

Punjabi and Heritage Language Planning in the UK

By: Stephen Gucciardi



A dissertation submitted for the Master of Philosophy in Modern South Asian Studies

at the University of Oxford

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
List of Abbreviations	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Language Planning	4
Micro Language Planning	8
Terminology: 'Heritage'	11
3. Macro Planning: Bilingual Education & Heritage Language Provision	14
The Early Years: Bilingual Education	15
The Swing to English: Inaction & Rhetoric	22
<i>Literacy & EAL</i>	23
<i>Heritage Language Provision & Modern Foreign Language Policy</i>	25
Recent Years	28
Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland	35
Changes in School Structure	37
4. Micro-Planning: Punjabis in the UK	40
Migration History	41
Punjabi Sociolinguistic Context	44
<i>The Chic Factor</i>	48
The History of Urdu in the UK	50
Class Offerings: Economically Feasible?	56
Declining Examinations Enrolment pre-EBacc: A Micro Perspective	61
Faith Schools, Academies and Free Schools	64
5. Conclusion	67
Bibliography	69

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Alison Shaw, for providing support throughout the preparation of this dissertation. She helped direct my initial curiosity in investigating the vitality of Punjabi in the UK, and her anthropological work on British Pakistanis was of great assistance in familiarising me with the wider South Asian community in this country. She has been incredibly accessible and helpful at every step.

I would also like to thank Fozia Tenvir and Caroline Roaf, two teachers from the Oxford area introduced to me by Dr. Shaw. I greatly appreciate having had the opportunity to discuss trends in the British education system relevant to migrants and their descendants with two teaching professionals.

Dr. Rosalind O'Hanlon and Dr. Imre Bangha of the Oriental Institute at the University of Oxford were of great assistance in aiding me during my initial brainstorming period. As tempting as it may be, conducting a study on the Bhojpuri diaspora will have to wait until my next life.

Derek Gillard's excellent categorisation and organisation of primary texts relevant to the British education system saved me untold hours of cross-referencing and trawling through libraries. Like many other students of education in the United Kingdom, I am indebted to his hard work.

Lastly, I am deeply thankful for the support provided by my family, without which I would not have had the opportunity to attend Oxford. Fellow students of St. Cross have also been invaluable in providing the emotional support required during protracted periods of studying and writing.

List of Abbreviations

DCSF – Department for Children, Schools and Families

DEE – Department for Education and Employment

DESc – Department of Education and Science

DESk – Department for Education and Skills

DfE – Department for Education

EAL – English as an Additional Language

EBacc – English Baccalaureate

KS – Key Stage

LEA – Local Education Authority

MFL – Modern Foreign Languages

NALDC – National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum

ONS – Office for National Statistics

QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

1. Introduction

As the world economy has become increasingly globalised, so has the role of language education increasingly been seen through the lens of international trade and supranational institutions. Within the United Kingdom, a sense of crisis prevails; while students of the past were confident in their education in the Classics or the language training provided for taking up positions throughout the Empire, today's youth have increasingly turned away from foreign languages. In a world in which global business is conducted in English and languages risk spoiling one's prospects in an education system more strictly defined by standardised tests than ever before, who can blame them?

Addressing this issue, the British Academy called attention to the country's disturbingly low level of language education in 2013: 75% of the country, the report claims, is unable to converse in ten of the most important world languages for the UK's 'economic and cultural wellbeing': Spanish, Arabic, French, Mandarin Chinese, German, Portuguese, Italian, Russian, Turkish, and Japanese (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 14). Government has responded to these challenges through educational reform that has moved towards making language study mandatory at earlier stages of education in children's lives. Schemes such as the English Baccalaureate have further incentivised language study.

Missing in this conversation is a deep appreciation for the UK's population of multilingual migrants and their descendants. The country has grown increasingly diverse since the 1950s. New communities of Somalis, Iraqis and Afghans live aside their more established Indian, Pakistani and East African counterparts. Though the languages of many of these communities have been formally adopted by the education system through

establishing formal qualifications, no government has crafted a national education strategy around the particular needs of those seeking to develop or learn their ‘heritage languages’. Instead, attention is limited to students interested in a general ‘modern foreign languages’ education. Today, despite the qualified success of some of the measures referenced above, many of these heritage languages are facing declining enrolment as their native speakers age and the majority of youth grow further removed from their migrant kin.

This dissertation has emerged out of curiosity surrounding what determines the fortunes of a heritage language in the British education system, as well as a particular concern for the decline in the position of Punjabi: the language of some of Britain's oldest, most established migrants of the 20th century, and the holy language of Britain's Sikhs, totalling over 400,000 persons. Beginning with an investigation of national education policy post-WW2, the project quickly widened in scope to consider the role of local actors responding to the particular pressures of the specific migrant communities that local education authorities were meant to integrate into mainstream schools.

In investigating early institutional responses to the needs of Punjabis, a simultaneous consideration of the unique role of Urdu became unavoidable. As the language of choice for Britain’s Pakistani Punjabi community, Urdu’s fate has been deeply intertwined with that of Punjabi. Similarities between the two run deep: Urdu figures centrally in North Indian Islam, much like Punjabi amongst the Sikhs, and the vast majority of the supporters of both Urdu and Punjabi in the UK share ethnic Punjabi ancestry. Yet even after adjusting for differences in population, literacy, and geography of settlement, Urdu seemed to continuously fare better in attracting students and the attention of educational administrators.

What seems to differentiate Urdu from Punjabi is its long history of community activism, such as free teacher training, national parties working on materials and syllabi, and fund raising. The work of the late Ralph Russell, head of the Department of Urdu at the School of Oriental and African Studies, formed the core of many of these early efforts. Using his personal notes and the wide variety of publications by his students and allies, this dissertation makes the case that these campaigns dug deep roots for Urdu in Britain, demonstrated most recently by the language's strong upswing following the latest rounds of education reform.

Punjabi and Urdu together serve as an example of how a complex array of factors combine to influence the place of heritage languages amongst other modern foreign languages in Britain's current education system. The early history of bilingual education and subsequent discourses surrounding 'English as an additional language' programs contribute towards charting the course taken by top-down players in the process. This wider perspective is methodologically framed by the academic discipline of micro language planning, which highlights the importance of local actors in influencing or directing state attempts to control language.

This project therefore advances an argument on how heritage languages are best nurtured. There is a clear role for both strong policy and the organised efforts of migrant communities in ensuring that Britain's children are best equipped with the linguistic skills necessary to succeed as pupils and later as professionals.

2. Language Planning

The position of heritage language instruction in the British education system has been shaped by a combination of planning and action at both the national and local levels. Individuals, groups of educators, unions, advocacy groups, government departments, and the legislative branch of government have all contributed to this end. That branch of the academy concerned with understanding the interrelation of all of these actors in seeking to control the use of language, the content of their actions, and the actual final outcomes is known as language planning and policy.

Academic material focused on the role played by academics themselves, government and government-sponsored actors in shaping language originally fell under the label of ‘language planning’. Ferguson traces the origin of the field to E. Haugen’s 1959 journal article, *Planning for a Standard Language in Norway*, in which he examined the history of the Norwegian language following Norway’s independence from Denmark (2006: 1). The term was methodologically reinforced by Rubin’s 1971 chapter, *Evaluation and language planning* (Ferguson, 2006: 16). The term ‘language policy’ would gain prominence with the dual-emergence of the journals *Current Issues in Language Planning* and *Language Policy* in the years 2000 and 2001, bolstered by B. Spolsky’s *Language Policy* (2004) and S. Wright’s *Language Policy and Language Planning* (2004) (Ferguson, 2006: 4-5), but ultimately deriving from earlier discussions in Baldauf (1994), Schiffman (1996), and Kaplan & Baldauff (2003) (Ferguson, 2006: 16).

These early works divided language policy and language planning into the respective realms of setting goals and their implementation, but discussion quickly arose

surrounding the implied linearity and segregation of these processes. Many scholars therefore pair the terms together so as to encourage constant consideration of both angles (Ferguson, 2006: 16). This dissertation adopts the academy's original use of 'language planning' due to the continued ambiguity encouraged by the use of separate terms, and the lexical feasibility of subsuming 'policy' under 'planning'. This choice also emphasises the role of micro planning in determining the success of heritage language instruction in the United Kingdom, which has traditionally been informed by an explicit lack of 'policy' on heritage languages on behalf of government, as is discussed below.

Initial work on language planning was embedded in scholarship responding to decolonisation and state demands for the development of unique, 'modern' national languages (Ferguson, 2006: 1). Throughout the 1960s, lexicons were developed, language laws written, reference grammars compiled, and new curricula enforced. The success of these efforts varied widely according to context as former colonial languages were often entrenched as languages of the bureaucratic, political, and business elite. They also often occupied a neutral status in multiethnic states, meaning their rejection risked inflaming ethnic tension (ibid, 2). Language planning in this era was therefore engaged both in planning efforts themselves and discussions around the factors informing their implementation and likelihood of success (ibid).

Academics of a variety of disciplinary stripes began their attack on language planning in the 1980s by accusing it of feeding elite, nationalist agendas (Ferguson, 2006: 3). The combination of this critique and the failure of planning efforts saw the field's decline until it began to boom in the 2000s. Ferguson attributes this shift to four distinct factors: the rise of ethnonationalisms with the USSR's collapse and further decolonisation

in countries such as South Africa; subnationalism and resultant language movements within European nation states; the impacts of globalisation, such as transnationalism, mass migration, global English and language death; and the growth of supranational organizations and their administrative language needs (2010: 5-8).

The question of how best to approach the role of language in educating migrants and their children extends back to the work of policy makers, educators and applied linguists of the 1960s. Consider the example of early bilingual education in Sweden: by the school year of 1979-1980, 8.2% of children in Swedish schools were speaking a language other than Swedish in the government school system (Kerr, 1984: 172). Earlier, in 1975, government had passed a bill adopting a policy of 'equality, freedom of choice, [and] co-operation' in adapting to the country's new state of multicultural pluralism (ibid, 173). This translated not only into a policy of free Swedish classes for migrants and their children (ibid, 174), but an expansion of efforts dating to 1966 in providing language support in the student's home language within the classroom (ibid, 179). By 1977, schools were obliged to arrange for teaching in the home language to all pupils between 7 and 16 years of age with the support of government grants (ibid, 181). Two years later, 52 languages were being taught by over 3,000 instructors and 47,100 out of 84,000 eligible students were attending such classes (ibid, 184).

Bilingual education in the United States has proceeded down a path much more strongly defined by assimilationist aims than in the Swedish model. By 1980, 11% of Americans used a language other than English at home. This statistic jumped three points by 1990. In states such as California, New York and Texas, numbers climbed to over 50% (Ferguson, 2006: 38). Apart from an insignificant total of \$7.5 million offered by the 1968

Bilingual Education Act to help schools across the country accommodate students with poor English skills, there was little initial support for these pupils' needs. Progress came with a Supreme Court case in 1974 brought against the San Francisco Unified School Board by Chinese-American parents, in which it was declared unlawful for schools to make no effort to accommodate their linguistically diverse student body (ibid, 42). The Department of Education thereafter endorsed a policy of supporting 'English as an additional language' focused education and support in the home language until the student could transition into the mainstream classroom. Following decades saw greater efforts to include students in ESL programs and a corresponding growth in official discourse prioritising English acquisition over home language support (ibid).

More recent history has seen the solidification of this English-centric approach. California's 1998 Proposition 227 replaced bilingual education with a single year of EAL. Other states adopted similar legislation, a trend culminating in the Federal Department of Education's No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (Ferguson, 2006: 43). Its focus on test-taking and measureable results extended to tracking students' English progress while bilingual programs were restricted to three years in duration (ibid, 44). The renaming of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs to the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficiency Students summarises the extent of this shift (ibid). Apart from the dearth of support for bilingual education, there are no federal drives supporting heritage language instruction. Such provision varies according to local educational bodies.

The American and Swedish examples show the degree to which politicization affects the content of language policy. While early Swedish efforts rooted in pragmatism

found quick support and reinforcement by a government committed to the ideals of a pluralistic multiculturalism, policy in the United States transitioned from pragmatism to an assimilationist response, thereafter influenced by wider assimilationist politics. Most striking in the case of the United Kingdom is how early efforts seemed to mirror much in the pluralistic policies of Sweden at the local level, whilst later years matched much in the USA's swing towards assimilation as the central government exacted deepening influence over the classroom. The exact path of bilingual and heritage language instruction in the UK will be analysed in depth below.

Beyond informing legislators as they attempt to develop policy which responds to both ground and political realities, language planning as an academic discipline can shed light on how local actors interact with the state as the content of these programs is negotiated. Consider the role of a local instructor who uses national grant money to develop a heritage language instruction syllabus that is then adopted by education institutions elsewhere in the country where the relevant migrant community has a significant presence. The subdiscipline of micro language planning examines these relationships to improve our understanding of how these programs can be more effectively developed, implemented, and sustained. It is through this lens of analysing the efforts of local actors that this dissertation attempts to understand the contemporary state of Punjabi heritage language instruction in the United Kingdom.

Micro Language Planning

Micro language planning challenges the assumption that decisions are enforced at the state level on a population and then modified based on distant observation of the new

policy's efficacy. Instead, power works in both directions as locals develop and implement their own policies, or lobby larger government bodies (Liddicoat and Baldauf, 2008: 3). This power is dynamic, extending beyond enforcement to the realm of argument, persuasion, and suggestion (ibid, 4).

At its most personal level, micro language planning includes the actions of individuals, such as a schoolteacher correcting gendered language (Winter and Pauwels, 2008: 204). The individual can wield immense power if their work connects with wider ideological trends: Eliezer Ben-Yehuda led the wildly successful movement to revive Hebrew by developing a modern standard (Liddicoat and Baldauf, 2008: 5). Hebrew is now an official language of Israel alongside Arabic. Wider political or social trends can also doom well-intentioned micro language planning, such as the failure of Oakland's school board to implement African American English programs in the city's schools when confronted with great public opposition (ibid, 10). This interaction between the 'micro' and 'macro' is the primary focus of scholars who study micro language planning.

The history of the contemporary Indian literary standard of Punjabi is replete with examples of macro and micro planning. Tradition attributes the creation of the Gurmukhi script to the fifth religious leader, or 'guru', of the Sikh religion: Guru Arjan Dev. Gurmukhi is used in Sikh scripture and is the official script of Punjabi as it is written in the Indian state of Punjab. Missionaries wrote dictionaries and reference grammars for the language in the 19th century, privileging specific dialectical grammatical forms that survive in today's standard (Diamond, 2011: 296-300). Sikh reformers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries adapted the language to serve as a vehicle for technical language and European literary genres, while the formation of the Indian state of Punjab in 1966

elevated Punjabi to the status of an official language of governance for the first time in its history. A flurry of planning followed and was led by the scholars of Punjabi University, Patiala: a university established in 1962 ‘with the main objective of furthering the cause of Punjabi language, art, and literature’ (THE PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA – Incredible Voyage to a Largest University, 2009). Also of great importance was the earlier 1948 founding of the Punjab Languages Department, the government body which later took control of formulating policy on implementing Punjabi as an official language of administration and education following the state’s creation (ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਭਾਗ, ਪੰਜਾਬ- ਪਿਛੋਕੜ ਤੇ ਇਕ ਝਾਤ, n.d.).

In examining the place of Punjabi in the United Kingdom, the planning in question is limited to the realm of education. As discussed in the next chapter, the majority of programs incorporating Punjabi into state schools via either bilingual education or heritage language instruction did not come into existence until the mid-70s. Some of this was an organic response by local education authorities to the needs of students who happened to have EAL teachers that spoke their home languages, while other programs were organized attempts to better understand the importance of language in educating migrants and their children. This original flurry of activity was explicitly ‘micro’ in character, though it was informed by two very important ‘macro’ factors: national funding made available for the education of commonwealth migrants, and a call by the European Council for its member states to ensure that their migrants’ children would receive education through the medium of their mother tongue.

This dissertation aims to flesh out the interplay of the micro and macro in guiding Punjabi’s path within the British education system. Two interrelated subjects are relevant:

bilingual medium education and heritage language instruction. It is necessary to first discuss what ‘heritage’ implies.

Terminology: ‘Heritage’

Existent literature examining the languages of migrants in the societies in which they have settled differs in the terminology used for discussing these languages in the census and their place in the education system. Mother tongue, immigrant language, community language, heritage language; these terms and many more are found in texts focused on language planning, education theory, and government policy. Each is uniquely problematic.

‘Mother tongue’ is thrice limited in its applicability. Firstly, it is common worldwide that children grow up with some degree of exposure to speech varieties which cross linguistic boundaries. Consider an upper-middle class Hindi-speaker from Delhi who is likely to consume English media, attend an English-medium school, and mix English into speech, even within the family. A variety of factors combine to determine the individual’s comfort using either Hindi or English for a particular purpose, but it is clearly inappropriate to set a strict dichotomy of status between the two, as the term ‘mother tongue’ implies. Secondly, the term may be wholly inaccurate its implication of great ability: the child may have extremely limited faculty in the language, or be entirely monolingual. For children of migrants, daily use of the ‘mother tongue’ is often passive, the child responding to its speakers in the language used outside the home. Thirdly, the term may be inapplicable, as the desired language of study may differ from the language used in the home. An example to which this dissertation repeatedly returns is the desire of

Punjabi-speaking Pakistanis to have their children educated in Urdu. ‘Mother tongue’ is therefore an entirely erroneous term to use when discussing educational efforts aimed at these communities.

‘Immigrant language’ immediately labels the language as external to the nation, stigmatising speakers by forever labelling them outsiders and questioning their level of integration. It implies that these languages are removed from the surrounding society, unvalued by that society, and not of value to those who have not directly migrated. The term seems to imply assimilation as an eventual end.

‘Community language’ and ‘heritage language’ are terms which seem to be favoured by most contemporary writers, but both are also recognised as problematic. Like ‘immigrant language’, these terms draw lines between the speakers and the wider society, identifying the speakers with a distinctly separate community and static culture. Both remove agency from speakers who may wish to study these language for pragmatic purposes without adopting a specific identity. Van Deusen-Scholl notes that the most common objection to these terms is that they implicitly construct a wall between languages, spoken by members of unchanging and ‘timeless’ cultures, and other modern foreign languages, associated with economically-dynamic, modern countries and peoples (2003: 216-7). Both terms nevertheless succeed in avoiding the implications surrounding proficiency inherent in ‘mother tongue’.

This dissertation will employ the term ‘heritage language’ as opposed to ‘community language’. While recognizing that the former may be more convincingly implicated in associating speakers with a static past, the latter implies strict division between communities, which is inappropriate in describing the contemporary position of

Punjabi. The advantage of the term ‘heritage’ is that it calls into focus a more nuanced appreciation of the positioning of Urdu and Punjabi amongst British Punjabis, as detailed below in the discussion of these languages’ social history. Both Sikh and Punjabi Muslims would recognize membership in a shared community: despite the demographic profiles of its varying dialects and technical word choice, the language the two religious groups speak has not been divided as have Hindi and Urdu. Adherents of the two faiths also share an ethnic identity based around the geographical region of Punjab. Nevertheless, their chosen languages of education have a history as strong components of these two distinct religious identities: Urdu is strongly associated with South Asian Islam and Punjabi with Sikhism. The religious and educational institutions affiliated with these languages are rooted in a sense of a distinct spiritual and intellectual inheritance. ‘Heritage’ is therefore preferable to ‘community’ in describing the role of these languages within the wider Punjabi ethnic community.

Another dimension of this debate touches on when a student is to be differentiated as a ‘heritage learner’ in a classroom setting. Van Deusen-Scholl summarises the literature as a struggle between authors privileging the student’s actual use of the language outside the classroom and those privileging the student’s cultural identity (2003: 221). While the latter has sociological value in understanding the relationship between the descendants of migrants and the heritage language, the former has more pedagogical value in structuring language education programs. This dissertation is concerned primarily with policy structured around language instruction for migrant communities and bilingual education, limiting sociological discussion to differences in identity between Sikh, Hindu and Muslim Punjabis.

3. Macro Planning: Bilingual Education & Heritage Language Provision

This dissertation is concerned primarily with the provision of heritage languages as structured objects of study in British schools, but the history of such programs is bound to a more general history of the educational response to the language challenges posed by 20th century migration into the UK. The question of migrants' language needs was initially tied to instruction in English as an additional language and bilingual education programs aimed at softening this transition. This chapter traces the macro planning response to these challenges, framing them within the wider context of trends in government policy in recent decades on how to structure the British education system.

While early years saw macro policy provide the funding and encouragement necessary to empower local actors to take initiative in developing innovative solutions to migrants' educational needs, a change in perspective from the mid-1980s onward informed policy which would harm these programs. Government privileged the role of English instruction, offering no systematic response in literacy campaigns and periods of curriculum reform to the systemic disadvantages in language faced by Britain's migrants and their descendants. LEAs, the sites of early experimentation and reform, have been disempowered as successive governments have both increased central control over school funding and the administrative power of individual schools. Bilingual education programs akin to the centrally-mandated Swedish model do not exist, and despite recent upswings in enrolment following policies encouraging general language study, the ongoing empowerment of communities to found their own faith schools, 'academies', and 'free

schools' looks unlikely to reverse wider negative trends in heritage language provision in an educational realm increasingly described by, and understood through, market-oriented economic language.

The Early Years: Bilingual Education

The first policy document on migrants and their language education was released in 1963. *English for Immigrants* continued governmental support for assimilationist attitudes prevalent within the British public education system since its establishment nearly a century prior (Conteh, Martin and Robertson, 2007: 2). Three years later, however, Section 11 of the new Local Government Act would equip language instructors with an invaluable tool in addressing the needs of migrants:

'(1) Subject to the provisions of this section the Secretary of State may pay, to local authorities who in his opinion are required to make special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence within their areas of substantial numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose language or customs differ from those of the community, grants of such amounts as he may with the consent of the Treasury determine on account of expenditure of such descriptions (being expenditure in respect of the employment of staff) as he may so determine.' (Local Government Act 1966, chap. 42 (I) (11))

By the mid-1970s, Section 11 funding had allowed LEAs to not only fund programs aimed at teaching migrants English, but also to develop bilingual welcome programs aimed at easing their linguistic transition by providing some curricular instruction via their first language. This funding was also employed to develop syllabi for heritage language classes, a process rapidly accelerated through the 1980s.

The uptake in Section 11 funded programs grew out of the first British policy document to explicitly recognize the value of migrants' native or heritage languages: the Department of Education and Science's 1975 work, *A Language for Life: The Bullock Report* (Conteh, Martin and Robertson, 2007: 3). The report endorsed more individual contact between pupils and teachers or other assistant instructors whilst simultaneously laying out the cultural and linguistic barriers faced by migrants in the classroom (1975: 68). It encouraged LEAs to collect linguistic data on their student body (ibid, 284), explicitly rejected assimilation whilst arguing that schools should actively support multicultural initiatives (286), stressed maintaining links between new migrants and the wider school (ibid, 289), and argued that 'the school should adopt a positive attitude to its pupils' bilingualism and wherever possible should help maintain and deepen their knowledge of their mother tongues...' (ibid, 293).

The Council of the European Communities passed the next round of policy particularly relevant to the languages and education of migrants in the UK. As early as 1970, the European Communities Commission recognized the 'inalienable right' of children to education, regardless of their status as migrants. It recommended cooperation with authorities in the country of origin to establish language classes, thereby facilitating re-entry later in students' lives (European Communities Commission, 1970: 2). This wording demonstrates how policy makers had in mind migrant communities such as Turkish 'guest workers' in Germany. Language recommendations were reinforced by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in 1976 alongside an endorsement of the policy of multiculturalism. In 1977, the Parliamentary Assembly laid out its language recommendations in greater detail, and a formal council directive was passed obliging

member states to provide for the language education of migrants from other member states (The Council of the European Communities, 1977). A five-year timeline was set for the first round of reports meant to gauge each member state's response to the directive. Despite this directive not applying to the languages of Britain's huge South Asian population, LEAs seized the opportunity to experiment with provisions in South Asian languages, and the directive itself was eventually interpreted by government bodies to extend to the children of all migrants (Inspectorate of Schools (England), 1984: 2).

As the Council of Europe was preparing its aforementioned directive, it had begun funding its own project in Birmingham's Steward Centre and a school in the Bedfordshire LEA in 1976. They were to act as the British sites for experimentation in 'mother tongue and culture teaching' (The Linguistic Minorities Project Team, 1981: 120). Sites in France, Belgium and the Netherlands were also chosen (Tosi, 1984: 122). The project aimed to develop students' first language, ease their transition into the English-speaking classroom, develop a sense of self confidence in their cultural heritage, and encourage the curiosity of those classmates of other backgrounds (ibid, 124-5). Initial reaction to the ideas informing the directive had been mixed: there was discussion amongst educationalists and in the press surrounding its applicability to Commonwealth migrants, existent teacher unemployment, and the difficulty of coordinating such programs across the country's LEAs (ibid, 123). The project nevertheless ran through 1980, targeted at Punjabi and Italian speaking schoolchildren in the cities of Birmingham of Bedford.

The Indian Punjabi-speaking pupils of Birmingham were taught Punjabi literacy skills alongside EAL, their instructors keeping particularly in mind the dual aims of equipping their students with the tools necessary in mainstream classrooms and the

encouragement of a sense of self-confidence in their Punjabi identity through exposure to authentic pieces of fiction and cultural showcase events (Andrews, 1980: 18). Results showed a definite increase in students' curiosity about Punjabi literature and greater ability to grapple with more complicated texts (ibid, 19).

The British Department of Education and Science responded to the directive via the Mother Tongue and English Teaching Project and the Linguistic Minorities Project (Conteh, Martin and Helavaara Robertson, 2007: 4). The former was based at the University of Bradford and aimed to gauge the classroom performance of two groups of five-year-old students over one school year. The first group was enrolled in a bilingual education program and the second joined monolingual English classes. The participants were all native speakers of the Mirpuri variety of Punjabi and had no functional skill in the English language. Results showed much greater performance by students in the bilingual program without any impact on the pace of their acquisition of English. Researchers also gathered information on child rearing practices and the attitudes of teachers and parents towards language (Fitzpatrick and Rees, 1980: 7-8).

The Linguistic Minorities Project was based in the University of London's Institute of Education between September 1979 and April 1983 (DESc, 1983: vii). It was rooted in the need for concrete data on pupils' multilingualism and community provision of language instruction (ibid, 4). Organizers highlighted the value of multilingualism to wider British society whilst noting the limitations of contemporary discussion of those questions: namely, the focus on heritage language provision as opposed to bilingual education, and the lack of discussion on including monolingual English speakers in these heritage language programs (ibid, 19).

The project was carried out through four surveys. The Schools Language Survey gathered information on pupils' multilingualism and linguistic competence from five ethnically diverse LEAs: Peterborough, Coventry, Bradford, Haringey, and Waltham Forest (DESc, 1983: 29). The Secondary Pupils' Survey gathered data focused on actual student language use across various social domains and with different members of the family (ibid, 59). The Mother Tongue Teaching Directory Survey looked at community provision in Coventry, Bradford, and Haringey (ibid, 91) by collecting data on attendance rates (ibid, 103), the age of these programs (ibid, 100), LEA support (ibid, 107), and frequency of instruction (ibid, 109). Lastly, the Adult Language Use Survey looked at linguistic vitality amongst adult migrants in order to understand the place of literacy in these communities and make predictions about the linguistic proficiency of coming generations (ibid, 117).

These projects were incredibly useful in providing supporters of heritage language provision and bilingual education with the data necessary to making their arguments in favour of such programs. Support materialised across government departments with the continued spread of pluralistic multiculturalism, such as the 1982 Commission for Racial Equality's recommendation that the first language of all pupils deserved a place within the country's education system (Gravelle, 1996: 66). Despite acknowledging the challenge of staffing these programs, the National Union of Teachers took the formal position of advocating for bilingual education in primary schools (1982: 3) and language provision within secondary schools, based upon a strong foundation of daytime timetabling, a school culture of multiculturalism (ibid, 4), LEA pooling of resources, and cooperation with community-run language provision (ibid, 6). However, despite the enthusiasm surrounding

these initiatives and policy statements, this period also saw numerous setbacks. In 1981, the Home Affairs Committee stated it was ‘not convinced either that a local education authority is under any obligation to provide mother tongue teaching or that it is necessarily in the general interest that they should do so.’ (Polling, 1984: 36)

The most damaging reversal of early gains was the Department of Education and Science’s 1985 *Education for All*, identified by Conteh, Martin and Helavaara Robertson as the philosophical turning point back towards monolingual, English-medium education in the United Kingdom (2007: 5). The report argues that languages other than English are to be restricted to the modern languages curriculum (1985b: 385). The authors are vocal in denouncing linguistic prejudice and any squandering of the opportunity to develop pupils’ multilingualism (ibid, 386), as well as in advocating for advancing pedagogical techniques in EAL provision (ibid, 387), but the document’s ultimate message is that the school system is not responsible for ensuring the development of students’ skills in first languages other than English.

The report begins with a re-evaluation of the European Community directive. Firstly, the report states that there is no implied responsibility of the education system to provide special language provision for generations following the first to be born into a migrant family within the UK (DESc, 1985b: 402). Secondly, the specific language of the directive speaks of promotion of these languages, not direct rights to their study (ibid). Thirdly, the report argues that the direction of British education policy has strayed from the original intent of the directive: to equip migrants to eventually return to their country of origin (ibid). The report then calls into question the conclusions to be drawn from studies released on the benefits of ‘mother tongue provision’, stressing the only observed increase

in educational performance via bilingual education was in the second language of education itself (ibid, 403-4). Lastly, it notes the concern that regardless of heritage language provision in schools, community-run provision may continue during students' evenings and weekends due to its added cultural or religious content (ibid, 405).

The report concludes that language *maintenance* is best achieved through the efforts of migrant communities themselves, albeit with LEA support in locating certified professionals, procuring materials, and securing teaching space (DESc, 1985b: 406). The report then continues to strongly advocate for adequate heritage language classes in maintained schools which have their own unique place in the daily timetable and their own modern examination and certification system. They must be properly staffed, viewed as equal in status to other modern foreign languages, and clearly open to the enrolment of students from diverse backgrounds outside of the languages' associated ethnic communities (ibid, 407-13).

By the mid-1980s, professionals wrestling with adapting the education system to the needs of migrants had reason to be cautiously optimistic. Though a major government report had rejected bilingual education as a method through which to address these students' underperformance, it had expressed support for assisting with heritage language provision. There was a genuine desire by government to use the education system as an instrument to promote a vision of Britain as a diverse, multicultural country, suggesting early reversals may not be permanent if faced by positive results borne of further experimentation in the classroom. Unfortunately, the aforementioned stumbling blocks would solidify, as would the promotion of linguistic diversity as rhetoric rather than determined action.

The Swing to English: Inaction & Rhetoric

Despite attention given to the linguistic needs of migrants in the aforementioned government-sponsored studies and policy documents, policy conversation around national curricula and the curricula themselves from the 1980s onward largely ignored these needs, even as approaches to students' literacy skills and heritage language provision were refined.

An example contemporary with *Education for All* is a document examining Britain's middle schools, in which the needs of EAL students are ignored entirely in the section on language and literacy. Brief reference is made in the 'Special Needs' section to the need for greater communication between schools, LEAs, and parents in dealing with those without English as a native language (DESc, 1985a: 43). It is also mentioned in passing when discussing barriers to performance in mathematics (ibid, 104). Two years later, a report on modern foreign languages in British schools devotes only a few paragraphs to the languages of migrants. Ignoring bilingual education altogether, the report quickly addresses provision of the languages of 'ethnic minority communities', arguing they should only be offered alongside modern European languages when practical and when English is not sacrificed (DESc, 1987: 31). Referencing *Education for All*, it envisions a strong role for community provision and insists upon its certification in maintained schools (ibid, 32). It does not discuss the pedagogical challenge of heritage language instruction; the difficulties of teaching students of varying skill levels is acknowledged, but the authors argue that pedagogical techniques should be identical to those employed in the teaching of European languages (ibid).

These trends towards ignoring the particular needs of EAL pupils in discussions of general academic performance and literacy, and avoiding any systematic approach to heritage language instruction in MFL provision characterise the majority of government-sponsored reports and policy documents through to the present day.

Literacy & EAL

The 1988 *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of English Language* addresses concerns about declining command of English (DESc, 1988: 1). Stating it is not written with EAL students in mind, it nevertheless argues that the guidelines within the report should be extended to those students, and that EAL specialists should correspond with teachers to that end (ibid, 58). The Welsh report *English for Ages 5 to 16* repeats many of the points established in years past on using multilingualism as a springboard for multicultural education and the necessity of keeping EAL students in mainstream classrooms, but bilingual education extends no further than the initial use of materials in the child's native language as they adapt to English (Department of Education and Science and the Welsh office, 1989: 104-5). A 1990 Report, *Starting with Quality*, addresses the linguistic needs of children under the age of five, but the issue of EAL pupils is brushed aside with a paragraph mentioning the possible benefit of bilingual teachers or classroom assistants (Committee of Inquiry, 1990: 12).

The dearth of attention afforded to EAL permeates further still. One document on *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools* goes no further than rather obviously stating that second language learners benefit from a system with 'awareness of the features of the particular school and community which bear upon day-to-day classroom decisions' (DESc, 1992: 37), while a curriculum evaluation of English

makes no mention of EAL whatsoever (School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 1994). A small sign of progress is found in two major curriculum reviews that argue against the limitations of assessment categories that ignore EAL students (Dearing, 1994: 55; 1996: 131), but a 1997 work by the government's Literacy Task Force reduces the issue to the need for school planning and teaching assistants (34). *Excellence in Schools*, another document released in 1997, describes the performance of some minority groups as 'unacceptable' (DEE: 34), but the role of language in the issue extends no further than mention of the possible benefits of language assistants (ibid, 50).

The same trends characterise documents released after the major curriculum review of the late 1990s. There is repeated emphasis on how EAL students must not be held back as compared to their peers, given their ability to transfer knowledge between languages (DEE and QCA, 1999: 37). Yet one continues to find examples of the complete avoidance of discussing EAL, such as in a report specifically 'aimed at reducing functional illiteracy and innumeracy' (Gillard, 1999: 1).

Two additional sources from the New Labour period can easily stand in as earlier examples of contemporary attitudes towards EAL. Firstly, a 2002 essay by David Blunkett, then-Home Secretary, entitled 'What does citizenship mean today?': arguing that 'citizenship should be about shared participation', Blunkett targets Britons with poor English skills. As the author is speaking of first generation migrants, he makes no direct call for better EAL provision within schools, but clearly implies that the English language is the key to resolving tension between migrant communities and broader UK society. There is no mention of the potential for social inclusion via elevation of the languages of

the next generation in schools. This exemplifies continued strains of populist support for the quick linguistic assimilation of migrants.

The second important source is the *Excellence and Enjoyment* series (DESk, 2006a-c). The series was published in response to the first government report to initiate calls for national standards in addressing the needs of bilingual pupils (ibid, 2003a: 5). *Excellence and Enjoyment* instead summarises what had already become common knowledge amongst educationalists: there is a boom in positive performance when the school values its multiculturalism and multilingualism (ibid, 2006a: 8), there are concrete benefits in the simultaneous development of the child's mother tongue (ibid, 15), there is a need for EAL support across a school's body of staff (ibid, 22), bilingual classroom assistants greatly aid bilingual pupils (ibid, 2006b: 12), and there is a necessity for cooperation with community groups and parents (ibid, 2006c: 57, 60). *Excellence and Enjoyment* is one of many reports to relay developments in the academy through a government body without challenging the role government is actually playing in EAL provision. This is a clear symptom of either the attitudes exemplified by the first source, or the limitations imposed on education policy when it risks becoming politicised.

Heritage Language Provision & Modern Foreign Language Policy

Returning to the 1980s post-*Education for All*, government discourse surrounding the role of modern foreign languages in the education system made little more than passing reference to the particularly unique role of Britain's heritage languages. One major exception, a government report entitled *Language Awareness and Foreign Language Taster Courses*, discussed two unique forms of language education in British schools: 'language taster courses' in which students would study two languages in a timeslot usually reserved

for one, and ‘language awareness courses’ which focused on changing how students conceptualised language using real-language examples (DESc, 1990: 2). Though the authors recognized the immense social value of including the languages of local multicultural communities in classwork (15), the majority of the report was scathing in its criticism of schools’ funnelling of their poor-performing MFL students into such classes (ibid, 3), the lack of proven benefit to students later in their MFL education (ibid, 4), the untrained teachers (ibid, 5), the poor materials, and the sloppy division of pupils according to linguistic ability (ibid, 12). Most concerning for the prospect of heritage language provision is the criticism of heritage language content in such courses coming ‘at the cost of diluting the experience of all pupils in European languages and of offering community language taster courses at too low a level for those pupils who already spoke them’ (ibid, 13-14). The report concludes by noting ‘much of the potential agenda for language awareness work has now been incorporated into the national curriculum for English under the heading “learning about language”’ (ibid, 16). Unfortunately, curricular change would not guarantee serious, macro-structured attention to heritage language provision.

With the *Education Reform Act 1988*, MFL was made mandatory for students in Key Stage 3, the curriculum stage between Year 7 and Year 9. It was also encouraged in Key Stage 2, between Year 3 and Year 6. Choice of which languages to teach remained with those in charge of an individual school’s policy, whether LEA-controlled or otherwise. No talk of reform to the new curriculum and literacy promotion throughout the 1990s would make reference to the specific role of heritage language provision, though *Excellence in Schools* argued that underachievement by ethnic minority pupils might be

partially met by specialist language education in schools independent of LEA control (DEE, 1997a: 72).

Plans for increased MFL provision continued throughout New Labour government: curriculum reform at the end of the decade set August 2001 as the date from which MFL would become statutory from Key Stage 4 onward; that is, Year 9 to Year 11 (DEE and QCA, 1999: 16). That same document emphasised the ability of multilingual students to transfer knowledge across languages, but no mention was made of encouraging development of their heritage language skills (ibid, 37). A 2002 policy document laid out the government's plan to ensure access to MFL in KS2 in all schools by 2010, emphasising the importance of languages to economics and a globalised world (DESk, 2002: 5). There is passing reference to the need to take Britain's bilingual students into account and not exclude their languages from timetabled, daytime provision (ibid, 10), but nowhere in the document is there any mention of South Asian heritage languages. The only non-European languages to be mentioned are Chinese and Japanese (ibid, 23), presumably with the globalised economy in mind.

By 2004, plans to make MFL statutory in KS4 had been dropped, and languages were no longer permitted at that level unless they would lead to certification such as a GCSE or A-Level (DEE and QCA, 2004: 14-16). Furthermore, schools had been banned from offering any heritage language provision whatsoever if pupils were not also given the choice to study an official language of the European Union (ibid, 109). For the first time, heritage languages faced an explicit macro-level policy challenge, not rescinded until August 2008 (DfE, 2011).

Policy documents nevertheless continued to afford value to developing literacy skills in heritage languages. Schools were encouraged to offer them at KS2, resources permitting (DCSF, 2005: 7). In targeting the needs of bilingual pupils, the strongest endorsement came from the authors of *Excellence and Enjoyment*, wherein schools were encouraged to provide first language assistance for as long as possible (DESk, 2006b: 15) and develop literacy skills as per general MFL policy (ibid, 17). Coming years would see further policy developments that would benefit enrolment in heritage language programs, but expose major weak points dooming their long-term provision.

Recent Years

Curricular reform in the period following Tony Blair's resignation has continued to avoid systematically addressing the needs of EAL students. A report on issues in assessment, for example, not only makes passing reference to the relationship between low performance and those with special needs, but it sidesteps language entirely (Children, School and Families Committee, 2008: 32); presumably a viable path to pursue in raising performance given the wealth of material published on the subject. Education officials also cite legal definitions as they continue to exclude EAL from discussions of students classified as having 'Special Education Needs' (DCSF, 2009b: 6) despite the UK Literacy Association speaking out about the EAL hole in the English portion of the national curriculum (Cambridge Primary Review, 2009a: 23). Furthermore, opposition parties failed to capitalise on the issue leading into the 2010 general election, the Liberal Democrats even limiting their proposed 'pupil premium' for disadvantaged students to a

single year of EAL provision, ‘after which children tend to catch up quickly’ (Liberal Democrats, 2009: 11).

Heritage languages continue to be recognized as inherently valuable and worthy of attention through the school system, but amidst declining enrolment, there remains a lack of centralised planning in their provision. An example of continuing endorsement of the same general points of preceding decades is found in a curriculum review based around diversity and citizenship, in which the authors encourage community-focused language ‘taster’ courses, greater communication between language instructors in the community and school teachers, and the careful support of students’ home languages (Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review, 2007: 59). An independent review two years later contradicts this point in arguing that schools should focus on the quality provision of one or two languages without wasting resources on languages more difficult to support (DCSF, 2009a: 24).

Developments under David Cameron’s Coalition Government betray a continued lack of government desire to strongly advocate on behalf of EAL and heritage language provision. A report on ‘Early Years Foundation Stage’ education highlights the immediate need for co-ordinated effort on language support beginning at the age of two (Tickell, 2011: 27), though there is no mention of simultaneously encouraging first language literacy. The arrangement of funding to support schools in meeting the needs of EAL pupils has also changed drastically since the early days of Section 11 funding, as discussed above. Section 11 was first replaced with the ‘Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant’ in 1999, according to which LEAs would be funded relative to the amount of students from underachieving groups, as well as the number of those in need of EAL support. The

Coalition abolished this grant by merging these funds into the Direct Schools Grant, thereby removing their earmark for EAL. Further change in 2013 introduced EAL funding claims for individual schools, but they are limited to the first three years after a pupil's enrolment. Furthermore, schools are not required to account for the actual use of these funds (NALDC, 2013). As of 2014, EAL students are therefore without guaranteed funding support; they are at the mercy of local decision-makers who are free to misallocate EAL moneys.

The current curriculum aggressively prioritises language study by making it mandatory at KS2 and KS3 (DfE, 2013c: 6), as well as guaranteeing students the option of KS4 study that leads to a formal qualification (ibid, 7). With KS1 MFL provision reaching 53% in primary schools and KS2 reaching 90%, it would appear that the climate would favour greater heritage language provision (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 33). The original list of languages from which schools were required to offer at least one choice at KS2 was extremely conservative, however, and betrayed a continued bias against Britain's heritage languages (DfE, 2013a). The requirement was replaced by the qualification that schools need to ensure students' ability to continuously study a single language to the point of making substantial progress (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 10). This disadvantages heritage languages once again by necessitating long-term planning in hiring staff capable of teaching them across key stages.

The English Baccalaureate, first announced in 2010, also demands further language study of students by demanding either a modern or classical language GCSE between a grade of C and A* (House of Commons Education Committee, 2011: 3). This prompted a call for revisiting the structure of language examinations by the Association for Language

Learning (ibid, 28), but a lack of action in this respect has not prevented a notable upswing in the amount of students registering for language examinations as of late: hitting a high of 76% in 2002-3 and a low of 40% in 2011-12, rates of students studying for an MFL GCSE in KS4 have now climbed to 48% as of 2013-14 (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 20). This is despite fewer schools than ever before in the state sector, just 16%, demanding MFL of each KS4 student (ibid, 80). MFL rates jumped a third across the board between 2011-12 and 2013-14, and teachers are being recruited with promises of signing bonuses reaching as high as £20,000 (DfE, 2014). There has also been a positive impact on local attitudes towards heritage languages in schools, as 31% of schools in 2013-14 have encouraged students to consider them in fulfilling EBacc requirements (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 7), up from 25% in 2011-12 (Tinsley and Han, 2012: 25).

Several major challenges remain. Firstly, there is a notable gender gap: 56% of pupils studying for an MFL GCSE in 2013-14 are female (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 21), climbing higher still to 64% in A-Level classrooms (ibid, 64). Secondly, though the number of schools with at least half their student body studying MFL in KS4 jumped from under 40% in 2010-11 to over 50% in 2013-14 (ibid, 83), MFL faces the particular problem of few students electing to continue on to write their A-Levels (ibid, 92). Some schools have had to cancel their A-Level offerings due to low interest (ibid, 93). Some students complete their GCSE early and are less likely to later continue language study after a one-year break (ibid), some believe it difficult to perform well in a language examination (ibid, 94), and others are not convinced of the utility in acquiring an additional language (ibid, 8).

Thirdly, time and scheduling limitations continue to restrict the efficacy of MFL instruction. 50% of schools are not confident that they will be able to implement new MFL provision according to the new KS2 curricular guidelines (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 5), while 27% of schools remove students from language instruction in order to provide them with remedial help in English literacy and numeracy (ibid, 6). This has resulted in the lowest rates of MFL study in KS3 in six years within the state system, rates having fallen from 98% in 2007-8 to 93% in 2013-14 (ibid, 64-5). Limitations are visible even in A-Level teaching time stats: at 52% as of 2013-14, the majority of students in state schools receive between two-and-a-half and three hours of instruction each week. Only 5% receive MFL instruction for four or more hours. Independent schools receive less time than their state counterparts despite higher rates of language study (ibid, 70).

Finally, 83% of teachers in state schools and 86% in independent schools are not confident in the potential of all of these curricular changes to MFL (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 6). This sentiment includes attitudes about upcoming changes to A-Levels which entail moving examinations to the end of two years of study, turning the current 'AS' exams at the end of the first year into a separate qualification. 25% believe more students will choose the new AS path rather than A-Levels, while 40.5% foresee students discontinuing MFL after GCSEs (ibid, 99). This is quite problematic given the aforementioned factors already dissuading A-Level MFL study. Other teachers are sceptical as to whether or not their schools can adapt to mandatory KS2 provision when there is already an undersupply of teachers with degrees in languages. 55% of schools report that the class teacher is responsible for most language teaching at KS2, while only 29% have language staff on hand (ibid, 38). This corresponds to 30% of schools reporting

that at least one member of staff has a degree in the language being taught.. It is therefore no surprise that teachers are sceptical as to the long-term benefit of the new national curriculum.

Taking this long history of government inaction on EAL and language education into account, a few main points come into focus. Firstly, government ‘policy’ on EAL provision has been limited to discussions of literature in committees and curricular reviews. There has not been any attempt to remedy the literacy challenges of migrants and their children through structured government action. *Education for All* broke the momentum of bilingual education programs to such an extent that such ideas did not even arise in later government discussion of EAL, which seemed to revolve around making suggestions to the local actors controlling such programs at a time of growth in centralised control of education. Unsurprisingly, mere suggestion which matched existent biases against bilingual education was enough to guarantee its failure, while strong language in support of EAL has not been enough to overcome continued strains of assimilationist attitudes, as in the aforementioned Liberal Democrat document which deems a single year necessary for acquiring English (Liberal Democrats, 2009: 11). With no accountability demanded of those awarded EAL funding, schools have lost the incentive first provided in 1966 by Section 11 of the Local Government Act to support their migrant students. Combined with the attitudes described above, it is unlikely their needs will be satisfactorily met in the future without significant curricular and funding reform.

Secondly, government post-1988 Education Act has attempted to carefully manage language provision via the national curriculum, but heritage languages have been unconvincingly endorsed at best, and entirely ignored at worst. Teachers and headmasters

have not been convinced of the concrete benefit inherent in heritage language study: even in 2005, the National Centre of Languages reported teacher attitudes dismissive of the need for heritage language study as students are already ‘naturally good’ (CILT, the National Centre for Languages; CILT Cymru; and Scottish CILT, 2005: 3). Soft language buried in reports is not potent policy: multilingual students as a national resource have been squandered by ignoring the opportunity to develop their literacy skills, and local innovation is especially unlikely to reignite without the type of support found earlier in Section 11 and Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant funding.

One final point demands consideration. However well-intentioned current discourse framing heritage languages with mention of economic benefit may be, one must ask whether promoting this kind of thinking about MFL study actually favours heritage languages. Particularly in the case of Britain’s South Asian languages, it may be difficult for potential pupils to see the benefit in developing these skills when they could instead focus on a language of international business or the European Union. The Punjabi AQA GCSE specification lays out the goal of Punjabi’s ‘practical use’, informing ‘further learning opportunities and career choices’ (AQA, 2012: 45). Its online profile also states that ‘Given employers’ demand for language skills... [qualifications] could mean higher employability for students’ (ibid, 2014b). The A-Level not only ‘enhances students’ employment prospects’, but it also ‘facilitates foreign travel’ (ibid, 2014c). However, the types of domestic jobs which may become available to a speaker of Punjabi or Urdu cannot compare in prestige to working within the UN, the European Parliament, or the most exciting of international business offices, particularly given the dominance of English amongst South Asia’s business and political elite. Such considerations surely cross the

minds of administrators when they decide which languages to prioritise in times of tight funding.

Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland

Due to geographical settlement patterns in the UK, almost all initial work of note on bilingual education, EAL and heritage language provision was carried out in England. The last decade has seen greater discussion of these issues within both Wales and Scotland, however; South Asians and Eastern Europeans have settled in cities such as Cardiff, Edinburgh and Glasgow. After English, Polish, Punjabi, and Urdu are the three most common languages of Scottish students, respectively (Scottish Government Languages Working Group, 2012: 13). Northern Ireland has seen comparatively low migration and has therefore seen little discussion of these issues amongst education officials.

The Welsh situation is unique in its mandatory status for Welsh beginning in KS2 (Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills, 2008: 2). Students are not required to begin their studies of an additional language until KS3, but schools are encouraged to introduce languages alongside Welsh so that students may elect to study two at once from a young age (ibid, 26). Schools have the freedom to choose which languages they introduce, and an official government document uses Urdu as an example (ibid, 11). The same document advocates for the introduction of students' 'home language' into the school, if possible, and argues for the benefits of developing their multilingualism with the early introduction of Welsh (ibid, 4).

The current Scottish language policy running through a trial period revolves around developing children's skills in three languages: their 'mother tongue' and two 'foreign

tongues' (Scottish Government Languages Working Group, 2012: 3). This is called the '1+2 Approach'. The use of 'mother tongue' as opposed to 'English' is intended to make space not only for Gaelic and Scots, but also for the languages of Scotland's migrant families (ibid, 6). For these pupils, English is to function as their first additional language (ibid, 13); quite a radical departure from the complete rejection of bilingual education in the English education system. LEAs are encouraged to develop strategies based around both practical concerns and the celebration of diversity in the student body (ibid), supported by 'Foreign Language Assistants' and trained members of migrant communities (ibid, 21). There is also a call to work with the Scottish Qualification Authority, Scotland's examinations board, to expand the range of certification available for speakers of various languages: the example is given of Urdu's provision alongside the absence of Punjabi (ibid, 25). In addition to GCSEs and A-Levels, the SQA will be encouraged to develop certification for various languages in earlier years of education, thereby matching earlier proposals in the English system around certification reform long since ignored (Russell, 1982c: 1).

It is no surprise that Welsh policy seems to mirror English policy, as they are governed by the same educational legislation. Scotland's greater autonomy has allowed for the creation of an education system which, in 2014, is of a very different character than its neighbours'. Most notably, the Scottish school system is entirely comprehensive: there are no bars to admission other than geography. England and Wales have seen decades of attempts by successive governments to reduce the power of LEAs and empower the most local of decision makers: parents themselves. It is necessary to expand further upon this history in making predictions about the future vitality of heritage language programs.

Changes in School Structure

In his history of the English education system, Derek Gillard, a retired headteacher, traces the origin of the Thatcher-era pushback against comprehensive schools and LEA authority to five black papers published between 1969 and 1977, in which comprehensive policy was likened to the systematic disadvantaging of talented pupils and ‘progressive’ teaching blamed for excesses in the activism of Britain’s university students (Gillard, 2011: Chapter 7). The Thatcher Government acted and legislated from such a perspective most dramatically in its development of a national curriculum towards the end of the 80s, buffered by coordinated efforts to end mandatory comprehensive policy and strengthen the local power of pupils’ parents, as well as the abolishment of the Schools Council, an attack on teachers’ influence on curriculum development (ibid, Chapter 8).

Gillard notes that the position of the education system had radically changed by 1993: capital spending was less than half of rates in the mid-1970s, while the number of pupils living in poverty had climbed from 10% in 1979 to 33%. John Major’s administration developed a Parents’ Charter, removed 6th Form from LEA control, and repeatedly argued for specialised schools targeted at pupils’ ‘natural strengths’. This was also an era of standardised testing and metrics: the government established the Office for Standards in Education, or OFSTED, through the 1992 Education Act, an organization responsible for organizing third-party inspection of schools and publishing reports based on data thereby gathered (Gillard, 2011: Chapter 9).

New Labour continued these trends. Tony Blair’s government ensured parental control over grammar school admissions policies and announced further transformations of comprehensive schools into specialist colleges. Action against LEAs advanced further still:

‘Education Action Zones’ exempted participating schools from both LEA controls and the national curriculum, and consultants were hired to evaluate LEA performance.

Government announced the creation of ‘academies’, private schools outside LEA control and supported by government funds after initial private capital funding, as well as greater support for faith-based schools. The Education and Inspections Act of 2006 gave every school the right to transition into a trust school and enlarged OFSTED (Gillard, 2011: Chapter 10).

Gordon Brown’s government allowed private schools the ability to access public funds via transformation into academies (Gillard, 2011: Chapter 11), while David Cameron’s Coalition expanded the program, encouraging every school in the country to consider transitioning into academy status whilst banning LEAs, teachers and parents from legally challenging such moves (ibid, Chapter 12). The Coalition has also introduced new ‘free schools’, which, like academies are free from LEA control, exempt from the national curriculum, and funded directly by the central government. Unlike academies, they are not in need of private start-up capital, and their creation is initiated by calls from local parents and teachers along with a third party which takes control of the school’s administration once it has been constructed (BBC News, 2010).

This turn towards private providers of education is relevant to the discussion of EAL and heritage language provision in two respects: firstly, a significant number of schools have broken free from the control of LEAs, which were the institutions originally pushing for systematic responses to the needs of migrants. These schools are free to set their own policy as per the views of those sitting on the school’s governing body. Combined with the aforementioned discussion of shifts in funding that have removed

accountability in tracing how funds marked for EAL provision are actually used, this change puts many pupils with linguistic needs at the mercy of the good will of their governing bodies. Given the continuing resonance of assimilationist ideas in language education, the contemporary situation does not bode well for any possibility of a return to bilingual education as per the 1970s and early 1980s. Secondly, though the boom in faith schools, academies and free schools seems to negate the curricular gains in greater MFL provision, it also suggest cautious optimism for increased heritage language provision within individual schools explicitly targeted at specific communities. Migrant communities may come together to establish their own schools, as may religious communities.

The link between Punjabi and Sikhism, and the role of Urdu in Britain's Punjabi Muslim community might seem likely to ensure for Punjabi and Urdu a more stable place within the education system described in this chapter. The contemporary vitality of these languages within the classroom however differs in some key respects, and examining this disparity illuminates the important role of micro planning. Before evaluating the fortunes of Punjabi and Urdu on the basis of available statistics, it is necessary to discuss the history of their speakers and context of their use in the United Kingdom.

4. Micro-Planning: Punjabis in the UK

According to the 2011 Census, there are 428,158 Sikhs in the England and Wales, 412,199 of whom self-identify as Indian, Pakistani, Other Asian, Other Ethnic Group,¹ White and Asian, or Other Mixed. There are also 1,028,459 Muslims who self-identify as Pakistanis (ONS, 2011a). As this chapter highlights, the majority of the British Sikh population is Punjabi and the majority of the UK's Pakistani Muslim population has roots in Mirpur and the northern cities of Pakistani Punjab. One would therefore expect Punjabi to far outpace Urdu in its enrolment numbers. However, a complex mixture of social factors around religious identity intervenes to steer Pakistani Punjabis away from Punjabi study and towards Urdu. Even then, a significant difference in enrolment rates remains: in 2010, there were 5,020 Urdu GCSE entries against Punjabi's 909 (CILT, 2011c). If all the entrants in the Urdu exam were Pakistani, then a total of 13.5% of Pakistanis aged 16-17 wrote the exam that year (ONS, 2011b), while 8.15% of Sikhs wrote the Punjabi exam (ibid, 2011d), showing Urdu is roughly 1.67 times as popular amongst Pakistanis relative to Punjabi amongst Sikhs.² This chapter explores the cause of this disparity by introducing

¹ Numbers for Other Asian and Other Ethnic Group are 50,564 and 40,642. This may be explained by self-identifying with 'Punjabi' or 'Sikh'. The Canadian census, for example, includes 'Punjabi' as an ethnic signifier.

² A few qualifications of these categories are necessary: firstly, there is no way to authenticate that all of the Urdu examinees were Pakistani, nor that all of the Punjabi examinees were Sikh. Both communities dominate classrooms in which these languages are taught, however, and any statistical anomaly would therefore be minimal. Secondly, not all who write the GCSE are 16-17, but this age group forms the vast majority of examinees. Thirdly, total Urdu GCSE data from Edexcel and the AQA are not available for 2011, hence the combination of 2010 figures with the 2011 census. Lastly, not all Pakistanis are Mirpuri or from the province of Punjab, but these two communities represent the majority of Pakistanis in the United Kingdom, as discussed in the previous chapter. Since 1.67 times the number of those towards whom the Urdu exam is primarily targeted enrolled as opposed to those towards whom the Punjabi exam is targeted, there is

the history of Punjabi migration to the UK, Punjabi sociolinguistics, and the history of Urdu instruction in British schools. Each combines to highlight the effectiveness of micro planning in ensuring a heritage language's success within the British education system.

Migration History

South Asian migration to the UK began before the First World War. The first migrant wave comprised mostly deserting Muslim seamen of the Merchant Navy and students in British universities (Ansari, 2006: 144). The former struggled to establish themselves but were assisted by their countrymen, some even marrying local British women (ibid, 146).

Many of these seamen had roots in the territory surrounding Mirpur, a city in the foothills of what is now Pakistani-held Kashmir. Their language is popularly thought to be closely related to Punjabi, but is sometimes identified as one of its dialects (Lothers and Lothers, 2012: 10), labelled independently as Mirpuri, or subsumed under the umbrella of Pothohari³ or Pahari⁴ (ibid, 3). Mirpuri speakers can usually understand the speech of Punjabis from the plains, and Ethnologue identifies the language as ‘Distinct from Western Panjabi... though closely related’ (Lewis et al, 2014). In popular and anthropological usage, the term ‘Punjabi’ includes the people of Mirpur. Mirpuris can therefore be identified as the first Punjabi migrants to the UK.

significant justification to claim that the difference between the figures listed is sufficient in demonstrating a disparity in enrolment rates.

³ ‘Pothohari’ is commonly used to refer to the most popular varieties of language used in the Pothohar Plateau.

⁴ ‘Pahari’ literally means ‘Mountain Language’. Popular use of the term is often at odds with the academic classification ‘Pahari Languages’.

Labour needs during the First World War attracted further South Asian migration (Ansari, 2006: 149), followed by demand in the factories of the Midlands in the years leading up to the Second World War (ibid, 152). Veterans of the British war effort in WW1 were the first Sikhs to settle in the UK. They worked as peddlers despite being of the agriculturalist Jatt caste. They were quickly joined by Sikh Bhatras, a caste involved in peddling and fortune telling in Punjab (Ballard, 1994: 93). These Sikhs lived primarily in port cities and their numbers were limited to several thousand (ibid, 94).

The majority of Punjabi migration to the UK followed WW2, particularly during the 1950s through the tightening of immigration rules in 1962 and 1965 (Ballard, 1994: 95). They staffed factories in the Midlands and England's North (Shaw, 2003), but also settled in London and small city centres across the country. Sikh migrants originated primarily from the Doaba⁵ region of Indian Punjab (ibid), while most Punjabi Muslims came from Mirpur, the Pothohar plateau, or the cities of northern Pakistani Punjab (Morawska, A., Smith, G., and Reid, E., 1984: 32). *Doabi* Sikhs faced the pressure of overpopulation at home and had tasted international travel during imperial military service (Ballard, 1994: 95), while Mirpuris were displaced within Pakistan during the construction of the Mangla Dam and could rely on former Mirpuri seamen settled abroad to help them migrate (Shaw, 2003). Both communities made extensive use of 'chain migration', aiding the migration of castefellows and kinsmen with the support of vouchers issued by their employers and the right to family reunification (Ballard, 1994: 94-5).

The final wave of Punjabi immigration in the 1970s and early 80s originated in East Africa, where middle-class South Asian communities faced hostility by governments looking to improve the economic lot of ethnic Africans. Many of these South Asians were

⁵ 'Doaba' is the region of Indian Punjab located between the Beas and Sutlej rivers.

of Punjabi heritage, including both Sikhs and Muslims. Unlike their Jatt and Bhatra counterparts from Punjab, many of the Ramgarhia Sikhs of East Africa were well-educated and accustomed to a 'European style of living' (Ballard, 1994: 97). Most importantly, they lacked a 'myth of return' (Bhachu, 1985: 3), having no intention to return to the countries they had just fled, nor to the distant Punjab. Their status markers were therefore entirely local, rooted in adopted professions and economic class (ibid, 9). While a minority worked as manual industrial labourers (ibid, 7), most attempted to secure employment in the public sector (ibid, 8) or use their craftsmanship skills to begin construction companies (Ballard, 1994: 99).

A general economic portrait of Punjabis in the UK places Sikhs in the middle classes while Mirpuris appear to struggle with unemployment and social exclusion.⁶ Pardah and Islamic prohibitions on women working seem to have harmed the earning potential of many Pakistani families, though some run businesses in the home, especially in handicrafts and stitching (Shaw 2003; Ballard, 1994: 102). More importantly, the industrial cities of Britain populated by Mirpuris have been hard-hit by globalisation: 50% of South Asian industrial workers had already lost their jobs by the mid-1980s (Ballard, 1994: 100). The Jatt Sikhs affected by the same changes in factories were more organised, many with communist backgrounds having formed Indian Workers' Associations (ibid, 107), and more dynamic in their response to closures: they were more likely to move between cities in seeking out professional advancement (ibid, 94) and many started their own small businesses (ibid, 104). Sikhs enacted pressure on their children to succeed in the education system and many have successfully entered into a wide variety of professions

⁶ Alison Shaw notes that the socioeconomic position of Punjabi Muslims from the plains tends to mirror the success of Britain's Sikhs. These migrants are most concentrated in Manchester, Glasgow, Dewsbury, Huddersfield, and Oxford (2003).

(*ibid*, 102). In contrast, Mirpuris continue to struggle, not at all aided by the social tensions following 21st century terrorist attacks and War on Terror, as well as the youth riots of cities such as Bradford (Shaw 2003).

The bulk of Punjabi youth in the UK today are now third or fourth generation Britons. Religious identity remains strong, but intermarriage reveals a weakening of caste boundaries, and a general 'Asian' identity carries increasing weight (Bhachu, 1985: 16; Gillespie, 1995: 46). 'Asian' as a widespread, catch-all term for those of South Asian ethnicity in the UK has many limitations, especially its association with stereotypes about social issues such as caste and honour killing (Sayyid, 2006: 2). In *A Postcolonial People: South Asians in Britain*, authors eschew the use of 'Asian' and 'British Asian', creating instead 'BrAsian': a term which seeks to avoid contemporary confusion surrounding the term 'British' whilst acknowledging the ambiguous place of ethnic minorities in national discourse (*ibid*, 6). Nevertheless, whatever its limitations, 'Asian' is the term of choice, exemplified by such public institutions as the BBC Asian Network. While this might suggest a threat to Punjabi as an identity marker for British South Asian youth, the popularity of British bhangra, a diasporic art form fusing Punjabi folk music with hip-hop and other Western genres, gives Punjabi a continuing *chic* factor amongst the younger generation. As will be expounded upon below, this has not translated into vibrant support for Punjabi language classes.

Punjabi Sociolinguistic Context

Despite the large number of ethnic Punjabis living in the United Kingdom, enrolment in Punjabi GCSE and A-Level examinations has been much lower than the

corresponding rates for Urdu, which many Pakistani Punjabis elect to study instead (CILT, 2011a; 2011b). Religious identity and social attitudes surrounding language explain why many privilege the study of Urdu.

The politicisation of language in the Punjab has colonial roots. As the champions of Hindu and Muslim identities sought to politically rally their respective communities in the heartland of North India, they adopted Hindi and Urdu as their linguistic media of choice. The former was a newly-crafted literary standard infused with Sanskrit neologisms and, to varying extents depending on the individual author, purged of its Arabic and Persian vocabulary (Shackle and Snell, 1990: 14). The latter was the literary treasure of the Muslim elites of the Gangetic Plain (ibid, 5), already made an official language across many of North India's colonial provinces, including Punjab, following the British attack on administrative Persian (ibid, 8). Despite being the mother tongue of the vast majority of Punjabis, the Punjabi language was only adopted and refined by Sikh elites of the Singh Sabha⁷ reform movement, tied into their sense of the language's unique role in the Sikh religion (Mir, 2010: 187).

Punjabi itself was not explicitly politicised until the decades following partition. In India, the Akali Dal political party launched a campaign for a Punjabi language majority state following their failure in seeking division along religious lines (Mir, 2010: 186). Hindu political elites were not at all amicable to a division which would produce a Sikh

⁷ 'Singh Sabha, (Punjabi: "Society of the Singhs") 19th-century movement within Sikhism that began as a defense against the proselytizing activities of Christians and Hindus. Its chief aims were the revival of the teachings of the Sikh Gurus (spiritual leaders), the production of religious literature in Punjabi, and a campaign against illiteracy.' (Singh Sabha, 2014)

majority, and the Arya Samaj⁸ religious organization succeeded in convincing Hindus to return 'Hindi' as their mother tongue on the 1961 census (ibid, 188). The Akali campaign, known as the Punjabi Suba Movement, eventually succeeded in 1966, and for the first time in its history, Punjabi was made an official language of governance.

In post-colonial Pakistan, Punjabi continues to be marginalised as the only major language in the country to lack official status. Though Punjabis form a plurality Pakistan, the official language of the Pakistani state of Punjab remains Urdu. Several university courses, literary and journalistic publications, theatre performances and poetry recitals demonstrate a genuine, albeit limited, place for the Punjabi language in Pakistan, identified by Alyssa Ayres as the 'Punjabiyaat' movement: a collection of literary figures from the 1960s through to the present day seeking to elevate Punjabi's status (1998: 925).

Nevertheless, Punjabi has not succeeded in infringing upon the space occupied by English and Urdu in politics, the bureaucracy, and higher learning. Urdu also remains a language of significant religious prestige and an expression of Pakistani religious nationalism (ibid, 922), a role the diaspora maintains through community classes in mosques in which Urdu is introduced to children shortly after they begin their study of Arabic.

Farina Mir cautions against using the political history of language in Punjab to argue that religious communities have successfully been manipulated to such an extent by the politics of language that they retain no attachment towards their mother tongue (2010: 191). When it comes to decisions surrounding the education of their children, however, Muslim and Sikh Punjabi migrants to the United Kingdom have largely continued these rooted attitudes towards language. This is most obviously apparent in the fact that Punjabi

⁸ 'Arya Samaj, (Sanskrit: "Society of Nobles") vigorous reform sect of modern Hinduism, founded in 1875 by Dayananda Sarasvati, whose aim was to reestablish the Vedas, the earliest Hindu scriptures, as revealed truth... From its beginning it was an important factor in the growth of nationalism.' (Arya Samaj, 2014)

is taught via the Gurmukhi script, which is used by Indian Punjabis, and not the Shahmukhi script, a modified Urdu script used in Pakistan. This literary standard was crafted by writers in the late-19th and early-20th centuries, who built on earlier religious, literary and historical works whilst structuring the standard around features of the *Majhi* and *Malwai* dialects, the latter falling almost entirely in Indian Punjab.⁹

In the UK, many South Asian students begin language study for the first time not in state schools, but in classes run by community members. The education of Sikh Punjabis often begins with basic work on literacy, as Gurmukhi is the script used in Sikh scripture. Whether or not these classes then turn towards the modern Indian literary standard of Punjabi or the study of scripture depends on the individual instructor. There is no record in the education literature of any notable interest shown by Britain's Pakistanis in learning Punjabi via the Gurmukhi script, and the demographics of Pakistani migration reveal that it is Punjabis who have developed, taught, and attended the Urdu education programs in the country. British Pakistanis of Punjabi heritage first attend classes in which they learn to read and recite Arabic, the sacred language of the Qur'an and Islam (Russell, 1982g: 21). Many then continue language study via Urdu, which the parents of these children value as their shared tool of literary expression. There are several notable examples of Punjabi being used in state schools with British Pakistanis, but these projects, detailed above, were all bilingual education initiatives aimed at softening the transition of monolingual Pakistani

⁹ Amritsar, the religious centre of the Sikhs, and Lahore, the Punjab's largest city, are both in the heart of Majha, so it is no surprise that its dialect informed standardization efforts of early Sikh writers. Orthography also betrays influence by the early grammars produced by Christian missionaries in Ludhiana, a city in the Malwa region (Diamond, 2011: 296-300). The *Malwai* dialect's influence on Punjabi as it is written in the Gurmukhi script has deepened due to the demographic weight of its speakers in the contemporary Indian state of Punjab.

children into the English-speaking classroom environment. A language acquisition or literacy program has never been taught in Shahmukhi Punjabi in the United Kingdom.

A particularly illustrative example of these social forces at work in the UK lies in the responses to the "Main Language" category in the 2011 census of England and Wales. The census identifies 273,231 residents with Punjabi as their main language and 268,680 residents with Urdu (ONS, 2011c). These figures do not include those for whom Punjabi or Urdu is a 'heritage language', but rather those who use the languages as their primary mode of communication. Given the demographic makeup of Britain's Pakistani migrants, it is clear that many Pakistani Punjabis abandoned their mother tongue on the census, a phenomenon noted decades earlier in the UK (Morawska, A., Smith, G., and Reid, E., 1984: 32). This is reminiscent of the deceptive nature of census questions on language in the Punjab: as referenced above, many Punjabi Hindus returned 'Hindi' as their mother tongue as a political statement in India's 1961 census during a period of Sikh political agitation for a Punjabi language majority state (Mir, 2010: 188). Some working in heritage language provision and EAL projects have noted that Hindu Punjabis have done the same when surveyed on their mother tongue in the UK (DESc, 1983: 41). Attitudes inherited from old brands of identity politics therefore continue to inform official, self-reported statements on language despite the differing political context of the diaspora.

The Chic Factor

Across North India, Urdu is often associated with literary merit, poetic beauty, and aristocratic history. Punjabi calls to mind images of Sikhism, gruff rural living, and large parties. It might seem, then, that Urdu's association with education and formal study might explain the higher rates of enrolment for Urdu in the UK, while Punjabi may suffer from

an active disadvantage in this regard. While it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to survey pupils on *why* they study their heritage languages and *how* they perceive them, data on adult literacy help combat the notion that Urdu enrolment in the UK benefits from an unfair social advantage.

As part of the Linguistic Minorities Project carried out between 1981 and 1984, adult Asian migrants were surveyed on their reading habits. Interestingly, despite Urdu's literary prestige, the results reveal little difference between those literate in Indian standard Punjabi and Urdu.

In Coventry, more than two fifths of Urdu speakers reported reading novels in Urdu, matching the rates in Punjabi. There was also parity in rates of regular newspaper readership. While only a tenth of Indian Punjabis read textbooks in their heritage language, however, three-tenths of Urdu speakers did the same. The literacy rates of both communities hung around 60% with Indians enjoying a slight advantage (Smith, Morawska and Reid, 1984: 47-9; 53-6).

Rates differ slightly in Bradford. While 50% of Urdu speakers were literate in their heritage language (Morawska, Smith and Reid, 1984: 38), rates climbed to 55% amongst Indian Punjabis (*ibid*, 44). Two thirds read Urdu newspapers, a third Urdu novels, and a quarter Urdu textbooks (*ibid*, 41). Two thirds read Punjabi newspapers, half read Punjabi novels, and none read Punjabi textbooks (*ibid*, 46).

The disparity in textbook rates is notable in that it may betray a continued bias against Indian Punjabi technical registers, which were infused with Sanskritic terminology in the decades following partition. As a result, technical language became incomprehensible to anyone without a formal education through secondary school or a

penchant for literary autodidacticism. Bilingualism may be another factor: in Bradford, where none read Punjabi textbooks, English literacy rates hovered around 30% for Urdu speakers (Morawska, Smith and Reid, 1984: 38) and 45% for Indian Punjabis (ibid, 44). The latter community was therefore more biliterate with a 10% disparity in favour of Punjabi, while 20% of Urdu-speaking respondents were literate exclusively in their heritage language.

The higher rate of reading novels by Bradford's Indian Punjabis upsets the argument that, at least among first generation migrants, greater literary prestige translates into higher rates of literacy and leisurely reading. These data say nothing of how these discourses may influence parental decisions about their children's education or the motivation of pupils themselves to deepen their literacy skills, but it is clear that the first generation of migrants amongst Britain's Indian Punjabi community values literacy.

Having now established why many Punjabi speakers in the UK have elected not to enrol their children in Punjabi language classes, a brief summary of the history of Urdu provision will further help contextualise the disparity in enrolment in Punjabi and Urdu examinations.

The History of Urdu in the UK

The history of Urdu instruction in the UK offers an additional layer of insight into the impact of micro-planning which coalesces around a strong sociolinguistic base. The work of a dedicated band of scholars, teachers, administrators, and community members, united under the guidance of Ralph Russell, built a powerful foundation of curricular and social support for Urdu classes in British schools. This chapter will describe the micro

planning efforts and social attitudes which combined to favour Urdu instruction's success over Punjabi's.

As was the case for Punjabi, Urdu community classes were being run in the early 1970s (Smith, Morawska and Reid, 1984: 97), around which time the national conversation on immigrants and their languages was growing louder. LEAs were the first government institutions to take initiative in addressing the linguistic needs of pupils by securing Section 11 funding whilst employing dual-English/heritage language instructors (Dalvi, 2009: 291; Molteno, 1984: 15). Towards the end of the decade, adult education centres also began offering Urdu language instruction, though these programs were primarily geared towards the need of English bureaucrats, policemen, professionals, and others who deal with Urdu speakers in the course of their daily work (Shaw, 2009: 253, 259; Molteno, 1984: 15).

An early respondent to the needs of Urdu speakers was Ralph Russell, who taught Urdu at London's School of Oriental and African Studies. Though he had been running short courses on South Asian culture for school teachers since the 60s (Russell, 1985b: 4), the summer of 1974 marked his first foray beyond SOAS when he ran an intensive course for adults in Bradford, followed by a ten-day SOAS course that autumn (Shaw, 2009: 251). By 1979, Russell had succeeded in winning the institutional support of SOAS in promoting Urdu instruction in the UK. The extramural division of SOAS and the Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research collaborated in hosting the First National Urdu Conference that December, inviting instructors, teachers, and education officials to share their stories and work rooted in local experiences (Russell, 1982g: 17).

According to the information made available at that conference, there were only ten schools in the country offering Urdu instruction during the normal timetable (Russell, 1982g: 57). None were using a national or LEA-wide syllabus (Russell, 1982b: 2; 1982c: 1). This prompted participants to form two national working parties focused respectively on the creation of teaching materials and the development of syllabi. The former, headquartered in Manchester, was borne out of conversation on the dearth of quality teaching materials relevant in tone and content to the education of children in British, urban environments as opposed to the pious, rural villages of Pakistan (Ralph, 1982g: 39; 58). Many of these materials were also printed on low-quality paper and based on rote memorization (Russell, 1986a: 2). The syllabus National Working Party was a response to the poor quality of examinations existent in the UK, rooted in either the civil service examinations of the Raj (Broadbent and Hashmi, 1983: 32) or the assumption that the student was a fluent, native speaker of the language working on acquiring literacy skills (Russell, 1986a: 43).

Russell retired in 1981 to devote all of his attention towards Urdu's cause (Robinson, 2009: 247). The Second National Urdu Conference was held the following year, marked by the speeches of politicians representing Labour, the Liberals, and the Conservatives. All used rhetoric in support of a multicultural Britain and the desirability of engaging pupils in their own languages (Russell, 1982g: 69-70). Simultaneously, Russell announced his success in securing direct funding for the working parties from the government of Pakistan, presenting a letter of support directly from the hand of Pakistan President Zia ul Haq (Russell, 1982g: 74). Russell had negotiated directly with the President, his staff, and the diplomats of Pakistan's London embassy during his travels to

Pakistan in 1980 (Russell, 1981: 1-2). This funding would support travel expenses and publication costs, including calligraphy services (Dalvi, 2009: 295). The Pakistani government also donated many books and other useful materials (Russell, 1984a: 3).

1982 also marked the expansion of short-term teaching programs in cities with a notable Pakistani presence, such as Oxford (Shaw, 2009: 254). By April, the working parties had developed a CSE Mode III¹⁰ Urdu Syllabus for the London Regional Examinations Board and some teaching materials (Russell, 1982b: 2). GCEs were being offered by the University of London, the Oxford board, and the Cambridge board (Broadbent and Hashmi, 1983: 31). The National Working Party continued working on syllabi with a Mode I target in mind, as well as the redevelopment of those already being used by the London board (Russell, 1982c: 1). Russell, meanwhile, had completed his three-part series, *A New Course in Hindustani for Learners in Britain*. The book was based on his classroom experiences teaching Urdu in SOAS and around the UK.

The next few years were marked by complications surrounding the recruitment and training of Urdu teachers. Russell assisted LEAs in their attempts to evaluate candidates because the successes of Urdu's supporters had created a huge disparity between demand and the availability of appropriately trained instructors (Russell, 1984c: 8). In a single year between 1982 and 1983, students taking the London O-Level jumped from 341 to 474 (Russell, 1983b: 10). Colleges began incorporating heritage language teaching into their education curricula in order to meet this demand (Russell, 1984c: 10), while Russell supervised Alison Shaw's establishment of a teacher-training program in Oxford in 1984

¹⁰ CSE Mode I includes examinations and syllabi created by an examination board. Mode II combines LEA syllabi with central exams, while Mode III is entirely local.

that targeted the largely-untapped source of native speakers from the community itself (Shaw, 2009: 250).

The mid-1980s also saw many successes. Russell's 1986 work, *A New Course in Urdu and Spoken Hindi for Learners in Britain*, added further to the pedagogically-modern, well-produced materials available to instructors. Though the National Working Party was unable to release a Mode I syllabus, a Mode II syllabus was used by one LEA (Russell, 1983b: 4), and schools were becoming more aware of the various paths through which their students could be certified in Urdu (Russell, 1986b: 3). The National Council for Urdu Teaching was then formed out of the merger of the two National Working Parties, thereby ensuring greater lobbying strength (Russell, 1986a: 7). Russell served as chairman over two Council members and others on the board put in charge of reforming London's O-Levels (Russell, 1984c: 12). Lastly, Bradford's LEA pioneered the administration of Urdu as a modern language, combining the benefits of multicultural consultation with the status of European languages enjoying this designation (Russell, 1984c: 11).

Russell was deeply aware of the necessity of engaging the community on its own terms if community language programs in schools were to be successful. He advocated early on for collaboration with members of the community engaged in teaching classes through mosques, often alongside classes teaching Qur'anic recitation (Russell, 1982g: 21). Russell believed that these individuals could be certified, thereby legitimizing their own unique role in the education of their own children whilst ensuring they be exposed to alternative pedagogical methodology (ibid, 32). Such collaboration could even take the form of providing teaching space free-of-charge (ibid, 34). This was already common in some LEAs. He fiercely pushed for teaching hours during school time, as this served the

dual-purpose of elevating the status of Urdu language instruction (Russell, 1985a: 6) and reducing the time demand placed on families (Russell, 1982g: 31). This was of significant importance due to the community's initial preference for investing their children's time in Arabic instruction (Russell, 1982d: 5).

All of these efforts would come to fruition in the eventual establishment of national Urdu GCSEs and A-Levels in the mid-90s (Dalvi, 2009: 296). As of 2014, the language is offered by Edexcel as a GCSE and A-Level (2014a; 2014b), and by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance, or AQA, as a GCSE (2014d). These organizations are two of the United Kingdom's largest examination boards. It is also offered as an International A-Level and an iGCSE is forthcoming for 2015, though enrolment is likely to be limited, as expanded upon later in this chapter.

As of 2013-14, enrolment in the Urdu GCSE is tilted strongly in favour of girls at 63%, which is higher than French and Spanish at 57% and both Arabic and Italian at 56% (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 22). This may be connected to the number of Islamic girls' schools, also discussed below. Some form of Urdu provision is limited to 8% of state schools, and not a single independent school offered the language (ibid, 106). It is offered by 4% of state secondary schools at KS3, 5% at KS4, and 3% in Sixth Form. A further 4% offer the language outside of the curriculum (ibid, 104). The EBacc gave the language a significant boost between 2011 and 2013 with the number of state schools offering KS3 provision doubling from 2% to 4% (ibid, 108).

The data provided above are not available for the Punjabi language, making an identically quantifiable comparison of the two languages' educational fortunes impossible. Nor is there much record of early micro planning efforts in the 1980s. Ralph Russell's

materials make reference to a Punjabi teaching conference held in 1980 (1982g: 85) and 1984 (1984c: 13), as well as isolated, individual efforts to publish materials (1982a: 4) and develop syllabi (1982b: 2), but there is no mention of national working parties or organised teacher training. Examination enrolment numbers are therefore the primary reliable source of comparative data. The success of Urdu micro-planning efforts becomes apparent when considering differences in GCSE and A-Level enrolment, but it is first necessary to consider further demographic arguments.

Class Offerings: Economically Feasible?

Given the difference in the absolute number of British Pakistanis versus Sikhs living in the UK, the disparity in examinations enrolment might be partially attributable to differential population size, it being more feasible economically to run classes for Pakistanis. This, however, does not appear to be the case: despite the Urdu community's numbers and greater youth, Sikhs have been present in significant concentration to justify Punjabi's role in the many early EAL and MFL experiments discussed above. Data on the education system and the case of MFL provision of Urdu and Punjabi in Scotland will demonstrate that the obstacles to Punjabi's popularity do not lie in demographics.

Within the schools of England, Scotland and Wales,¹¹ both Punjabi and Urdu speakers have continued to maintain quite a strong presence over the last decade. In 2006, Urdu and Punjabi were the first and second most wide-spread languages in schools after

¹¹ In Northern Ireland, there were no students registered for Punjabi or Urdu examinations in the 2008/9 school year (CILT, The National Centre for Languages, 2009a; 2009b). The largest examinations board in the country does not offer qualifications in any languages apart from French, Gaelic, German, Italian, and Spanish (Council for the Curriculum Examinations and Assessment, 2009). The 2011 census lists only 216 Sikhs and 3,832 Muslims (Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, 2014), as well as approximately 1,100 Pakistanis and 6,200 Indians (ibid, 2013: 71). It is unlikely that there is any form of Punjabi or Urdu provision in maintained schools.

English: the presence of Urdu and Punjabi speakers was noted respectively in 69 and 67 LEAs (CILT, 2008). Data on the first language of students in English schools in 2008 enumerate 102,570 Punjabi speakers and 85,250 Urdu speakers, representing 1.6% and 1.3% of the total number of students in maintained schools (ibid, 2011). Scottish officials noted 4,622 Punjabi speakers and 4,207 Urdu speakers that same year (The Scottish Government, 2009). The most recent data available from schools in Wales list 1,256 Punjabi-speaking pupils and 1,129 Urdu-speaking pupils in the 2012/13 school year (Stats Wales, 2013). While some of those claiming ‘Punjabi’ are Pakistani pupils interested in Urdu provision, numbers clearly indicate a vibrant base of support for Punjabi provision, as well.

According to survey results on adult education programs submitted by roughly a third of local authorities and further education colleges in England between November 2006 and February 2007, 12% of the former and 3% of the latter offered Punjabi, while Urdu was present in 26% and 10% (CILT, 2007: 5). The total number of Punjabi learners in 2004-5 was 27, growing to 37 the following year, while Urdu shrunk from 237 to 226 (ibid, 6). Given the small numbers involved, these shifts likely represent the addition of a single Punjabi class somewhere in England, while the Urdu statistic may represent a cancellation or natural fluctuation in class size. It is impossible to explain why such a stark disparity exists, though it is worth noting that those attending adult education programs are often professionals who encounter these languages in the workplace. There are no contemporary data on the levels of monolingualism amongst Punjabi and Urdu speakers to confirm the latter requiring greater language support from service providers.

The four largest concentrations of Punjabi speakers in England & Wales according to region are London (25.1%), the West Midlands (25%), Yorkshire and the Humber (15.9%), and the North West (10.5%). Urdu speakers are most concentrated in the same regions at different rates: London (29.5%), the West Midlands (18%), the North West (15.1%), and Yorkshire and the Humber (14.1%). Both communities have a negligible presence in Wales: at 1,651 persons, a mere 0.6% of Punjabi speakers call Wales home, together with 2,350 persons, or 0.9%, of Urdu speakers (ONS, 2011e). These data offer no evidence of Urdu provision uniquely benefitting from particularly high concentration of potential pupils within a specific region. Both reported Punjabi and Urdu speakers are concentrated in the UK's most urbanised areas.

Urdu speakers are younger than their Punjabi speaking counterparts, however: combining the languages' two largest age brackets, 51.8% of Urdu speakers fall between ages 25-49, versus 48.4% of Punjabi speakers between ages 35-64. 8.7% of Punjabi speakers are between ages 3-15, whilst 12.7% of Urdu speakers fall into the same bracket. The oldest bracket, 85+, includes 1.4% of Punjabi speakers, but only 0.45% of Urdu speakers (ONS, 2011e). The example of Scotland nevertheless shows that the numbers being discussed are not significant enough to severely disadvantage Punjabi provision.

The history of the provision of Punjabi and Urdu in Scottish schools is similar to that in England if viewed through the lens of examinations statistics, but demographics have served to better highlight the role of micro-planning. The sole Scottish examinations board, the Scottish Qualifications Authority, does not offer Punjabi GCSE or A-Levels, while it has offered these qualifications for Urdu since 1998 (Scottish Qualifications Authority, 1999: 6). Officials and parliamentarians have recognized the disconnect

between Punjabi provision and the demography of Scotland: Hanza Malik, a Labour MP from Glasgow, first raised the issue on 11 January 2012, later re-emphasising the problem during a Parliament discussion on MFL in Scottish schools. Malik called attention to the number of Punjabi speakers Scotland (erroneously stating that Punjabi is the second-most spoken language in Scotland when it is actually the third, after English and Polish), arguing that SQA claims about the lack of demand for Punjabi certification do not match population statistics. Malik avoids addressing the sociolinguistic factors at play between Punjabi and Urdu amongst Punjabi Muslims, but nevertheless denounces the lack of Punjabi provision in Scottish schools and the need for students to sit AQA examinations (The Scottish Parliament, 2012).

Malik was surely channelling the frustration of his constituents in discussing the situation in Glasgow's schools, as in 2008, the Glasgow Gurdwara Council publically called attention to cuts to specialist school funding resulting in the elimination of Punjabi provision in Shawlands Academy, a local secondary school. According to the council's secretary, the school had been teaching Punjabi for twenty years, and demand was strong from the city's community of Sikhs. The SQA responded with claims that there had been no real demand for Punjabi, while the LEA adviser on race equality called on the community to lobby on the language's behalf. He also pointed to strong demand for Urdu provision underlying that language's continued success (Bynorth, 2008).

This episode highlights the concrete impact of micro-planning efforts on heritage languages in schools. Urdu provision in the schools of Glasgow dates back at least to 1980, when Ralph Russell visited to work with the Glasgow branch of the National Association of Multi-Racial Education in implementing proposals for introducing further local Urdu

provision (Russell, 1980: 1, 10). Russell reported the presence of two Urdu teachers, one employed by the LEA's language centre for evening instruction and the other enlisted as a volunteer for instruction during school time (ibid, 1). Punjabi is only referenced in Russell's mention of an LEA grant for language provision through community mosques, temples, and gurdwaras (ibid). The Sikh population of Glasgow has since grown to 3,149 according to the 2011 Census versus the city's 32,117 Muslims. This makes Glasgow the largest centre of Sikhism in the UK, with Edinburgh following at 1,110 individuals. As referenced above, the Sikh community totals 9,055 persons Scotland-wide versus 76,737 Muslims (National Records of Scotland, 2013), with 4,622 pupils listed as Punjabi speakers and 4,207 as Urdu speakers four years prior (The Scottish Government, 2009).

If the claims of the SQA and the secretary of the Glasgow Community Council are accurate, then Shawlands Academy offered Punjabi instruction between 1988 and 2008, in which time the community did not organize to demand SQA-administered Punjabi qualifications. The community only launched its campaign after Punjabi had lost its funding, and four years later, the basic issue of SQA support was still being raised in the Scottish Parliament. The question of funding for such programs is being debated as Scotland moves forward with the aforementioned 1+2 language policy, but recent trends are a cause for concern.

In 2007, 3% of respondents to a secondary school survey on modern languages in Scottish schools reported an increase in MFL provision, while 33% reported a decrease. In 2011, 13% reported an increase, while 31% reported a decrease, blaming the non-compulsory status of MFL for drops while attributing growth to trends surrounding Spanish (Scotland's National Centre for Languages, 2012: 3). In S4, equivalent to Year 10

in England and Wales, 61% of schools had mandatory MFL instruction in 2007, while 49% did in 2011 (ibid, 5). Provision of Urdu saw even more drastic a decline: 8% of these schools offered Urdu in S4 in 2007, while 2% did in 2011 (ibid, 8).

The 1+2 language policy offers hope as a macro planning stimulus that might reverse the above trend currently harming Urdu provision, but it remains to be seen how effectively the reforms encouraged by government will be adopted in the case of Punjabi without real pressure coming from members of the community. Officials quoted above were already receptive to the language, but as demonstrated by the SQA, authorities are slow to take initiative if there is no demand coming from the community itself. Demographics in Scotland do not explain the gap between Urdu and Punjabi. A return to examinations statistics reveals how the recent upswing in enrolment actually reveals further weaknesses of Punjabi provision in the UK.

Declining Examinations Enrolment pre-EBacc: A Micro Perspective

Macro planning encouraging language use has seen recent success in reversing the downward trend in MFL GCSE enrolment. In the decade prior to these changes, removing the statutory status of MFL study had led to a steady decline in interest. The previous chapter addressed some of the factors at play: concerns about grades and doubts about utility, in particular. A few additional points are relevant to Punjabi and Urdu.

As referenced above, Punjabi GCSE and A-Level qualifications are offered exclusively through the AQA. The same Urdu qualifications are offered through Edexcel, though the AQA also offers an Urdu GCSE. Urdu is also offered as an iGCSE and International A-Level through Cambridge International Examinations, but participation in

the UK is negligible, if at all existent: iGCSEs are only offered through 4% of state schools, and though they are common through the independent sector at 47% (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 68), no independent school in the UK currently teaches Urdu (ibid, 105). The Urdu iGCSE is being introduced for 2015 (Cambridge International Exams, 2014b), but given that growth in general iGCSE interest is being driven primarily by independent schools (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 6), in which Urdu is not taught, this is unlikely to have any significant impact on Urdu provision. Statistics below will therefore be limited to the GCSE and A-Level.

From 1995 through 2013, registration for writing the Punjabi GCSE through the AQA in England, Wales and Northern Ireland was at its height for the examinations of 1997 at 1,939. After a sharp decline to 1,670 the following year and some minor fluctuation, enrolment saw a steady decline from 1,655 in the year 2000 to 909 in 2010 (CILT, 2011c). The last few years have seen a slight rise and more fluctuation: 910 registered for 2011, 999 for 2012, and 970 for 2013 (AQA, 2011c; 2012c; 2013c).

It is much more difficult to speak of patterns in Punjabi A-Levels. Between the examinations of 1995 and 2013, the three most successful years were 1996-1998 at 269, 253 and 258 entries. The weakest years were 2002, 2004 and 2010 at 134, 160, and 159 entries. Fluctuation could be rather striking: while 235 students enrolled for 2006, 178 enrolled the following year. The jump from 159 entries in 2010 to 196 in 2011 is therefore not indicative of a new trend, especially given the fluctuation down to 184 in 2012 and back up to 189 in 2013 (CILT, 2011b; AQA, 2011a; 2012a; 2013a).

Urdu has followed a moderate path in both declines and gains. As with the data for enrolment in both Urdu AQA and Edexcel GCSE examinations, the highest numbers were

registered in 1996 at 6,956, though dips and rises in the hundreds would persist until 2004, when numbers began their decline from 6,914 registrations to 5,020 for the examinations of 2010 (CILT, 2011c). Available data for England alone show a favourable response to the EBacc: GCSE entries rose from 3,604 in 2012 to 4,093 in 2013, reversing a trend that saw numbers fall from 4,988 in 2008 (Board and Tinsley, 2014: 26).

Urdu A-Level statistics for 1995-2010 reveal larger swings in enrolment. After rising from 895 students in 1995 to its height of 1,093 in 1997, numbers fell to 655 in 1998 and swung upwards to 857 in 1999. Numbers rose from 702 in 2002 to 762 in 2005, but declined to 645 by 2007, staying at roughly the same level through 2010 (CILT, 2011b). Unfortunately, data specific to Urdu enrolment are not available post-2010.

Some of the factors influencing a decline in interest in South Asian qualifications are tied in to changing demographics. Firstly, increased diversity in Britain in recent decades has seen areas formerly dominated by South Asian migrant families become much more international, thereby diversifying the linguistic needs of the local school's student body (CILT, the National Centre for Languages; CILT Cymru; and Scottish CILT, 2005: 3). This lowers the bargaining power of South Asian parents as a bloc and introduces the awkward question of which heritage languages the school would like to support through in-class teaching. Secondly, first generation migrants are aging, meaning British South Asians are increasingly removed from their languages (ibid). Continued linguistic assimilation means that the question of Punjabi or Urdu study is becoming rooted in identity as opposed to developing skills in a language already used in the home. Nevertheless, policy clearly matters, as demonstrated above by measureable responses to statutory status in the curriculum and the impact of EBaccs.

The numbers above display that the enrolment in the Punjabi GCSE grew a total of 9.8% following the introduction of the EBacc, but also that enrolment declined 3% between 2012 and 2013; a year in which Urdu enrolment grew by 13.6%. The absolute numbers involved also betray the possibility that this drop in Punjabi of 29 examinees may represent the disappearance of one or two classes of pupils. The boom of 489 Urdu examinees is much more significant. There was clearly a more robust Urdu-focused MFL infrastructure in place to respond to the lure of the new EBacc, much of which is linked directly to the efforts of Ralph Russell, described above. A final factor worthy of consideration is the role of schools in which Punjabi and Urdu have a more stable, assured role: faith schools, academies and free schools.

Faith Schools, Academies and Free Schools

There is a handful of different types of schools in the UK based around Sikhism and Islam. The Department for Education reported a total of four state Sikh schools and eleven state Islamic schools in England as of January 2010, each of them ‘voluntary aided’ (2010: 18); this means the schools were established with exemptions from the national curriculum around religious studies, staffing and admissions (GOV.UK, 2014). Two years later, the Guardian reported the same number of Islamic schools in the country, but only listed three Sikh primary schools, dropping the one Sikh secondary school from 2010 (Rogers, 2012).

While none of the listed Islamic primary schools have any Urdu provision, it is included in the curricula of four of the five Islamic secondary schools, usually alongside Arabic. Based out of Birmingham, Al-Hijrah Secondary School, ‘an Islamic school with

science status', provides Urdu and Arabic provision throughout both KS3 and KS4 (Al-Hijra School, 2013). Bolton Muslim Girls School, a language college, teaches Chinese, Spanish, French, Arabic, Gujarati, and Urdu from KS3 through A-Levels (Bolton Muslim Girls School, 2014), just as Bradford's Feversham College provision for Urdu and Arabic (Feversham College, 2014). Tauheedul Islam Girls' High School and Sixth Form College of Blackburn, Lancashire provides Urdu, French and Arabic instruction for their GCSEs but does not prepare students for their A-Levels (Tauheedul Girls, 2014). The exception to these schools are the twinned Madani Boys School and Madani Girls School, in which French is the sole language on offer (Madani High, 2014). Three of the schools teaching Urdu are girls' schools, which likely accounts for some of the gender disparity in pupils enrolling for exams.

Two of the three primary schools listed in the Guardian article teach Punjabi at both KS1 and KS2: Khalsa Primary School in Slough (Khalsa Primary School, Slough, 2013), and Khalsa VA Primary School in Ealing (Khalsa Primary School, 2013). The former also offers Sunday provision to help local secondary school students and adults prepare for Punjabi A-Levels and GCSEs (Khalsa Primary School, Slough, 2014). The third school, Guru Nanak Primary School of Hillingdon, does not teach Punjabi, but the institution's newly affiliated secondary school provides Punjabi instruction through KS4 (Guru Nanak Sikh Academy, 2014). There are more such schools to come: eight Sikh schools are included in government plans to certify fifteen new faith schools beginning from 2014 (Dua, 2013).

Other school types, such as free schools and various independent institutions, may also offer Urdu or Punjabi provision. An example is the network of free schools under the

Niksham School Trust. The first opened as a primary school in Birmingham in 2011 (Elkes, 2013). A neighbouring nursery, a high school, and a sixth-form college have since opened, as well as another set of schools in West London. Punjabi features in the trust's curriculum (Niksham School Trust, 2011: 8).

These kinds of schools are unique in offering stable job opportunities to Punjabi instructors and highly valuing the place of the language in the curriculum. Punjabi as a heritage language in the UK faces some major challenges: an ageing community increasingly distant from those who first migrated, tepid rates of enrolment in examinations, poor availability of provision in general comprehensive state schools, its absence from independent schools, and the low probability of provision in schools disassociated from LEAs for reasons elaborated upon in the previous chapter all paint a rather bleak picture. While Urdu also faces the above problems to varying degrees, its supporters have long demonstrated a commitment to fighting for its provision, and the recent upswing post-EBacc is much more encouraging. Schools founded by the Sikh community are a new wildcard; they demand close attention in the coming years as a potential challenge to the expectation of Punjabi's slow death in the British school system.

5. Conclusion

This dissertation has sought to understand the role of planning in ensuring a heritage language's success in the British education system. It has highlighted the importance of both local efforts and government policy, and has argued that while higher enrolment statistics are the demonstrable result of strong macro planning, enrolment has also been affected across the board by the vitality of micro level organisation, advocacy, and action.

After providing a survey of the field of language planning, this dissertation analysed the history of national education policy in the UK, as moving from a period of accommodation in the 70s to a situation in which schools are now independent of local education authorities that had promoted the initial round of experimentation in how best to meet migrants' needs. Like Sweden, Britain used calls for multiculturalism to inspire the initial response to migration, but as in the United States, this response then came to be coloured by assimilationist thought and political pressure.

Against this backdrop, the dissertation examined the history of Punjabi migration and sociolinguistics. It demonstrated the importance of Urdu amongst ethnic Punjabis and the parallels Urdu shares with the Punjabi language, presenting the history of Urdu micro planning alongside analysis of demographic and educational data. The image which emerged establishes the crucial role played by Urdu's supporters throughout the late 70s and beyond. This has equipped them with the infrastructure necessary to allow a vigorous

response to recent shifts in macro policy that have favoured greater modern foreign language study.

The negative fortunes of Punjabi, by comparison, revealed a key point about the role of micro planning in heritage language provision. As demonstrated in Scotland, authorities sympathetic to the linguistic needs of migrant communities are often unwilling to offer provision if migrants themselves do not articulate such a demand. While early education professionals made use of available funding to experiment with a variety of techniques incorporating migrants' languages, they were forced to retreat as the issue became the object of assimilationist attitudes and politics. The support for heritage language provision articulated in policy was thereafter limited to soft endorsements imbued with the latest academic ideas, not a systematic response to the needs of these communities. The record of action by local actors is most important when macro planning is under review: if they have not lobbied politicians, taken initiative in securing places for their languages in schools, or developed materials, then they will continue to be ignored, and their languages will continue to fall prey to linguistic assimilation.

The coming years will shed further light on the future vitality of Punjabi and Urdu provision as the EBacc matures and the impact of mandatory language study at KS2 is felt in KS4. Experiments with academies, faith schools, and free schools will also reveal whether or not some heritage languages are guaranteed a more stable position in the education system. Based on the study above, it is safe to conclude that micro planning will continue to play a central role.

Bibliography

- Abbas, T. (2004) *The Education of British South Asians: Ethnicity, Capital and Class Structure*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Al-Hijrah School (2013) *Curriculum*, [Online], Available: http://alhijrahschool.co.uk/sec_curriculum.html [6 May 2014].
- Ali, N., and Russell, R. (Translator) (1982) 'Urdu Journalism in Britain', in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Ali, N. et al. (2006) *A Postcolonial people: South Asians in Britain*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- All-Party Parliamentary Group for Education (2011) *Report of the Inquiry into Overcoming the Barriers to Literacy*, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2011-appge-literacy-report.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Andrews, J. (1980) 'Council of Europe Project', *Disadvantage in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring, pp. 18-19; 21.
- Ansari, H. (2006) 'Mapping the Colonial: South Asians in Britain, 1857-1947', in Sayyid, S., Kalra, V.S. and Ali, N (eds) *A Postcolonial People: South Asians in Britain*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- AQA (2011a) *Exam results statistics - June 2011. A-level*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-A-LEVEL-STATS-JUNE11.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2011b) *Exam results statistics - June 2011. A-level - AS*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-A-LEVEL-AS-STATS-JUNE11.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2011c) *Exam Results - June 2011. GCSE - Full Course*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-GCSE-FC-STATS-JUNE11.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2012a) *Exam results statistics - June 2012. A-level*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-A-LEVEL-STATS-JUNE-2012.PDF [29 March 2014].

- AQA (2012b) *Exam results statistics - June 2012. A-level - AS*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-AS-STATS-JUNE-2012.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2012c) *Exam results statistics - June 2012. GCSE - Full Course*, [online], Available: http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-GCSE-FC-STATS-JUNE-2012.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2012d) *GCSE Specification: Panjabi*, Manchester: Author.
- AQA (2013a) *Exam results statistics - June 2013. A-level*, [online], Available: http://filestore.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-A-LEVEL-RESULTS-STATISTICS-JUNE-2013.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2013b) *Exam results statistics - June 2013. A-level - AS*, [online], Available: http://filestore.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-AS-RESULTS-STATISTICS-JUNE-2013.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2013c) *Exam results statistics - June 2013. GCSE - Full Course*, [online], Available: http://filestore.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-GCSE-FC-RESULTS-STATS-JUNE-2013.PDF [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2014a) *Panjabi*, [Online], Available: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/subjects/panjabi> [29 March 2014].
- AQA (2014b) *Panjabi (4680)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/subjects/panjabi/gcse/panjabi-4680> [28 March 2014].
- AQA (2014c) *Panjabi (2680)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/subjects/panjabi/a-level/panjabi-2680> [28 March 2014].
- AQA (2014d) *Urdu (4645)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/subjects/urdu/gcse/urdu-4645> [31 March 2014].
- Arya Samaj (2014) In *Encyclopedia Britannica*, [Online], Available: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/37454/Arya-Samaj> [29 April 2014].
- Baldauf, R. (1994), ‘"Unplanned" language policy and planning’, in Grabe, W. (ed), ‘Language Policy and Planning’, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 14, 82-9.
- Baldauf, R. (2008) ‘Rearticulating the Case for Micro Language Planning in a Language Ecology Context’, in Liddicoat, A. and Baldauf, R. (eds) *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
NOTE: Clarify format; chapter author same as an editor.
- Ballard, R. (1994) *Desh Pardesh: The South Asian Presence in Britain*, London: Hurst.

- Bardell, G. and Craft, A. (1983) 'Introduction', in Broadbent, J. (ed) *Assessment in a Multicultural Society: Community Languages at 16+*. York, UK: Longman for Schools Council.
- BBC News (2010), *Q&A: Academies and free schools*, [Online], Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10161371> [28 April 2014].
- Bending, H. B. (1970) 'The Preparation of Teachers of Adults: English as a Second Language', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Aspects of the Preparation of Language Teachers: CILT Reports and Papers 3 - Abridged proceedings of a conference held at State House, London WCIR 4TN on 23rd and 24th February 1970*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Bhachu, P. (1985) *Twice Migrants: East African Sikh settlers in Britain*, London: Tavistock.
- Bhatti, G. (1999) *Asian Children at Home and at School: An Ethnographic Study*, New York: Routledge.
- Blunkett, D. (2002) 'What does citizenship mean today?' *The Guardian*, 15 September, [Online], Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/sep/15/race.thinktanks> [24 April 2014].
- Board, K. and Tinsley, T. (2014) *Language Trends 2013/14: The State of language learning in primary and secondary schools in England*, [Online], CfBT Education Trust, Available: <http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/language-trends-survey-2014.pdf> [3 May 2014].
- Bolton Muslim Girls School (2014) *Specialisms*, [Online], Available: <http://www.bmgs.bolton.sch.uk/specialisms/10587.html> [6 May 2014].
- Broadbent, J. (ed) (1983) *Assessment in a Multicultural Society: Community Languages at 16+*. York, UK: Longman for Schools Council.
- Broadbent, J. and Hashmi, M. (1983) 'Urdu', in Broadbent, J. (ed) *Assessment in a Multicultural Society: Community Languages at 16+*. York, UK: Longman for Schools Council.
- Bynorth, J. (2008) 'Punjabi fears as exams dropped', *Herald Scotland*, 12 January, [Online], Available: <http://www.heraldscotland.com/punjabi-fears-as-exams-dropped-1.828295> [28 March 2014].

- Cambridge International Examinations (2014a) *Urdu (A Level Only) (9676)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.cie.org.uk/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-international-as-and-a-level-urdu-9676/> [6 May 2014].
- Cambridge International Examinations (2014b) *Urdu as a Second Language (0529)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.cie.org.uk/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-igcse-urdu-as-a-second-language-0539/> [6 May 2014].
- Cambridge Primary Review (2009a) *Towards a New Primary Curriculum: Part 1*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge, [Online], Available: http://www.primaryreview.org.uk/Downloads/Curriculum_report/CPR_Curric_rep_Pt1_Past_Present.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Cambridge Primary Review (2009b) *Towards a New Primary Curriculum: Part 2*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge, [Online], Available: http://www.primaryreview.org.uk/Downloads/Curriculum_report/CPR_Curric_rep_Pt2_Future.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Campbell-Platt, K. (1976) 'Distribution of linguistic minorities in Britain', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Bilingualism and British Education: The Dimensions of Diversity. CILT Reports and Papers 14. Papers from a conference convened in January, 1976*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) (1970a) *Aspects of the Preparation of Language Teachers: CILT Reports and Papers 3 - Abridged proceedings of a conference held at State House, London WCIR 4TN on 23rd and 24th February 1970*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) (1970b) *Examining Modern Languages. CILT Reports and Papers 4. Abridged proceedings of a conference held at State House, London WCIR 4TN on 19th and 20th March 1970*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) (1975) *Less commonly taught languages: Resources and problems. CILT Reports and Papers 12. Papers from a conference convened in June, 1975*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) (1976) *Bilingualism and British Education: The Dimensions of Diversity. CILT Reports and Papers 14. Papers from a conference convened in January, 1976*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Chapman, R. D. (1976) 'Bilingualism in Birmingham', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Bilingualism and British Education: The*

Dimensions of Diversity. CILT Reports and Papers 14. Papers from a conference convened in January, 1976, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

- Children, School and Families Committee (2008) *Testing and Assessment*, London: The Stationery Office, [Online], Available:
<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2008-testing-and-assessment.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Children, School and Families Committee (2009) *National Curriculum*, London: The Stationery Office, [Online], Available:
<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2009-CSFC-national-curriculum.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2007) *Local Authority and FE college Adult language learning survey*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/language_trends_surveys/idoc.ashx?docid=16fc60a6-9ebc-4424-b01f-79966cd420e1&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2008) *Appendix A: Languages spoken by school children in England*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/language_trends/idoc.ashx?docid=ea0df8c5-0ef8-4e1d-bbe2-5a5c79a58b68&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2009a) *Northern Ireland: GCSE Entries by Subject*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/secondary_statistics/idoc.ashx?docid=7906e876-a978-49e7-a791-e678d8fb6791&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2009b) *Northern Ireland: A Level Entries by Subject*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/secondary_statistics/idoc.ashx?docid=7eb41c44-2f7a-444a-aa4d-6beddd2a45cb&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2011a) *Annual School Census: language data collection*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/languages_in_the_population/annual_school_census.aspx [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2011b) *National trends in AS and A Level entries 1995 to 2011*, [Online], Available:
http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/secondary_statistics/i

- [doc.ashx?docid=270754e5-7b6d-4a4a-b36a-bf5ad2513a81&version=-1](http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/secondary_statistics/doc.ashx?docid=270754e5-7b6d-4a4a-b36a-bf5ad2513a81&version=-1) [28 March 2014].
- CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2011c) *National trends in GCSE entries 1995 to 2011*, [Online], Available: http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/secondary_statistics/doc.ashx?docid=b4dd6655-fed3-4f18-a612-3e90890ee5ed&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- CILT, the National Centre for Languages; CILT Cymru; and Scottish CILT (2005) *Language Trends 2005: Community language learning in England, Wales and Scotland. Key findings from a survey of local authorities, mainstream and complementary schools*, [Online], Available: http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/language_trends/idoc.ashx?docid=d382eed5-5ef9-4c09-b68a-bd737f13f8ed&version=-1 [28 March 2014].
- Coleman, P. (1982) 'The Response of the Public Library Service', in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Committee of Inquiry into the Quality of the Educational Experience Offered to 3- and 4-Year-Olds (1990) *Starting with Quality*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/rumbold/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Conteh, J. (2007a) 'Culture, Languages and Learning: mediating a bilingual approach in complementary Saturday classes', in Conteh, J., Martin, P. and Helavaara Robertson, L. (eds) *Multilingual Learning: Stories from schools and communities in Britain*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.
- Conteh, J., Martin, P. and Helavaara Robertson, L. (eds) (2007b) *Multilingual Learning: Stories from schools and communities in Britain*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.
- Council for the Curriculum Examinations and Assessment (2009) *Qualifications*, [Online], Available: <http://www.rewardinglearning.org.uk/qualifications/> [2 May 2014].
- Council of Europe (1976) *Recommendation 786 on the education and cultural development of migrants*, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, [Online], Available: <http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta76/EREC786.htm> [24 April 2014].
- Council of Europe (1977). *Recommendation 814 on modern languages in Europe*, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, [Online], Available:

<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta77/EREC814.htm> [24 April 2014].

Craft, M. and Atkins, M. (1983) *Training Teachers of Ethnic Minority Languages: A Report for the Swann Committee*, Nottingham: School of Education, University of Nottingham.

Dakin, J. (1971) *A Survey of English Courses for Immigrant Teachers: CILT Reports and Papers 5*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

Dalvi, K. (2009) 'Ralph Russell', in Menon, M. U. (ed) (2009) *The Annual of Urdu Studies, No. 24*, Madison, USA: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia.

Dearing, R. (1994) *The National Curriculum and its Assessment: Final Report*, London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/dearing1994/index.html> [23 April 2014].

Dearing, R. (1996) *Review of Qualifications for 16-19 Year Olds*, Hayes, UK: SCAA Publications, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/dearing1996/index.html> [23 April 2014].

Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (2008) *Modern foreign languages in the National Curriculum for Wales*, [Online], Available: http://wales.gov.uk/dcells/publications/curriculum_and_assessment/arevisedcurriculumforwales/nationalcurriculum/modernforeirnlanguagesnc/mfleng.pdf?lang=en [23 April 2014].

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2005) *KS2 Framework for Languages - Part One*, [Online], Available: http://www.primarylanguages.org.uk/policy_research/policy_and_reform/key_stage_2_framework.aspx [23 April 2014].

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2005) *KS2 Framework for Languages - Part Two*, [Online], Available: http://www.primarylanguages.org.uk/policy_research/policy_and_reform/key_stage_2_framework.aspx [23 April 2014].

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007a) *KS2 Framework for Languages - Part Three*, [Online], Available: http://www.primarylanguages.org.uk/policy_research/policy_and_reform/key_stage_2_framework.aspx [23 April 2014].

- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007b) *Supporting Children Learning English as an additional language*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.naldic.org.uk/Resources/NALDIC/Teaching%20and%20Learning/ealeyguidance.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2009a) *Independent Review of the Primary Curriculum: Final Report*, Annesley, UK: Department for Children, Schools and Families Publications, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2009-IRPC-final-report.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2009b) *Special Education Needs (SEN) - A Guide for Parents and Careers*, Annesley, UK: Department for Children, Schools and Families Publications, [Online], Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/190545/DCSF-00639-2008.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education (2010) *Schools, pupils and their characteristics: January 2010*, [Online], Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/218952/main_20text_20sfr092010.pdf [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education (2011a) *Primary National Curriculum until 2014 - Modern Foreign Languages (MFL)* [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130802151255/https://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/primary/b00199137/mfl> [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education (2011b) *Secondary National Curriculum until 2014 - Modern Foreign Languages (MFL)*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130802151255/https://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/secondary/b00199616/mfl> [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education (2011c) *The Framework for the National Curriculum. A report by the Expert Panel for the National Curriculum review*, London: Author, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2011-nc-review-panel-report.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education (2012) *Review of the National Curriculum in England*, London: Author, [Online], Available: <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/b0073043/remit-for-review-of-the-national-curriculum-in-england/> [23 April 2014].

- Department for Education (2013a) *2014 National Curriculum - Key Stage 2 languages consultation report*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130802151255/https://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/nationalcurriculum2014/a00221243/ks2-languages-consultation-report> [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education (2013b) *Statutory Guidance - National Curriculum in England: Languages Programmes of Study*, [Online], Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-languages-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-languages-programmes-of-study> [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education (2013c) *The National Curriculum in England: Framework Document*, London: Author, [Online], Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/210969/NC_framework_document_-_FINAL.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education (2014) *Teach modern foreign languages (MFL)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.education.gov.uk/get-into-teaching/subjects-age-groups/teach-mfl> [28 March 2014].
- Department for Education and Employment (1997a) *Excellence in Schools*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/wp1997/excellence-in-schools.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Employment (1997b) *Excellence for All Children*, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1997-green-paper.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Employment, and Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (1999) *The National Curriculum: Handbook for Primary Teachers in England*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1999-nc-primary-handbook.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Employment, and Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2004) *The National Curriculum: Handbook for Secondary Teachers in England*, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/QCA-04-1374.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2002) *Languages for All: Languages for Life. A Strategy for England*, Nottingham: DfES Publications.

- Department for Education and Skills (2003a) *Aiming High: Raising Attainment for Minority Ethnic Pupils*, Annesley, UK: Department for Education and Skills Publications, [Online], Available: https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/213_1.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2003b) *Every Child Matters*, Norwich, UK: The Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/CM5860.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2003c) *Excellence and Enjoyment: A Strategy for Primary Schools*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20040722013944/dfes.gov.uk/primarydocument/> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2006a) *Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and Teaching for Bilingual Children in the Primary Years - Unit 1*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110809101133/nsonline.org.uk/node/85322> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2006b) *Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and Teaching for Bilingual Children in the Primary Years - Unit 2*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110809101133/nsonline.org.uk/node/85322> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2006c) *Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and Teaching for Bilingual Children in the Primary Years - Unit 3*, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110809101133/nsonline.org.uk/node/85322> [23 April 2014].
- Department for Education and Skills (2006d) Primary Framework for literacy and mathematics, Annesley, UK: Department for Education and Skills Publications, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2006-primary-national-strategy.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science (DES) (1974), *Educational Disadvantage and the Educational Needs of Immigrants. Observations on the report on Education of the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department of Education and Science (DES), (1975) *A Language for Life: The Bullock Report*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/bullock/bullock1975.html> [24 April 2014].

- Department of Education and Science (DES) (1983) *Linguistic Minorities in England: A Report from the Linguistic Minorities Project*. London: University of London, Institute of Education.
- Department of Education and Science (1985a) *Education 8 to 12 in Combined and Middle Schools*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/hmi-8to12/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science (1985b) *Education for All*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/swann/swann1985.html> [23 April 2014]
- Department of Education and Science (1987) *Modern Foreign Languages to 16*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/hmi-curriculum/modforlang.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science (1988) *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of English Language*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/kingman/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science (1990) *Language Awareness and Foreign Language Taster Courses*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/hmi/1990-language-courses.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science (1992) *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools*, London: Author, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/threewisemen/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Department of Education and Science and the Welsh office (1989) *English for Ages 5 to 16*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/cox1989/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Diamond, J. (2011) 'A 'Vernacular' for a 'New Generation'? Historical Perspectives about Urdu and Punjabi, and the Formation of Language Policy in Colonial Northwest India', in Schiffman, H. (ed) *Language Policy and Language Conflict in Afghanistan and its Neighbors: The Changing Politics of Language Choice*, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

- Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review (2007) *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship*, Annesley, UK: Department for Education and Skills Publications, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2007-ajegbo-report-citizenship.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Dua, Rohan (2013) 'UK to open 8 Sikh 'faith schools' to inculcate tolerance', Times of India, 21 September, [Online], Available: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/chandigarh/UK-to-open-8-Sikh-faith-schools-to-inculcate-tolerance/articleshow/22830051.cms> [6 May 2014].
- Edexcel (2014a) *GCE from 2008 / Urdu*, Available: <http://www.edexcel.com/quals/gce/gce08/lang/urdu/Pages/default.aspx>, [31 March 2014].
- Edexcel (2014b) *GCSE from 2009 / Urdu*, [Online], Available: <http://www.edexcel.com/quals/gcse/gcse09/mfl/urdu/Pages/default.aspx> [31 March 2014].
- Education Act 2002*, chap. 32, [Online], Available: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/32/pdfs/ukpga_20020032_en.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Education Reform Act 1988*, chap. 40, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1988-education-reform-act.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Education Scotland (2013) *Curriculum for Excellence Implementation Plan 2013-2014*, [Online], Available: http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/Images/CfEImplementationPlan2013to14_tcm4-810944.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Edwards, V. (1998) *The Power of Babel: Teaching and Learning in multilingual classrooms*, London: Trentham Books.
- Elkes, Neil (2013) '700 new places as Birmingham free school grows', Birmingham Mail, 13 February, [Online], Available: <http://www.birminghammail.co.uk/news/local-news/700-new-places-birminghams-nishkam-1316350> [6 May 2014].
- Equality Act 2010*, chap. 15, [Online], Available: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15> [4 April 2014].
- European Communities Commission (1970) *Resolution (70) 35. School Education for the Children of Migrant Workers*, Strasbourg, [Online], Available: <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2076469&SecMode=1&DocId=639874&Usage=2> [23 April 2014].

- Farr, M. (1980) 'Meeting the needs of the Ethnic Minorities', *Disadvantage in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring, pp. 15; 23.
- Ferguson, G. (2006) *Language planning and education*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Feversham College (2014) *Modern Foreign Languages*, [Online], Available: <http://www.fevershamcollege.com/subjects-modern-foreign-languages.php> [6 May 2014].
- Fitzpatrick, B. and Rees, O.A. (1980) 'Mother Tongue & English Teaching Project', *Disadvantage in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring, pp. 7-8.
- Gillard, D. (1999) The Moser Report: Summary and Recommendations, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1999-moser-summary.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Gillard, D. (2011) *Education in England: a brief history*, [Online], Available: www.educationengland.org.uk/history [23 April 2014].
- Gillespie, M. (1995) *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural change - Ethnographic a Study of South Asian Youngsters in Southall*, London: Routledge.
- GOV.UK (2014) *Types of school: 2. Faith Schools*, [Online], Available: <https://www.gov.uk/types-of-school/faith-schools> [6 May 2014].
- Gravelle, M. (1996) *Supporting Bilingual Learners in Schools*, London: Trentham Books.
- Gundara, J. S. (1982) 'Issues of Linguistic Diversity', in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Guru Nanak Sikh Academy (2014) *Punjabi*, [Online], Available: <http://secondary.gurunanaksikhacademy.co.uk/page/?title=PUNJABI&pid=18> [6 May 2014].
- Hashmi, M. and Russell, R. (Translator) (1982) 'Teaching Urdu in the State Schools', in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Haugen, E. (1959) 'Planning for a standard language in Norway', *Anthropological Linguistics* vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 8-21.
- Helavaara Robertson, L. (2007) 'The Story of Bilingual Children Learning to Read', in Conteh, J., Martin, P. and Helavaara Robertson, L. (eds) *Multilingual Learning*:

Stories from schools and communities in Britain, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.

- Henley, D. (2012) *Cultural Education in England*, London: Department for Education, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2012-henley-report-cultural.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Houlton, D. (1984) 'Overview of the Project', in *Mother Tongue Colloquium: Papers Presented to the European Commission, London 26-29 March 1984*, London: SCDC Publications.
- House of Commons Education Committee (2011) *The English Baccalaureate*, London: The Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2011-CESC-ebac.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Inspectorate of Schools (England) (1984) *Mother tongue teaching in school and community: an HMI enquiry in four LEAs*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Jahr, E. (ed) (1993) *Language conflict and language planning*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jernudd, B. (1993) 'Language planning from a management perspective: An interpretation of findings', in Jahr, E. (ed) *Language conflict and language planning*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaplan, R. and R. Baldauf (eds) (2003), *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kennedy, C. (ed) (1984) *Language planning and language education*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kerr, A.N. (1984) 'Language and the Education of Immigrants' Children in Sweden', in Kennedy, C. (ed) *Language planning and language education*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Khalsa Primary School (2013) *Years 1 to 6*, [Online], Available: <http://www.khalsaschool.co.uk/primary-curriculum-years-1-to-6-ages-5-to-11/> [6 May 2014].
- Khalsa Primary School, Slough (2013) *Curriculum*, [Online], Available: <http://www.khalsaprimarieschool.com/curriculum.html> [6 May 2014].
- Khalsa Primary School, Slough (2014) *Sunday Punjabi School*, [Online], Available: <http://www.khalsaprimarieschool.com/panjabi-school.html> [6 May 2014].

- Khan, V. (1976) 'Provision by Minorities for Language Maintenance', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Bilingualism and British Education: The Dimensions of Diversity. CILT Reports and Papers 14. Papers from a conference convened in January, 1976*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Lewis, M., Simons, G. and Fennig, C. (eds) (2014) *Ethnologue: Punjabi, Mirpur*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International, [Online], Available: <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/pmu> [28 April 2014].
- Liberal Democrats (2009) *Equity and Excellence: Policies for 5-19 education in England's schools and colleges - Policy Paper 89*, London: Policy Projects Team, Liberal Democrats, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2009-libdems-policy-paper-89.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Liddicoat, A. and Baldauf, R. (eds) (2008a) *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Liddicoat, A. and Baldauf, R. (2008b) 'Language Planning in Local Contexts: Agents, Contexts and Interactions', in Liddicoat, A. and Baldauf, R. (eds) *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Literacy Task Force (1997) *The Implementation of the National Literacy Strategy*, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/literacytaskforce/implementation.html> [23 April 2014].
- Little, D. in consultation with James Anderson et al. (2010) *The Linguistic and educational integration of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Available: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Source2010_ForumGeneva/MigrantChildrenConceptPaper_EN.pdf [3 April 2014].
- Local Government Act 1966*, chap. 42 (I) (11), [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1966-local-government-act.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Lothers, M. and Lothers, L. (2012) *Mirpuri Immigrants in England: A Sociolinguistic Survey*, SIL International [Online], Available: <http://www.sil.org/resources/archives/48007> [19 April 2014].
- Madani High (2014) *School Curriculum*, [Online], Available: http://www.madanihigh.leicester.sch.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=95&Itemid=92 [6 May 2014].

- Martin, P. et al (2007) 'Multilingual Learning Stories in Two Gujarati Complementary Schools in Leicester', in Conteh, J., Martin, P. and Helavaara Robertson, L. (eds) *Multilingual Learning: Stories from schools and communities in Britain*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.
- Menon, M. U. (ed) (2009) *The Annual of Urdu Studies, No. 24*, Madison, USA: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia.
- Mir, F. (2010) *The Social Space of Language: Vernacular Culture in British Colonial Punjab*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Mobbs, M. (1985) *Britain's South Asian Languages*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Mobbs, M. (1997) *Children's other languages: expertise, affiliation and language use amongst second generation British South-Asian pupils*, Lancashire: National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum.
- Molteno, M. (1984) 'The Conditions Under Which Community Language Teaching Takes Place: Implications for Teacher Training', supplement to Russell, R. *Urdu Teaching Newsletter No. 15*. Author.
- Molteno, M. (1986) *Teaching Britain's community languages: Materials and methods (With examples from teaching Urdu)*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Morawska, A., Smith, G., and Reid, E. (1984) *Languages in Bradford: CLE/LMP Working Paper No.11*, London: Community Languages and Education Project & University of London Institute of Education.
- Mother Tongue Project, (1984), *Mother Tongue Colloquium: Papers Presented to the European Commission, London 26-29 March 1984*, London: SCDC Publications.
- Mukherjee, T. (1986) 'ESL: An Imported New Empire?', *Journal of Moral Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 43-49.
- National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (2013) *EAL Funding*, [Online], Available: <http://www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-funding> [28 April 2014].
- National Records of Scotland (2013) *Scotland's Census 2011 - Table KS209SCa – Religion (UK harmonised)*, [Online], Available: http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/councilarea/KS209SCa_CA.pdf [2 May 2014].

- National Union of Teachers (1982) *Linguistic Diversity and Mother Tongue Teaching*, London: Author.
- Nishkam School Trust (2011) *Nishkam High School*, [Online], Available: http://www.nishkamschooltrust.org/download/Nishkam_high_brochure_v12_web.pdf [6 May 2014].
- Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (2014) *Religion - Full Detail: QS218NI*, [Online], Available: http://www.ninis2.nisra.gov.uk/Download/Census%202011_Excel/2011/QS218NI.xls [28 March 2014].
- Nowaz, H. (1984) 'Linguistic and Cultural Background (Bengali)', in *Mother Tongue Colloquium: Papers Presented to the European Commission, London 26-29 March 1984*, London: SCDC Publications.
- Office for National Statistics (2011a) *Census 2011 - Ethnic Group by Religion*, [Online], Available: <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC2201EW> [28 March 2014].
- Office for National Statistics (2011b) *Census 2011 - Ethnic group by sex by age*, [Online], Available: http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC2101EW/view/2092957703?rows=c_age&cols=c_ethpuk11 [9 May 2014].
- Office for National Statistics (2011c) *Census 2011 - Main Language by Sex and Age*, [Online], Available: <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/dc2104ew> [28 March 2014].
- Office for National Statistics (2011d) *Census 2011 - Religion by sex by age*, [Online], Available: http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC2107EW/view/2092957703?rows=c_age&cols=c_relpuk11 [9 May 2014].
- Office for National Statistics (2011e) *Figure 7: Main language other than English, England and Wales, 2011. 2011 Census data from DC2104EW*, [Online], Available: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census/detailed-characteristics-for-local-authorities-in-england-and-wales/detailed-characteristics---chd-figure-7.xls> [28 March 2014].
- OFSTED (2012) *Moving English Forward*, Manchester: Author, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2012-ofsted-english.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- OFSTED and Audit Commission (2003) *School Place Planning: The influence of social place planning on school standards and social inclusion*, HMI, [Online], Available:

<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2003-school-place-planning.pdf> [23 April 2014].

- Patel, K. (1982) 'Down with Gujarati', Times Educational Supplement, 21 November 1980, in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Perren, G. E. (1975) 'Introduction', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Less commonly taught languages: Resources and problems. CILT Reports and Papers 12. Papers from a conference convened in June, 1975*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Polling, O. (1984) 'Towards a Rationale' in Reid, E. (ed) *Minority Community Languages in School: NCLE Paper and Reports 4*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Purushothaman, M. (1980) 'Immigrants at School', *Disadvantage in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring, pp. 22.
- Race Relations Act 1976*, chap. 74, [Online], Available: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1976/74> [24 April 2014].
- Ravi, P. (1990) *Speaking in tongues: Heritage language maintenance and transfer in Canada*, Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.
- Reid, E. (ed) (1984) *Minority Community Languages in School: NCLE Paper and Reports 4*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Reid, E., Smith, G. and Morawska, A. (1985) *Languages in London: CLE/LMP Working Paper No.12*, London: Community Languages and Education Project & University of London Institute of Education.
- Richardson, H. (1980) 'Bilingualism and Mother Tongue Teaching', *Disadvantage in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring, pp. 4-5.
- Robinson, F. (2009) 'What Ralph Russell Really Meant and Means to Me', in Menon, M. U. (ed) (2009) *The Annual of Urdu Studies, No. 24*, Madison, USA: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia.
- Rogers, Simon. (2012) 'Faith schools in England: every one mapped', The Guardian, 5 March, [Online], Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/interactive/2012/mar/05/faith-schools-free-school-meals> [6 May 2014].

- Roussou, Maria. (1984) 'The Project Materials', in *Mother Tongue Colloquium: Papers Presented to the European Commission, London 26-29 March 1984*, London: SCDC Publications.
- Rubin, J. (1971) 'Evaluation and language planning', in Rubin, J. and B. Jernudd (eds), *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*, Honolulu, East-West Center: Hawaii University Press.
- Rubin, J. (1984) 'Bilingual Education and Language Planning', in Kennedy, C. (ed) *Language planning and language education*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Russell, R. (1980) *Urdu Teaching in Glasgow: Report of a visit, 12th-15th March, 1980*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1981) *Urdu Teaching - Newsletter No. 5 (I think) [ibid.]*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982a) *Urdu Teaching Newsletter, No. 6*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982b) *Urdu Teaching Newsletter, No. 7*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982c) *Urdu Teaching: Newsletter No. 8*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982d) *Urdu Teaching: Newsletter No. 9*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982e) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 10*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1982f) 'Unfair to Mother Tongues', Times Educational Supplement, 26 December 1980, in Russell, R. (ed) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Russell, R. (ed) (1982g) *Urdu in Britain: A Report on the First and Second National Urdu Conferences, 1979 and 1981*, Karachi: Urdu Markaz.
- Russell, R. (1983a) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 11*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1983b) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 12*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1984a) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 13*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1984b) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 14*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1984c) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 15*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1985a) *The Educational Needs of Pakistani Children. Speech to a conference at the Pakistan Centre, Nottingham, on 10th February, 1985*. Author.

- Russell, R. (1985b) *South Asian Radicals and Britain's South Asian Languages*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1986a) *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 18*, Author.
- Russell, R. (1986b) 'Urdu in the Last Four Years. A Personal Statement by Ralph Russell', supplement to Russell, R. *Urdu Teaching, Newsletter No. 18*, Author.
- Sayyid, S. (2006) 'BrAsians - Postcolonial People, Ironic Citizens', in Ali, N. et al. (eds) *A Postcolonial people: South Asians in Britain*, New York: Columbia.
- Schiffman, H. (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*, London: Routledge.
- School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (1994) *Evaluation of the Implementation of English in the National Curriculum at Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 (1991-1993)*, London: Author, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/warwick/index.html> [23 April 2014].
- Schools Council (1967) *English for the Children of Immigrants; Working Paper No. 13*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Scotland's National Centre for Languages (2012) *National Survey of Modern Language Provision in Scottish Schools. Part Two: Secondary Schools*, [Online], Available: http://www.scilt.org.uk/Portals/24/Library/research/mlsurvey/MLSecondary_Survey_2011_summary.pdf [28 March 2014].
- Scottish Executive (2004) *A Curriculum for Excellence: The Curriculum Review Group*, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2004-scottish-curriculum-review.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Scottish Executive (2006) *A Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum 3-18 (1) - The Contribution of Curriculum Areas*, [Online], Available: http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/images/building_curriculum1_tcm4-383389.pdf [23 April 2014].
- Scottish Government Languages Working Group (2012) *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach*, [Online], Available: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0039/00393435.pdf> [28 March 2014].
- Scottish Qualifications Authority (1999) *Annual Statistical Report: 1998*, Glasgow: Author.
- Shackle, C. and Snell, R. (1990) *Hindi and Urdu since 1800*, New Delhi: Heritage Publishers.

- Sharma, B. (1983) 'Hindi', in Broadbent, J. (ed) *Assessment in a Multicultural Society: Community Languages at 16+*. York, UK: Longman for Schools Council.
- Shaw, A. (2003) 'Immigrant Families in the UK', in Scott, J., Treas, J. and Richards, M. (eds) *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families*, Blackwell Publishing. [Online], Available: http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode.html?id=g9780631221586_chunk_g978063122158618 [29 March 2014].
- Shaw, A. (2009) 'Ralph Russell and Teaching Urdu to English-Speaking Adults in the Community', in Menon, M. U. (ed) (2009) *The Annual of Urdu Studies, No. 24*, Madison, USA: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia.
- Singh Sabha (2014) In *Encyclopedia Britannica*, [Online], Available: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/545856/Singh-Sabha> [29 April 2014].
- Smith, G., Morawska, A. and Reid, E. (1984) *Languages in Coventry: CLE/LMP Working Paper No.10*, London: Community Languages and Education Project & University of London Institute of Education.
- Sneddon, R. (2007) 'Disabilities in tertiary education', in Conteh, J., Martin, P. and Helavaara Robertson, L. (eds) *Multilingual Learning: Stories from schools and communities in Britain*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.
- Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Statistics for Wales (2008) *Modern Foreign Languages in Schools in Wales, 2007*, [Online], Available: <http://wales.gov.uk/docs/statistics/2008/080827sb452008en.pdf> [28 March 2014].
- Stats Wales (2013) *First language of pupils aged 5 and over, by language and year*, [Online], Available: <https://statswales.wales.gov.uk/Catalogue/Education-and-Skills/Schools-and-Teachers/Schools-Census/Pupil-Level-Annual-School-Census/Ethnicity-National-Identity-and-Language/FirstLanguageOfPupilsAged5AndOver-by-Language-Year> [28 March 2014].
- Tansley, Paula. (1984) 'Transferability', in *Mother Tongue Colloquium: Papers Presented to the European Commission, London 26-29 March 1984*, London: SCDC Publications.
- Tansley, P. (1986) *Community Languages in Primary Education: Report from the SCDC Mother Tongue Project*, Windsor: The NFER-NELSON Publishing Company Ltd.

- Tauheedul Girls (2014) *Curriculum*, [Online], Available: <http://www.tighs.com/landdcurriculum> [6 May 2014].
- Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group (2006) *2020 Vision: Report of the Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group*, Annesley, UK: Department for Education and Skills Publications, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2006-2020-vision.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- The Council of the European Communities (1977) *Council Directive 77/486/EEC of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers*, [Online], Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31977L0486:EN:HTML> [28 April 2014].
- The Linguistic Minorities Project Team (1981) 'Bilingualism and Education in England: The Work of the Linguistic Minorities Project and Other Recent Research', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2, March, pp. 112-121.
- THE PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA - *Incredible Voyage to a Largest University* (2009), [Online], Available: <http://punjabiversity.ac.in/pbiuniweb/introductionnew.html> [28 April 2014].
- The Scottish Government (2009) *Pupils in Scotland, 2008: Main home language in publicly funded schools, 2008*, [Online], Available: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/04/01090908/20> [28 March 2014].
- The Scottish Parliament (2012) *Meeting of the Parliament 24 May 2012 - Languages (Improving Opportunities)*, [Online], Available: <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/28862.aspx?r=7604> [28 March 2014].
- Thomas, R. (2009) *Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tickell, D. (2011) *The Early Years: Foundations for Life, Health and Learning*, [Online], Available: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/2011-tickell-report-eyfs.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Tikly, L., Osler, A. et al. (2002) *Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant: Analysis of LEA Action Plans*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, [Online], Available: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR371.pdf> [23 April 2014].
- Tinsley, T. and Han, Y. (2012) *Language learning in secondary schools in England. Findings from the 2011 Language Trends survey*, [Online], CfBT Education Trust,

Available: <http://cdn.cfbt.com/~media/cfbtcorporate/files/research/2012/r-language-learning-in-secondary-schools-in-england-language-trends-2012.pdf> [28 March 2014].

- Tomlinson, S. (1983) *Ethnic Minorities in British Schools*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Tosi, A. (1979) 'Mother-Tongue Teaching for the Children of Migrants', *Language Teaching*, vol. 12, no. 3-4, October, pp. 213-231.
- Tosi, A. (1984) *Immigration and Bilingual Education*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Townsend, H. E. R. (1971) *Immigrant Pupils in England: The L.E.A. Response*, London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.
- Truman, A. R. (1970) 'Specialised Training for Teachers of Immigrant Children', in Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) *Aspects of the Preparation of Language Teachers: CILT Reports and Papers 3 - Abridged proceedings of a conference held at State House, London WCIR 4TN on 23rd and 24th February 1970*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- UNESCO (1953) *The use of vernacular languages in education. Monographs on fundamental education*. Paris: Author.
- UNESCO (1978) *The education of migrant workers and their families. Educational studies and documents, 27*. Paris: Author.
- Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003) 'Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations', *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, vol. 2, pp. 211–230.
- Winter, J. and Pauwels, A. (2008) 'Trajectories of Agency' and Discursive Identities in Education: A Critical Site in Feminist Language Planning', in Liddicoat, A. and Baldauf, R. (eds) *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wright, S. (2004) *Language Policy and Language Planning*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਭਾਗ, ਪੰਜਾਬ ਪਿਛੇਕੜ ਤੇ ਇਕ ਝਾਤ [Online], Available: <http://www.pblanguages.gov.in/history.html> [28 April 2014].