Turning a Bourdieuian lens on English teaching in primary schools: linguistic field, linguistic habitus and linguistic capital

Book or Report Section

Accepted Version

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Turning a Bourdieusian lens on English teaching in primary schools:

linguistic field, linguistic habitus and linguistic capital

Naomi Flynn, University of Winchester

(Chapter 10 in Murphy, M. & Costa, C. (Eds) (2015) *Theory as Method in Research: On Bourdieu, social theory and education,* pp 156 – 170, London: Routledge)

The research project used to frame discussion in this chapter was a doctoral study of the experiences of English primary school teachers teaching pupils whose home language was not English in their previously monolingual classrooms. They taught in a region in the south of England which experienced a significant rise in the population of non-native English speakers following Eastern European member states' accession to the EU in 2004 and 2007. The study focussed principally on the teachers' responses to their newly arrived Polish children because Polish families were arriving in far greater numbers than those from other countries. The research aims focussed on exploring and analysing the pedagogical experiences of teachers managing the acquisition of English language for their Polish children. Critical engagement with their experiences and the ways in which they did or did not adapt their pedagogy for teaching English was channelled through Bourdieusian constructs of linguistic field, capital and habitus. The following sections explore my reasons for adopting Bourdieu's work as a theoretical lens, the practicalities and challenges of incorporating Bourdieu's tools for thinking in data analysis, and the subsequent impact on my research activity.

1. **Bourdieu as method for exploring the teaching of English**

Bourdieusian constructs of field, habitus and capital have been used in analysis for the teaching of language and literacy perhaps primarily because of his work *Language and Symbolic Power* (Bourdieu, 1991) that theorises the power relationships inherent in the promotion of standardised forms of language in classrooms. This work takes the notions of field, capital and habitus introduced in *The Logic of Practice (Bourdieu, 1990b)* and applies them to both the nature of language use of itself and to the nature of language use in the classroom. Bourdieu found fault with the view of linguists like Saussure and Chomsky, who put forward an image of language as coming from a store to which we all have equal

access (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 43). Rather, he surmised, nations create a dominant form of language which transcends accent and dialect and which is potentially capable of unifying citizens from a range of linguistic backgrounds; in reality, however, it more commonly divides citizens into those who know the rules and those who do not (Luke, 2008). Inherent in this establishment of a dominant form of the language is an understanding that it becomes the one against which all other forms of language are measured (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 45). Thus, by default, those who are able to understand and use the dominant form of the language are able to gain access to employment and other aspects of the social and economic market place by virtue of their ownership of linguistic capital (Goldstein, 2008).

Grenfell (2012a) draws our attention to Bourdieu's view of language as a special kind of field in that language transcends all fields because it is the medium for communication (Bourdieu, 1977) . Bourdieu identified the notion of the linguistic market place as a way of describing how language exchanges of themselves are a structuring feature through which agents are able to gain social and economic capital. Thus ownership of linguistic capital is pivotal as a bargaining chip; whether that be fluency in a language that is valued over other languages, or socio – cultural understanding of the rules relating to language use in any field. The position of language use as a key player in interaction in any field means that 'All language has a value…. and at every linguistic level.'(Grenfell, 2012a, p. 51). Education as a field is therefore potentially instrumental in 'construction, legitimation and imposition of an official language' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 47) and therefore something of a broker in terms of facilitating or inhibiting the flow of linguistic capital between teachers and children.

Education as 'field' is a broad construct and one that has been sub-divided by researchers in order to explore the inter-relationships of fields within fields. This sub-division has the potential to usefully highlight the conflicting pressures on classroom practitioners in ways that are not necessarily apparent without the layers of analysis afforded by a Bourdieusian lens. Hardy (2012) explores the relationship of the field of education to the field of power; more specifically she examines how teachers in the field of education are related to the expectations of policy for the curriculum which is generated by central government (field of power). Interestingly in her study she found that teachers are more likely to relate to their local field – their local authority or their school and their Headteacher – in terms of who they wish to please, than to national expectations for the teaching of a subject. Thus, Hardy surmises, teachers' habitus appears more likely to be shaped by the local field than by the national field, despite successive governments' desire to shape practice from the top down. Nevertheless, there are those who

recognise the social and political embeddedness of language policy in the field of power in particular and urge researchers to seek ways of highlighting how policy for language may foster symbolic violence through inequality (May, 2012).

In my own work Bourdieu's view of language as a form of capital, and the accompanying notion of a linguistic field or fields, had a natural match with analysis of primary school teachers working with children who did not speak English for several reasons: these related to the power inherent in English as a language and to the very particular nature of the curriculum and policy for the teaching of English in England. Firstly, the position of English as a language that dominates discourse on a global scale imbues the English language with an immeasurable weighting of symbolic capital. This potentially generates a linguistic habitus among English language users that assumes without question the superior and desirable position of the language they use. The classroom has a linguistic 'sense of place' in which those lacking capital may be constrained, possibly silenced, by specific expectations of discourse (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 82).   Luke, using a Bourdieusian interpretation of the pedagogy for literacy, proffers that reading and writing are gifts given by teachers to prospective literates (Luke, 2008, p. 71). Through this metaphor he likens teaching and learning to a commodity exchange which entails unspoken rules relating to obligation and responsibility. The teacher might see it as their role to modify and impose expectations of a code that will allow access to 'appropriate' forms of spoken English and standardised forms of written English. Furthermore they may be unaware of the extent to which their pedagogical choices for the teaching of English will support or inhibit the development of English in both their native-born and foreign-born pupils. In this way they have the potential to enact what Bourdieu identifies as the illusion ('illusio') of buying in to the game that is prescribed by the curriculum by reproducing values generated by government (Bourdieu, 1991, 1999).

Secondly, an important feature of the curriculum for the teaching of English in England is that it has been prescribed at national level since 1989. The curriculum is framed in overview through the National Curriculum programme of study for English, and during the years 1998 – 2010 was further defined through the guidance in the ambitious national strategies for teaching English (DfES, 1998, 2006) that sought to raise standards in reading and writing by dictating both the curriculum and the practical pedagogy for teaching language and literacy. At the time of data collection for my own research teachers were working with a National Curriculum that had been in place since 2000 (QCA/DfES, 1999)

and with the additional guidance provided by *The Primary National Strategy for English (DfES, 2006)* which gave detailed advice on how to plan and deliver the objectives for teaching English in both paper-based and on-line guidance. The fact that teachers were expected to use this documentation as the starting point for their teaching meant that the linguistic field for the teaching of English was, and remains, very clearly marked out for teachers in England. Something that became particularly apparent from the data was the way in which the linguistic field - and the sub-fields within the overarching linguistic field - unconsciously dominated teachers' classroom practice. The fact that teachers had become assimilated in to a national framework that governed the decisions they made for their teaching had already been examined in broad terms (Moore, Edwards, Halpin, & George, 2002) ,and the ways in which linguistic field became important in data analysis of teachers talking about their practice for English teaching is explored in the next section.

2. Applying practical logic to data analysis; the position of subjectivity

Methodologically this project was framed within an interpretive paradigm and used interview as the principle research instrument. Interpretivist enquiry assumes that what we imagine is knowledge and truth is not an objective reality but is the result of our perceptions. Furthermore the interpretivist researcher sees a duality between objectivity and subjectivity that means the one is partnered by the other, and that the two are not necessarily separable as ways of either seeing or interpreting (Schwandt, 2000). Such a stance is closely matched to a Bourdieusian view that social scientists can only construct meaning when they take account of all levels of context for their participants and when they acknowledge their own habitus in both seeking and interpreting their data (Bourdieu, 1990b). It was particularly important during data collection and analysis that I acknowledged my own background, that of a researcher with practical-professional experience of the field of second language learning in inner-city classrooms, in order that I addressed the likelihood that I would make various evidence-free assumptions about my participants whose experiences were very different from my own.

The use of interview to gather data relating to language teaching was also matched to a Bourdieusian view of the world because I was exploring the nature of language teaching through a language-focussed research method. That said, the Bourdieusian view of language as 'value laden' made analysing the nature of what teachers said about their language teaching, the ways in which they said it, and taking

account of the context in which they were expressing their thinking, sometimes impenetrable and seemingly over-complex. Nevertheless, the fact that Bourdieu gives the researcher a clear account of his world view without defining a methodological prescription for the researcher allowed for flexibility in interpreting teachers' fields, habitus and capital that engaged my own linguistic habitus on a reflexive journey of enquiry. To deepen further the challenge of working with a Bourdieusian approach, it was also necessary to engage with his criticism of the academic who assumes that association with the practical field she is researching means that she shares an affinity with her participants (Bourdieu, 1990a). The difficulties of interviewing teachers, with whom I felt a professional fellowship, when I was positioned as 'the expert' in their eyes, took me by surprise. I had to work hard at openly exploring my erroneous sense of shared game playing that was based on an assumption that teachers and 'teacher as researcher' inhabit the same field.

Conceding the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity was made manifest in the adoption of a constructivist grounded theory approach to data analysis that merged Bourdieusian practical logic with the process of coding. Within my research, the Bourdieusian constructs of field, habitus, doxa and capital were used to frame the generation of coding in the practice of constructivist grounded theory. Grenfell and James (1998) are critical of grounded theory as an approach because in their view it is precisely the kind of pseudo-scientific method despised by Bourdieu as attempting to create logic where there is none (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.82). However, significantly, their criticism is related to Glaserian grounded theory and they may think differently of the more recent work of Charmaz (2000, 2014) in devising a form of grounded theory that matches the interpretive turn. Consistent with Bourdieusian theory, constructivist grounded theory respects the nature of research as presenting *a* reality – not *the* reality - that is grounded in a specific context of social and political history. For analysis of education in particular, with its complex fields within fields and the centrality of language to its operation, the match of Bourdieusian theory to constructivist grounded theory allowed for theory generation in a way that Bourdieu might recognise as logical practice.

The need to structure a coding framework of overarching node[1] families emerged after several iterations in the coding process. Initially I was subject to the belief that codes would somehow emerge from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and this resulted in a somewhat

---

[1] The term 'node' is used as a noun to describe an emerging theme following the practical process of coding (verb) in the qualitative data analysis programme NVivo.

descriptive set of themes that principally reflected my own subjective and personally contextualised account of what I was 'reading' in the transcripts (Figure 1). It was also true at this early coding stage that I had not intended using Bourdieusian constructs in the coding process, planning instead to layer on a Bourdieusian analysis post-coding.

Figure 1: node titles from early coding

Nodes		
Age of arrival makes a difference	Pedagogy - props or visual	School anxiety about EAL
Attainment – lack of English problem	Pedagogy – different from monolingual	School involvement EMAS
Attainment – language development	Pedagogy – modelling	School managing support for English language acquisition
Attitude - other children	Pedagogy – no different	School Prior experience of EAL
Attitude – cultural difference	Pedagogy – reading	Subject knowledge – limited
Attitude – nurturing self esteem	Pedagogy – talk	Subject knowledge – understanding EAL issues
Attitude to Polish – positive	Pedagogy – word level	Support EMAS – effective and how or not
Attitudes – teachers to EAL children	Pedagogy – writing	Tension – curriculum relevance for EAL
Confidence - training related	Polish children arrival circumstances	Tension – PC
Confidence – feeling supported	Polish children early experience in school	Tension – role and time management
Confidence – lack of	Polish children individual difference	Tension – streaming
Confidence – liaison inter staff	Polish children settling in	Tensions – age of arrival
Confidence – providing for EAL	Polish families and school	Tensions – funding support
Experience of teaching EAL – teacher	Polish families and speaking English	Tensions (class management)
Interview response – anxious	Research engaged	
Metalinguistic awareness	Rise in number of EAL children	

The nodes in Figure 1 show some move towards identifying node families, but they are arguably surface-level descriptors that have been generated largely through an informed but subjective practitioner-researcher lens. This was unsatisfactory because the value of simply reporting what I could 'see' was neither going to push any boundaries methodologically nor offer something new to the academy.

In order to bind some notion of objectivity, or perhaps reflexivity, to this subjectivity I chose to use Bourdieusian constructs explicitly to name node families. This construction of a framework for analysis grew from my understanding of the Charmazian view that 'we *construct* our grounded theories through our involvement with people, perspectives and research practices'(Charmaz, 2014, p. 17) . The work of other researchers using what is described as Bourdieusian three level analysis also influenced this choice. As noted in an earlier part of this chapter, field analysis supports the revelation of fields within fields and the embedded nature of policy with field (Hardy, 2012; May, 2012). Taking this further, three level analysis encourages the researcher to seek explanations for the nature of agents' actions within fields through examination of their habitus and what is valued as capital within their social or professional field (Grenfell, 1996, 2012c). Coding of interview data using Bourdieusian constructs allowed for the possibility of researching the inter-relationship between linguistic field and habitus; for the possibility of 'mapping the field' and for identifying the role of linguistic capital in that field. The terms could inform the coding, but the codes were free to find their own homes as part of a reflexive process common to both Bourdieu and a Charmazian world view. This was not without its difficulties and the barriers to clarity in interpretation are discussed later in this chapter.

As coding generated nodes it became quickly apparent that there were two main stories emerging from the data: those of how policy and habits of practice worked to dominate teachers' classroom decisions and of how their responses, and the response of policy, to the impact of migration in schools further influenced these decisions. Mapping the field involved mapping two seemingly separate fields – pedagogical and cultural - and tracking relationships across habitus, doxa and capital. Thus the way in which Bourdieu encourages the researcher to see data as relational (Grenfell, 2012b; Pahl, 2012) was apparent from the outset. I developed nodes according to the four constructs of field, habitus, capital and doxa and the following tables show examples from field and capital in order to make clear for the reader where analysis intersects across these notions (Figures 2 and 3). Note that in these later rounds of coding node families generated subsets and thus became more complex than the single level titles in the early coding stage.

Figure 2: Nodes related to field

PARENT NODE	1st level child node	2nd level child node	*3rd level child node*
FIELD	**Tensions**	limited resources	
		limited funding	
		limited time	
		leadership challenges	
		philosophical difference	
	Curriculum influences	age-related	
		policy-related	
		school-related	
		attainment-driven	
	Learning communities	teachers supporting teachers	
		beyond school	
		teachers supporting children	
		children supporting children and teachers	
	School philosophy	caring ethos	
		other children accepting	
	Migration impact		
	EAL training limited		

Exploring the examples of field-related nodes in the table above, the ways in which teachers' wider working communities impacted on their responses to their Polish children pedagogically and culturally became clear. There was a sense in which their decisions to change their classroom practice to accommodate their English language learners rested on notions of inclusivity that were common to their practice and the ethos of their schools. Similarly, their capacity to embrace cultural difference was nested within the same professional outlook. Thus their lives appeared governed by several fields: that of the nature of the curriculum and the nature of funding for schools which presented tensions for them, and that of their sense of moral purpose to support each other and their children which was generated by personal and group-related beliefs. This professional conflict between what policy demanded of them in relation to pupil attainment and what they believed they should be doing for their

pupils was a key finding from the project (Flynn, 2013b), and one that might have remained invisible without Bourdieusian analysis. The reader may have already noted that within this paragraph my commentary moves towards discussion of habitus and doxa, and this fluidity between nodes was central to the marriage of Bourdieu with Constructivist Grounded Theory.

Figure 3: Nodes related to capital

PARENT NODE	**1st level child node**	2nd level child node	*3rd level child node*
CAPITAL	**Linguistic Capital**	relative value of languages	
		teachers' sense of capital	
		use of Polish	
		English fluency	*impact on attainment*
			parents' level of
			children more fluent
			children less fluent
			confidence to speak English
			Polish better than native English
	Professional Capital (Experience)	research oriented	
		inexperienced in L2	
		inexperienced	
	Professional Capital (Subject knowledge)	L1 development	*L1 [2]writing*
			phonics teaching
			L1 spoken
		L2 generic subject knowledge	*L2 spoken*
			L2 writing
			L1SK is L2 SK
			relationship to English lessons
			L2 reading
	Social Capital	migrant parents in school	
		attributed to Polish children	

---

[2] L1 refers to first language, which in this context means the teachers' first language of English, and L2 to second language, which in this context means the teachers' understanding of second language acquisition

		social deprivation	
	Cultural Capital	teacher perceptions of national differences	
		difference celebrated	
		difference generalised	
		Polish culture and faith	
		travel experience	

Different forms of capital emerged from the coding process (Figure 3), partly in response to their revelation of fields with fields and partly in response to the necessary exploration of both pedagogical and cultural responses in the teachers. The notion of linguistic capital was one already coined by Bourdieusian researchers such as Luke and Grenfell, and in Bourdieu's own writings, but within this project it came to mean several different things: the use of third level child nodes was particularly important in revealing its complexity. Linguistic capital was apparent in teachers in the form of their own fluency in English, their responses to lack of fluency in English and their equating fluency in English to attainment. Finally, the notion of professional capital emerged in terms of the teachers' own subject knowledge about teaching either monolingual or second language learners, and this appeared to impact on their confidence or lack of confidence as practitioners facing linguistic difference in their classrooms.

Taking the nodes for field and capital together, within field it was necessary only to code comments as relating to 'migration impact', but recognition of this field encouraged the formation of nodes around social and cultural capital. Furthermore, within the coding related to doxa, nodes about teachers' responses to Polish parents and Polish children dominated analysis with much greater prevalence than coding of beliefs about teaching English. Thus, a study that had set out to explore teachers' pedagogy for teaching English to non-native speakers evolved in to a study that also explored teachers' responses to the children of migrant families. It became impossible to separate the one from the other, and this development was fostered explicitly by the Bourdieusian approach which took account of deep levels of context in teachers' and children's' lives. In particular it generated examination of the ways in which Polish children conform, in teachers' minds, to the image of a 'model minority' (Li, 2005; Ng, Lee, & Pak, 2007) and of how relationships of teachers and Polish children are founded on 'elective affinities' (Grenfell & James, 1998). This revelation of fields operating together supported a richness in the enquiry that fostered outputs beyond my common publication sphere (Flynn, 2013a), and this opportunity as a researcher was both unexpected and profoundly developmental in my thinking.

3. Dealing with fuzzy logic and responding to determinism

The 'richness' described above was not the product of a straightforward journey using Bourdieu as a framework for interpretive enquiry. The fact that other researchers write of their frustration at misuse of Bourdieu's constructs, habitus in particular, is not without good reason (King, 2000; Nash, 1990). In my early thinking about where Bourdieu's logic of practice might sit in my data analysis the constructs appeared too readily malleable to subjective interpretation by the researcher both in terms of what they represented and in their use in application. The notion of habitus in particular appeared contradictory: simultaneously an unconsciously structuring structure (Bourdieu, 1990b) and "an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 132). This suggests that the habitus is at once the invisible limiter on change and yet subject to change. Finding a path through this anxiety about the value of using the logic of practice was supported largely though the strengths in existing work by Reay (1998) and by Grenfell, whose Bourdieusian take on education resonated with my own understandings of the field. Ultimately, however, the researcher using a Bourdieusian lens will need to grapple with their choice and whether it is one that allows them to simply report subjectively on what they think their data say, or to immerse themselves in first exploring their own habitus as a route to finding objectivity within subjectivity.

Welding the use of constructivist grounded theory to Bourdieu's constructs was the way in which I attempted this open acknowledgement of subjectivity, but this also was not without its problems. In coding the data it was necessary at times to make choices as to where transcript extracts might be housed, and at other times coded extracts obviously belonged to more than one node family. For grounded theory purists this might appear fuzzy and altogether lacking in any methodological rigour. This was definitely a complication in coding but also unavoidable in order to reflect a Bourdieusian view that field, habitus and capital are fundamentally inter-related. Coming to the coding with predetermined over-arching nodes could have restricted interpretation, but in fact seeing the data as relational felt liberating and supportive of genuine enquiry.

Nodes relating to habitus and to doxa were particularly difficult to code separately because of the proximity of habitus to doxa conceptually. Indeed at times, it was difficult to house data within any particular node because of the inter-related nature of all aspects of Bourdieu's practical toolkit. The whole thrust of Bourdieusian thinking is that it is not easy to unravel the 'immanent dynamics' between

field and habitus (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 140). The extent to which the habitus has internalised the rules of the field means that the two are mutually inter-dependent and it is recognition of this inseparability that is of itself of interest to research (p. 127). Nevertheless, in interpreting the stories of individuals, it is incumbent on the researcher to represent those individuals as truthfully and honestly as possible (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2005), and the use of Bourdieu as a lens threatened that at times.

The threat came in the form of attempts at generalisations across the group when coding within the nodes related to each of the constructs. While using a Bourdieusian framework layered on to a constructivist grounded theory approach, I was probably unconsciously looking for commonalities and perhaps assuming a group habitus, when much of the time, even in settings where more than one teacher was interviewed, the teachers were very much individuals. Their individuality was rooted in their past histories and their present teaching context, and this was different in every case. There was a movement from the individual to the group and back to the individual throughout the analysis and this is illustrative of the difficulties involved in attempting to deconstruct practice as something logical. However, again, Bourdieu would defend his own theory here and would no doubt criticise the use of grounded theory for being a research tool that attempted to find logic in practice where there is none (Bourdieu, 1990b; Grenfell & James, 1998). Thus, the search for commonality was perhaps more a shortcoming in interpretation and my use of the method, than a failing attributable to the method or the theory of themselves.

The claim that Bourdieusian theory is unacceptably deterministic is supported to some extent by the above commentary. While Bourdieu might describe a theory-of-practice of seemingly infinite flexibility in its use as an interpretive tool, his view of the world is essentially 'agonistic' (Wacquant, 2008) and this may have led to perceptions of problems for teachers and children where there were none. If, as researcher, I went into this research with a past history of criticism of the curriculum for English, it is possible that I adopted an 'agonised' approach to interpreting the data and unconsciously, or even consciously, sought out tensions and contention. In this way, I may have determined what I was going to see in the data rather than allowing the data to speak for themselves (assuming such a thing were possible).

Resisting any inherent determinism in Bourdieu's way of thinking was particularly important to a researcher with a practitioner background, and this made for findings that at times sat apart from a

Bourdieusian interpretation of the classroom. Perhaps most importantly, the teachers saw it as their responsibility to manage the language acquisition needs of their Polish children regardless of whether they felt equipped to do this. They articulated anxieties about their potential to do the best by their pupils, and the revelation of the conflicting fields they were operating in made clear why this was, but it was essential to ensure that their professionalism was reported respectfully. This sense of moral imperative observed in the teachers was at odds with Luke's observation that teachers seek to maintain the dominance of their own language in the classroom, particularly when that language is English (Luke, 2008). Moreover, it did not sit comfortably with a depiction of pedagogic action as symbolic violence when associated with teachers' unconscious attempts to assert the dominance of the language of power (Bourdieu, 1991; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). The teachers demonstrated that their craft is about more than a subject and that they seek to put children's needs at the heart of their professional decisions. Holding on to this important positive outcome from data analysis was challenged throughout by the methodological choices I had made.

4. **Moving on with Bourdieu: the theorising practitioner**

Despite some reservations about the use of Bourdieu as a lens for examining the practice of teachers in England, the process of engaging with his logic of practice has revealed several new research possibilities that might otherwise have remained unexplored. The first of these is the use of Bourdieusian ways of thinking to construct analysis of the ways in which the policy for the teaching of English in England is founded on assumptions relating to the value of English as a language. The second is the potential use of Bourdieu to unravel where teachers have been unconsciously subject to decades of centralised curriculum control, arguably a form of symbolic violence, that has reduced if not eliminated their sense of agency to make choices about how and what they teach. Finally, the use of Bourdieu's constructs of capital in particular is valuable for exploring teachers' responses to children from different national and ethnic groups as the minority ethnic population in English schools continues to diversify.

The use of Bourdieu to explore policy, particularly how policy plays out in practice, is potentially acutely powerful in examining education. Something that emerged strongly from my research was the positioning of the teaching of EAL as secondary and subservient to the teaching of English to monolingual learners; the monolingual habitus operated as a structuring structure at both individual and

institutional level. This has fostered an interest in exploring how policy positions teachers' thinking about their practice and how that thinking is realised practically. Work by Leung (2001) and Safford and Drury (2013) has usefully identified the problem that the teaching of second language learners is perceived within a monolingual curriculum framework, and also that such teaching is not perceived as a set of important subject knowledge of itself. While recognition of these findings brings much to our practical thinking about multilingual pedagogies, it can be further enriched through a Bourdieusian lens. If we take up Gerrard and Farrell's (2013) exhortation to use Bourdieusian analysis in disambiguating the policy-practice interface, we become better able to explore the complexity in why practice is as it is. To this end, my future research will focus on analysing where the discourse of policy for the teaching of English in England is located in a narrative resting on notions of 'the right kind' of English and a lack of acknowledgement of differences needed in pedagogy for second language learners. In laying bare the fields operating on and shaping the architecture of policy we are better equipped to critique its shortcomings, and, more importantly, argue for alternatives, in ways that go beyond the understandable lamentations of researchers identifying 'problems' with policy.

As a researcher who identifies with practitioners, while also acknowledging the difference in being a member of the academy and all that brings with it, perhaps the most frustrating and discouraging finding from my study was that of the reduction over decades of teachers' agency as curriculum makers within their own classrooms. In an effort to offload any sense of determinism that might easily overcome the Bourdieusian researcher, my response to this has been to shape research that engages teachers in exploring their pedagogy for EAL at classroom action-research level; this with a view to publishing guidance for the teaching of EAL learners that marries theory and practice and counteracts the reduction in guidance for non-native speakers in the most recent version of The National Curriculum. It was tempting to continue in breast-beating vein and bemoan the lot of a profession who can only act as blindfolded players in a game where the rules change on the whims of government and the inspectorate, but, perhaps ironically, other policy-related developments have supported a more positive approach to moving on. Publications from the OECD (2011) and the UK government for *"research that provides high-quality evidence to inform policy development and delivery"* (DfE, 2013) partner a significant report from BERA/RSA (2014) which indicates a need to engage teachers in researching their own practice. If those of us engaged in research in the classroom want to see teachers take ownership of their professional lives again we need to work alongside them in order that they become games-makers who create their own rules of the field, and who theorise their practice in ways

that enable them to consciously question the institutional habitus of policy where it does not account for the needs of their pupils.

Finally, Bourdieusian analysis led me to fields I didn't expect to occupy in that it forced me to engage with the literature relating to migration studies in an effort to understand the responses of teachers to the migrant families and children in their schools. This was a necessary but not often a comfortable journey. The constructs of field and capital in particular supported revelation of layers of interpretation that went seemingly well beyond the pedagogical and this was challenging for an educational researcher who is not defined as a sociologist. Perhaps, however, this is evidence of just how powerful Bourdieusian analysis is: in openly acknowledging the subjectivity operating at all levels of analysis, the researcher is able to see layers of meaning that may be considerably outside her usual range of sight. The data revealed a need for further exploration of teachers' responses to difference; particularly when those differences are less obvious in children of the 'new migration' (Favell, 2008) who are largely white-skinned. There were assumptions about the nature of Polish children as 'hard-working' that sat at odds with conversations I had around the same time with teachers in Poland, and the complicated construct of the 'elective affinities' between teachers and children has been explored by myself and others (Flynn, 2013a; Kitching, 2011; Sales, Ryan, Rodriguez, & Alessio, 2008). But there is more to do here in terms of exploring the stereotypes of nationality that teachers may hold, stereotypes that do not relate to earlier research around pupils from background associated with England's colonial past, and of how these stereotypes are inextricably linked to fluency in English. Opportunities for inter-disciplinary research framed in a Bourdieusian approach appear both obvious and desirable.

References

BERA/RSA. (2014). *Research And The Teaching Profession: Building The Capacity For A Self-Improving Education System, Final Report Of The BERA-RSA Inquiry Into The Role Of Research In Teacher Education*. London.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges (Translated R.Nice). *Social Science Information, XVI*(6), 645 - 668.

Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *In other words: essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *The Logic of Practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society* (P. Ferguson, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Second ed.). London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2005). Confronting The Ethics of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Constructive Psychology, 18*, 157-181.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 509 - 535). London: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

DfE. (2013). *Research Priorities and Questions: Teachers and Teaching*. Nottingham.

DfES. (1998). *The National Literacy Strategy Framework for Teaching*. London: DfES.

DfES. (2006). *Primary Framework for Literacy and Mathematics*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Favell, A. (2008). The New Face of East-West Migration in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 34*(5), 701-716.

Flynn, N. (2013a). Encountering migration: English primary school teachers' responses to Polish children. *Pedagogies:An International Journal, 8*(4), 336 - 351.

Flynn, N. (2013b). Linguistic capital and the linguistic field for teachers unaccustomed to linguistic difference. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 34*(2), 225 - 242.

Gerrard, J., & Farrell, L. (2013). ''Peopling' curriculum policy production: researching educational governance through institutional ethnography and Bourdieuian field analysis.'. *Journal of Curriculum Policy, 28*(1), 1 - 20.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Goldstein, T. (2008). The capital of 'attentive silence' and its impact. In J. Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and Literacy Education* (pp. 209 - 232). London: Routledge.

Grenfell, M. (1996). Bourdieu and Initial Teacher Education: A Post-Structuralist Approach. *British Educational Research Journal, 22*(3), 287 - 303.

Grenfell, M. (2012a). Bourdieu, Language and Education. In M. Grenfell, D. Bloome, C. Hardy, K. Pahl, J. Rowsell & B. Street (Eds.), *Language, Ethnography and Education* (pp. 50 - 70). London: Routledge.

Grenfell, M. (2012b). Bourdieu: A Theory of Practice. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics* (pp. 7 - 34). London: Continuum.

Grenfell, M. (2012c). Methodology. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu:Key Concepts* (2nd ed., pp. 213 - 228). Durham: Acumen.

Grenfell, M., & James, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*. London: Routledge.

Hardy, C. (2012). Language and Education. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics* (pp. 170-193). London: Continuum.

King, A. (2000). Thinking with Bourdieu against Bourdieu: A Practical Critique of the Habitus. *Sociological Theory, 18*(3), 417-433.

Kitching, K. (2011). Interrogating the changing inequalities constituting 'popular' 'deviant' and 'ordinary' subjects of school/subculture in Ireland: moments of new migrant student recognition, resistance and recuperation. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 14*(3), 293-311.

Leung, C. (2001). English as an Additional Language: Distinct Language Focus or Diffused Curriculum Concerns? . *Language and Education, 15*(1), 33 - 55.

Li, G. (2005). Other People's Success: Impact of the 'Model Minority' Myth on Underachieving Asian Students in North America. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 2*(1), 69 - 86.

Luke, A. (2008). Pedagogy as Gift. In J. Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and Literacy Education* (pp. 68 - 92). London: Routledge.

May, S. (2012). Language Policy. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics* (pp. 147 - 169). London: Continuum.

Moore, A., Edwards, G., Halpin, D., & George, R. (2002). Compliance, Resistance and Pragmatism: the (re)construction of schoolteacher identities in a period of intensive educational reform. *British Educational Research Journal, 28*(4), 551 -565.

Nash, R. (1990). Bourdieu on Education and Social and Cultural Reproduction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 11*(4), 431-447.

Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the Model Minority and Perpetual Foreigner Stereotypes: A Critical Review of Literature on Asian Americans in Education. *Review of Research in Education, 31*, 95-130.

OECD. (2011). *Building A High-Quality Teaching Profession: Lessons From Around The World.* . Paris.

Pahl, K. (2012). Seeing with a Different Eye. In M. Grenfell, D. Bloome, C. Hardy, K. Pahl, J. Rowsell & B. Street (Eds.), *Language, Ethnography and Education: Bridging New Literacy Studies and Bourdieu* (pp. 89 - 109). London: Routledge.

QCA/DfES. (1999). *The National Curriculum for Primary Schools in England and Wales*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Reay, D. (1998). Cultural Reproduction: Mothers' Involvement in Their Children's Primary Schooling. In M. Grenfell & D. James (Eds.), *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory* (pp. 55 - 71). London: Falmer.

Safford, K., & Drury, R. (2013). The 'problem' of bilingual children in educational settings: policy and research in England. *Language and Education, 27*(1), 70 - 81.

Sales, R., Ryan, L., Rodriguez, M. L., & Alessio, D. A. (2008). *Polish Pupils in London Schools: opportunities and challenges*. Middlesex: Multiverse and Social Policy Research Centre, University of Middlesex.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Constructivist, Interpretivist Approaches to Human Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics Of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Wacquant, L. (2008). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Sociological Thinkers*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.