

Teacher Education and Professional Development

John Landon

INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, there is no doubt that the rhetoric of teacher education has changed. From a monocultural and broadly assimilationist position, there has been a shift towards an avowed commitment to multiculturalism and anti-racism. The commitment is evident at the level of policy, and in claims made in course proposals and validation documents; the extent to which the rhetoric of change has actually affected practice within teacher training institutions or in school-based in-service programmes is a matter of debate. A major government survey of in-service teacher education in England and Wales in 1981 found that the support for minority group aspirations implicit in terms like 'integration' and 'cultural pluralism' is not necessarily apparent in public practice. In education most special resources allocated to teachers of minority groups continue to support provisions which could be interpreted as assimilatory (Dunn, Eggleston and Purewal 1981). There is little to suggest that the situation has changed in the six years since then, a view supported in evidence on teacher training in England and Wales, submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (Swann 1985).

The assimilationist bias of teacher education is highlighted in the approach adopted towards training to meet the linguistic needs of ethnic minorities. Provision is overwhelmingly oriented towards the teaching of English as a second language. Training of teachers of heritage and Native languages is, by comparison, a desert (Craft and Atkins 1985). However, in relation to general teacher training provision, even ESL teacher training appears to be marginal and low-level, a situation which exists internationally, as suggested, for example, by reports from U.K. (Dunn, Eggleston and Purewal 1981), Canada (Newsham and Acheson 1981) and Australia (Campbell et al. 1984). Higher status is usually reserved for the more prestigious and money-earning English as a foreign language teacher training operations.

The discrepancies between the claims and the practice of teacher training for a multicultural and multilingual society indicate a number of serious shortfalls in current provision. It is not keeping pace with societal change, nor with the increasingly urgent calls from minority groups for the education system to be responsive to their aspirations and demands. It

is not in tune with the most recent research findings into bilingual development, which show points of similarity (Ervin-Tripp 1974; Ellis 1985) and complementarity (Cummins 1979; Cummins and Swain 1986; Rees 1981) between first and second language development, and the need to create environments where the target language is a genuine means of communication and learning, rather than the objective of formal language instruction (Krashen 1982; Hester and Steedman forthcoming). Nor does it lead towards curricular and structural changes within schools, as advocated at least for TESL in the Bullock Report (1975) and a decade later by Swann (1985): namely that 'the needs of learners of ESL should be met by provision within the mainstream as part of a comprehensive programme of language education for *all* children.' Neither report, however, broadens the scope of its recommendations to include provision for *all* languages, thus perpetuating the outsider status of Native and heritage languages within (or, more often, outside) the mainstream school.

These shortfalls in current provision for professional development need to be addressed urgently if provision is to match demand, and is to be responsive to recent research findings and developments in schools. If teacher training is to prepare teachers who can meet the needs and maximise the potential of children, *qua* bilinguals, TESL training and the training of teachers of non-official languages must be brought closer together, so that from the training stage there develops a tradition of collaboration between professionals in each of these areas.

Progress towards a holistic approach to professional development in the education of bilinguals might be seen as moving through three stages. First of all, it is necessary to provide openings, and strengthen opportunities, for the training of heritage and Native language teachers, so that ESL teacher training opportunities do not continue to outstrip those which exist for teachers of the first languages of minority groups. If this is not done, the balance in schools will continue to be weighted in favour of TESL, with heritage and Native languages remaining at the margins of provision, with an untrained or inadequately trained teaching force. Second, from a practice of training language teachers who will operate outside the mainstream class, training for first and second language teachers needs to be geared towards bilingual development within the mainstream. It must also be complemented by the inclusion of elements, within the training of all class and subject teachers, which raise awareness of the nature and benefits of bilingualism, and of the role of all teachers in providing for bilingual development, both when working alone, or when team-teaching with language specialists. Third, the planning and operation of initial and in-service teacher training programmes should be predicated upon the existence, across the curriculum and throughout the school, of a whole network of potential for language development, and of

an overlapping continuum of language needs. Such a comprehensive view of language throughout the school would demonstrate the mutually supportive interests and roles of first language teachers (i.e. teachers, of English/French as a mother tongue, and of Native and heritage languages), teachers of ESL, and teachers of foreign languages. These three stages represent both a progression in the evolution of a comprehensive programme of teacher training, and, as will be demonstrated later, a framework for the planning of in-service training programmes at different levels.

Stage 1 Making provision for the training of teachers of heritage and Native languages

One consequence of a subtractive approach to minority group bilingualism (Lambert 1977) is the dearth of initial and in-service training provisions for teachers of those languages. An effective and credible heritage and Native language teaching programme, however, depends upon the establishment of a highly qualified and well-trained cadre of teachers. A second consequence would be the shortage of entrants adequately qualified in specific heritage or Native languages, were training courses to exist. The paucity and poverty of language courses at school, and the high degree of language shift which occurs under the pressure of majority languages (Tosi 1984) have meant that few students graduate from secondary school, or university courses in those languages. The vicious circle is complete (Craft and Atkins 1985).

In order to provide an infrastructure to support a steady flow of entrants into teacher training, points of entry into the vicious circle must be opened at several levels: see Figure 1.

First, for those who do not have appropriate qualifications, or adequate competence, in the language they wish to teach (Categories A and B) development programmes, in further or adult education, need to be set up as a means of access to teacher training. They may concentrate on the development of communicative competence in domains other than 'home' and 'community', and will need to strengthen higher-order literacy skills.

Second, instead of demanding secondary school matriculation or a university degree in the relevant language as a condition of entry into teacher training, colleges and teacher accreditation bodies could shift the effective gateway for entry into the profession to the qualification gained on termination of the training course, and accept students for training who could demonstrate a high level of communicative competence and literacy alone (Category B). There are precedents for such flexibility in conditions of entry to attract teachers to shortage subjects, like physics

and mathematics, or new subjects, like computing. However, any suggestion of a change in entry requirements for teachers of heritage or Native languages is usually greeted by protests over lowering standards.

Third, qualifications which provide a basic level of training for teachers in supplementary language schools, could be accepted as a formal and accreditable teaching qualification, through the addition of a module dealing with wider professional aspects of the theory and practice of teaching and learning (Category C). A basic training course for heritage language teachers, which could be supplemented in this way, has been devised by the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) in UK to lead to a Diploma in the Teaching of Community Languages (RSA 1986). Entry to such a course is a minimum of secondary matriculation in the language, an acceptable level of communicative competence and literacy in the heritage language, assessed over the period of an access course where these exist. The RSA programme consists of a minimum of 100 class contact hours, and is designed to provide an understanding of the theory of language teaching and learning, balanced with the demands of practical application. Two of the three assessment requirements are of a practical nature: the production of a scheme of work for a particular learning group, and an assessment of practical teaching. The third requirement is a written examination covering the theoretical aspects of the course. This examination and the scheme of work may be presented either in English or in the heritage language.

Course Types:

1. Access Course: First language enrichment/higher order literacy skills
2. Modular Training Course (e.g. RSA Diploma)
 - a) Module One: Theory of bilingual development
 - b) Module Two: Description of heritage language
 - c) Module Three: Language teaching methodology
 - d) Module Four: Practicum (classroom-based teaching practice, and seminars on lesson planning and evaluation)
3. Bridging Course: Theory of Education

A final point of entry into the vicious circle of inadequate provision is to improve possibilities of entry into graduate training courses. This requires tertiary institutions to offer programmes in those languages to degree level (Category D). Craft and Atkins (1985) see the graduate course route as the most probable main future avenue in this field. However, more realistically, they add the postscript that 'if on further investigation under-

graduate provision proves to be limited, an additional way of breaking into the vicious circle would be to extend the present practice of allowing undergraduates without modern language 'A' levels (i.e. the standard university entrance requirement in England and Wales) to commence courses in heritage languages as initiates.'

Figure 1
Variable Training Routes For Heritage and Native Language Teachers

Category of Teacher	Course Type						Certification/ Accreditation
	1	2 a	2 b	2 c	2 d	3	
A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
B	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
E		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
F	(?)	✓	✓	✓	✓	(?)	✓(?) already gained
G	(?)	✓	✓				✓ already gained

The recognition of the variety of base-lines at which prospective heritage and Native language teachers commence, and the provision of access to training through staged entry points is necessary, if the whole gamut of needs is to be met. Access courses, providing language enrichment and development of higher order literary skills, leading into a modular teacher training course, which, in turn, might provide entry into a bridging course in the theory and practice of education, should secure accreditation and entry into the teaching profession. A further reason for a flexible training programme is the variation in teaching situations which heritage and Native language teachers might expect to meet. Some will teach their first language as a subject; others will use it as a medium. Those teaching it as a subject will serve either in mainstream schools or in supplementary

community-run schools. In community schools, the language may be the prime focus of teaching, or it may be linked to cultural enrichment or religious/moral instruction. Those using the first language as a medium may be employed in full or partial bilingual programmes, which continue through the various stages at the school, or they may be working in transitional programmes only in the early years of nursery and primary education (Tansley 1986). Those teaching the language as a subject might find that they have more in common with foreign language teachers; those using the language as a medium might benefit more from shared training with ESL teachers.

Stage 2 Training of first and second language teachers towards bilingual development within the mainstream

Recently there has been a change in policy and practice with a movement away from withdrawing bilingual learners from mainstream classrooms for ESL support to giving responsibility for English language development to the mainstream teacher, with the support of an ESL specialist. This change however is by no means universally welcomed nor implemented. Very often separate funding arrangements for the education of migrants make change difficult. However, the withdrawal of bilingual learners from the benefits of interaction with English-speaking peers, the meaningful context of the mainstream classroom and curriculum, and the denial of equal access to the full public education system are clearly not within the best interests of the migrant child. This has been recognised by minority groups and by organisations defending equal rights. In November 1986, for example, one English local education authority was formally investigated by the U.K. Commission for Racial Equality on the grounds that the system it operated of 'segregating Asian children (for English language instruction) from mainstream schooling might be racially discriminatory' (CRE 1986). Whilst recommending a change in provision in schools, the investigation report implies that a complementary change in the content of teacher training is long overdue. Emphasis is placed upon the need to modify training programmes, to prepare mainstream primary, or secondary, subject teachers to provide adequate support for bilingual learners as they use English as a medium for learning and engaging in class activities. Also, ESL teachers, who formerly taught largely on a withdrawal basis, require modifications to their training programmes, in order that they might be prepared to take on an unfamiliar consultancy and support role within the mainstream classroom, and, in some cases, across the whole school as 'language coordinators' (Riley and Bleach 1985). The point is made that 'when the structure (of withdrawal) is dismantled, it is vital to ensure that appror-

priate support remains. The provision of this support will only become possible through a programme of teacher training which encompasses all teachers involved in multilingual situations.' (CRE 1986). The danger, for bilingual learners, is that the present ESL support programmes, however inadequate and inappropriate they might be, will be removed, and learners will be placed in mainstream classrooms, where teachers are not prepared for them, and the few specialists that remain are not equipped to identify the linguistic demands of the new context, nor to support the learners in meeting them. The last state might turn out to be worse than the first.

A new era of TESL provision within the mainstream class requires new training emphases, and a restructuring so that training programmes do not merely encompass the needs of specialist second language teachers, but of all teachers who may have contact with bilingual learners during their professional lives. At the same time, with the increasing development of programmes which use heritage or Native languages as a medium of instruction (Cummins 1984; Rado 1984; Tansley 1986), there is a requirement, during training, for first language teachers to gain an awareness of the linguistic demands of mainstream learning tasks, and to know how to diagnose needs, provide appropriate support and intervene effectively, during the learning process. Equally, if first language support teachers are working collaboratively, in transition or bilingual education programmes within the mainstream context, with second language, and subject teachers, they too will need to develop skills which will enable them to plan and work collaboratively, in an effective manner with their colleagues (Nicholas 1985; Robinson 1985).

Such a comprehensive and collaborative approach to bilingual development, in operation within schools, should clearly be reflected within programmes of teacher education. As Wiles (1985) reports, some training centres have over the years responded to the changing nature of provision. In-service training courses at the London Centre for Urban Educational Studies have evolved in the ways represented within their titles:

- 1978 The education of children whose mother-tongue is not English.
- 1980 Collaboration and learning in the multilingual classroom (with a special focus on second-language learners)
- 1984 Language issues in the multicultural classroom: supporting children's first and second language development.

This convergence of interests in mainstream, second, and first language teacher training, when the first or second language is to be used as a medium of instruction, would suggest a rationalisation of training provision. The modular course already outlined in Fig. 1 could be further

extended, to meet the training needs of teachers working within the mainstream. First of all, for those whose approach to bilingual learners has been influenced by the deficit argument and by the practice of withdrawal, a change of perceptions is required. Module One, dealing with the theory of bilingual development, would introduce a positive perspective on bilingualism. It would also provide an opportunity for second language teachers to hear the views and experiences of Native and heritage language speakers at first hand.

The language description module (Module Two) would need to be divided according to specific languages or groups of cognate languages. The third and fourth modules, dealing with pedagogical issues, would be differentiated according to whether the language was to be taught as a subject, or as a medium. There are several reasons for this; first, the content of language teaching is different. In the first case, the language itself is the subject matter of teaching, often together with the culture of the minority group. In the second case, the subject matter is that of the mainstream classroom. The second reason for differentiation relates to the different patterns of classroom management found within the two teaching situations. Where the language is taught as a subject, the language teacher works alone. Where it is developed as a medium, complex patterns of collaboration between the mainstream teacher and support staff are necessary at the planning, delivery and evaluation stages, involving the bringing together of different perspectives and the fulfilment of different roles. A third reason is the understandable opposition that heritage and Native language teachers sometimes voice when second language teaching methodology is recommended as the approach to teaching the minority language. Distrust of paternalism, the desire of minority language groups to be given the responsibility for the development of their own methodologies and the feeling that second language teaching methodology is only appropriate for transitional programmes underlie this stance (Alladina 1986).

Methodological training for teachers of first or second languages as the medium of instruction and learning would involve consideration of the relationship between language and learning; in particular, the necessity of providing for maximum peer-group interaction (Barnes 1976; Barnes and Todd 1977; Wells 1981). In addition, attention would be focussed on the informal strategies that children employ to support the language learning of other children with whom they are working. Certain learning tasks, like classroom investigations, stories and the staged development of concepts in primary school mathematics and science, provide ideal contexts to encourage interaction between children, and to structure support for language development (Hester 1985; Hester and Steedman, forthcoming). The growth of common perceptions and collaborative patterns of work-

ing with the mainstream classroom resulting from joint training programmes provide a sound basis for a holistic approach to bilingual development within the school.

The model so far discussed is appropriate for initial teacher training, or the traditional college- or school- based in-service course planned and presented by individuals from outside the school. The working procedures which they suggest are, to a certain extent, idealised. Individual schools, with their own traditions, networks of staff relationships and pupil populations, will throw up their own needs, which will require very specific solutions. In-service courses, in which the staff of a particular school identify their own needs and priorities and set about responding to them within the context of the school, are likely to have great potential for initiating change at a local level (Wiles 1985). In the dynamic field of bilingual education, issues are bound to arise during training which require further exploration and research. One approach to staff development, used within Inner London, is to identify these issues and to centre around them an action research project which involves staff from a number of schools working under the direction of a coordinator from outside. The findings of the research are constantly fed back into the schools as a basis for curricular or pedagogical innovation. Projects serve to bring together first and second language teachers as well as general classroom teachers (Wiles 1985; Riley and Bleach 1985), with the result that bilingual development is being brought from the deficit closets tucked away in the recesses of the curriculum into the daylight of the school's total language provision.

Stage 3 Recognising, during training, the continuum of language provision existing in schools

Every trainer of ESL teachers, who has had the opportunity to share the 'arcane' skills of the TESL profession with teachers of English as a mother-tongue will be familiar with the look of surprise and the gasps of enlightenment as they realise that the kind of support provided for bilingual learners of English might help monolingual learners as well (Landon 1983a). Similarly, teachers of heritage and Native languages who have taken part in curriculum planning with teachers of foreign languages will know that they too have many interests in common. Yet, first and second language provision for minority language groups remains largely apart from first and second language provision for majority language groups. Training programmes also are separate. Schools, and teacher training institutions largely fail to perceive a continuum in the language provisions which they make.

Interests of English mother-tongue and ESL teachers coalesce also

when we consider the varieties of language within a school: distinct languages, interlanguages, creoles, non-standard dialects, as well as accented varieties of standard Englishes. A number of these may comprise the repertoires of individual learners. Exciting new literary forms arise when this wide range of varieties, rather than the narrow repertoire of the monolingual English speaker (whose non-standard variety is possibly disallowed), becomes the source of selection for stylistic effect. New depths are possible when bilingual writers perceive and use English through their bilingual eyes, and from the experience of straddling two cultures. 'Out of a sense of loss, of exclusion, foreignness, of having no demarcated culture of your own, can come this sort of assertiveness, even aggression, a conviction that there is something of spectacular importance in the outsider's stance vis-a-vis a society's taken-for-granted assumptions.' (Miller 1983). Studies of a bilingual's use of the second language will be of interest to teachers of English or French as a mother tongue, in providing insights into the teaching of composition to second-language learners, and into the appreciation of writers writing in their second language.

Teachers of languages other than English — first or foreign languages — also have much to learn from each other. When the languages are taught as subjects, they share the problem of communicative syllabus design, without an obvious body of content (Brumfit 1984). In Britain, both heritage and foreign language syllabus design has derived much from the 'graded levels of achievement' model, inspired by the Council of Europe's Threshold Level (Council of Europe 1975; Clark and Hamilton 1984). Although the contexts in which the languages are used will be different, the approach to selection and grading, and the use of a wide range of activities to stimulate language use within the topic areas, has been found to be helpful across the range of languages. The model too has proved a useful framework for the criterion-referenced assessment procedures adopted for learners studying foreign languages at ages 14 and 16+, and is likely to be trialled at the same levels for heritage language learners (Clark et al. 1984). Clearly, if a common methodology and set of assessment procedures can be found for foreign, and heritage and Native languages, it provides the latter with an entry into the prestigious position traditionally held by the former. This could serve to bring heritage and Native languages from the margins of provision to enjoy equal status with other languages.

Finally, a recent introduction to the curriculum at upper primary and lower secondary levels, may be the rallying point for the so far separated language inputs across the school. Language awareness as a curricular area is attracting considerable attention in British schools (Donmall 1985), and has also been a feature of language education in some Austral-

ian states (Trounce & Quinn 1985). It is variously defined as teaching directly *about* language as an introduction to foreign language learning (as, for example, in Aplin et al. 1981) or as enabling pupils to reflect upon their own experience of language, language learning and language use (Raleigh 1984). It is seen as a perspective which might integrate English mother-tongue, foreign and classical language studies and heritage languages, and which might be developed also in other subject classrooms. In a multilingual school, it would introduce the language dimension of the multicultural curriculum and in a predominantly monolingual school would be one means of combatting linguistic prejudice (Rado 1984; Houlton 1985). Research evidence of the greater linguistic awareness of bilingual learners would seem to show that this is a curricular area in which they might excel (Cummins 1979).

These examples of interests shared by all language teachers suggest that teacher education and professional development within the language area should be comprehensive enough to allow collaboration and exchange of views at the training stage, as well as within the school. Certainly, within a multilingual society all teachers should be given a positive awareness of bilingualism as part of the core of initial teacher education programmes. However, at higher levels of professional development, within post-graduate and masters programmes, opportunities should be given for language teachers of all kinds to study together, and to pursue interests which they have in common. Higher studies of language acquisition, language use, language variety and variation, literacy, language and power, and so on, as they manifest themselves within a multilingual society, and as they affect teaching and learning, would form the basis of these programmes.

CONCLUSION

The imperialistic precept of 'Divide and Rule' has not only informed colonial government. It appears also to have led to the fragmentation of language provision across schools, and to the establishment of a definite hierarchy of language subjects. Teacher education and staff development programmes reflect this fragmentation. There is an urgent need to change this unfortunate situation, in the interests of ensuring equality of access and opportunity for all children within our multicultural and multilingual societies. First of all, the infrastructure within teacher education required to support the continuation of heritage and Native language programmes in schools needs to be strengthened. The possibilities for integrated provision afforded by the use of ESL and heritage and Native languages as mediums of instruction need to be developed within teacher training, and within schools. The common interests of language teachers across the

curriculum also need to be recognised. Each of these developments in teacher training will only eventuate within institutions whose structures and practices are governed by a commitment to multiculturalism and equality of opportunity. Narrow subject compartmentalisation, which engenders defensiveness and suspicion of initiatives which might threaten professional territoriality, is a barrier to outside groups looking for a point of entry. Selection procedures drawn up for what was considered to be a relatively homogeneous society will discriminate against those who do not belong to that particular social, linguistic or cultural group. Monolingual and ethnocentric curricula do not encourage the full contribution and cooperation of bilingual students from different cultural backgrounds. With the restructuring of teacher education for a multilingual society, there must inevitably come professional 'glasnost' (openness).

REFERENCES

- Alladina, S. (1986). Black people's languages in Britain — a historical and contemporary perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7(5), 349-359.
- Aplin, A. et al. (1981). *Introduction to Language*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Barnes, D. & Todd, F. (1977). *Communication and learning in small groups*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Broadbent, J. (1984). Towards a programme of in-service teacher training for community language teachers. In Reid E. (Ed.) *Minority community languages in school*. NCLE Papers and Reports 4, London: CILT.
- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, C., Ellis, R. & Levine, J. (Eds.) (1985). *English as a second language in the United Kingdom: Linguistic and educational contexts*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Bullock, Sir A. (1975). *A language for life*. HMSO.
- Campbell, W. J., Barnett, J., Joy, B., & McMeniman, M. (1984). *A review of the Commonwealth ESL program*. Commonwealth Schools Commission: Canberra.
- Cherrington, D. & Giles, R. (1981). Present provision in initial training. In Craft, M. (Ed.) *Teaching in a multicultural society: The task for teacher education*, Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Clark, J. L. & Hamilton, J. (1984). *Syllabus guidelines 1: Communication: A graded communicative approach towards school foreign language learning*. London: CILT.
- Clark, J. et al. (1984). *Assessment in modern languages 51-54*. (mimeo: Lothian Region Education Department).
- Commission for Racial Equality. (1986). *Teaching English as a second language: Report of a formal investigation in Calderdale LEA*. London: CRE.
- Council of Europe. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Craft, M. & Atkins, M. (1985). *Training of teachers of ethnic minority community languages*. In Swann (op. cit.).
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 222-251.
- Cummins, J. (1984). The minority language child. In Shapson, S. & D'Oyley, V. (Eds.) (op.cit.).
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. Harlow: Longman.
- Donmall, B. G. (Ed.) (1985). *Language awareness*. NCLE Papers and Reports 6. London: CILT.
- Dunn, D., Eggleston, J., & Purewal, A. (1981). In-service education for the teaching of minority groups in England and Wales. In Megarry, J. et al. (Eds.) *World yearbook of education: Education of minorities*. London: Kogan Page.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1974). Is second language learning like the first? *TESOL Quarterly*, 8, 111-127.
- Gillham, B. (Ed.). (1986). *The language of school subjects*. London: Heinemann.
- Hester, H. (1985). Learning from children learning. In Brumfit, C. et al. (Eds.) (op. cit.).
- Hester, H. & Steedman, C. (Forthcoming). *The multilingual primary classroom: Children and teachers working together*. London: Heinemann.
- Houlton, D. (1985). *All our languages: A handbook for the multilingual classroom*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lambert, W. E. (1977). The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural consequences. In Hornby, P. A. (Ed.) *Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Landon, J. (1983a). TESL in the secondary school: Mystery or plain good practice? *Teaching English*, 16(2), 12-14.
- Landon, J. (1983b). Patterns of liaison: The TESL specialist and the subject teacher. *Teaching English*, 17(1), 32-35.
- Levine, J. (1985). On the "training" of teachers. In Brumfit, C. et al. (Eds.) (op. cit.).
- Miller, J. (1983). *Many voices: Bilingualism, culture and education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Newsham, G. S. & Acheson, P. (1981). *English as a second language in Canada*. Centre for the Teaching of English as a Second Language. Montreal: Concordia University.
- Nicholas, H. (1985). The implications of bilingual education for teacher education. Paper presented to the State Conference on Teacher Education for ESL, Community Languages and Bilingual Education. Victoria, Australia.
- Rado, M. (1984). *Teaching in the multilingual classroom*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Raleigh, M. (1984). *The languages book*. Ebury Teachers Centre: ILEA.

- Rees, O. (1981). *Mother tongue and English teaching project*. Bradford College.
- Riley, S. & Bleach, J. (1985). Three moves in the initiating of mainstreaming at secondary level. In Brumfit, C. et al. (Eds.) (op. cit.).
- Robinson, B. (1985). Bilingualism and mother tongue maintenance in Britain. In Brumfit et al. (Eds.) (op. cit.).
- Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board. (1986). *Certificates and diplomas in language teaching*. London: RSA.
- Shapson, S. & D'Oyley, V. (Eds.). (1974). *Bilingual and multicultural education: Canadian perspectives*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Swann, L. (1985). *Education for all: The report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups*. London: HMSO.
- Tansley, P. (1986). *Community languages in primary education*. Windsor, Berks: NFER/Nelson.
- Torbe, M. et al. (Eds.). (1981, 1982). *Language teaching and learning*. London: Ward Lock. Series.
- Tosi, A. (1984). *Immigration and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Trounce, M. & Quinn, T. J. (1985). Some aspects of Australian experience with Language Awareness Courses. In Donmall, B. G. (Ed.) (op. cit.).
- Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiles, S. (1985). Developments in ESL INSET: One centre's experience. In Brumfit, C. et al. (Eds.) (op. cit.).

THE AUTHOR

John Landon is the Director of the Multicultural and Anti-Racist Education unit of the College of Education, Moray House, Edinburgh. He is one of the architects of the Royal Society of Arts Certificate for Teaching Community Languages. He has broad skills in language education, has extensive foreign experience and is fluent in Japanese. He was a visiting professor in 1987 at Concordia University.