needs to the imagination and tenacity required to overcome them, point to the range of perceptions that participants had of EAL linguistic, social and cultural difference. However, these lacked the unity of a common vision, and instead generated confusion about what constituted appropriate provision, and, ultimately, for some participants, it reduced provision: 'they (EAL pupils) are not considered as Additional Support Need (ASN), but they are part of ASN… I do think EAL pupils are just ignored…are just put on the side' (NQT).

One reason for this may be that strength of "numbers" rather than the strength of the social justice claim dictates the strength of "voice" in support of EAL provision: 'it's a big barrier to learning, so yes, it probably should be recognised as an additional support need. Why is it not? Probably because they are quite a small percentage of our population' (PT). The lack of a common approach to the recognition of EAL barriers to learning, not only linguistic but also social and cultural, dissipated the resolve to respond to EAL needs.

In addition to the barriers in school, some experienced teachers suggested that issues beyond school such as cultural hierarchies between groups of EAL pupils added to the sense that they did not have enough knowledge and experience to effectively recognise barriers: 'If I said French, people wouldn't think twice about French, but Polish, oh there's loads of Polish. So I don't

know if it's a stigma outside school, I don't know' (ET). These differences between EAL groups was widely considered problematic in school, because the principle method of developing relationships between groups, which was working together in class, was not considered enough to integrate different groups: 'The Spanish speaking kids all cluster together, and the Chinese speaking kids all cluster together, it's very cliquey, like, they tend to gravitate towards kids of their language. The rest of the time, if they're put into groups, they work fine, but there is not actually a relationship that they have built' (NQT). Without an overarching identity group to which they felt they could belong, EAL pupils only identified with their own linguistic and cultural group.

On the other hand, participants were positive about native pupils' willingness to accept EAL pupils: 'I mean the other pupils are totally accepting, you know, that there's another language there, that's never an issue' (ET). However the benefits were generally appreciated unilaterally, recognising advantages only for native pupils. For example, the benefits were described as being 'a plus for the other ones, having EAL kids with them in class, it can give them the opportunity to learn about a different culture which I think is invaluable' (ET). This may have been in part due to many participants expressing less ability to feel concern for EAL pupils, for example: 'I'm pretty sure he was Syrian, although I never really found out. I never actually managed to have a conversation with him, he just used to smile at me when I asked him how he was getting on, and used to nod, and he's just not here now. I don't know where he's gone' (PT). Acceptance of difference did not generate understanding of differences.

There was a recognition, however, that the primary need of EAL pupils was not to be different. Most participants reported that this generally manifested as not wanting to accept additional support, even if it jeopardised their chances of academic success: 'they won't accept any support, they'd really rather… even me saying now you get an extra 10% time, no no I'm not taking it, they don't want to take it, which is bizarre. They don't want to be different' (PT). Several participants reported that refusing to use a dictionary helped EAL pupils to not be different: 'they want to fit in, they want to be, and I'll use the phrase, normal, they want to be like an English speaking pupil in an English speaking school, you know, so therefore they don't use a dictionary' (PT). Thus, provision to overcome some barriers could create others that were more powerful: 'the EALs I think need the social support that it's acceptable to use a dictionary,… so us trying to help places a barrier because then they feel different' (ET). Even positive difference can make them feel stigmatised: 'I think they want to ensure they are the same as everyone else. Sometimes like you know if I say who can speak another language, they are frightened to even put their hand up' (ET). In the view of some participants, to avoid the stigma of difference, EAL pupils try to confine their different identity to their home life: 'so I think that these children have two identities actually…. they have their identity in the house, they keep the traditions of their own culture alive through language and religious celebrations, whatever, and then there's school' (PT).

The separation of identities, where socially-ingrained habits and dispositions that shape perception of the social world is of primary importance at home,

but secondary in school, was considered by some participants to have a negative impact on the formation of inclusive values: 'sometimes they (EAL pupils) feel a bit reluctant to share their values because they know that it's totally different; and even their values, anything controversial, they're very reluctant to actually say what they think, and I think that then impedes on learning because they are less likely to contribute and be part of the class in discussions' (PT). The reluctance of EAL pupils to share their values suggests that equality of difference is less important for EAL young people than the inclusiveness that derives from sharing the same values. It suggests that, where the two sets of values do not imbricate, EAL pupils have to choose between being authentic and being included. While participants described the capacity for the curriculum to tolerate a widening range of values, their accounts of EAL pupils' reluctance to reveal different values from that of the school suggests an insecurity with regard to the understanding, as opposed to tolerance, of difference. It suggests that EAL pupils do not generally see themselves in the values of the school. While most participants considered it their job to reflect accepted social and cultural values, while tolerating others which were different, some, including most NQTs, proposed that this prevented schools from having a more transformational role, where different values were not only tolerated as different, but respected as part of the whole. One ET, a former pupil in a European school, used her parallel experience to illustrate the effect of mere tolerance: 'I didn't have a different colour of skin and there was no social stigma to being Scottish, whereas if you're a Turk…. I think if you came from Somalia, were Muslim, maybe looked different, dressed different, didn't speak the language, well they are going to stay in

their ghettos, aren't they' (PT). Tolerance rather than understanding of differences meant that learning that could be drawn from EAL pupils' life worlds was not generally considered relevant.

However there were two areas which many participants highlighted as of possible relevance for all pupils. One was the arguably greater resilience shown by EAL pupils: 'Because they've had to go through significant change whether it's moving homes multiple times, moving country, and setting up in new schools, so all those life experiences for me make these children much more resilient, and then knock backs don't need some kind of counselling to deal with it. I think the natural ups and downs of their lives makes them much more resilient people' (PT).

The other was some EAL pupils' different approach to learning: 'Definitely with eastern European families it's just not on, that kind of attitude (a sense of victimhood). You're here to learn, and that's where I see the differences…. I think we are missing an opportunity' (PT). While there was recognition of missed opportunities in these areas, surprisingly, it did not prompt participants to discuss how to enable these opportunities. Within the deficit model, the requirement is to identify and meet EAL needs: 'as a classroom teacher we have absolutely been told that you need to know what the needs are of every single young person who comes into your classroom, and you need to meet them' (PT). But in practice it did not require gaining benefit from their strengths. There was, nonetheless, a consensus that there could, and should, be a response to EAL needs that was more inclusive.

- **Recognising diversity**

While participants were consistently in favour of mainstream education in theory, the practice raised dilemmas that were difficult to resolve. There were two main dilemmas.

The first was linguistic. All participants were ambivalent about the means at their disposal for resolving communication problems. For example, the use of other pupils with the same language for translation purposes, although meeting the needs of one pupil, could be detrimental to the needs of the other: 'they've managed to put (an EAL pupil with the same language) in the same class as her, so I have to work through him, so he is ending up my translator, which I'm not entirely sure is fair on him' (NQT). This was a common practice which was recognised as unfair, but justified because it enabled some measure of inclusion: 'I mean I can understand why (it is done), and it's very beneficial for teachers. It is. But there is a tendency to be too reliant on that' (ET).

The alternative was using dictionaries, where they were provided: 'I've had absolutely no additional support other than a couple of Polish dictionaries in the classroom' (PT). But some participants found this so unsatisfactory that they had taken on translation tasks themselves. For example, one lesson 'was learning about alignment and measuring and margins, and I then made up a little check sheet for her where I had it in Latvian with the English next to it. I went onto Google, I got a Latvian dictionary and I learned how to do it' (ET).

With little knowledge of language acquisition, participants who took on these tasks pointed out how challenging they were: 'You have to find the diagram, then translate each individual word and copy it onto that diagram which is sometimes very difficult' (PT). This meant that, for most participants, translating was not a sustainable response to the dilemma: 'So I don't think it's people don't want to, but time is such a constraint and everything is squished to within an inch of its life' (ET). This did not apply only to issues of communication. Supporting EAL pupils in general was considered difficult: 'In terms of the support by classroom teachers, there's a very strong willingness and there's a very strong intention of support. The capacity to provide that support is very limited' (PT). Willingness to resolve issues was evident across all the groups, while the capacity to do so was not.

Commonly, across all groups, the duty to provide for EAL pupils' needs without the means to do so evoked responses of frustration, guilt and anger, which could lead to a withdrawal of goodwill: 'I have never ever had any support in my classroom for anyone with an additional language, and it is impossible, it is absolutely impossible, and you feel so sorry for these pupils' (PT). Ultimately it gave rise to a lack of care: 'All the schools, everyone's overstressed and understaffed. So, I think in an ideal world they would actually care, but they just don't have the time or the resources to facilitate their needs' (PT). Since the mainstream model is predicated on the goodwill of teachers, this response has major implications for the inclusion of EAL pupils.

The second major dilemma raised by participants was social. The importance of social inclusion for EAL pupils was identified by almost all participants. Its expression was frequently through accounts of incidents where EAL pupils' reluctance to use English was found to correlate with a lack of social interaction with native pupils. For example: 'because she didn't have any friends, I feel like she didn't try, she was really like excluded from the rest, and every time giving the excuse that I don't understand' (NQT).

But it was also recognised that the onus was on teachers as well as individual pupils. There was a widespread view that 'you have to separate them out anyway, because if you don't, then they end up just speaking Polish between themselves and thereby isolating themselves from everybody else… and that would have a negative impact on them and on everybody else in the classroom' (PT).

But, for those with direct contact with families, this did not go far enough. For these participants, wider social integration was considered the responsibility of the school, for example: 'the social integration in the community, not just in the school but the actual community itself is probably the greatest need of EAL pupils, and learning English is almost the second part of that, and … I realise now that my attitudes have changed and these children need to be socially, socially included' (PT). Compositional diversity was not seen to guarantee that pupils will have the motivation to interact with those who are different. Interactional diversity was instead necessary for pupils to engage with those who have a differing world view.

For most participants recognition of both linguistic and social needs had implications both for the wider social network and in the longer term. The influence of the school environment on building a network of relationships was acknowledged to be: 'really, really important, this is where they can have a really good interaction, you know, it's almost like being forced upon you to interact with this new culture and society and make bonds and friends and get support, and that can carry on into your life after that…I think they can become isolated or ostracised if that's not in place. I think it can have a wider impact. If the children are included then the parents feel included' (ET). Equally, for longer term opportunities school was considered to provide the best foundation: 'young people will never be supported in the real world the way they are in school' (PT).

Despite the consensus on the importance of recognising both linguistic and social needs, most participants did not think schools fully met these needs. Some participants considered it a question of quantity, that not enough was done: 'I feel like they feel very isolated and there's not really been a lot of work to help integrate them' (PT). Others considered the problem to be the quality of the integration: 'I don't think it's fully integrated, I think it's tolerant. You'll always get people that can take them under their wing and be kind and considerate to them. But again, it's left to their own common sense' (PT). While some policy initiatives here were lacking, others were criticised as ineffective. One example was a naming strategy: 'We went through a stage where every assessment had to have an Abdul in it…It was a joke because it was almost making a mockery of it, but it looked like we were being inclusive

(laughs),…. we hadn't changed anything else other than the name which then didn't actually reflect the culture of the country you know, so we had the woman going on a train and she was all of a sudden called, you know, Hamida – that was a good name that was always put in there - Hamida - Hamida wouldn't be going on a train on her own (laughs), if we were actually being truthful' (ET).

While this strategy was considered to misrecognise one aspect of difference, advice proposing that teachers should insert multiple cultural perspectives, rather than just names, into their subject resources was considered unworkable, as it had a propensity to cause confusion: 'I'm not sure if it's possible to incorporate a variety of different points of view … you're just going to confuse a lot of them' (PT).

Faced with a lack of practical policy solutions, participants were unsure how to recognise EAL needs in a way that could harness the potential of EAL inclusion: 'It should be an opportunity to develop wider cultural understanding. …. I think that would take a lot of time, I'm not entirely sure how we would go about doing that' (PT).

Others mentioned their fear of misrepresenting the ideologies of minority groups, or reluctance to increase workload, or concern that subjects would be squeezed by additional content. In the absence of structures that could respond to these issues, across all the groups, devolving the responsibility for finding solutions to individual teachers was considered to have failed to enhance inclusion.

A few participants proposed viewing inclusion differently. For example, one suggestion reduced the unwieldy notion of recognising global diversity to a more manageable notion of recognising local diversity: 'One of the things that teachers could do is simply be more aware themselves of the differences, the cultural differences in the pupils that they're teaching' (PT). Examples were offered by all participants about the way this was currently explored in schools. As curricula generally did not include the histories and cultures of new citizens, instead, schools used events to demonstrate recognition of the range of ethnicities, for example celebration days: 'We do… world languages day and we do all the different events…'; or diversity days: 'we had a diversity day, celebrating different types of diversity in the school'; or food days: 'I guess we had some things to do with ..em ..pupils bringing in and parents bringing in foods from their countries'; presentation events: 'we had pupils presenting about their differences, you know, how we celebrate holidays'; or short daily routines: 'I had word of the day in Polish so the whole class learnt the word of the day in Polish'. To recognise EAL needs was to celebrate EAL diversity, sometimes once a year, thus rendering it exceptional rather than normal.

- **Practitioner preparedness**

Through their efforts to make good the deficits of the curriculum both in the classroom and through whole school events, participants demonstrated their willingness to deliver a curriculum that reflects the diverse backgrounds of their pupils. However, most noted their limited capacity to be cognisant of other cultures: 'We're quite a secular nation, I think we're all fairly ignorant,

124

being brought up in the UK with our culture, because rightly or wrongly we're identified as a superpower across the world which is why people come to…that's why people want to come and stay in the UK, but it does develop a natural ignorance of other cultures' (NQT).

To help counteract this, most participants identified a need for developing pedagogical skills to develop their awareness of EAL needs: 'I think more training is definitely needed…so, we'll know they're an EAL pupil, and we may know what language they speak or where they're from, and that's it… she was just put in the class and then that was it. She was given no support; I was given no support…very unprepared, very, very unprepared' (PT).

Teachers tried to compensate for lack of information through informal means: 'It's usually word of mouth in the staffroom. You know, has anyone else got a boy that's from Syria, he doesn't speak any English' (PT).

This gap between the duty and the capacity to recognise difference engendered a wide range of opinions about participants' moral stance. While some participants across all groups correlated what they did with what they should do, others were candid about the mismatch between 'could' and 'should': 'If we were ranking the needs that I can kind of cater for I'd probably put bilingual pupils right at the bottom' (NQT). Other more experienced teachers had a more cynical attitude to the mismatch between 'could' and 'should': 'you're just trying to push them through an exam…and trying to do it in a different language... it's not that I'm bitter in any way!' (PT). Others were resistant, for example: 'Is it teachers' job to develop EAL pupils' wider skills?

Yes, no! Morally and ideologically yes. Practically… practically you would have to train teachers how to do that because I wouldn't know where to start…. I've got 23 years of experience and my heart would not be delighted to see an EAL pupil, with an expectation to meet their needs and not have a clue how to do it. I wouldn't feel comfortable with that at all' (ET).

More support and training were reported by all participants to be crucial, but the combined impact of moral duty and practical lack of expertise left both experienced and new teachers frustrated. ETs did not think their years of experience prepared them: 'I don't have any problem with EAL pupils being in my class, but you know… em.. I'm expected to teach anyone who is in my class, but their (EAL) needs are so deep and different from everybody else in the class and nobody has ever given me a strategy for how to deal with an EAL pupil in my class, and so, they just chuck them in and say give them differentiated work. What?!' (ET). Nor did NQTs think their recent teacher training had prepared them. All answered negatively, some forcefully, for example: 'No. No nononono. No no. No. Ummmm. No. I have thought about it and whether I could change my mind, but no' (NQT).

Several participants expressed an awareness of what this meant for EAL pupils, for example: 'you could just tell that these children had a really hard time, and you want to help them, you want to reach out to them, but there's no way to do it. They just sit in the class' (PT). There was a clearly expressed desire across all groups to respond effectively to the needs of EAL pupils. But there was also an awareness that their limited knowledge of what these needs were and what tools they could apply to meet these needs impeded their

efforts, and that the inclusive ethos did not effectively support them in representing their EAL pupils.

4.4 Implementing inclusion

- **An enabling ethos**

There were various interpretations of the ethos that underpins inclusion. Some participants described the ethos in schools as representative of universal values: 'the idea that tolerance and honesty and openness… they're in the curriculum for excellence documents as well…the idea that those are British values is just silly. Those are the values of people all over the world…' (PT). For these participants, British values were a manifestation of the values of the globally interconnected world. Therefore values that were firmly rooted in the notion of Britishness could justifiably represent EAL pupils. For others, the values that underpinned education were rooted in heritage: 'At the end of the day, we are a country that has to have its own values, I suppose, and if you come to live here, there has to be some understanding of what's here already' (ET).

Some participants, in particular teachers with personal experience of EAL, proposed that there were differences in values even between the countries of Europe. They did not consider that there was a consensus over what a culture of British values was: 'we can't sort of get a siege mentality and say well we're going to defend British culture, for a start we're not even entirely sure what that means' (PT).

With the values that underpin inclusive education unclear, some participants questioned the purpose of education for all, particularly its economic underpinning. For example: 'Do we know what we are educating pupils for? … I know the majority would say in order to learn skills, to be able to find a job, to make money, and I usually say: so that's to fulfil the western dream. House, and family, dog, a car, cottage, maybe a yacht and holidays to whatever islands we go. So, is that what we are educating for? To make money?... I don't know. I don't know. I don't know because it's so conflicting in the literature, we don't know why we are educating pupils' (NQT).

Most participants agreed that the primarily economic aims - learning skills, getting a job and making money – were insufficient. Some proposed instead that the purpose of education should be learning how to live in the present, rather than attainment for an uncertain future. One participant gave an example of such a practice from the perspective of their own school: 'it's a cultural thing, you know, it's the way that we do things. So, young people respond to that, … they kind of absorb that ethos and then they live it. So, if it's not there in the first place, then it's less likely that they're going to articulate it, and visibly live it.' This required a strong ethos with clearly articulated, structurally embedded values which could sustain all those who belonged within the structure. Most participants did not consider that their school values met this stipulation.

However, the firmly embedded values of faith (Catholic) schools were considered to promote a more explicit ethos by all participants who had taught in them. For example: 'I absolutely do think that the ethos is overt in a way

that it is not in non-denominational schools…I speak from experience because I worked in non-denominational schools and I've taught in Catholic schools. There is a distinct difference. And I'm not saying that this wouldn't happen in non-denominational schools but I think that maybe it happens to a greater extent because of the ethos in this school' (PT). In faith schools, values were structural, albeit from a primarily religious perspective. But where they overtly underpinned educational purposes, they promoted a strong school ethos.

Where the values of an inclusive ethos are less explicit, EAL needs can be overlooked: 'I think a lot of bilingual pupils are in such an unfortunate position because there is so few of them, the reason these issues aren't getting raised is because … it sounds very clichéd but they don't have a voice really, they can't really raise issues themselves' (NQT). It is not only a question of the strength of the values base, but also its breadth, that is, who is included within its frame.

- **Inclusive values**

All participants expressed support for the values-based approach to the curriculum. As such, they were supportive of the values embodied in GIRFEC, and reflected in the curriculum statement and in the ASN guidance. These were framed as being 'caring, inclusive and fair'. Most, however, did not agree with the policy interpretation of how values should be embedded in practice, as tools to raise attainment. Most participants preferred an interpretation which was less utilitarian and which supported a wider purpose for education,

for example: 'We're trying to turn these people into responsible adults, and it's not all about academic success, it's about the person as a whole, and it's about developing them as a whole', (ET).

As school values were selected democratically, they were generally within the British tradition, and less able to reflect minority views. Thus, most participants expressed a preference for minority views that matched British values, such as in this example where words like 'good' and 'succeed' were applied to one minority group but not the other: 'a lot of the Romany gypsy kids or the kids from Slovakia, if they go (to school), they can leave whenever they want, it (school) is not like a mandatory thing… the Indian, Bangladeshi kids a lot of them come from good families whose parents want them to succeed very well, so they work really hard' (NQT).

This led some participants to consider school values as legitimate only in cases where 'as far as everyone is quite similar and as long as those values are akin to your own you can be accepting of them anyway…' (PT). It concealed differences between British values and those of EAL pupils, and exaggerated the extent that British values represented those of EAL pupils, disregarding divergences even among close neighbours: 'I don't think European countries have the things in common that we want to suppose. Personally, how I travelled around, I don't see many commonalities between let's say the north and the south. There are basic structural differences in the cultural way' (NQT).

Thus, participants were divided over whether education should be about values 'that represented everyone', or about values that represented 'how we do things here'. School values were perceived either as synonymous with global values, representing a sense of the good life that is shared across cultures, or with local values, representing a contextualised interpretation of the good life. In either case school values were generally considered to be socially just. Although participants did not agree on what constituted socially just school values, they did agree on the purpose of values, that it was to underpin relationships, which were considered 'fundamental to pupils' success in the classroom and beyond the classroom as well' (ET).

In the selection of values, there was a large overlap between schools. The three most prominent values were respect, kindness and equality. There was, however, a disparity in how these values were interpreted and enacted. While most participants believed their school's values were important, there was generally one or more that they personally emphasised. Most frequently respect was considered the most important value, and was given a particular interpretation as respect towards the teacher in the form of desired behaviour. This ranged from individual behaviour, 'when discussing with a pupil who has misbehaved, we'll say you didn't respect me in the way you answered' (ET), to class behaviour: 'from my point of view I don't talk about the values overly, apart from if I'm picking up behaviour in the class, and I pick up on respect' (ET). This narrow interpretation was assumed to reflect a wider notion of respect: 'I think respect is one of the key principles across everywhere, a little bit of respect goes a million miles for me' (PT). In effect, the main purpose of

values for most teachers was in guiding pupil behaviour towards an optimal teacher-pupil relationship.

In addition to the disparities between different interpretations, the school's values were also variably embedded in teachers' practice. While some teachers knew which values represented their school, others struggled to remember some or all. Their familiarity with the values frequently reflected how recently and prominently they had been selected, suggesting that the impact of the values on the ethos and relationships in schools was variable. The significance of the values was also variable. For example, for some participants, it was individual teachers' personal values that were more important, and the school values had minimal significance: 'Well, honestly, I don't think they are very important. I think having teachers with good values teaching the kids is important. I don't think the school's values are important because I think teachers come in, they are who they are and they go home'. For others, the importance of the school values was central: 'Absolutely pivotal…. It's incumbent on members of staff to espouse the values of the school, to champion the values of our school, and our young people should champion the values of our schools as well'. What mattered for these practitioners was the espousal of values rather than their impact.

Others, however, cautioned that the main issue was the nature of the values: 'we all talk about these values, but we forget that they are taking place within a particular system' (NQT). These participants considered school values, like respect, kindness and equality, to be social values and therefore subject to change, less durable, and less able to guide inclusive practice. They stressed

instead the importance of character values such as integrity, dignity, understanding and empathy, which were considered to provide a stronger basis for inclusion.

Teachers were free to foreground the values that they found most meaningful, to interpret them from their personal perspective, and to engage much less with other values. The selection, interpretation of and engagement with school values was a matter of individual choice, and, lacking the force of a common enterprise, could undermine, weaken or distort the values base of inclusive practice.

Participants in faith schools, on the other hand, described a system of pre-ordained values which were not subject to change and which were embedded in the daily life of the school. These values were not selected in accordance with social issues or personal preference. Interestingly, most participants in faith schools reported that both those who shared the particular faith of the school, and those who did not, felt included: 'you know the majority of our kids aren't Catholic, aren't Christian. However I do think that's why a lot of parents do send their kids to a religious school because of this whole belonging' (PT). Those teaching in faith schools identified the ethos as underpinned by more durable, less temporal concerns, albeit emanating from faith, for example: 'I think that the Catholic ethos enables young people to feel more included. And that, I think, is why lots of people who have another faith, because we have quite a lot of Muslims in our school, and that's because, from casual conversation with parents, they would rather send their children to a faith school, albeit not **their** faith school, than to a non-denominational school.

Because they feel that there is just something about having a defined ethos that they feel supports their faith even though it's a different faith' (PT).

The established values which defined faith schools restricted subjective interpretations of values, and strengthened the definition and articulation of the values base of inclusive practice: 'the only difference (in a faith school) is that I would be able to articulate the values that I hold; it's not about them being chosen, it's more about the emphasis that's placed on them, and how well they are articulated; I would say having a shared value, but I don't think that value necessarily needs to be a religious value, but I think having that shared vision of what you want the school to be manifests itself easier in a religious school where that value, that shared value, is very, very clear'.

In this understanding of ethos, values are not a list to be remembered, an expression of democratic engagement, or a notion to be unpacked in lessons. They are embedded in the life of the school: 'It's just what we do. That's the culture…And the kids just accept it. They don't accept it because they're forced to accept it. It's just because why would you do anything different' (PT).

Some teachers in faith schools described the ethos as being part of a family: 'it's a Catholic school but that doesn't matter, it's all about being part of a family, and I do feel that's what makes (the school) different from a lot of other secondary schools, it's a family, we're a family, I really do feel it's inclusive, regardless of background, you know, where the pupils have come from, there's a sense of belonging at our school' (PT). Although the inclusive ethos was typically much stronger in faith schools, these participants highlighted

that it was not a question of religious faith, but of values that go beyond current social and political and religious notions of inclusion. This raises the issue of teachers' capacity to deliver a curriculum based on such values.

- **Representing individual needs in an inclusive environment**

Despite the notion of inclusion being supported by all participants, most considered inclusive practice as simply rhetoric: 'I think schools are very positive about inclusion, and I think the curriculum is very positive about inclusion. I just don't think it's actually happening in practice' (PT).

While participants from all three levels of experience voiced concerns about the implementation of inclusive measures for EAL pupils, each group had different views about their capacity to include them. Most NQTs believed their capacity to meet EAL needs was limited. For example: 'I don't have… I can't physically retain all of the information from their personal education plans, from the able plans, and the strategy sheets in my head in time for them coming to my lesson, impossible' (NQT). Several NQTs noted that not being able to retain information about additional support impacted on their ability to do their job: 'If I'm teaching 200 kids in front of me, I'm not remembering if he's come across from Syria or… I'm sorry, I know it's my job to do that as a professional, but it's…' (NQT). NQTs, who already considered themselves stretched, regarded meeting EAL needs as unreasonable: 'and then be expected to also differentiate that unit for someone who can't speak English— it's almost impossible' (NQT). These participants considered their lack of capacity to recognise EAL needs a matter of injustice: 'I don't think it is fair in

any society in any culture just to, you know, basically plonk people here, and then just say now on you go, get on with integrating' (NQT).

While NQTs' frustrations lay with the practical difficulties of EAL inclusion, more experienced participants were concerned with a lack of dialogue and deliberation about the concept of inclusion for EAL pupils, for example: 'I think it's not even been talked about. It's not even a bullet point on the agenda….' (ET).

PTs, on the other hand, accepted the moral responsibility to make EAL inclusion work: 'I mean we've got a moral responsibility to get it right for every single child that walks through our doors. We're never ever going to have full resources, there's a squeeze on resourcing at the moment. It's about making sure we try our very best' (PT).

Although the level of experience dictated the focus of concern, from practical difficulties to moral responsibility, the nature of concerns did not depend on experience. All teachers expressed a professional commitment to EAL inclusion. But for some it concerned matching their practice to an internal ideal, while for others their practice reflected an external ideal. For example, a small number of participants across all three groups matched their practice to the external requirements of policy, either teaching their subject: 'primarily at the end of the day I feel I'm here to teach drama, not learning through drama, but teaching drama as a subject' (NQT), or teaching for attainment: 'I feel my job is to deliver a curriculum and help them achieve the best result they can get' (ET). These participants did not express the same frustrations with

contradictions between policy and practice as others, but they were criticised by others for being directed by, rather than directing inclusion policy, and thereby not contributing to its direction: 'a lot of teachers need to be more engaged in terms of policy decisions, some teachers think "my responsibility begins and ends at my classroom door". It's about being actively engaged in what the whole education agenda is' (PT).

However, teachers' lack of active engagement in debates about EAL inclusive practice generally reflected a lack of opportunity rather than commitment. These were not debates that most teachers had access to: 'it's not really a debate, it's not really about what do you as teachers think about this, it's more just like this is how we're going to do this now. This is how things will be done' (NQT). Most participants were of the opinion that, while democratic processes underpinned debate between practitioners, they did not frame debate with policy makers, which was considered regrettable, 'because at the end of the day people are more likely to buy into something they've had a say in rather than something that's been put upon them' (PT). Teachers' restriction of their critique of EAL inclusion to classroom pedagogy rather than wider issues of inclusion can be understood as an adaptive preference, restricted by the limited choice available to them.

The lack of voice in the inclusion debate, in addition to confusion about what EAL inclusion meant and how it should be achieved, prompted several practitioners to make suggestions for improving inclusive practice. For example: 'So I definitely think we need to look at it a bit more. Find what worked in the past, try out some new things, support groups, making new

members of staff fit for the job of dealing with pupils with an additional language' (ET). But equally some practitioners were not hopeful that such measures would produce solutions: 'I don't think it's achievable but we need to try, we are doing our best, but I don't think we can fully include them' (NQT). Others went further, proposing that EAL inclusion required to be interpreted differently in order for it to be workable and just. Inclusion could be re-imagined, not as the opposite of exclusion, but by considering that 'there is always some kind of exclusion and how to minimise the exclusion is the issue. So, to bring it back to form a circle with the bilingual person, that person is excluded. Let's start how I reduce the exclusion; I reduce the negative to come to the positive rather than saying I need to include them and all that kind of stuff' (NQT).

In this view, the dilemma becomes a dialectic, and the issue is no longer inclusion or exclusion: 'in the sense of people with an additional language, these people can never be included 100%. So, in this way I constantly try to create a space where I can find ways to… not to include them but… but to approach them. And then they can approach me and then we can create something. Only if we create something together will inclusion, not be achieved, but we would not need to talk about it' (NQT).

One of the main obstacles to re-imagining inclusion is the nature of the context within which EAL inclusion needs to happen: 'we are saying the right things, we're trying to do the right things, but ultimately we live in a country that has a huge emphasis on generating wealth and being wealthy and not really wanting the value of people at all. So, we don't talk about the humanity

138

of families sort of struggling, we talk about how much they cost in terms of benefits' (ET). A re-imagining of EAL inclusion can refocus inclusive practice on solutions which are both workable and socially just.

In summary, the findings indicate that inclusion is considered a valid underpinning of education for EAL pupils. However, the notion is not clearly unpacked, which leaves teachers unsure how to deliver inclusion for EAL pupils. The findings indicate four main issues.

1. The resources required by subject teachers are limited.

2. The foregrounding of attainment as the main aim of inclusive practice is problematic.

3. Policy is determined largely without the contribution of insights from teachers.

4. While values are critical to the success of EAL inclusion, their effectiveness is variable.

There is limited support, recognition and representation of teachers, who, despite sometimes great efforts, are hampered in providing for the needs of their EAL pupils. The failure to fully take account of these considerations makes EAL inclusion difficult to implement.

The next chapter discusses the conflict between what should happen and what does happen in the light of the findings. It argues that the conflicting discourses in EAL inclusion can be disrupted, that parity of participation can

offer a framework for inclusive provision, but that both these rely on inclusion

being re-imagined.

Chapter 5: An Inclusive Paradigm

Before considering the implications of the findings, it is useful to restate the purpose of the study. The aim was to determine how EAL provision responds to both a policy of inclusion for all and the individual needs of EAL pupils. Previous studies have examined the issue from the perspective of initial teacher training, from the perspective of EAL pupils themselves or from a theoretical perspective. These highlighted a gap between the notion of inclusion and its application as inclusive practice. By focusing on the pivotal role of teachers in interpreting policy and delivering provision for EAL pupils, the findings of this study corroborate the existence of this gap, and foreground the issues this raises for teachers and ultimately for the inclusion project itself.

This chapter synthesises the findings from the analysis of the texts and the interviews, and takes account of points raised in the literature, in order to discuss the wider implications of the findings. Synthesising the data from these two very different approaches risks ignoring the differences previously laid out. While it is important to acknowledge these differences and conflicts, there is 'the danger of becoming so fascinated with impossibilities and undecidables that we lose any sense of coherence and unity' (Bernstein P 281).

With this in mind, each approach can be said to require the other in a 'fusion of horizons' (Bernstein, 2002, 281). The hermeneutic approach offers context in its interpretation of institutional practice, within which critical analysis can be usefully deployed. Equally, structured critique avoids the possibility of institutional practice becoming, through resistance to change, dogmatic and

reproductive. Rather than examining the inclusion dilemma exclusively from one perspective, 'each can serve as a corrective to the other' (Bernstein, P278) to shed light on the dilemma. First, the conflict between the discourses of inclusion and of individual needs are discussed by examining the influence of the texts on participants' interpretation and implementation of inclusion. Then the effectiveness of the mechanism of parity of participation as a socially just response to EAL needs is discussed. And finally it is argued that a dilemmatic stance allows a synthesis of critique and creative construction which can respond to both individual needs and inclusion for all.

5.1 Perspectives on EAL inclusion

The findings indicate that the principle of inclusion was valued by practitioners as the basis of the education of EAL young people. However, contradictions between its philosophical underpinnings and inclusive practice were considered to compromise the effectiveness of provision. Participants' concerns echoed those expressed by Mohan (2001), reflecting the tension between the philosophical basis of EAL education 'which emphasises diversity and complexity', and the requirements of the mainstream classroom 'for commonality, simplicity and homogeneity' (Mohan et al., 2001, p3).

The main problem for participants was that the notion of inclusion was not clearly unpacked and left teachers unsure how to enact it. The data identified four issues for the participants, namely a) resources did not adequately support EAL inclusion, b) the claim that attainment goals exclusively or predominantly could enact inclusion was problematic, c) policy was decided

without insights from practitioners, and d) the role of values was neglected. This chapter discusses how these issues imbricate with the themes identified in the discourse analysis.

- **EAL inclusion discourse**

Two of the issues identified in the interviews, attainment goals and decision-making, particularly imbricated with the findings from the analysis of the Curriculum for Excellence Statement, namely that the Statement promotes tighter control of the curriculum and the prioritising of assessment.

From a justice perspective curriculum arrangements need to consider equally the needs of all those who are part of the school community. The equal right of access to the curriculum that the arrangements provide was generally acknowledged by participants to be a just basis for the education of EAL young people on the basis of equal distribution of resources. However, the analysis of the texts together with the concerns of the majority of participants show that the point at issue is the form of access and the appropriateness of the curriculum in schools where there is a wide range of EAL identities. In other words, the recognitional aspect of equal access needs to be addressed.

Underlying both the form of access and the appropriateness of the curriculum is the question of the nature of knowledge. The epistemological orientation of the curriculum, as encapsulated in the Curriculum for Excellence Statement (Scottish Government, 2016a), does ostensibly allow for different expressions of objective knowledge. But it does not take into account the socially embedded, context-bound nature of meaning and knowledge, and so does

not challenge the conceptualisation of knowledge as 'an objective, transferable commodity' (Gu, 2010, 340). As a result, it does not question the appropriateness of the curriculum for a changing demographic who may not share this conceptualisation.

The participants, on the other hand, did interpret curricular knowledge as being socially embedded, in that knowledge was not seen to be neutral and disinterested. It was perceived to be embedded in native language and cultural tradition, which condition how knowledge is understood. Most participants were unconvinced that curricular knowledge was accessible to EAL pupils. Several participants considered ways of making it more accessible, notably, suggesting that the knowledge base could be enlarged to take into account the wider range of identities in schools. However, there was no discussion of how this might be done, and most proposed overriding reasons against doing so. Some rejected this approach on the grounds that the curriculum would become too cumbersome. Others objected on the grounds that it was difficult, and potentially damaging, for teachers to impart knowledge that was outside their experience. A third argument proposed that there was no need to adapt the curriculum, as it represented a global curriculum, and was therefore appropriate for all pupils anyway, including EAL pupils. In short, for most, changes to the curriculum were considered either too cumbersome to be practical, too difficult, or unnecessary.

Interestingly, these practical considerations, mainly issues of workload and accessible resources, overrode professional debate about the nature of recognitional justice presented in the curriculum. It seemed that these

concerns were overriding in part because debate about what education in general, and schooling in particular, is for was not considered a debate that was accessible to participants, a view that correlates with the tighter control of the curriculum advocated in the Curriculum Statement. It also correlates with the literature which notes that teachers have limited scope to challenge strategies which fail to address inequality and marginalisation (Ainscow et al., 2012, 211).

However, denying practitioners a voice to discuss the impact of the changing demographic on the curriculum excludes an important perspective from the debate. The way practitioners make meaning of inclusion 'is inherently *situated* in cultural and social realities' (Gu, 2010). In view of the loss of certainty in the old cultural and social realities, such as tradition, faith or nationalism, representation of the teacher's perspective is particularly important in devising a new conception of inclusion.

Lack of voice did not prevent teachers from expressing their own views on inclusion. The findings indicate that practitioners define inclusion in various ways, from attending a particular school to belonging to the school community or sharing British values promoted in school. Although there was no commonly agreed interpretation of inclusion, significantly, it was generally defined by the local context of the individual school and linked to a sense of Britishness.

Whether a sense of Britishness is a notion that can promote a common vision and sense of belonging which is ethically and socially inclusive has, however,

been questioned (Rhamie et al., 2012, 172). Criticism has been aimed at the process of socialisation, because it is regarded as the imposition primarily of dominant modes of expression and ways of seeing the world (Bohman, 1999, 137). EAL pupils' needs are in this view interpreted by others whose assumptions are unquestioned.

Bohmann's criticism implies that the notion of socialisation itself is suspect, because it necessarily requires a dominant view which is imposed on others. But participants' views did not correlate with Bohmann's in that they considered socialisation to be both possible and desirable. Since it was considered that all knowledge was contextualised, in order for the culturally contextualised knowledge in the curriculum to be made accessible, some form of socialisation was considered by most to be essential.

Socialisation was considered to comprise not only knowledge, but also social skills. These, particularly interpersonal skills, were considered to present a barrier for EAL pupils. Although interpersonal skills were regarded as essential for the integration of EAL pupils, and in addition for attainment and vocational purposes, curricular focus on these skills was limited, with little interaction between EAL pupils and other pupils. A possible factor here was the limited consequence of these skills in a culture of assessment, a frequently mentioned point being that there was little room in the curriculum for what was not assessed.

As pupils form their understanding of the world and their identities at least in part through the knowledges and narratives available to them in the

curriculum, the limited cultural lens of knowledge and skills in the curriculum is particularly problematic. It suggests that EAL pupils can suffer misrecognition by being ascribed identities which derive from having the wrong knowledge and skills, and thus do not reflect their capabilities. This is significant, as there is evidence that the greatest effect on young people's achievement is the expectations of others (Sharples and Sharples, 2017).

Membership of the school community, however, need not place EAL young people at the centre of concentric circles of identity. These circles can instead be considered as intersecting, and sometimes even conflicting, as it is only when we recognise identities as fields of sometimes conflicting intersections that we can 'imagine possibilities which are non-binary' (Sengupta, 2006, 632), and therefore no longer a choice between inclusion and exclusion. While the intersections of EAL identity can work well at the individual level of the pupil, at the system level of the school the multiplicity of intersections can hinder the establishment of connectedness which is at the centre of inclusion. A more useful approach is for it to influence the formation of shared values which explicitly recognise the range of intersections.

Language proficiency, however, was considered by all participants except one as binary. Access to the curriculum was denied without it. In contrast to the participants' views, the mainstream agenda does not recognise language as a potential barrier, and instead adopts the view that EAL pupils learn from immersion in the language when teachers teach in an immersive environment (Scottish Government, 2016a). The consequence of the immersion strategy is that EAL pupils are no longer removed from class for additional language

tuition, which makes this approach appear inclusive. But the findings demonstrate that the consequence for teachers can be an inability to communicate with and therefore to teach the EAL child, thus affecting the teacher's impression of, and pedagogical approach to the child. Taken together with other findings which show that teacher expectation has a profound effect on pupil achievement (de Boer et al., 2010), these findings are worrying from the perspective of parity of the child's participation in schooling.

Although developing communication skills was acknowledged as the necessary prerequisite to participation as a member of the school community, reflecting other findings in the literature (Anderson, F. et al, 2016, 24), linguistic competence alone does not unquestioningly constitute inclusion. It is rather a currency which confers the right not to be excluded. Inclusion is more than using the dominant language to communicate. The importance accorded to meaningful social interaction in the findings, as going beyond the placing of EAL pupils in mainstream, correlates with the association found in the wider literature, namely that language acquisition is built on the basis of 'common human learning and meaning-making' (Leung et al., 2014, 196), where pupils acquire meaning and knowledge through social interaction. Supporting this view, the findings indicated that neither language nor social skills could subsume the other. Instead, support was required for both language and social skills, in order for pupils to acquire meaningful knowledge. In this view language is not a tool with which we construct the world, but is the medium within which meaning-making takes place. The process of understanding a new environment is a process of mediation between the familiar and the

unfamiliar where neither remains unaffected, a process which can be understood as a fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 2013). This process suggests that for EAL pupils to be included, those they engage with in school need to also be ready to adapt to the unfamiliar. It suggests that inclusion of EAL pupils is dependent on successfully adapting the curriculum for all pupils.

- **Inclusion and Attainment**

The CfE Statement structures the two major aims of the curriculum in terms of attainment, specifically, improving attainment generally and improving the attainment of those from economically deprived backgrounds (Scottish Government, 2016a). In doing so, the Statement limits the scope of curricular change to issues of attainment. The findings demonstrate that positioning attainment as the primary, even the only focus has affected teachers' capacity to adapt the curriculum to respond to EAL needs. However, it is important to clarify that participants' criticism was of the foregrounding of attainment, and not of attainment itself. The findings show that participants acknowledge that EAL pupils both need and want the recognition and the rewards that attainment brings. These rewards are valued precisely because they are inflexible, a dependable currency in the market for jobs. Rather, it was the use of knowledge, in particular a certain kind of knowledge, as primarily an economic asset that was questioned, in that it was considered to devalue the child-centred notion of education as enabling flourishing (Gu, 2010).

It is, arguably, the emphasis on support for economically viable curricular content that has driven the reduction in support of EAL language acquisition

(Scottish Government, 2018c). Practitioners found themselves implementing a policy view that placed language acquisition within the wider process of socialisation, along with other forms of learning where pupils acquire meaning and knowledge through social interaction. But practitioners found it difficult to sustain the view 'that learning an additional language across the curriculum will develop naturally in the language-rich classroom environment', (Anderson, F. et al, 2016, 18). The findings support the notion that the equation is not one where access equals learning. The results here correlate with the view that that 'being exposed to input, however comprehensible, does not guarantee 'intake' by the learner' and 'few teachers are comfortable with the responsibility for developing EAL pupils' language and literacy skills' (Anderson, F. et al, 2016, 14). The findings showed that practitioners, keen to compensate for disadvantage, are sometimes driven to exploit loopholes, such as offering EAL languages as foreign languages to native EAL pupils. While attempting to correct one injustice, teachers are in danger of creating others. Such practices can devalue the very qualifications that EAL pupils have cause to value, in both providing employment credentials and enhancing esteem.

The attainment priorities in the CfE Statement, "raising attainment, and closing the gap in attainment for those in the low socio-economic bracket" (Scottish Government, 2016, p4) are presented as necessary for social justice, from the perspective of economic inequality. As such, it implies that attainment is the solution to inequality. There is some correlation in the literature between attainment and equality, but it is rather the reverse

causation, with the benefits of inclusive and equitable classrooms extending to academic achievement. As such, schools with the smallest achievement gaps between demographics have the highest overall test scores (Gorard and Smith, 2004, 15-28). In short, when schools are mindful of different backgrounds and provide the right resources, all pupils can learn and help each other succeed.

The priority given to attainment goals led participants to interpret inclusive practice as identifying and applying effective strategies to achieve these goals, in essence, providing additional resources (UNICEF, n.d.-b). The inflexibility of the goals did not allow for recognition of different needs to be incorporated into the goals. The inappropriateness of the achievement goals for EAL pupils was instead met with a response that was redistributive rather than recognitional, where additional resources were intended to make good the deficit. It demonstrates the need for both redistributional and recognitional issues to be addressed.

The redistributive nature of additional support for EAL pupils left it vulnerable to the availability of resources. Being initially intense but decreasing over time, it is differentiated from support required by all pupils and from support for named groups, both of which are legally binding. But the findings of the additional needs policy analysis imbricated with those from the interview analysis, implying that in practice targeted support is a weak notion of support which can be interpreted as optional. Additionality, although valued by practitioners where it complemented teacher expertise, was considered problematic for three reasons. Where additionality referred to strategies in

addition to mainstream, mainstream teachers were reluctant to adopt responsibility for their EAL pupils. Secondly, EAL pupils can reject additionality because of its capacity to highlight difference. Thirdly, the decline in additional support from specialist teachers, as a consequence of support being no longer for teachers but by teachers, has left the teachers of EAL pupils effectively unsupported. There was no mechanism to identify the level of need, and therefore the level of support required, and thus EAL pupils were widely considered to receive little or no support.

In consequence, additional support can draw attention to difference but away from need. In this way the curriculum can be said to avoid excluding EAL pupils, rather than to enable their inclusion. Practitioners' limited opportunity to voice their concerns compounds this lack of coherence between policy and practice, and limits the effectiveness of practitioners as the custodians of attainment for all. Transformative solutions for more inclusive attainment strategies are much more difficult to implement in this context. These findings point to the need for targeted support to be much more robust, with more specialised language support, and much more emphasis on pedagogy and resources, than is currently the case.

- **Inclusion and Individual Needs**

The reduction of additional specialist strategies can allow inclusive practice to accord more with the right of every child to be included, by being taught in the same classrooms in the same schools (Unicef, n.d.). Yet the findings demonstrate that inclusion is considered by practitioners not to be happening.

Teachers, in accord with the findings of the GIRFEC document analysis, do not consider that the opportunity to be in a mainstream classroom is sufficient to meet the needs of EAL pupils. This interpretation of an inclusive environment both fails to recognise EAL need and fails to distribute adequate resources to meet it, and, as such, responds to only one side of the dilemma. Teachers' interpretation of the inclusion principle was that EAL pupils are able to access the curriculum and build relationships, and that these capacities *along with* linguistic competence are mutually reinforcing. Rather than linguistic competence automatically enabling the other two, all three are required for inclusion to succeed. This interpretation represents a notion of belonging that is qualitatively different from 'allowing diverse groups to grow side by side' (Unicef, n.d.). It is interesting that this finding represented the views of teachers across all three groups. While quantitative data could clarify the finding further, it is nonetheless important to note that the majority of teachers across all the groups rejected both an integrative and a difference-tolerant interpretation of inclusion as insufficient for a socially just interpretation of EAL needs.

The way teachers did implement inclusion was, however, influenced by mechanisms which enabled and constrained particular practices. Where they enabled, they defined the possibilities, while the constraints imposed limits. In a discursive environment teachers can engage with these mechanisms. However, an important finding was that, beyond discussion of classroom pedagogy, the environment for practitioners is not discursive. Presented as part of an enabling discourse, the constraints are not easily challenged, and

ignore rather than shape possibilities emerging from practice. While practitioners are free to explore possibilities on their own account from a pedagogical perspective, the potential of their contribution to EAL inclusion, in particular their capacity to articulate how inclusion negotiates difference, is neglected. The issue is not difference in itself but what difference any particular difference makes, and why it does so (Stoetzler, 2017). In other words, while difference is neither just nor unjust, its interpretation renders it so.

The findings suggest that a repositioning of EAL inclusion is needed. The current approach to inclusion can be described as assimilationist, embedded in existing methods of curriculum transmission and knowledge construction. If schools are to transform the notion of 'us' and 'them', the practice of both curriculum transmission and knowledge construction needs to be shaped by a third element of practice, critical pedagogy. In its manifestation of critical theory in an educational context, critical pedagogy promotes democratic education, and challenges the top-down banking model of curriculum and assessment. One of the main proponents of critical pedagogy, Ira Shor (2009) refers to the challenge of critical, democratic teaching as 'to advance knowledge, literacy and civic arts in the same syllabus' (2009, 17).

Such an approach can enable a critical awareness of inclusive practices. It would mean that inclusion was not a concept that dictated teachers' and pupils' experiences, but that teachers and pupils could dictate the nature of inclusion. These three practices together arguably offer a more

comprehensive method of 'educating the whole child', and can be further examined through the lens of parity of participation.

5.2 Inclusion as parity of participation

To meet the needs of EAL pupils, teachers need to be able "to identify disadvantage, marginalisation and exclusion" (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007, p5) among EAL pupils. However, the capacities basis of the Scottish curriculum, although predicated on the notion of social justice, was not considered to be sufficient for a socially just framing of provision for EAL pupils.

- **Capacities**

Capacities form the backbone of the Scottish curriculum. The four capacities on which the curriculum is built are 'ontologically individualistic' (Tikly, 2011, 4), designed to enable all children to become successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors (Scottish Executive, 2004). However, while participants considered the capacities to be very effective in defining personal achievement goals, they were not equally valued. Capacities that supported attainment, as successful learning, were prominent, while others were accorded less importance. In addition to the variable importance of the capacities, the curricular focus on individual development was considered to be at the expense of collective enterprise. Both were considered essential to well-being, and particularly important for EAL pupils, on the grounds that their own cultural inheritance was different from the hegemonic culture of the school.

As mentioned above, most practitioners were critical of the additional measures that were supposed to enable capacities to become outcomes for EAL pupils. Practitioners reported that their EAL pupils were not always willing to accept the additional measures. The failure to ensure that additional measures were seen positively meant that additional support could create barriers of difference more powerful than those it attempted to dispel. In support of additionality, most participants concurred with Norwich's finding that 'while arrangements for the minority can benefit the majority, other arrangements may not be required by the majority or may even be inappropriate, like the level and pace of learning' (Norwich, 2002, 484). Thus, there was a clear rationale for some additional measures, but pupils were only keen to accept them when practitioners could make them available to all who could benefit. Hence, it can be concluded that it was exclusion from the norm, and not the measures themselves, that EAL pupils found stigmatising. A more flexible allocation of resources would both benefit all those to whom it was applicable and reduce the emphasis on EAL difference. It suggests that, for EAL pupils, attainment measures need to imbricate with social inclusion if they are to be effective.

Where schools fail to be inclusive of difference, valued competences are seen to belong only to the dominant culture. In this case, it becomes less about the value of each young person, and more about their 'fit'. Despite the GIRFEC message that every child should be valued equally (Scottish Government, 2018a), from the practitioner perspective, it can, in practice, be less about seeing merit in young people and more seeing young people through a

restricted notion of merit. The practice can be referred to as symbolic violence (Bourdieu,1991), perpetrated through actions by which the elite maintain their distinction. Similar criticism, which polarises EAL pupils as victims and the teaching profession as oppressors, is expressed elsewhere in the literature. Leung et al (2014, 215), for example, criticise 'educational systems that claim to be inclusive' but in practice 'are indifferent and insensitive to the full range of (EAL) needs'. Such critiques, by implying intent through descriptors such as violent, indifferent and insensitive, deny the efforts of practitioners to resolve the complex issues around the what, how and who of merit. By misrepresenting the intent of practitioners, it can undermine practitioners' efforts to negotiate a path through the dilemmas of participative parity.

A robust commitment to 'getting it right for every child' (Scottish Government, 2018) can help address these inequalities, but the findings point to just how difficult that is. Practitioners' views correlated with the literature in that EAL practices are 'shaped to a great extent by the socio-cultural and political context' (Leung et al., 2014, 215), and that schools have only limited scope to overcome 'the powerful socio-economic forces that engender inequality and lead to marginalisation' (Ainscow et al., 2012, 211).

Although participants were generally supportive of the capacities which framed the curriculum, they were largely pessimistic about their ability to deliver the curriculum equitably. Inclusion in the mainstream is implemented by teachers who are mostly untrained in EAL education and who have little access to EAL resources. Furthermore, most practitioners across all three groups did not find that their capacity to respond to EAL needs had increased

157

either with experience or initial teacher training. The current distribution of resources, by means of which capacities become outcomes, was seen to hinder rather than support teachers to deliver an inclusive education for EAL pupils.

- **Knowledge Construction**

Such issues of redistribution of resources were for most participants imbricated with provision falling short of equal recognition of needs, what Reay calls the 'mutual regard of all citizens for all other citizens' (Reay, 2011, 1). As a result, 'pupils can find themselves "in" but not "of" the class in terms of social and learning membership' (Ferguson 2008, 111). While the findings showed that teachers considered pupils to be positive about diverse school populations, compositional diversity did not guarantee interactional diversity, which was considered necessary in order for pupils to engage with those who have a differing world view. These findings imbricated with findings in the literature on the consequences of limited social interaction among diverse groups (Rhamie et al, 2012, 181).

In attempting to address this issue, teachers were faced with the complex task of how to build social cohesiveness while recognising individual identity. Where the goal is to enhance social cohesiveness, it is important not to essentialise difference. This exaggerates the similarities within the hegemonic culture, and the differences between it and other cultures. A persuasive argument can be made both for societies having much in common and for them having little in common. But a more helpful understanding is that the

same concepts can be understood by all but with different nuances. The key is 'the different weight each idea carries in different cultures, ….what aspect of our humanness a cultural tradition tends to emphasise, enhance and preserve as central' (Kasulis, 2002, 20).

While participants acknowledged the lack of recognition of other histories and cultures in the curriculum, they were unsure how to harness the potential of what EAL pupils brought with them. As described in the previous chapter, some had practical objections to expanding the curriculum as there would be little support for the presumed increase in workload. Others were wary of misrecognising EAL, as they felt they lacked the skills to develop knowledge and understanding of other cultural inheritances, and accepted that the curriculum seemed to only be capable of integration rather than inclusion.

In taking account of both of these views, schools used celebration days and other events to demonstrate recognition of the range of ethnicities, with recognition restricted in some schools to one day a year or as ad hoc lessons. There are two consequences here. Firstly, the focus on EAL can render it an exotic 'other'. Secondly, celebrations of otherness suggest tolerance of difference rather than inclusion. There was acknowledgement that inclusion meant more than tolerance.

Developing awareness of other ways of being, both for its own sake and in order to mitigate ignorance and intolerance, is one of the stated purposes of education. The curricular requirement to recognise difference was, however, seen as largely rhetorical in practice. Curricular space was afforded in

Religious Education/Philosophy, but even here other worlds can be presented as anthropological curiosities, seen from our own certainties, rather than as coherent alternatives. The findings suggest that teachers are interested in improving cultural literacy, and keen to move beyond exploring the cultures of EAL pupils as distant 'others', with a sense that these cultures do have something to say to the here and now. But how to move from a replicating to a more transformative practice remained elusive.

One finding, that indicates the urgency of finding answers to this question, was that some EAL pupils, once they started to acclimatise to their new educational environment, began to lose any educational advantage from their previous schooling. This process was particularly evident in Maths and to a lesser extent in Science, perhaps because the arguably more common language of these subjects could more clearly reveal the effect of different approaches. This finding suggests that all pupils have yet to benefit from knowing about the cultures of our EAL pupils.

Pupils' motivation to engage with their new environment was partly dependent on the esteem derived from attainment, but it was also dependent on the expectations of teachers. This correlates with the literature, for example, Mohan and Leung found that 'pupils' perceptions of how others in the school regard them in terms of ability, achievement and personal worth are important factors in shaping learning behaviour and achievement' (Mohan et al., 2001, 177-178). As EAL pupils are motivated to share the same values as those who confer esteem, teacher expectation is particularly important in this

respect. Consequently, the value teachers place on linguistic difference, and by extension social and cultural difference, is crucial to their achievement.

As policy does not clearly define what is meant by difference, or how it should be valued, teachers were unclear how they should work with EAL. In considering the redistributional and recognitional aspects of EAL, it seems that ethnicity is, in Fraser's words, "a bivalent mode of collectivity with both a political-economic face and a cultural-valuational face" (Fraser, 1997). In the first case, the logic of the remedy is to redistribute resources so that EAL pupils no longer exist as a group. In the second case, on the contrary, it is to valorise the differences that make EAL pupils an exclusive group. Both remedies can generate further injustices. But the findings suggest that the choice need not be binary, either integration or exclusion, and that practice can be more inclusive. To this end, teachers need to be able to represent the needs of their EAL pupils. A major obstacle to developing the capability to do so was the limited capacity of participants to themselves be represented in the inclusion discourse.

- **Critical Pedagogy**

Shor (2009) characterises current educational arrangements quoting Dewey: 'a few do the planning and ordering, the others follow directions and are deliberately confined to prescribed channels' (2009, 17). Critical pedagogy for Shor is to act against this reproductive trend, 'teaching against unequal status quo and for majoritarian agency' (2009, 6). Instead he bases his critical teaching on democracy, equality, ecology and peace, and proposes that these

values should remain the agenda for educational policy as well as for learning and teaching. These values offer a means of critique of current educational practice, and can foreground just redistribution of resources and just recognition of others, but require appropriate representation of all those within its frame.

In terms of parity of participation, the bivalent elements of inclusion, redistribution and recognition, require to be bound by the third element of representation, which is key to resolving the conflicting redistributive and recognitional requirements of inclusion (Fraser, 2005). Importantly, representation requires setting a frame, which defines who is included within it, and which therefore determines to whom issues of redistribution and recognition apply. The literature highlights that in matters of inclusion this element is rather weak, and that 'the important point of democratic participation … needs to be emphasised' (Walker, 2006, p169), not least because a lack of democratic participation has consequences for the justice claims of the curriculum. Most participants saw themselves as executors of, rather than contributors to, policy. They did point to a large degree of autonomy in issues of classroom practice, but did not consider they were heard in matters of redistribution and recognition that defined the nature of inclusive practice.

Defining the parameters of inclusion (Fraser, 2005, 21) presupposes identifying who is included in the frame. This is difficult if inclusion is open to different interpretations. For example, additionality is certainly defensible as an interim stage in the process of inclusion, but barely defensible as the only

adjustment for a new demographic. Additionality allows access to, not inclusion in, the curriculum, largely at the level of language acquisition. If EAL pupils are to be included in the frame, then the frame needs to represent their needs along with all others. This suggests a need for reframing certain aspects of the curriculum, and that requires a reframing of what knowledge counts. It requires that teachers know much more about the cultures, provenance and identities of the pupils in their care, in order for inclusion to be an arrangement where EAL pupils can see themselves in the curriculum. Some projects have begun to address these issues, notably the Inclusive Practice Project (Florian and Rouse, 2009), currently an optional module in initial teacher training. But neither ITT nor CPD were considered to have provided teachers with the means to reframe the curriculum.

The 10 year consultation on the curriculum which engaged with teachers to produce the curriculum based on capacities included public participation and dialogue and engagement of all stakeholders. Yet the findings identified a critical loss of confidence among practitioners in their capacity to deliver an inclusive curriculum, underpinned by a lack of consensus on what education was for. Participants disagreed about whether it was to educate the whole person, to educate for jobs or to educate for attainment. Yet actively reaching a consensus on 'what to preserve and what to let go' (Sen, 1999, 242; Walker and Unterhalter, 2010), in order to reach consensus, was problematic.

The participation, dialogue and engagement that characterised the initial curricular consultation is no longer a feature of inclusive practice. In the findings, issues of parity that touched on redistribution of resources,

recognition of difference and representation of need were indeed the concern of all participants. But their interpretation, and prioritising of these issues was determined by other factors. The lack of unity of purpose limited agreement on an overarching system of values which could guide decisions of parity.

For practitioners, being clear about the purpose of EAL education, being confident that efforts to achieve it would be supported, and having the tools to resolve dilemmas of practice were essential components of inclusive practice. The findings suggest that, in order to deliver inclusion, parity of participation needs to be contextualised, that is, responsive to local constraints, and framed by a consensus of values. In this way, local expressions of parity of participation can be measured against a framework of values, which can provide a marker against which to judge conflicting decisions of redistribution and recognition and conflicting expressions of values.

In addition, the extent to which pupils' experiences and outcomes were considered equitable was not dependent only on the educational practices in schools. The findings support those in the literature which note its dependence on the wider context of schools, and the socio-economic processes which impact on schools (Ainscow et al., 2012). Most participants shared the view that schools can do much to tackle issues of inequity, but are not able to tackle others, unless they work together. A collegiate approach, which extends democratic debate beyond the school can do much to transform the inclusiveness of schools. Viewed as an 'ecology of equity' (Ainscow et al., 2012), it can link within-school factors, between-school factors, and beyond-school factors.

While critical pedagogy invites egalitarian relations and democratic development, 'such a learning process is unavoidably deconstructive/reconstructive' (Shor, 2017, 10). The discourse it enables 'becomes a material force for re-perceiving self-in-society' (Shor, 2017, 10). However, it requires the complementary force of careful deliberation of values which go beyond the political, and which encompass the inter-personal and individual, if it is not to be limited to avoiding exclusion.

Shor proposes the political values of democracy, equality, ecology and peace to critique education and to ensure just redistribution of resources and just recognition of others. But while these values can disrupt marginalisation and exclusion, what is also required in creating an inclusive environment, is a values base that can construct and consolidate an inclusive environment to which all those within its frame can contribute. The data showed that values needed to be lived at an individual and inter-personal level. In the pursuit of social change, both are required.

5.3 A paradigm for inclusive practice

- **Recalibrating inclusion**

The purpose of EAL education can be understood as enabling a set of rights that represent individual freedoms. These can be understood as 'agency, well-being, and human dignity' (Walker, 2006, 181), embodied in the GIRFEC document in two entitlements: the entitlement to gain from opportunities and the entitlement to a positive and sustained destination. Ostensibly both have

intrinsic value. But in the context of the educational and social structure in which they are used, their value is instrumental, as they depend on the opportunities and destinations available. Practitioners noted that the validity of the entitlements depended particularly on the appropriateness of curricular content, the requirements of attainment and the availability of support. The capacity of EAL pupils to benefit from the entitlements was questioned, because these contexts were found to hinder rather than support inclusive practice.

The entitlements were presented in policy documents as positive rights. That is, practitioners, in delivering inclusion, were required to act to create positive opportunities and sustained destinations for EAL pupils. However, in view of the bounds of curricular knowledge, lack of support for strategies and restricted voice in representing EAL needs, practitioners pointed to these as negative rights. That is, they were able only to minimise exclusion. As such, belonging to the school community was considered to be no more than the sum of its members, the common interest no more than a network of individual interests, rather than a social enterprise to which belonging meant more than the sum of its parts. Where values did not act as guiding principles, the prioritising of rights could, at best, be subject to policy trends, and at worst, be arbitrary. The findings identified that parity of participation was only unproblematic when applied to basic rights. Where access to resources, recognition and representation was subject to conflicting rights, it was much more difficult to apply parity of participation.

By focusing only on rights, the inclusion equation was considered to be unbalanced. Practitioners questioned whether a policy of entitlement was sufficient to establish an inclusive environment, and identified that low expectation of responsibility engendered low expectation of participation. EAL education was not considered to be a process that built trust, cooperation and a sense of belonging. While individual freedoms were respected, social responsibilities were neglected, and social cohesion was considered to have suffered. While there was recognition that identities could be multiple and overlapping, and that this allows the different spheres *within* an individual's life to overlap, without adherence to common values, there was considered to be little shared identity *between* diverse groups.

Values define what information is important, how it is imparted, and the interactions between people. But while the moral dimension of schooling was considered by all participants to be essential in essence, it was unclear in practice. While education was considered to have both intrinsic and instrumental value, it was found that the focus on attainment had weakened the intrinsic value of education, and its notion of flourishing. It was found that values are largely implicit, and the societal norms that emanate from them are largely unquestioned.

Values are circumscribed by language, in that language frames the imagined realities available to those who speak it. While English, as the hegemonic language, frames a set of values that are assumed to be inherently right, recognition of different languages can lead to an accusation of moral relativism, where multiple different and sometimes conflicting moral stances

are considered equally right. For instance, a value system that foregrounds materialism, hedonism and risk-taking might be in conflict with a value system that foregrounds deep thinking, precision, and reducing risks. On the other hand, a synthesis of values, which represents local needs and reflects a wider conception of values, can be forged by adopting a dilemmatic stance. To this end, educating for a diverse society requires practitioners to apply the critical thinking methods implicit in a dilemmatic approach as a means of 'acquainting students with some fundamentals about the histories and cultures about the many different groups with whom they share laws and institutions' (Nussbaum, 2006, p390).

A dilemmatic approach can develop habits of cooperation, familiarity and trust, and bonds of language, history and culture, on which successful inclusion can be based (Satterwhite et al., 2020; Sarid, 2021). Taken for granted practices can no longer be sustained without rigorous challenge. Where values have been traditionally considered concentric with national values, a dilemmatic approach acknowledges that in practice countries do not always uphold values that deserve to be upheld (Brown, 2005, p108). Brown goes so far as to suggest that "quite a number of states are little more than complicated protection rackets – sometimes actually quite simple protection rackets – rather than anything so grand as an expression of a conception of the Good" (Brown, 2005, p112). A dilemmatic approach can challenge these views. Speaking to a new demographic, it seems that schools can no longer simply base their values on national or religious myths and stories, as these are no longer able to represent justice or equality in a diverse environment.

Nonetheless, the results showed that a values system in itself was important. Catholic faith schools, which constitute roughly one fifth of schools in Scotland, were considered to impart a sense of belonging which derived from their focus on values. That these were religious values was considered to be of secondary importance. According to participants, a set of established values that underpinned the life of the school was most important. As a collective enterprise it could inspire to promote high levels of well-being and attainment.

- **The Role of Values**

Within a globally interconnected learning environment, it is possible to talk about widely held, established values as conceptions of the Good, where these are not dependent on historical and cultural norms. The results were however ambivalent with regard to the existence of a universal set of values against which to measure norms. Participants did not agree that 'teachers needed to overcome the view that societal members have obligations to one another that are qualitatively different from those they have to everyone else' (Brown, 1998, 108). The response to the dilemma of difference within schools did not correspond with Brown's view that, "while customs and mores may differ from locality to locality, the requirements of morality are the same always and everywhere" (Brown, 1998, p108). Values were instead understood to be contextual responses to the need for a common code of behaviour.

However, there is arguably now more consensus about which values are socially just and inclusive, and this offers an opportunity to focus on values that apply much more widely than those that exemplify nationhood or which are western-centric. Values which define 'how we do things here' are no longer enough. The question of 'why we do things this way' is now necessary. This does not preclude an approach based on national values, but it does require that these values be re-examined to reflect the new realities of nationhood. Difference should be a matter of shade, tone and texture rather than substance.

Thus, where capacities tell us **what** we are to do, and parity of participation tells us **how** to do it, values can tell us **why** we do it. However, one finding identified that, while values were considered key elements in establishing an inclusive environment for EAL pupils, in practice they were associated with emblems, clichés or incomprehensible Latin mottos with little relevance to daily life. Inclusive values were generally not embedded in practice. There are three possible explanations for this. Values are not tangible, but attitudinal, they are difficult to evaluate, and they do not fit easily within an economically competitive educational policy. Efforts to place them more centrally have generally been directed towards reducing them to something more tangible, easier to evaluate, and a better fit. An example is the common practice of dedicating one hour sessions to learn what values look and sound like (Keddie, 2012a, 1305). Instead, values should be rules which underpin the life of the school. They should provide a measure of what should happen against

which to judge what does happen. As such, they need to be continually foregrounded as authoritative references for how to live and learn together.

Thus, inclusion becomes essentially about the embodiment of particular values in particular schools. At best, they are embedded in the culture of a school, in its characteristic spirit and belief, and are reflected in 'the norms and values that regulate the ways according to which people treat one another and the nature of the working relationships' (Horenczyk and Tatar, 2002, 436). Through the social learning processes that are implicit in this practice, schools can be defined as 'communities of practice,' where 'through active and dynamic negotiation of meaning, practice is something that is produced over time by those who engage in it' (Wenger in Blackmore, 2010, 180; Ainscow and Sandill, 2010). These processes can shape teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards inclusion (Booth and Ainscow, 1998), and thus contribute towards the school's inclusion narrative.

The results highlighted however that the capacity for re-imagining values is limited. The individualist focus of the curriculum, reflecting wider society, has weakened the importance of values, as indicated by the low level of consensus in the data on the values that underpin education, and the view that in practice they are additional rather than integral features of the curriculum. While values were in principle considered important and even essential underpinnings of the curriculum, and while most practitioners stated what values they personally found important, most were unable to identify the school, curricular or education values. An indication of the lack of embeddedness of values was that the curricular values of 'wisdom, justice,

compassion and integrity' recently refreshed in the policy statement on the curriculum (Scottish Government, 2019c), were unfamiliar to participants.

Values that participants personally promoted in their practice were generally individual attributes, a recurring one being kindness. But the most commonly identified value was respect, which was limited to respect for teachers, and interpreted as good behaviour. While co-opting the notion of kindness or respect to support the maintenance of teacher-pupil or pupil-pupil relationships can be justifiable, the narrowness of the interpretation precludes consideration of their wider potential as a pillar of inclusion.

One example of a value system which was able to develop excellence in both inclusiveness and attainment is the Finnish curriculum, which 'seems to achieve both high quality and equality at the same time' (Halinen and Järvinen, 2008, 78). But the importance of Finnish cultural homogeneity in this achievement needs to be considered. The factors which appear critical in Finnish schools' capacity to create a counter-narrative which values both attainment and inclusion are: a more homogeneous society (teachers manage much less extremes of social/cultural origins in their classes), much more autonomy for teachers about curriculum and pedagogy, and a teaching profession which is widely respected (Kivirauma and Ruoho, 2007, 298).

While Finnish education has demonstrated two decades of quality and equality, there is now doubt about the capacity of school policy to continue these achievements under the growing influence of the same global trends that beset other countries like Scotland (Kivirauma and Ruoho, 2007). With

global pressures affecting these critical factors in recent years, achieving both high attainment and an inclusive environment within the traditional value system has become much more difficult. It suggests that, in responding to the rapid demographic changes which have placed EAL pupils in the front line, it is not just schools in Scotland that need to develop the capacity for transformational change.

The transformative view of inclusive values is incompatible with an *authoritarian* values system. Rather, a school-based value system requires a *democratically* established moral code, which is consistent with global values in its formation, and flexible in its implementation. It can provide insulation from bias that allows values to degenerate into dogma, hierarchise differences, and provide justification for the imposition of a hegemonic morality. Where adherence to an agenda of human rights and equal opportunities requires legal compliance, and where parity of participation challenges practice, engaging with and in a system of values requires active participation. All three are required in the practice of inclusion.

- **Establishing an Inclusive Environment**

To summarise, a binary choice between integration and exclusion is no longer a just response to the dilemmas of inclusion. Such an antagonistic spirit is antithetical to cooperation, compromise and seeking common ground. The value-laden nature of curricular knowledge, the notion that the curriculum is not just a matter of imparting neutral knowledge, needs to be acknowledged. As such, it is vital that the values underpinning the curriculum are

acknowledged, examined and challenged, in order that EAL pupils can be confident that adhering to these values will not require compromise and dissimulation. Identifying, examining, and challenging values, through critical thinking skills, introspection and self-criticism (Fraser, 2013), is therefore an important component of the inclusive curriculum and of inclusive practice.

Thus, an overarching values system can guide decisions of parity of participation in a capacities-based curriculum. However, the need to negotiate conflicting values in the light of the new demographic requires a dilemmatic stance. Such an approach can enable an enlarged world view, which is more responsive to the different needs of EAL pupils and which can challenge arbitrary national values.

The dilemmatic approach, in its capacity to consider differing views of society and negotiate common values, offers a way to negotiate a democratically agreed, socially just values system which can help reconfigure inclusion. It can make possible the co-existence of inalienable rights and group attachment, and can enable schools to be both equal and inclusive (Goodhart, 2017, p115). The next chapter summarises the findings, synthesises the results, and proposes a method of addressing the dilemma of difference which has the potential to benefit all pupils.

Chapter 6: Evolving Practice

6.1 The origins and purpose of the study

The study set out to examine the conflicting rationales of inclusive practice: how EAL provision responds to inclusion for all and the individual needs of EAL pupils. Specifically it was concerned with how practitioners minimise difference while also acknowledging difference. As both are required as a socially just response to the education of a wider demographic in schools, the dilemma has implications for the social justice credentials of EAL provision.

The study was located in Scotland, which offered a context where inclusion as a social justice framework for education is explicitly at the heart of the curriculum. Scotland is positive about increasing numbers of EAL pupils, not least because of the economic imperative to increase the percentage of young people in the population. As a result, Scotland offers an environment where there is political motivation for EAL inclusion to succeed. There is also an educational rationale, as the curriculum is based on a premise of social justice and equal opportunity. In this way, Scottish education rhetoric can be said to be firmly rooted in inclusion.

Nonetheless, the study showed growing criticism of the capacity of the curriculum to include EAL pupils. While the literature generally focused on policy, teacher training initiatives, pre-adolescent primary education, and the perspective of the EAL pupil, there was little engagement with the secondary school practitioner's perspective. As inclusive practice defines the learning environment for EAL adolescents, teachers' role as mediators between policy

and practice is crucial to implementing a practical response to socially just inclusion for EAL pupils. Given that practitioners' intentions guide this response, their unique role was acknowledged by foregrounding their perspective. Specifically, the study examined how their attitudes, beliefs and experiences determine inclusive practice. The influence of the three key policy texts which provide guidelines on EAL inclusion was also examined, in order to take account of the situated nature of practitioners' perspectives.

6.2 A summary of the project

To examine inclusive practice from this perspective, practitioners' interpretation of, response to, and engagement with inclusion were explored. Accordingly, the study sought to answer the following questions:

a) How do practitioners interpret EAL inclusion policy?

- How does EAL inclusion policy correlate with practitioners' understanding of the principle of EAL inclusion?

- How does EAL inclusion policy inform teachers' practice?

b) How do practitioners respond to the needs of EAL pupils?

- How do practitioners understand EAL pupils' needs?

- How do practitioners consider that they meet EAL pupils' needs?

c) How does EAL provision engage with a socially just conception of inclusion for all?

- How can teachers provide a socially just education for EAL pupils?

- How does EAL provision impact on inclusion for all?

Considering inclusive practice through the lens of dilemmas of difference allowed the study to account for the complex nature of the dilemmas, where the resolution of one aspect could create injustices for another. These conflicting aspects of inclusive practice were examined using the conceptual model of parity of participation (Fraser, 2009). Applying this conceptual model in an education context allowed inclusive practice to be framed, examined and discussed according to the three components of parity of participation, namely the redistribution of resources, the recognition of difference and the representation of needs. In short, it provided a framework for investigating how inclusive practice responds to both inclusion for all and individual needs.

As a theory of social justice, it was used to examine the two underpinnings of EAL practice: the redistribution of resources, a practice that renders EAL difference invisible; and the recognition of difference, which renders EAL difference visible. It was thus an appropriate model to examine the dilemma of difference, where to redistribute for difference implies that difference is a temporary feature of EAL pupils, yet to recognise difference implies that difference is an inherent characteristic of EAL pupils. The model proposes that representation has the potential to resolve the dilemma by representing

both redistributional and recognitional needs, and thus achieving both equality of opportunity and equity. Parity of participation proved to be an effective tool for examining the justice claims of inclusive practice, and a fitting frame of reference against which to measure the justice claims of a capacities-based curriculum in responding to needs. However, the results point to its limitation as a model for inclusive practice, and propose that an overarching system of values is required in order to respond to both individual needs and inclusion for all.

To consider practitioners' beliefs, attitudes and experiences, a phenomenological method of enquiry in the hermeneutic tradition was adopted. This allowed an investigation of how inclusion is understood by practitioners, how their interpretation of inclusion guides practice, and how they conceptualise socially just practice.

Data were collected from individual interviews which were semi-structured in line with the three themes of parity of participation. Practitioners were recruited from schools throughout Scotland in order to take account of differences between local authorities. Equal numbers of participants from three different levels of experience were recruited to ensure an equal distribution of experiential influences. Data from the interviews were analysed thematically in line with the conceptual framework.

Three key policy texts were also analysed to establish their influence on practitioners' approach to inclusive practice. These defined policy in the three main areas of EAL inclusion, namely, the curriculum, additional needs, and

inclusion for all. In order to establish the influence of the texts on practitioners' interpretation of inclusion, a critical discourse analysis was carried out, and the data from the texts analysed discursively using Fairclough's approach of textually oriented critical discourse analysis to examine the relationship between policy and practice.

The critical data from the textual analysis and the interpretive data from the interviews were then integrated. A synthesis of the data, linking findings from the discursive analysis with those from the thematic analysis, identified connections and dissonances between the policy and practice perspectives. It offered insights on practitioners' interpretation of policy and on their response to EAL needs in the light of the influence of the texts.

6.3 Reflections on EAL inclusive practice

Adopting a phenomenological design allowed the meaning-making process in inclusive practice to be foregrounded. In placing the practitioner perspective at the centre of this process, the study yielded findings which highlight important aspects of inclusive practice with regard to how EAL pupils' needs are met and how an inclusive environment is established, and which offer a method of resolving the dilemma of inclusive practice.

In responding to the questions raised, the study complements and extends the existing literature on EAL inclusive practice by contributing three main findings in answer to the question posed by the study:

- How do practitioners interpret EAL inclusion policy?

While practitioners were unanimous in their support for a curriculum built on capacities, their views differed markedly from policy, particularly with regard to the mainstreaming process, and the prioritising of attainment. They generally valued policies which promoted equity above policies which focused on shorter-term political goals. They valued the notion of capacities which could deliver a curriculum of equal opportunities for EAL pupils. But delivering the curriculum entirely through mainstreaming, while reducing cost, presented considerable challenges in enabling capacities to become outcomes, and thus promoting equity. In addition, policy which was focused mainly on attainment outcomes, promoted some capacities, but disregarded others. Thus, the texts and the participants advanced different conceptions of EAL inclusion, weighted in the texts towards equal opportunity, and for participants towards equity.

- How do practitioners respond to the needs of EAL pupils?

In order for capacities to become outcomes, practitioners need to address issues of redistribution, recognition and representation that affect EAL pupils. These are complex, interrelated issues that require a collaborative response between policy and practice. However, teachers are hindered from meeting EAL pupils' needs by issues of resource distribution such as classroom support and training, recognition of the parameters of their role, and representation of their views. In order that issues of parity of participation can be addressed for EAL pupils, parity of participation needs to be applied also at practitioner level. This can not only enable the implementation of inclusive measures but also the conditions required for their implementation.

- How does EAL provision engage with a socially just conception of inclusion for all?

Inclusive practice is required not only to respond to individual needs but to provide a sense of belonging. The identification of a set of values that explicitly includes all stakeholders can offer a framework for belonging. In guiding decisions of parity of participation, the values set, as the ethos of the school, can synthesise conflicting perspectives and establish a common educational purpose. As a method of resolving dilemmas of inclusion for all and individual need, this approach can help inform decisions of parity of participation both in and beyond issues of EAL. In this way, the justice claims of inclusive education can be both redistributive/recognitional and contributive.

To summarise, guided by an explicit values set that includes all those who belong within its frame, parity of participation can ensure that teachers do have the tools to represent their EAL pupils, to recognise their needs, and to redistribute resources appropriately, in order that the capacities that underpin the curriculum become outcomes. The framework enables schools to acknowledge different ways of being and knowing, and to examine their claim to be socially just. In this way, inclusive practice has the potential to respond to both inclusion for all and individual needs.

The practical implications arising from these results are listed below:

- Teachers, at all three levels of experience, need guidance, training and support in EAL inclusive practice, in order to meet the needs of their EAL pupils.

- Teachers need to have the means of advocating for their EAL pupils, in order that schools can recognise and redistribute for EAL pupils' needs.

- The teacher perspective needs to be included in policy discussion, in order that policy acknowledges the parameters of practice.

- The critical role of values in framing inclusive practice needs to be acknowledged.

The main impediments to implementing change were identified by practitioners as time and cost. The proposals have implications for both, for example with regard to resources for practitioner training and language support. On the other hand, what the proposals call for is modification of existing inclusion mechanisms: that all four capacities have prominence and not only those that support attainment; that the mechanisms of parity of participation are explicit rather than implicit; that they apply to practitioners as well as pupils; and that the school's value set is made central rather than additional.

The use of parity of participation as a conceptual framework informed both the process and the findings of the study. It offered a means of examining the capacities-based curriculum, allowing the elements of the practice of inclusion to be examined separately. In its capacity to provide a just frame of reference for capacities-based provision, it offers a practical method for schools to both organise and evaluate provision. In terms of providing an inclusive

environment, the findings highlighted its limitations and proposed that parity of participation be set within a system of democratically determined values.

The study makes contributions to the literature on EAL inclusion in terms of methodology, frame and perspective. The application of a mixed methods qualitative approach to the analysis of the dilemma of inclusion offers evidence that using mixed methods within the qualitative paradigm is an effective means of analysing the symbolic meaning of a concept like EAL inclusion, whose dilemmatic nature suggests the need for two different methodologies. The framing of the dilemma of EAL inclusion in terms of parity of participation is a framework which can be used both for organising and for evaluating procedures, and the perspective of the mainstream teacher contributes a key contribution to the existing knowledge base on inclusion.

The main contribution is the proposal of an approach to EAL inclusion that contextualises parity of participation within a negotiated system of values. Thus, where capacities tell us what we are to do, and parity of participation tells us how to do it, values can tell us why we do it. It frames practice in terms of three requirements: legal compliance to human rights and equal opportunities, challenging the justice claims of practice, and active participation in a community of practice. As such, it reframes inclusion in terms of both redistributive/ recognitional/ representational justice and contributive justice, enabling EAL education to be both equal and inclusive. In addition, it proposes some practical considerations for successfully implementing the approach.

By answering the questions it set out to examine, the study achieved what it intended. It is important to acknowledge that the results are the product of a process of meaning-making, and therefore influenced by researcher interpretation. While all research is to some extent influenced by the researcher, addressing the nature of the influence allowed researcher interpretation to make a positive contribution to the results. It is also important to acknowledge that, while there is no claim to representativeness, the Scottish context shares similarities with education systems elsewhere in the developed world, and therefore the results can claim to have relevance for these contexts.

These points suggest that there is potential for further research that is beyond the scope of this study. As a qualitative study, it focused on aspects of practice that presented challenging dilemmas and proposed a method of resolving the dilemmas. A quantitative or mixed method study could confirm and extend the results by evaluating the cost and time implications of adopting an approach of value-based parity of participation, and examining the support and training required in developing the approach. The practical implications of the approach could be usefully analysed in a practitioner action research project.

References

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Goldrick, S., & West, M. (2012). Making schools effective for all: Rethinking the task. *School Leadership and Management*, *32*(3), 197–213.

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *14*(4), 401–416.

Allan, J. (2010). Questions of inclusion in Scotland and Europe. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *25*(2), 199–208.

Anderson, F; Sangster, P; Foley, Y; Crichton, H. (2016). How are we training our mainstream teachers to meet the needs of EAL learners? The case of two University Schools of Education in Scotland. EAL Nexus Research. British Council.

Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating Difference: Neo-Liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the Politics of Educational Reform. *Educational Policy*, *18*(1), 12–44.

Apple, M. W. (2011). Global Crises, Social Justice, and Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(2), 222–234.

Baggini, J. (2018). How the World Thinks. Granta.

Bernstein, R. in *Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, ed. Dostal R. (2002), ch. 12, 267-282

Bohman, J. (1999). Practical Reason and Cultural Constraint: agency in Bourdieu's theory of practice. In: Shustermann, R. (ed.) *Bourdieu.* Blackwell. 129-152.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (1998). From them to us : an international study of inclusion in education. Routledge.

Boucher, D., & Kelly, P. (1998). Perspectives on social justice: from Hume to Walzer. Routledge.

Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. (1991). Language and Symbolic Power. Polity.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *11*(4), 589–597.

Brown, C. (2005). International Social Justice. In: Boucher, D. & Kelly, P. (eds.) *Perspectives on Social Justice: From Hume to Walzer.* Routledge. 105-122.

Butler, J. (1999). Performativity's social magic. In: Shusterman, R. (ed.) *Bourdieu : a critical reader.* Blackwell. 113-128.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education. Routledge.

Cummins, J. (2015). Intercultural education and academic achievement: a framework for school-based policies in multilingual schools. *Intercultural Education*, *26*(6), 455–468.

Dunne, L. (2009). Discourses of inclusion: a critique. Power and Education, 1(1), 42-56.

Dawkins, R. (2017). Science in the soul. Bantam Press.

de Boer, H., Bosker, R., & van der Werf, M. (2010). Sustainability of Teacher Expectation Bias Effects on Long-Term Student Performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(1), 168–179.

European Commission. (2018). Non-national population by group of citizenship.
https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Non-national_population_by_group_of_citizenship,_1_January_2018_.png

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis : The Critical Study of Language. Penguin.

Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis : The Critical Study of Language. 2nd edition. Routledge.

Florian, L., & Linklater, H. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive education: using inclusive pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning for all. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *40*(4), 369–386.

Florian, L., & Rouse, M. (2009). The inclusive practice project in Scotland: Teacher education for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(4), 594–601.

Foley, Y., Sangster, P., & Anderson, C. (2013). Examining EAL policy and practice in mainstream schools. *Language and Education*, *27*(3), 191–206.

Foskett, N., & Maringe, F. (2010). Globalization and internationalization in higher education. Continuum.

Fraser, N. (1997). Justice Interruptus. Routledge.

Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing Global Justice. *New Left Review*, *36*(69).

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of Justice : Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Columbia University Press.

Fraser, N. (2013). Scales of Justice : Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World. Wiley.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Penguin.

Friedman, S. (2016). Habitus clivé and the emotional imprint of social mobility. *Sociological Review*, *64*(1), 129–147.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2013). Truth and Method. Bloomsbury.

Goodhart, D. (2017). The road to somewhere. Hurst.

Gorard, S., & Smith, E. (2004). An international comparison of equity in education systems. *Comparative Education*, *40*(1), 15–28.

Greene, J. (2015). Moral tribes. Penguin.

Grix, J. (2004). The Foundations of Research. Palgrave.

Groenewald, T. (2004). A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*(1), 42–55.

Gu, Q. (2010). Knowledge in Context. In: Thomson, P. & Walker, M. (eds) *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion.* Routledge. 335-343.

Haidt, J. (2006).The happiness hypothesis : putting ancient wisdom and philosophy to the test of modern science. Arrow Books.

Haidt, J., Rosenberg, E., & Hom, H. (2003). Differentiating Diversities: Moral Diversity Is Not Like Other Kinds. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1–36.

Halinen, I. and Järvinen, R. (2008). Towards inclusive education: The case of Finland. *Prospects, 38(1)*, 77–97.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse. In: Wetherell, M; Taylor, S; Yates, S (eds) Discourse Theory and Practice. Blackwell. 72-81.

Halliday, M. (1985). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Arnold.

HMIE. (2007). Count Us In : Success for All. https://education.gov.scot/Documents/CountUsIn.pdf

Honneth, A & Farrell, J. (1997). Recognition And Moral Obligation. *Social research, 64 (1),* 16-35.

Horenczyk, G. & Tatar, M. (2002). Teachers' attitudes toward multiculturalism and their perceptions of the school organizational culture. *Teaching and teacher education, 18 (4),* 435-445

James, D. (2015). How Bourdieu bites back: recognising misrecognition in education and educational research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *45*(1), 97–112.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool. *Discourse, 18 (3),* 329-342.

Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. Sage.

Kasulis, T. (2002). Intimacy or Integrity. University of Hawaii Press.

Kaur, B. (2012). Equity and social justice in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(4), 485–492.

Keddie, A. (2012). Schooling and social justice through the lenses of Nancy Fraser. *Critical Studies in Education*, *53*(3), 263–279.

Keddie, A. (2012a). Pursuing Justice for Refugee Students: addressing issues of cultural (mis)recognition. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16(12*), 1295-1310.

Kivirauma, J. and Ruoho, K. (2007). Excellence through special education? Lessons from the Finnish school reform. *International Review of Education, 53(3)*, 283–302.

Leung, C., Davison, C., & Mohan, B. (2014). English as a Second Language in the Mainstream : Teaching, Learning and Identity. Taylor and Francis.

Liu, Y., Fisher, L., Forbes, K., & Evans, M. (2017). The knowledge base of teaching in linguistically diverse contexts: 10 grounded principles of multilingual classroom pedagogy for EAL. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 17*(4), 378–395.

Mayoh, J., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2015). Toward a Conceptualization of Mixed Methods Phenomenological Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 9*(1), 91–107.

McArthur, J (2021). The Inclusive University: A Critical Theory Perspective using a Recognition-Based Approach. *Social Inclusion*, 9(3), 6-15.

McArthur, J. (2016) p977 Assessment for Social Justice: the role of assessment in achieving socail justice. *Assessment and Evakuation in Higher Education,* 41(7), 967-981.

Menzies, C. & Chiong, L. (2016). Can Schools make our society more cohesive. *LKMco; London:Department of Communities and Local Government.* https://cdn.lkmco.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Can-Schools-Make-Our-Society-More-Cohesive.-Chiong-and-Menzies-2016.pdf

Mohan, B. A., Leung, C., & Davison, C. (2001). English as a second language in the mainstream : teaching, learning, and identity. Longman.

Morrison, S., Decety, J., & Molenberghs, P. (2012). The neuroscience of group membership. *Neuropsychologia*, *50*(8), 2114–2120.

Nash, K. (2013). Transantionalising the public sphere. Wiley.

Neubauer, B. E., Witkop, C. T., & Varpio, L. (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *8*(2), 90–97.

Norwich, B. (2002). Education, Inclusion and Individual Differences: Recognising and Resolving Dilemmas. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *50*(4), 482–502.

Norwich, B. (2005). Inclusion: Is it a matter of evidence about what works or about values and rights? *Education 3-13*, *33*(1), 51–56.

Norwich, B. (2014). How does the capability approach address current issues in special educational needs, disability and inclusive education field? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *14*(1), 16–21.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). Education and Democratic Citizenship: Capabilities and Quality Education. *Journal of Human Development*, *7*(3), 385–395.

OECD. (2007). Review of the Quality and Equity of Education Outcomes in Scotland Diagnostic Report. https://doi.org/10.1787/148012367602

OECD. (2015).Improving Schools in Scotland: An OECD Perspective. 180. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

OECD. (2021). Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence - Into the future. https://www.oecd.org/education/scotland-s-curriculum-for-excellence-bf624417-en.htm

Pantic, N., Taiwo, M. & Martindale, A. (2019). Roles, practices and contexts for acting as agents of social justice – student teachers' perspectives. *Teachers and Teaching, 25*(2), 220-239.

Pantic, N., Galey, S., Florian, L., Joksimovic, S., Viry, G., Gasevic, D., Nyqvist, H. & Kyritsi, K. (2021). Making sense of teacher agency for change with social and epistemic network analysis. *Journal of Educational Change.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-021-09413-7.

Papastephanou, M. (2013). Cosmopolitanism discarded: Martha Nussbaum's patriotic education and the inward–outward distinction. *Ethics and Education*, *8*(2), 166–178.

Pinson, H. & Arnot, M. (2007). Sociology of education and the wasteland of refugee education research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *28*, no *3*, 399–407.

Reay, D. (2011). Schooling for democracy: A common school and a common university. *Democracy & Education*, *19*(1), 1–4.

Rhamie, J., Bhopal, K., & Bhatti, G. (2012). Stick to your own kind: Pupils' Experiences of Identity and Diversity in Secondary Schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *60*(2), 171–191.

Riddell, S. (2009). Social justice, equality and inclusion in Scottish education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *30*(3), 283–296.

Robeyns, I. (2003). Sen's Capability Approach And Gender Inequality: Selecting Relevant Capabilities. *Feminist economics, 9(2-3),* 61-92.

Robeyns, I. (2006). The Capability Approach in Practice. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, *14*(3), 351–376.

Roth, K., & Burbules, N. (2011). Cosmopolitan Identity and Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *43 (3)*, 205–208.

Rutter, J. (2006). Refugee children in the UK. Open University Press.

Sandel, M. (2022). Meritocracy, Education and the Civic Project. *Theory and Research in education, 20 (2)*, 193-199.

Sarid, A. (2021). Social Justice Dilemmas: A Multidimensional Framework of Social Justice Educational Leadership. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 20 (2)*, 149-167.

Satterwhite, R., Sarid, A., Cunningham, C., Goryunova, E., Crandall, H., Morrison, J., Sheridan, K., & Miller, M. (2020). Contextualizing our Leadership Education Approach to Complex Problem Solving. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 14 (3)*, 63–71.

Saunders, M. (2000). Beginning an Evaluation with RUFDATA: Theorizing a Practical Approach to Evaluation Planning. *Evaluation*, *6*(1), 7–21.

Scholten, P., Collett, E., & Petrovic, M. (2017). Mainstreaming migrant

integration? A critical analysis of a new trend in integration governance.

International Review of Administrative Sciences, *83*(2), 283–302.

Scottish Executive. (2004). A curriculum for excellence.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-3010.2009.01800.x

Scottish Government. (n.d.-a). Policy for Scottish educataion.

https://education.gov.scot/education-scotland/scottish-education-

system/policy-for-scottish-education

Scottish Government. (2016a). Curriculum for Excellence: Statement for

Practitioners. Education Scotland.

https://education.gov.scot/education-scotland/scottish-education-

system/policy-for-scottish-education/policy-drivers/a-statement-for-

practitioners-from-hm-chief-inspector-of-education-august-2016

Scottish Government. (2016b). Delivering Excellence and Equity in Scottish

Education a Delivery Plan for Scotland.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/delivering-excellence-equity-scottish-

education-delivery-plan-scotland/

Scottish Government. (2016c). International Surveys - PISA.

http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/PISA

Scottish Government. (2017). Additional Support for Learning Statutory

Guidance.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/supporting-childrens-learning-statutory-

guidance-education-additional-support-learning-scotland/

Scottish Government. (2018a). Getting It Right For Every Child.

https://www.gov.scot/policies/girfec/principles-and-values/

Scottish Government. (2018b). Learning in 2+ Languages.

https://education.gov.scot/improvement/learning-resources/Learning in 2+

Languages

Scottish Government. (2018c). Schools: Additional support for learning.

https://www.gov.scot/policies/schools/additional-support-for-learning/

Scottish Government. (2019a). Summary statistics for schools in Scotland no.

10.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/summary-statistics-schools-scotland-

no-10-2019-edition/pages/4/

Scottish Government. (2019b). GIRFEC Evaluating Wellbeing.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/girfec-evaluating-wellbeing-

guide/documents/

Scottish Government. (2019c). Refreshed Narrative on Scotland's Curriculum

2019.

https://scotlandscurriculum.scot/

Scottish Government. (2020a). Additional Support for Learning

Implementation.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/review-additional-support-learning-

implementation/pages/17/

Scottish Government. (2020b). Additional Support for Learning Action Plan.

https://www.gov.scot/publications/additional-support-learning-action-plan/

Scottish Government. (2021). Human rights: children's rights.

https://www.gov.scot/policies/human-rights/childrens-rights/

Scottish Parliament. (2017). How is Additional Support for Learning working in

practice.

https://digitalpublications.parliament.scot/Committees/Report/ES/2017/5/

15/How-is-Additional-Support-for-Learning-working-in-practice--

1#Conclusions-and-recommendations

Scottish Parliament. (2019). Additional Support Needs in School Education.

https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/currentcommit

tees/103397.aspx

Sen, A. (1992). Inequality reexamined. Russell.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. K. (2002). Open and Closed Impartiality. *The Journal of philosophy*, 99
(9), 445-469.

Sengupta, S. (2006). I/Me/Mine—Intersectional Identities as Negotiated

Minefields. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *31*(3), 629–639.

Sharples, R., & Sharples, R. (2017). Local practice , translocal people :

conflicting identities in the multilingual classroom in the multilingual

classroom. *Language and Education*, 31(2), 169–183.

Shor, I. (2009). Critical Pedagogy is too big to fail. *Journal of basic writing,* 28(2), 6-27.

Shor, I. (2017). Dialogic and Critical Pedagogies: An Interview with Ira Shor. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, (5, 1-21). https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/208.

Sleeter, C. (2013). Teaching for Social Justice in Multicultural Classrooms. *Multicultural Education Review*, 5(2), 1–19.

Smith, E. (2018). Key issues in education and social justice. Sage.

Steele, C. (1999). Thin ice: stereotype threat and black college students. *Atlantic Monthly*, 44–54.

Stoetzler, M. (2017). From interacting systems to a system of divisions. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *20*(4), 455–472.

Strand, S & Hessel, A. (2018). English as an Additional Language, proficiency in English and pupils' educational achievement. https://www.bell-foundation.org.uk/app/uploads/2018/10/EAL-PIE-and-Educational-Achievement-Report-2018-FV.pdf

Thatcher, J., Ingram, N., Burke, C. & Abrahams, J. (2015). Bourdieu - the next generation. Routledge.

Thomson, Pat. & Walker, M. (2010) (eds.) The Routledge Doctoral Student's

Companion. Routledge.

Tikly, L. (2011). Towards a framework for researching the quality of education in low-income countries. *Comparative Education*, *47*(1), 1–23.

Tuffour, I. (2017). A Critical Overview of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: A Contemporary Qualitative Research Approach. *Journal of Healthcare Communications*, *02*(4:52). https://healthcare-communications.imedpub.com/a-critical-overview-of-interpretative-phenomenological-analysis-a-contemporary-qualitative-research-approach.php?aid=20787

UNCRC. (2009). Child Friendly Schools. https://www.unicef.org/media/66486/file/Child-Friendly-Schools-Manual.pdf

UNESCO. (2020). Framework for Action on special needs education. http://www.csie.org.uk/inclusion/unesco-salamanca.shtml

UNICEF. (n.d.). Inclusive Education. https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education

UNICEF. (n.d.-a). Adolescent development and participation | UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/adolescence

UNICEF. (n.d.-b). Rights under the Convention on the Rights of the Child. https://www.unicef.org/crc/index_30177.html

UNICEF. (2011). The State of the World's Children: Aolescence.

https://www.unicef.org/sowc2011/pdfs/SOWC-2011-Main-Report_EN_02092011.pdf

UNICEF. (2014). UNICEF Annual Report 2014. https://www.unicef.org/publications/index_82455.html

Waghid, Y., & Smeyers, P. (2010). On Doing Justice to Cosmopolitan Values and the Otherness of the Other: Living with Cosmopolitan Scepticism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *29*(2), 197–211.

Walker, M. (2006). Towards a capability-based theory of social justice for education policy-making. *Journal of Education Policy*, *21*(2), 163–185.

Walker, M., & Unterhalter, E. (2007). The Capability Approach: Its Potential for Work in Education. In: Walker, M. & Unterhalter, E. (eds.) *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education*, 1–18. Palgrave Macmillan.

Warin, J. (2011). Ethical Mindfulness and Reflexivity. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(9), 805–814.

Wenger, E. (2010) Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems. In: Blackmore, C. (Ed.) *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice.* 179-198*.*

Wilson-Strydom, M., & Walker, M. (2015). A capabilities-friendly conceptualisation of flourishing in and through education. *Journal of Moral Education*, *44*(3), 310–324.

World Health Organisation. (n.d.). Sustainable Development Goals. https://www.who.int/health-topics/sustainable-development-goals#tab=tab_3.

Wright, K. (2010). "Count us in" - Achieving inclusion in Scottish schools: An analysis of policy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *14*(2), 153–164.