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Abstract
This doctoral study explores the museum as site and resource for language learning by adult migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision has emerged over the past decade in museums across the UK and elsewhere within an increasing emphasis on informal adult learning programs. While there has been extensive research on second language acquisition, museum learning and social inclusion separately, there have been few studies that have investigated language learning in the context of museums, and even fewer studies that have sought to understand the benefits of language learning in museums for this target group of learners and how it might relate to the concept of inclusion.

The study is centred around an ethnography that addresses these gaps in the literature and which examined three primary questions: (a) what are the target learners’ experiences of social inclusion and exclusion post-migration, and its interface with their English language abilities? (b) what are learners’ perceptions of the impact of participating in ESOL in museums in terms of exclusion and inclusion?, and (c) what occurs in interaction during ESOL in museums?

In collaboration with City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries Service, a cohort of 14 adult ESOL learners were studied over a 5-month ESOL course held in the City’s Museums and Galleries. In-depth time-series interviews were conducted with participants over the 5-month period. Narrative analysis (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Riessman, 1993) of interviews examined narrative trajectories within case and across cases, mapping experiences post migration, in and beyond museums. In order to investigate the affordances of dialogue in museums, conversational interaction was observed and recorded during the 11 weekly museum visits. Conversation analysis (Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Markee, 2000) examined what occurred in talk, focusing on interaction between interlocutors, its function and content.

Drawing on a social theory that conceptualizes language as symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1977, 1989, 1991) and identities as constructed and reflexive (Block, 2007b; Giddens, 1991; Norton, 2000), analysis indicates that the experience of migration provoked deficit conceptions of self as participants negotiated their new
social milieu through English language. Access to opportunities to engage in English are mediated both by institutional forces, e.g. social space afforded in institutional contexts, and perceptions of self. Analysis of dialogue in museums shows participants positioning themselves and being positioned as ‘knowers’, where primacy was given to collaborative meaning making about museum displays, objects and artefacts in conversational interaction. Analyses of interviews indicate shifts in identity trajectories from deficit to competent views of self through participation in ESOL in museums. These findings suggest a cumulative effect of micro-interactions on identities constructed in dialogue and point to the critical role which learning in museums and other informal environments can have in terms of providing social space within which to engage in positive dialogue that both challenges isolation and exclusion and helps foster increasing confidence and competence in the target language alongside feelings of inclusion for the majority of participants in the research.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF EXCERPTS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Coming to the Research</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Social inclusion to tackle Social Exclusion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 UK Immigration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Museums as agents of social change and inclusion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Investigating ESOL in museums</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Overview of the thesis</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART 1: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Literature Review Methodology</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LANGUAGE LEARNING AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 'The Social Turn'</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Social exclusion</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Social exclusion and the limitations on social space</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 THE NEW MUSEOLOGY</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Towards a Theory of the Museum Experience</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Museums for social inclusion</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Understanding learning conversations in museums</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Social inclusion and Social Space</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Social space in museums, but to what end?</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Cognitive and discourse development through discussion in museums</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Implications for an investigation of ESOL in museums</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II: METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OVERVIEW</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Research Design</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Analytical Tools: Grounded Theory</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Contextualizing linguistic competence and performance</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Learning as a socially mediated process</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Identities</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 FROM THEORY TO METHOD</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 FIELDWORK PHASE 1: COMMUNITY BASED ESOL</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 FIELDWORK PHASE 2: ESOL IN MUSEUMS PILOT</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 PHASE 3: MAIN STUDY</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORKS</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 INTERVIEW ANALYSIS</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 NARRATIVE ANALYSIS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 MUSEUM OBSERVATIONS: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART III: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FINDINGS OVERVIEW</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 THE LEARNERS</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 UNDERSTANDING MIGRATION, SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND MUSEUM LEARNING</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 UNDERSTANDING MIGRATION, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND MUSEUM LEARNING</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 THE NATURE OF LINGUISTIC INCLUSION AND ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 TRAJECTORIES OF SELF</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS OF ESOL IN MUSEUMS</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 REVISITING THE RESEARCH PROBLEM</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A: ESOL IN MUSEUMS COURSE OVERVIEW</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B: SAMPLE LESSON PLAN</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C: ACCESS TO PARTICIPANTS: LETTER TO GATE KEEPERS</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D: COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE FOR LANGUAGES: LEARNING, TEACHING, ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F: SESSION 4, PEOPLE’S STORY TRANSCRIPT</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G: SESSION 11, CITY ART CENTRE, UNSEEN CHINA EXHIBITION TRANSCRIPT</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX H: CONSENT FORM</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I: IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW PROTOCOL</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure 4.1 Interactive Experience Model (Falk & Dierking, 1992) ........................................50
Figure 7.1 Contextualized Learner .................................................................93
Figure 8.1 Attendance over 3-month period of museum visits .......................................133
Figure 10.1 Perceptions of factors contributing to linguistic barriers ..........................191
Figure 10.2 Self identities as contributing factor to linguistic barriers outcomes .......197
Figure 10.3 Relational identities as contributing factor to linguistic barriers outcomes ...197
Figure 11.1 Settings of mid-EIM and post-EIM linguistic inclusion narratives ........205
Figure 11.2 Perceptions of factors contributing to linguistic inclusion .......................214
Figure 11.3 Impact of inclusion on engagement ..................................................216
Figure 11.4 Representation of Identity and Engagement Trajectories .......................234
Figure 11.5 Teacher - Student Turn-taking .......................................................238
Figure 11.6 Repair requests and suggestions ......................................................239
Figure 11.7 Repair suggestions by category ......................................................240
Figure 11.8 Co-construction: contingency in dialogues .........................................242
Figure 11.9 Sources of knowledge in utterances ...............................................247
Figure 12.1 Discursive Engagement as the Collaborative Construction of the Self ......259
Figure 12.2 Revisiting the Contextualized Learner .............................................263
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.1</td>
<td>BOOLEAN keyword search terms for meta-search</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.2</td>
<td>Literature Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.1</td>
<td>Study Overview</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.2</td>
<td>Participant attendance during study Phase 2</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.3</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.4</td>
<td>Main study sample</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9.1</td>
<td>Free codes and definitions</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9.2</td>
<td>Tree codes and definitions</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10.1</td>
<td>Linguistic Barrier Narratives across study phases</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10.2</td>
<td>Events participants coded as linguistic barriers</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10.3</td>
<td>Coding scheme for engagement outcomes of linguistic barrier narratives</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11.2</td>
<td>Agnieszka’s identity trajectory</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11.3</td>
<td>Fatimah’s identity trajectory</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11.4</td>
<td>Friderich’s identity trajectory</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Excerpts

Excerpt 3.1 Social Space from Bremer, et al., 1993, p176 (TLS=target language speaker) ..........38
Excerpt 8.1 Sarah’s story. ........................................................................................................103
Excerpt 9.1 Zofia’s Story ........................................................................................................148
Excerpt 9.2 Agnieszka’s 1st interview, narrative 1.5 ..........................................................152
Excerpt 9.3 Zofia’s 1st interview, narrative 1.2 ................................................................153
Excerpt 10.1 Cyril’s 1st interview, narrative 1.7 .................................................................171
Excerpt 10.2 Cyril’s 1st interview, narrative 1.8 .................................................................172
Excerpt 10.3 Cyril’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.8 ................................................................173
Excerpt 10.4 Karol’s 1st interview, narrative 1.3-1.4.........................................................175
Excerpt 10.5 Karol’s 2nd interview, narratives 2.2-2.3 ....................................................176
Excerpt 10.6 ZhaoHui’s 1st interview, narrative 1.15 .........................................................177
Excerpt 10.7 ZhaoHui’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.10 .......................................................177
Excerpt 10.8 Fatimah’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.3 .........................................................180
Excerpt 10.9 Fatimah’s 1st interview, narrative 1.8 ..........................................................181
Excerpt 10.10 Cyril’s 1st interview, narrative 1.9 ..............................................................183
Excerpt 10.11 Laura’s 1st interview, narrative 1.11 ...........................................................184
Excerpt 10.12 Agnieszka’s 1st interview, narrative 1.10 ....................................................185
Excerpt 10.13 Aruni’s 1st interview, narrative 1.7 ..............................................................186
Excerpt 10.14 ZhaoHui’s 1st interview, narratives 1.11, 1.14 ...........................................187
Excerpt 10.15 Cyril’s 1st interview, narrative 1.3 ..............................................................188
Excerpt 10.16 Agnieszka’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.5 ....................................................189
Excerpt 10.17 Agnieszka’s 1st interview, narrative 1.12 ....................................................193
Excerpt 10.18 ZhaoHui’s 1st interview, narrative 1.13 ......................................................195
Excerpt 11.1 Fatimah’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.14 .........................................................206
Excerpt 11.2 Agnieszka’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.4 .......................................................207
Excerpt 11.3 Agnieszka’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.5 .......................................................209
Excerpt 11.4 ZhaoHui’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.1 ..........................................................210
Excerpt 11.5 ZhaoHui’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.6 ..........................................................210
Excerpt 11.6 Cyril’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.12 .............................................................211
Excerpt 11.7 Agnieszka’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.7 ......................................................212
Excerpt 11.8 Fatimah’s 2nd interview, narratives 2.10-2.11 ...........................................213
Excerpt 11.9 Agnieszka’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.2 ......................................................217
Excerpt 11.10 Friederich’s 3rd interview, narratives 3.12-3.13 .........................................220
Excerpt 11.11 Friederich’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.10 ....................................................220
Excerpt 11.12 Fatimah’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.17 ......................................................230
Excerpt 11.13 Fatimah’s 2nd interview, narratives 2.6, 2.7 ...............................................231
Excerpt 11.14 Fatimah’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.6 .........................................................231
Excerpt 11.15 Session 11 Phonetic Repair Request and Suggestion ................................240
Excerpt 11.16 Session 4: Contingent to other ...................................................................242
Excerpt 11.17 Session 11: Contingent to other ...................................................................244
Excerpt 11.18 Session 4: Fatimah’s contingency to self ....................................................245
1 Introduction

This study investigates what I will be referring to as adult ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) in museums, henceforth EiM. EiM is the use of museum contexts and their collections for the education of English language learners. Upon commencing this study, I was aware of 25 such programs in museums across the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. These programs are specifically targeted towards engaging migrant populations with museum collections, which is to be distinguished from other populations of language learners, e.g. international students. In addition to these Anglophone countries, several countries in the European Community have utilized museums as a resource for education of immigrants, refugees or asylum seekers (Lauritzen, 2000; Maroevic & Cukrov, 2000).

These types of programs represent the intersection of social, immigration, education, cultural and language policies. It is therefore necessary for me to foreground my discussion of EiM by situating the emergence of this kind of educational provision in its socio-historical context. In the next sections, I will discuss how I came to the research and the policy context that has helped to give rise to these kinds of initiatives.

1.1 Coming to the Research

My interest in this area of inquiry emerges from my work as an educator and ESOL practitioner in the US, UK and Asia, working in diverse learning contexts from museums, community centres, public and private schools and universities.

---

In particular, it was my community-based teaching experience that has largely fuelled my research interests in learning contexts and individual differences. The community centre that I worked in was situated in a densely populated suburb of New York, and at the time served an all female cohort of adult learners who were recent immigrants from El Salvador to the US. The women came from diverse educational backgrounds, ranging from completing the equivalent of the 3rd year of primary school and illiterate in their mother tongue to having a secondary school diploma, with mother tongue literacy skills. All of the women were unemployed, raising new-born babies or school aged children. With children in schools and husbands working as day workers, many of these women were isolated given their limited to no proficiency in English. It was not long after working with these women that I began to see the multidimensional nature of this community-based ESOL class, being equally educational, social and therapeutic space for recent migrants to the US. I became quite interested in understanding post-migration experiences of speakers of other languages and the ways in which education, particularly informal learning, could possibly serve their needs.

During my Masters research in TESOL, I learned of museum programs being developed in continental Europe for immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Initially this sparked my interest as my undergraduate study was in Art History and I spent much of those years (and many afterwards) in museums. In addition, I had volunteered for several years in New York’s Museum of Modern Art’s Education Department. I began researching the kind of programs that museums were developing for this population of learners. This initial research only provided evidence that these programs existed, but the nature of the programs, how they were developed, who developed them, for what reasons and with what impact remained elusive. As a result, I proposed my Masters’ dissertation explore English language learning in museums with museum objects. Drawing on empirical research of second language learning and pedagogy, my Masters dissertation proposed how to use art and objects for second language learning and acquisition (Clarke, 2006). This research was very much the impetus for the present investigation.
1.2 Social inclusion to tackle Social Exclusion

EiM is situated within museums’ social inclusion policy and provision. Therefore it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the policy context in order to unpack substantive aspects relevant to this study.

Social policy did not play a significant role in early years of the European Community, rather it served primarily as an ends-means approach to realizing other objectives (Atkinson, 2002, p. 627). In 1973 an agreement was made for member states to collaboratively develop an approach to tackle poverty, a collaboration that made progress towards alleviating some of the stresses of poverty, albeit slowly. In the ensuing decades, priorities of the Union were predominantly focused upon European economic policies and development. However, there was a marked shift towards developing a European social policy around the turn of the 21st century in light of emerging discourses on social exclusion.

Social exclusion is a concept appropriated in the 1980s by French sociologists to describe the social issues that emerged from socio-economic problems generated in post-industrialized France (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 11; Sandell, 2003). It has since become increasingly a part of academic, economic, social and cultural debate on policy in Europe as well as comparable post-industrialized states. Social exclusion has been defined as the “weakening of social ties resulting from the processes of social disqualification (Paugam, 1993) or social disaffiliation (Castel, 1995) caused by the return of mass social and economic vulnerability in industrialised countries” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 11). ‘Poverty’ was deemed inadequate for describing and attempting to eradicate the multidimensional nature of deprivation, as it measured disadvantage primarily in terms of income levels. Social exclusion has been conceptualized as a process, or rather a system of being denied access to services such as education, healthcare, employment and housing. Another interpretation of exclusion, which attempts to take into account the complexity of disadvantage, describes exclusion as a social process, whereby inequality reproduces and perpetuates disadvantage, e.g. lack of power, perpetuates disempowerment, likewise with respect to limited resources (Tett, 2006, p. 48).
The definition of social exclusion is evolving and a highly contested area primarily because the nature of how the concept is described, embeds assumptions of how it can be addressed through policy and practice (Tett, 2006, p. 48). In other words, social exclusion that is defined as lack of access to material or intellectual assets suggests that combatting exclusion would entail increased access to education, healthcare, job training, and housing. One might argue that such a stance oversimplifies disadvantage. An alternative stance, conceptualizing social exclusion as a social process, suggests that engaging excluded communities, both in the sense of capacity building by eliminating barriers to education and training, as well as through understanding individuals’ needs, and helping to empower individuals (Tett, 2006).

Discourses on social exclusion imply a relationship between individuals and society and the precariousness of this relationship when individuals are denied access to welfare support (Council of Europe, 2001; Dodd & Sandell, 2001, p. 8-9). In this respect, efforts to combat exclusion have been framed as a matter of national interest for social cohesion, economic, political and social participation.

Social inclusion is the term used as the opposite of exclusion. Policies promoting social inclusion aim to provide access to resources, engage the disenfranchised, and build up their social networks that would lend themselves to access to resources.

At the European level, one of the first strides taken towards addressing the “cumulative disadvantage” experienced by those socially excluded at the European level was the Council of Europe’s Human Dignity and Social Exclusion Project (HDSE) conducted from 1994-1998. HDSE aimed to assess social exclusion in Europe and propose ways of addressing its main issues such as, education, health, housing, employment and social protection (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 12-13). The assessment culminated in 300 proposals from member states with suggestions for eradicating exclusion. In May of 2000 the Council of Europe adopted a Strategy for Social Cohesion in order to combat social exclusion and its related issues (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 15). Through the Strategy, the Council of Europe aimed to develop best-practice models, policies and projects, conduct research and analysis to “ensure
the welfare of all its members, minimizing disparities and avoiding polarization” (Council of Europe, 2004, p. 2).

At the national level, the UK’s response to social exclusion began to take shape when the New Labour government was elected into office in 1997. The then PM, Tony Blair, described social exclusion as “a short-hand term for what can happen when people or areas have a combination of linked problems, such as unemployment, discrimination, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime and family breakdowns” (Cabinet Office, 2007). Recognizing that the problem of social exclusion is the cumulative effect of linked problems, one of the characteristics of the UK strategy to tackling social exclusion was what has been referred to as “joined up solutions to joined up problems” (Dodd & Sandell, 2001, p. 12). That is, creative partnerships with agencies that might not have previously collaborated, such as health services collaborating with museum services. The New Labour government set up the Social Exclusion Unit, later renamed, the Social Exclusion Task Force, whose commission was to oversee the government’s joined up efforts to tackle exclusion.

Lifelong learning, specifically lifelong learning through the cultural sector, has been harnessed by governments as a vehicle through which to promote social inclusion. The thrust of this work, as Tett suggests, is the “rectification of personal deficits” through education and training (Tett, 2006, 46). The present investigation seeks to problematize lifelong learning in the cultural sector as means to promote social inclusion, examining the nature of exclusion of the target population and the extent to which the cultural sector can address some of these issues. I will discuss this in detail in the subsequent chapters.

1.3 UK Immigration

Another contextual factor that has contributed to the establishment of programmes in the sphere of EiM are recent immigration trends in the UK.

New Commonwealth immigration, that is migration from nations that were former British colonies, was indicative of post-1945 reconstruction in the UK and elsewhere
in Europe. The post-war period gave way to rebuilding, the development and growth of the service industry, creating a flurry of new employment opportunities for those previously in unskilled or semi-skilled employment. This shift left a high demand for unskilled and semi-skilled labour, which Britain sought abroad in the newly established New Commonwealth countries. What ensued were a series of immigration policies that would facilitate immigration, with migrants primarily from the Caribbean, the Indian subcontinent and Africa (Mason, 2000). These communities have primarily settled in England, with small numbers in Scotland. Until the late 1980s, Scotland had more out-migration than in-migration. Over the course of the last 3 decades, however, the number of migrants settling in Scotland and has continued to increase. Since 2003, there has been a sharp rise of migrants from overseas settling in Scotland, with a small dip in numbers reported in 2010-2011 (MacKenzie, 2012, pp. 47-48).

These recent demographic changes, characteristic of post-devolution Scotland, have created a growing population of linguistic minorities. New accessions to the EU have attracted high-skilled and low-skilled economic migrants to Scotland (Sriskandarajah et al., 2004). Asylum seeker dispersal to Scotland began in 2000, primarily in Glasgow and Edinburgh. The population of those seeking asylum has continued to grow, as has the population of asylum seekers being granted refugee status (Lewis, 2006; IPPR, 2005). Population changes have fuelled social inclusion efforts, in particular through lifelong learning and language training (Scottish Executive, 2005). Those efforts particularly germane to this study will be examined in depth in subsequent chapters.

### 1.4 Museums as agents of social change and inclusion

The museum as it is presently understood has undergone a variety of changes and transformations that are relevant in order consider the impact implementing social inclusion initiatives might have on individuals, the wider community and society as a whole. In this section I will discuss the development of the museum and its messages, articulated through their collections, exhibitions, architecture of museum spaces, and consider access to these collections for visitors.
The first museums were developed in European cities during the 15\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The public museum thrived during the industrial age, with many new museums emerging initially in Europe, then its colonies, which, as it has been suggested, was indicative of globalization trends of the period (Fyfe, 1996, p. 26).

Smith notes that some of the characteristics which defined the first public museums in Europe were that they made publicly available formerly privately owned collections, which were interpreted and displayed by curators to convey meanings for educational purposes (Smith, 1989). Thus, museums developed “schemes of classification” in which to exhibit objects, which were used by museum visitors for self-study. In addition, museums were intended to be relatively accessible to the public.

One view is that by virtue of the museum’s position as a public institution, it can be conceived of as an agent of civil society (Karp, 1992). Positions that view the museum as having social agency have been supported by historical accounts of the management of museums and subsequent consideration for the implications of these practices. Cultural institutions that emerged from the mid to late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, such as public museums, public parks and department stores have been thought of as having a distinct role in facilitating the governmental agenda of “civilizing” the populace (Bennett, 1995: 19, 100).

Historians that have investigated the nature of the museum and the public argue that coercive power dynamics with respect to representation shape how people come to understand aspects of those collections, advancing the claim that museums possess social agency. For example, museums’ ‘authority’ on art/artefacts culture/history through the act of display and their ability to grant access to collections, could be conceptualized as coercive relations of power. In this sense, power flows from the museum exhibitor through the conduit of the artefacts to the museum visitor. Cultural reform, in this respect, could be achieved by the museum’s exercise of power over the populace through display and access.

Public access to museums, in the early days of some of these institutions, was not widely accessible (Hudson, 1975). The British Museum for example, granted access
to select individuals for the purposes of scholarship. In other museums, exclusivity was instituted through admission fees, which had the effect of excluding members of the public who could not afford the fee (Hudson, 1975: 4, 10). The art museum, considered by some as the last bastion of inaccessible public institutions, has been interpreted as exercising power through forms of display that render collections uninterpretable without possessing the necessary high levels of ‘cultural capital’ needed to interpret them (Bennett, 1995: 10).

Historical analysis of the museum as agent of social change helps to situate the current interest in these institutions for contemporary social agendas, such as inclusion. In the following section, I will discuss current movements in the museum sector.

As mentioned above, one of the initial foundations upon which the museum was built was that it be an institution for educational purposes. Historically, public museum policy in the UK and elsewhere in Europe focused primarily on collection and display, while the educational function of the museum was reserved for only a small public. More recently, however, the concept of museums for education took on a more central role, gaining a more prominent place in museum policy during the period following the World Wars.

Bennett notes that the main goal of the post-war museum was educating the public, as nation states increasingly recognized their moral and ethical responsibility to society (Bennett, 1995). Hooper-Greenhill defines the educational role of museums as “the development of responsive relationships with visitors and other users such that increased enjoyment, motivation and knowledge result”. This is realized through exhibitions and educational programs (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994b, p. 1-2). Increasingly characteristic of museums of this period, was that they sought to adopt a more neutral stance in their collections and displays that would distance these from their former aristocratic ownership (Smith, 1989).

In the United Kingdom, new types of museums emerged in an effort to fulfil the state’s post-war agenda for museums, such as the living history museums, folk museums and open-air museums adopting a realistic approach to the collection and
presentation of objects, reflecting the lives of popular culture as a method to provide access to the populace (Bennett, 1995).

Since the mid 1980s the recognition of the educational role of the museum has continued to expand. The new emphasis on the educational role of the museum, encouraged the movement towards more democratic and inclusive practices, which through extensive research on visitors, helped to raise more awareness of groups that were less likely to attend museums, such as women, the disabled and ethnic minorities (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a). During this period, many museums professionalized their education practice by defining education policies, hiring museum educators to develop resources and deliver programs and providing a variety of services to the public (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a).

Funding for museums in the UK shifted in the 1990s and museums had to become both accountable for the services they provided as well as competitive with other leisure markets in order to vie for future funding from the government (R. Davies, 1999). This change marked the resurgence of visitor surveys as a tool for learning more about museum visitor experiences to develop a learner-centred museum experience (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a).

Recent research in the UK on visitor attendance has highlighted those visitors that do attend museums, as well as raising an awareness of the profiles of visitors that are underrepresented in museums (A. Martin, 2003). Research that has emerged from visitor surveys has aimed to understand why some groups are underrepresented in museums. These studies have highlighted how perceptions of these institutions are a key barriers to attendance, e.g. individuals perceived the museum as endorsing haute culture. Further, the findings indicate that perceptions held by underrepresented groups limit participation, as participants, sampled from these populations, report the lack of belonging in museums (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a; Hooper-Greenhill, 1994b). In sum, the findings from these studies have served as a framework for the museum sector’s response to social exclusion (Dodd & Sandell, 2001).

Urged by national policy (DCMS, 2000), the museum sector began to working towards tackling social inclusion by identifying and eliminating barriers that have
traditionally excluded underrepresented groups from engaging with their resources (Newman & McLean, 2004b). This includes eliminating financial barriers such as entrance fees, physical barriers through retrofitting buildings to enable physically disabled visitors to navigate museums, attitudinal and cultural barriers through a range of programs that work with excluded communities to collaborate on exhibition and display, and finally, linguistic barriers through a range of measures, such as producing museum guides in several languages to developing educational material to teach language through the museum collections (Dodd & Sandell, 2001). It is this last category of provision that is the focus of this present investigation.

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport’s (DCMS) guidance on social inclusion in museums has urged that museum education play an integral role in tackling social exclusion (DCMS, 2000). Many museums such as the Victoria & Albert Museum (V&A), National Galleries of Scotland and National Museums of Scotland have made social inclusion central to their education policy (Scottish Museums Council, 2000; Victoria and Albert Museum, 2004).

1.5 Investigating ESOL in museums

It is from the aforementioned social, immigration and policy context that ESOL for immigrants, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in museums, has developed.

The present investigation emerges out of what appears to be several gaps in the literature. Firstly, while there has been a vast amount of research on second language learning and acquisition, social inclusion, and learning in museums (mapped respectively by Ellis (1994), Levitas (2005) and Hooper-Greenhill & Moussouri (2001)), it seems that there has not yet been significant empirical research on language learning in the context of museums. In addition, there has not yet been research that investigates language learning in these contexts with respect to social exclusion and inclusion. This research therefore aims to provide a conceptual framework within which these disparate concepts could be interrelated and empirically investigated, as well as contribute to the development of a practical theory of language learning in museums, especially in relation to the population under study.
I argue that research is needed in order to understand the opportunities and tensions of using museums to address disadvantage. I also argue that more research is needed to understand the experiences of the target population. In particular, this research takes a critical stance towards concepts such as exclusion and inclusion, seeking an understanding of these concepts in relation to the population under study. Moreover, this research seeks to understand what it means to be included with respect to the target population, specifically what it means to be included in museums. Working towards these research goals, this study will consider the opportunities and limitations of museums tackling deprivation. Newman, et al (2005) have highlighted that there is limited research that has explored the impact of social inclusion initiatives in museum contexts on the individuals these initiatives aim to ‘include’ (Newman & McLean, 2004b; Newman, McLean, & Urquhart, 2005). In this respect, the present study seeks to address this gap in research by contributing to the research on social inclusion in museums through a micro-level analysis of population that these initiatives seek to include.

Through a micro-level analysis of participation in EiM, this study will examine the stories/histories of immigrant learners post-migration in order to better understand their educational needs to inform educational provision. A better understanding of the experiences of social exclusion faced by immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers can provide a better understanding of immigration and its impact on the language learning process. This research therefore seeks to contribute to the policy debate on social exclusion and inclusion, the initiatives that have arisen under inclusion policy, and their impact(s) on individuals with respect to inclusiveness.

This research also aims to provide a conceptual framework for the education of migrants, immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers for social inclusion. In addition, what is needed is an evidence base for EiM, one that could help explicate the affordances or disadvantages of language learning in these distinctive learning environments, especially given these contexts have been understudied language learning contexts as compared to traditional language learning contexts (Firth & Wagner, 1997).
A growing number of studies are seeking an understanding of language development through micro-analysis of talk in-interaction. The present investigation also seeks to contribute to this growing corpus of research, through an examination of language learners’ conversational interaction in museums.

1.6 Overview of the thesis

In this chapter, I have provided a brief introduction of the social policy, immigration and cultural policy context in which the present investigation is situated.

The rest of the thesis will be subdivided into three parts.

Part I will review the relevant literature. In Chapter 2, I provide an overview of the literature review methodology. Chapter 3 synthesizes the relevant empirical research on language learning, social exclusion and social inclusion. In Chapter 4, I provide a synthesis of the relevant empirical research on museum learning and social inclusion. Chapter 5 considers the implications of the findings of the review. In particular, considering the questions they raise and how these questions inform the present investigation.

Part II will outline the methodological approach taken for this investigation. In Chapter 6, I outline the research design of the study. Chapter 7 provides an overview of the theoretical and conceptual framework guiding this investigation. Chapter 8 provides an overview of the data collection protocol. Finally, Chapter 9 describes the analytical frameworks used in the analysis of the data.

Part III will present and discuss the findings of this investigation. In Chapter 10, I provide an overview of the cases that are the focus of this study. In this chapter, I also report on the findings of the analysis that sought to examine migration, social exclusion and museum learning. In the Chapter 11, I report on and discuss the findings of the analysis that sought to examine migration, social inclusion and museum learning. Finally, in Chapter 12, I consider the implications of the findings for theory and practice., reflect on the limitations of the study and make recommendations for future research, policy and practice.
PART 1: A Review of the Literature

2 Introduction

The present study, which will be described in depth in subsequent chapters, investigates language learning in museums, inclusive programs targeted towards immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, a demographic underrepresented in museums. This chapter seeks to situate this study within the literature by systematically reviewing relevant empirical research. To date, there has not yet been a significant body of research that investigates language learning within these learning contexts (see for example Gill, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007). It is therefore necessary to examine empirical research across second language and museum learning research respectively in order to develop an integrative empirical basis to inform the present investigation. Accordingly, the focus of this review is twofold: first, to provide a review of research on language learning with respect to this target population of learners; and second, to review the research on learning in museums that has focused specifically on social inclusion/exclusion and the relationship between discourse and learning.

2.1 Literature Review Methodology

Emerging from the social inclusion agenda of the museum sector, educational provision like EiM has sought to combat social exclusion by providing linguistic and educational access to underrepresented groups, such as migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Consequently, one of the guiding questions of this research, which will be discussed in greater depth in subsequent chapters, is to understand the extent to which language learning in museums could combat social exclusion for migrants, refugees and asylum seekers.

Definitions of social exclusion and what it means to be included are numerous and disparate, immerging from discourses on poverty in Europe and socio-political discourses on cohesion in the UK, particularly in the wake of 7/7 (Boswell, 2008; Levitas, 2005). It is not my aim to reconcile these disparate definitions of social exclusion or inclusion, but rather to critically examine the evidence on these social
processes as they relate to this target group of learners in the context of museums. In this respect, I ask whether a more robust definition of social exclusion and inclusion could be arrived at through the analysis of literature on these social processes with respect to immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers and whether more empirical research is needed to understand these social processes. I also ask what the evidence is on the impact of these social processes on learning.

Accordingly, this review of the literature seeks to answer the following questions:

- What is currently known about this target group of learners with respect to learning and social inclusion/exclusion?
- What is known about the impact of social inclusion in museums on groups these programs aim to include?
- What is known about the relationship of discourse and learning in museums?

In order to conduct a systematic review of the literature, I used a meta-search engine to conduct a BOOLEAN search for relevant empirical research. Table 3.1 lists the keywords used for the search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>AND</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Learning</td>
<td>ESOL, ESL</td>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Inclusion, belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion, isolation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum learning</td>
<td>Museum education</td>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 BOOLEAN keyword search terms for meta-search

### 2.1.1 Inclusion Criteria

The results of the initial searches were broad, consisting of 2,164 references for language learning and 938 in the museum literature. I refined the search results further by limiting the results to scholarly books, book chapters, dissertations/theses and journal articles in peer-reviewed journals. This helped to reduce the number of articles, but not significantly. To further refine the search results, I narrowed the keywords to those that were synonymous with the keywords noted in table 2.1, as the
meta-search database had identified a broad range of related keywords, many of which were outside of this research’s scope. Common irrelevant search results, for example, were studies that focused on instructional interventions in which a particular linguistic form was isolated to aid and/or study acquisition of that form. I interpret this as the meta-search generalizing the keywords “exclusion” or “isolation” such as a component of an intervention, rather than the meaning intended, which in this case refers to social processes. From the remaining search results, the following criteria were applied:

| Language learning | a. The study investigated learning  
b. Target population of study were immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers  
c. Social exclusion or inclusion were central concepts |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Museums AND social inclusion/exclusion | a. Social exclusion or inclusion central concepts  
b. The study examined the impact on museum learning or museum visiting |
| Museums learning AND discourse | a. The study investigated learning  
b. Discourse used as a metric for learning in museums |

Table 2.2 Literature Search Inclusion Criteria

The results of this search produced a range of studies ranging from small-scale ethnographic studies, to experimental studies and large-scale surveys. The research on second language learning is extensive, but there appears to be a much smaller body of empirical research on language learning with respect to immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers. Likewise there is a large corpus of research on museum learning, with a growing number of studies over the past decade that examine social exclusion and learning through conversational interaction. No date constraints were used for this search. The date of publication of the studies that met the search criteria are clustered in and around the last decade, which seems to suggest that the research that investigates these issues has emerged has recently emerged, possibly as research imperative in light of the socio-political context described in Chapter 1.
2.1.2 Classification
After applying the above criteria to identify studies for this review, I examined these studies to establish emergent themes in the literature that seemed to cut across the evidence reported.

I coded the studies for contextual details, e.g. methodology, analytical approach, theoretical framework, and core constructs, then used inductive coding for conceptual details, e.g. the nature of inclusion/exclusion, and their impact on social and cognitive factors of learning.

The outcomes from this and its presentation as a review will be divided into three parts. The first will examine the literature on second language learning and exclusion. The second will report on the findings from a synthetic review of the research on social exclusion/inclusion and discourse and learning in museums. In both of these sections, I will report the findings of the review, considering the evidence and issues they raise, methodological insights and challenges. In the final section of the review, I will synthesize the findings of parts one and two, discussing their implications for the aims of this research and methodological approach for this investigation which will be described in subsequent chapters.
3 Language learning and social exclusion

3.1 ‘The social turn’

This review examines the evidence from research on language learning and social exclusion as it relates to learners who are immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers. While this section will discuss the studies that explore these issues, first, it is necessary to preface this review with background on the research context in which these studies have emerged.

Second language acquisition (SLA)\(^2\),\(^3\) as a field of inquiry in its own right is a relatively young discipline. As Mori summarizes, the central concern of the field has been with “what has been learned, when it has been learned, and why it has been learned” (Mori, 2007, 853), a question frame that provides a useful departure for a discussion of this kind.

The study of SLA embodies two implicit beliefs: a belief about the nature of language and a belief about learning. The hegemonic view of language in the field has been informed by Structural Linguistics, and views of learning have been shaped by behavioural and cognitive psychology (Larsen-Freeman, 2007). In the last decade however, a branch of SLA research has been developing, which looks beyond cognitive theory to more socially informed explanations of language learning processes (Block, 2007a, 2007b; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2002; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004), a corpus of research that will be referred to here as the ‘social turn’ (Block, 2003).

The ‘social turn’ in SLA and the research within this paradigm, conceptualizes language as fundamentally communicative (emerging from Hymes’ 1972 reworking of Chomsky’s competence into ‘communicative competence’), and learning as socially situated, occurring in social interaction (Lantolf, 1994, 419; Vygotsky &

\(^2\) For the purposes of this discussion, I will refer to the acquisition of additional language(s) after one’s mother tongue as a second language, however acknowledge that this designation may very well include the acquisition of third, fourth and fifth languages after one’s mother tongue.

\(^3\) Distinctions have been made between \textit{acquisition} and \textit{learning} of an additional language as two separate processes (Krashen 1981). However, for the purposes of this discussion, these concepts will be referred to as one and the same.
Cole, 1978, 27). The birth of ‘social turn’ in SLA is often attributed to Firth and Wagner’s (1997) seminal paper, *On Discourse, Communication and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research*, first presented at the 1996 Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics and later published in a special issue of *The Modern Language Journal*. However, given the range of studies and publications that emerged shortly thereafter and a few prior to its publication (see for example Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Norton-Pierce, 1995), it is more probable that Firth and Wagner gave voice to concerns and epistemological differences already existing in the field, albeit silenced by hegemony⁴.

Firth and Wagner’s paper challenged previously unchallenged constructs of the field, such as the nature of language and learning. They posited that language was both social and cultural and that acquisition of a second (or additional) language occurs through the process of social interaction (Firth and Wagner 1997, 287). They challenged broad discourses in the field that have implicitly informed the kind of studies that have been conducted and the social positioning of individuals under investigation. They argued that the widespread and rather uncritical use of the terms native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) had positioned learners of an additional language as deficient or ‘defective communicators’ and through their use in the research literature, have essentialized the NS (Firth and Wagner 1997, p. 291). This, they argued, was reflected in the vast amount of studies in the field that have been devoted to the study of learner errors and the concept interlanguage⁵. Finally, Firth and Wagner urged for the development and use of methodological approaches that would enable the analysis of learning through interaction (1997, p. 296).

This theoretical, epistemological and methodological discontent has had the effect of broadening the scope of SLA research over the last decade. Much of the research located within this paradigm has drawn on epistemological, theoretical and

---

⁴ Gass et al (2007), for example, is devoted to advancing the argument that Firth and Wagner’s ideas were not particularly original within the literature on SLA.

⁵ Interlanguage is a concept introduced by Selinker (1972) to refer to ‘transitional competence’ or stage of development of L2 speakers as they work towards achieving native speaker competence (Ellis, 1994, 710).
methodological insights from the social sciences more broadly to unpack the factors that account for individual differences amongst learners.

In particular, this research has examined learners with *identities*. That is to say, one of the primary characteristics of the studies within this paradigm is that they, by definition, use as their unit of analysis a sub-set of learners, rather than a generalized learner. Many studies of second language acquisition that focus on interaction between learners or speakers of the target language are outside of the scope of the present review because these studies by definition are working towards a generalizable theory of acquisition, that is one in which the sampling procedure seeks to identify a representative sample of language learners as a whole and in which individual differences are controlled for (e.g. Gass, 1997; M. H. Long, 1983; Mackey, 2007). Studies like that have generated a corpus of evidence on acquisition, where the conditions of conversational interaction occur in controlled settings and relations between interlocutors are made equitable for the purposes of investigating language acquisition. I will argue that this kind of research is critical for providing cumulative evidence towards a general theory of second language acquisition, however by seeking to understand the social context of learning and its conditions the research that locates itself within the ‘social turn’ broadens the scope of the kind of questions that could be asked about the learning process and methodological approaches for investigating them.

In addition to researching learners with ‘identities’, another characteristic of this line of research has been that the sociocultural context of learning is also an object of enquiry, in order to understand socially situated aspects of learning processes (Baynham, 2006; Block, 2006, 2007b; Goldstein, 1997; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2001; Pavlenko, Blackledge, Piller, & Teutsch-Dwyer, 2001; Perdue, 1993; Roberts et al., 2004; Skilton-Sylvester, 2002).

In the following sections I will discuss the findings of this systematic review of the literature. I first examine the nature of social exclusion and inclusion, as it is defined in this literature and the evidence on the impact as it relates to learning and participation.
3.2 Social exclusion

Review of research on social exclusion reveals that exclusion is not conceptualized in singular terms, but rather the literature seems to point to a more complex picture embodied through practices and processes at the micro and macro level across a range of linguistic contexts. One of the characteristics of this body of research is that definitions of social exclusion and inclusion do not seem to be directly informed by governmental social policy and discourses, but seem to be rather marginally related migration policy and practices, examining linguistic exclusion and inclusion as a post-migration phenomena across a range of social (and national) contexts in Europe and North America.

It is important here to clarify precisely what is meant by context. Following Ellis and others, I will use the term ‘context’ to refer to the type of second language learning setting (Ellis, 1994; Mitchell & Myles, 2004). In this respect, we can distinguish between an informal learning context, such as museums, and a formal one as in a Further Education college (FE) setting. Context is also used to distinguish between learning contexts, in which the language being learnt is the majority language spoken (such as economic migrants, refugees and asylum seekers learning English in the UK) versus a context where language might be learnt as a minority language (such as secondary school students learning English in China for university entrance exams, a policy that many nations have advanced for the purposes of greater global market competitiveness).

series of studies analyse interaction in service encounters. Broeder et al (1996) and Cooke (2006) explore the ways in which interaction during service encounters open or close down spaces for talk during these interactions. These studies help to explicate how context implies different needs for the language, motivations for its use, opportunities for production and essentially differential relationships between the learner and the target language, target language speakers and target language culture. In the following section I will report on the findings of these studies as they help to provide a cumulative understanding of social exclusion and inclusion post-migration with respect to immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers.

### 3.2.1 Opportunities for Natural Language Acquisition

The workplace cuts across many of these studies as a site of investigative interest for natural language acquisition. For some migrant groups, such as economic migrants in particular, the workplace is the primary place in which social interaction in the target language occurs (Perdue, 1984). However, for other groups, access to work and work that would enable conversational interaction is far more limited. Ager and Strang (2008) found a positive correlation between employment and linguistic proficiency for refugees settling in the UK, suggesting that access to work is the product of one’s already existing linguistic proficiency.

High levels of unemployment are characteristic of the refugee populations in UK and to some extent migrant populations, despite high levels of educational qualifications and prior work experience this group has achieved prior to migration (Ager & Strang, 2008; Block, 2007b; Goldstein, 1997; Liversage, 2009; Norton, 2000; Schrauf, 2009). Liversage (2009), examining the gendered dimension of social exclusion, notes that female migrants often migrate with less educational qualifications than their male counterparts and as a result obtain less paid work in the country of migration.

For migrants that are able to obtain employment, the quality of work opportunities shapes the opportunities for conversational interaction. For example, the Office of National Statistics (ONS) reports that employed refugees, roughly a third of the refugee population, held predominantly low level jobs when surveyed after 8, 15 and 21 months after they were granted asylum in the UK (Cebulla, Daniel, & Zurawan,
Case studies of migrants make the connection between that of low skill, low labour positions and little opportunity, if any, to use the target language (Norton, 2000; Block 2007b; Liversage 2009).

Norton’s (2000) ethnography of immigrant women in Canada shows how, by virtue of their position within the institutional structure, the migrants that participated in her study were socially marginalized in the workplace. Norton refers to this as a paradox in which an individual’s limited ability to speak the target language is structured around lack of opportunity to use the language, and lack of opportunity in turn, limits ability to speak (Norton, 2000, 64). For example, Norton’s case study Eva, a Polish economic (and educational) migrant to Canada with a high degree of motivation to learn English and achieve her professional and educational goals, was hired to work in a low-skill heavy labour job at a restaurant in which there was limited interaction with her English speaking colleagues and none with the restaurant’s clientele. Eva’s interpretation of her placement in that particular role at the restaurant was that it was a result of the restaurant’s lack of confidence in her English language skills, therefore relegating her to ‘backstage’ work as opposed to the other, more ‘centre stage’ roles that her colleagues held at the restaurant. When opportunities for Eva to engage with colleagues outside of the workplace presented themselves, thus outside of the ‘institutional constraints’ of the restaurant, Eva was able to negotiate access into this social network. Norton interprets Eva’s case as both marginalization by virtue of her position within the institutional structure of that restaurant, but also Eva’s elective social exclusion from her colleagues because she, in turn, lacked the confidence to engage with her colleagues (Norton, 2000).

Block’s (2007) case study of ‘Carlos’, a Columbian migrant to London, also relegated to backstage work, shows how gendered expectations in workplace discourse served to marginalize Carlos in those workplace conversational interaction. Carlos had been a lecturer at a university in Columbia, married to a British woman and migrated with his family to London. Unable to find skilled work in London, attributed to his English language proficiency, he settled for unskilled work as a porter at a university. As a male porter at a university, football was the lingua franca amongst his colleagues, which Block suggests is a manifestation of masculine
subject positions in his male dominated work environment (Block 2007, p. 101). Within this particular social milieu, Carlos lacked the social space within which to be heard about things that mattered to him, e.g. politics.

These studies seem to highlight that at one level, the workplace is a primary space within which conversational interaction in the target language occurs. However, access to work, roles within the institutional structure and perceptions of roles can dictate how these social spaces are shaped. While these studies frame the workplace as a critical space for natural language learning, the data suggest that many migrants have very limited opportunities for talk in these contexts.

3.2.2 Opportunities for formal language learning
The research that has been discussed thus far has been limited to studies that have investigated learning in naturalistic (or informal) learning environments, like workplaces. Research on classroom contexts also point to the influence of institutional structure on discourse practices.

A large-scale study of ‘what works’ with respect to ESOL provision was conducted in in the UK (Baynham, 2006; Baynham et al., 2007; Roberts, et al., 2004). Modelled on a similar study of ESOL provision conducted in the US (Condelli, Wrigley, & Yoon, 2002), the study sought to establish best pedagogical practices that produced the best learning outcomes. The study was spread over a two-year period, 2003/4 and 2004/5, in which they conducted and audio-recorded 3 observations of 40 classrooms (a total of 120 classroom observations). Discourse analysis was conducted on observations to examine the impact of classroom practices in interaction.

Overall, they found that students made progress over the course of the study as measured by pre- and post-tests (Baynham et al., 2007). The interview data, however, provide rich in-depth analysis of the participants and their stories. Cooke (2006) found that the adult ESOL learners that participated in these classes had limited opportunities to speak English, and most opportunities to speak were characterized by inequitable relations of power, such as in service encounters or interaction with bureaucrats. Cooke found that participants viewed the ESOL class
as their sole opportunity to speak, and a dominant theme across the dataset was the participants’ strong belief in how critical ESOL was for their well being (Cooke 2006, p. 61).

The observation data was analysed using conversation analysis. Early studies into the social organization of the classroom identified a structure to the turn-taking that occurs in classrooms, which is governed by social roles of teachers and students (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair, Coulthard, & Council, 1975). Mehan and Sinclair et al respectively found that in classrooms the teacher organizes talk around a tripartite structure of Initiation (teacher poses a question) —Response (student provides an answer to the teacher’s question) —Evaluation (teacher evaluates the correctness of the student’s utterance), what Mehan refers to as (IRE) and what Sinclair et al refer to as IRF, Initiation—Response—Feedback. In this respect, teachers have authority over the conversational space, which can be used to open up or limit social engagement.

A great body of scholarship has been devoted to countering IRE (Michaels, O'Connor, & Resnick, 2008; Resnick, Michaels, & O'Connor, 2010), arguing that it is characterized by a limited amount of conversational space for learners. Sociolinguistic analysis of classroom discourse has shown that talk structured in this way constrains student utterances both in substance and length. With respect to substance, student utterances are solely in the form of possible answers to the teacher’s question prompt. In terms of length, student talk is often in the form of short responses, which move around the classroom from student to teacher until the teacher obtains the correct answer to the question prompt (see review in Lefstein & Snell, 2011).

Drawing on these studies of classroom discourse and insights from Systemic Functional Linguistics (J. R. Martin & White, 2005) Baynham et al’s evaluation study of ESOL provision examined the nature of conversational interaction in the classes observed (Baynham, 2006, 2007; Roberts, et al., 2004). They focused in particular on the substance of talk in these classrooms and the ways in which authority, or epistemic positioning in Systemic Functional Linguistics terms
(Muntigl, 2009), was distributed in the classroom between teachers and students. Epistemic positioning is defined in terms of who has authority over knowledge in discourse. In a typical IRE sequence, the authority lies with the teacher, who has posed a question to which the answer is known by the teacher. Students are positioned as ‘secondary knowers’ in that interaction because their contribution seeks to provide the answer that the teacher has in mind for the question. Conversely, if the teacher poses a question for which the answer is unknown, then students might be positioned in that discourse as ‘primary knowers’, because they are the sole authority on their utterances in that interaction.

Baynham et al’s analyses found that some of the talk produced in these classes was ‘off-task’. They define off-task talk as talk that was not related to the learning content, but rather to the participant’s experiences and life outside the classroom context, in which the students were positioned as ‘primary knowers’. They observed through the discourse analysis that when talk was off-task, participants produced longer, and more complex utterances, and some instructors used these moments to focus on the form and function of language produced for whole-class instruction. However, they found that there was no statistically significant relationship between the prevalence of off-task talk and learning gain as measured by curriculum-based post-test measures. They still argue, however, that the presence of off-task talk in these case study classrooms with this particular group of learners, might suggest that ‘bringing the outside in’ is a critical condition for adult language learning (Baynham et al., 2007, 60). One of the limitations of theoretical and empirical work on adult ESOL, I would argue, is that it is developing in isolation from theoretical and empirical insights from outside of the TESOL or SLA literature. For example, Knowles’ theory of adult education, andragogy, posits that drawing on adult learners’ knowledge schemata is critical as their goals and interests are key motivational aspects of adult education (Knowles, Swanson, & Holton III, 2011). This might help to provide a theoretical basis for their claim that ‘bringing the outside in’ is a critical condition for SLA.

What Baynham, et al. (2007) show, like prior studies of classroom discourse, is that the classroom is governed by distinct social roles and that teachers organize the
discursive space, often by structuring student turns exclusively around the forms and functions of language. Some teachers, however, open up the social space for talk that the learners themselves are the sole authority of, e.g. life experiences. They considered teachers that took advantage of these off-task moments to focus on form and function of language as examples of good practice.

Gill’s doctoral study of adult ESOL in an art museum (2007) takes up this point of ‘bringing the outside in’, focusing in on authentic communication as a construct, and its impact on the development of communicative competence. She conducted her study in two phases over a 5-week period. The first phase sought to define authentic communication through the analysis of five critical discussions in ESOL sessions in an art museum. First language interaction was used as a model for defining authentic communication. A tutor facilitated the discussion and also played the roles of participant observer and practitioner action researcher as a means to plan lessons for subsequent weeks.

The second phase focused on one learner, Juan, examining his utterances in-depth over time in the museums. Her analysis found that Juan’s utterances became more lexically dense, drawing on a wider range of lexis, and grew in length and grammatical complexity over the study period. In addition, he produced more density of communicative acts, such as expansions, and clarifications over time. However, this finding might be confounded by participant attrition over the study period. Juan was the only participant out of 6 that attended all five sessions. The reduction of the number of ESOL student interlocutors, affecting the student-teacher ratio (1:2 in at least one of the sessions) during the museum visits might in part explain the increase in amount of talk produced by Juan and nature of that talk. Gill argues that the process of engaging in ‘authentic communication’ was what helped to develop Juan’s communicative competence.

Both Baynham, et al. (2007) and Gill (2007) through discourse analysis show developmental benefits within the discourse of pedagogical practices across formal and informal contexts that make a break from institutionalized ways of interaction,
which in Gill’s terms, creates space for ‘authentic’ discourse, and leverages that talk for student learning.

On the whole, these studies show the ways in which institutions, such as the workplace, the classroom and museums, and the social roles within these institutions organize and make accessible social interaction. The organization of social interaction can function both to create and limit the amount of social space individuals can claim within these contexts.

3.2.3 Interactional Practices
The previous section discussed findings that show how institutional practices can structure talk and one’s access to social interaction. Other studies show how talk and access to talk is negotiated at the local level, in and through interaction.

In a European-wide study of second language acquisition Broeder, et al. examined natural language acquisition through the microanalysis of service encounters (Broeder, et al., 1996; Perdue, 1984, 1993). In their analysis of *ways of achieving understanding* in discourse, the researchers focused in particular on misunderstandings and non-understandings that lead to communication breakdowns, which they argued would give insight into how mis- or non-understanding is made evident in conversational interaction, and how it is (or is not) rectified (Bremer, Broeder, Roberts, Simonot, & Vasseur, 1993, 157-8). Their data show that in conversational interaction target language interlocutors dominated the ‘floor’, exhibiting attitudes such as annoyance in the face of less-than native language competence of their conversational partner. Bremer, et al. observed that when target language learners’ utterances conveyed mis- or non-understanding, target language speakers (TLS) generated increasingly opaque utterances. This can be illustrated in the following excerpt of a service encounter with an Italian participant enquiring about a mortgage from a Building Society in the target language:

**TLS:** we can’t/we can’t say how our funds will be available because sometimes you have to be saving with us for two years + (if) you approach us at the wrong sort of time

**Andrea:** ya + mm
TLS: at the moment you’d have to be saving with us for six months but/+ you know I can’t say what its going to be like in six months time it might have changed again

Andrea: yes + ?and/ and depend of how much money I need for the borrow

TLS: + ya well no it/ really depends + on how long you have been saving and how much funds we have available whether we are helping people that have been/ + that haven’t got accounts with us so whether its/ you have to be saving with us for a year or + two years

Andrea: yes

Excerpt 3.1 Social Space from Bremer, et al. 1993, p176 (TLS=target language speaker)

In this excerpt Andrea, the target language learner, displays his non-understanding in this service encounter. Bremer et al (1993) highlight two points about this encounter: (1) the nature of the target language speaker’s discourse, which is characterized by long and complex utterances, and (2) the nature of Andrea’s utterances, which are clearly shorter in which he seems to be hypothesis testing about what the TLS has conveyed in their previous complex utterance. Despite Andrea’s non-understanding, which is marked in part by turn 2 and more precisely in turn 4, the TLS makes no accommodations to make their message more comprehensible. In fact, utterance 5 seems to be counterproductive towards the end intended by this communicative event: obtaining a mortgage. In this respect, Andrea seems to be denied the social and interactional space within which to misunderstand, but more importantly, within which to get the information he was trying to solicit.

Cooke (2006) reports a similar finding in her interview study of adult migrant and refugee leaners. Research participants reported that they had limited opportunities to speak and the same imbalance with respect to power, when in dialogue with bureaucrats. Norton’s analysis describes the impact of such a power imbalance on identity, and subsequent interaction (Norton, 2000). She found that experiencing anxiety speaking English was a recurrent theme across her case studies. Norton suggests that this derives from participants’ fear that their English language usage would position them as less legitimate speakers of English. Anxiety about language use, Norton suggests, made participants feel far less free to use English, a contradiction that Bourdieu makes note of with respect to freedom of expression of those speakers of what is perceived to be the legitimate discourse. He suggests that speakers of legitimate discourse “can make deliberately or accidentally lax use of
language without their discourse ever being invested with the same social value as that of the dominated” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 653). Norton’s case studies however felt restrained in their of English and making mistakes was a source of anxiety for them. For example, Norton’s case study Martina described herself as ‘stupid and inferior’, which Norton suggests emerged from her belief in her ability to communicate in English (Norton, 2000, p. 111).

These findings have a number of implications for an understanding of social exclusion at the interactional and micro level. First, there appears to be a relationship between identity and social exclusion. Second, their interlocutors can position individuals in discourse, and can serve to create social exclusion (as we see in Excerpt 3.1). Third, individuals can actively position themselves with respect to their interlocutors, and this ‘self-positioning’ can influence future agency, which might also serve to perpetuate social exclusion. Fourth, identities can be attributed, constructed, and taken up by individuals in interaction. In the following section, I will examine these implications further.

### 3.2.4 Social Inclusion and Exclusion and the Impact on Identities

The research reviewed thus far, has examined the social organization of discourse in a range of social contexts (the workplace, school, leisure, service encounters and more specifically in and through conversational interaction), in which differential opportunities to engage in conversational interaction exist. The studies reviewed show how opportunities for social engagement can be hindered by institutional barriers, such as opportunities for employment, and types of employment. These studies also show that opportunities for social engagement can be structured around relational identities and expectations, such as teacher-student, migrant-target language service person, migrant-target language colleagues.

*Excerpt 3.1*, for example highlights how the relational identity ‘migrant’, as manifested through Andreas’ utterances, structure the TLS’s subsequent utterances, which serve to socially exclude Andrea in so far as he is not able to acquire the information he has requested. The lack of success of this encounter could be explained by Andrea’s limited linguistic ability, however the TLS’s subsequent utterances make this interpretation less tenable if we assume Gricean logic (Grice,
1975), that is, that perspicuity is a norm that governs conversational interaction. Instead of making themselves more easily understood after Andrea’s non-understanding is made evident, we see the TLS makes no accommodations, thus making this interactional encounter unsuccessful from Andrea’s standpoint.

Norton argues that relational identities can both construct social interaction (and I would add, opportunities therein, as we see in Excerpt 3.1), as well as be constructed in and through social interaction (Norton, 2000, p. 9). Norton’s case study Eva gained access to the social network of her colleagues at the restaurant through social events organized outside the restaurant. Access to this social network enabled Eva to take on the identity of ‘valued co-worker’ at the restaurant over time, which she reports enabled her to speak more in the target language. The newfound interaction with her colleagues helped to construct her identity as valued-colleague and impacted her future social engagement with her colleagues at work. In another case, Katarina, Norton reports that her ESOL teacher suggested that she was unqualified to attend a computer class because of her proficiency in the English. Katarina interpreted the teacher’s opinion as her teacher’s perception that she speaks ‘immigrant’ English. As a result, Katarina never went back to the English class. In contrast to the additive identity that Eva constructs through interaction with her colleagues, we see that Katarina constructs an identity as ‘immigrant’ English speaker, which shapes her future agency not to engage in ESOL education. In both of these examples, we see how linguistic exclusion or inclusion shapes relational identities’ interaction and future action or engagement with the target language.

Block (2007) reports a similar finding in his case study Carlos. Carlos’ masculine work environment shaped identities in talk, which were dominated by discussion about hyper-masculine subjects. Carlos’ sense of marginalization in workplace discussions, which were at conflict with his own conception of self as academician. As a result, he engaged his identity as academician in his mother tongue with other Spanish-speaking expatriates.
These studies help to show the ways in which social exclusion or inclusion shapes identity construction in interaction, and influences future action, or engagement in the target language.

### 3.3 Social Exclusion and the Limitations on Social Space

The studies included in this review provide evidence of factors that impact individual differences of language learning, such as power dynamics, institutional structures, institutional roles and identities, in particular, perceptions of self in relation to other.

These studies highlight that there is not a one to one relationship between context and opportunities to engage in a language, but rather that this relationship is structured around relations of power that impact on identities of individuals whose linguistic products might be more or less valued in a given context. Norton suggests that cases like the one’s reported on in her 2000 study underscore the fluidity of identity, such as with Eva, in which a change of the context helped to shift Eva’s ‘positioning’ in relation to her colleagues, and thus her identity as a speaker of English in relationship to these target language speakers.

Norton’s (2000) study and others (Block, 2007; Broeder, et al. 1996) also raises important questions about core constructs of the field that define the learner in binaries, such as, static trait-like conceptualizations of motivation and anxiety that view the learner as possessing or lacking these ‘characteristics’. Instead drawing on Bourdieu’s economic metaphor, Norton suggests that motivation be conceptualized as ‘investment’ in symbolic resources which yield a payoff of increased cultural and linguistic capital that could be used on the market in exchange for things such as better job opportunities and/or access to social networks, for example (Norton 1995, 2000).

#### 3.3.1 Language, power, identity and adult ESOL: ‘More than a language’

Collectively, what these studies highlight is that there is much more involved in learning a language than simply the language itself. The politics of immigration and
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the politics of language imply power dynamics that impact on an individual’s social access to networks in which to speak, their identities, and therefore have implications for the acquisition of the language.

What seems to punctuate all of these studies are experiences of social exclusion and how social interaction is mediated by and structured around these social relations of power. If we examine social interaction, or accounts of social interaction with respect to these case studies, what can be seen is that power dynamics embedded in interaction can at once enable or deny discourse. Norton’s case studies Eva and Martina are examples in which the social space to speak was denied by positioning them in jobs that did not rely on their linguistic capital, a finding also reported on in Liversage (2009), Block (2007) and Cebulla, et al. (2010). Power in these cases is embedded, at an institutional level, within the organizational structure of these low-skill, heavy labour jobs.

Power dynamics are also present at a local level, through interaction between individuals, which might be a function of prejudices about immigration and immigrants in general. For example, Martina’s narrative highlights how the structure of interaction between her and her English speaking Canadian colleagues was one in which she perceived she was being systematically being denied access into their social network, through the exclusion of her in casual workplace conversations, which were plentiful. It could be argued that other factors might have led to social exclusion in this case that are not reflected in her narrative, such as personality clashes. However, I would argue that what is significant here is how Martina interpreted these experiences, as being shut out from their social network, excluded, ignored, and made to feel invisible. She notes that the social interaction that did exist between her and her colleagues was limited to work-related directives. In this case, her colleagues’ behaviour could be interpreted as functioning to emphasize asymmetrical relations of power by both denying her access into their social network, and limiting their social interaction to authoritative discourse. The ESF study data (Broeder, et al., 1996; Perdue, 1993) highlights that some target language interlocutors strive to reduce asymmetrical relations of power and in doing so, give to floor to L2s, while others exercise coercive relations of power that make
communication overly complex, opaque and inaccessible. This study also highlights how discourse is often governed by attitudes towards the speakers from minority ethnic groups.

Another key dimension of the studies discussed is the view that identities are reflexively shaped by the power dynamics that enable or deny discourse, which can also impact upon social interaction and ultimately, exclusion. These studies help to provide empirical support for Bourdieu’s argument on identity, which suggests that an individual’s awareness of the value afforded to their linguistic products bears on their identity (how one sees oneself) and identity in relation to others (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 660). Participants’ identities as speakers of the target language were shaped by interaction or actions that positioned them as speakers of a less legitimate variety of the target language. For example, in Block’s study, Carlos’ inability to secure an academic position in the UK due to his linguistic products, and subsequent work in low-skill labour work in London, shaped his identity as an English speaker. He interprets migration as ‘declassing’ him, which in turn reduces his investment in learning English, and fosters his resistance of a migrant identity. Similarly, Eva’s (Norton, 2000) positioning in work that did not rely on her linguistic skills, affected her self-concept as an English speaker and confidence to speak with her colleagues altogether. Likewise, Norton’s case study Martina, in light of her interactions in English with her colleagues and lack thereof, described herself as ‘stupid’. In this sense, the self is interpreted through interaction that is inherently shaped by inequitable relations of power.

3.3.2 Debating the Validity of Socially Informed Studies into SLA
Much of the debate around the studies I have reviewed have taken shape around discussions of the validity of the paradigm these studies are situated in and as a result, questions of the whether research within this paradigm could provide empirical evidence to advance SLA theory. Proponents of this approach to SLA research, could be broadly characterized as supporting socially informed research, while researchers that challenge the validity of socially informed research, could be characterized broadly as supporting cognitive/psycholinguistic approaches to SLA, the distinction being primarily disciplinary with implications cascading on to
theoretical and epistemological positions, research goals, questions, designs, methodologies, and analytical approaches.

As I have mentioned, socially informed SLA research has broadened its theoretical toolkit for SLA research, looking towards other disciplines in social sciences such as sociology and education for its theoretical insights. Language is viewed as a social construct and learning conceived of as participation in social practice. Methodological approaches such as life history interviewing and sampling conversations in authentic contexts with authentic interlocutors are targeted towards unpacking discursive realities that shape social participation. These studies investigate SLA at the micro-level, mainly consisting of in-depth analyses of small samples of participants (usually under 10). Contrastingly, those critical of this approach, seek universal and objective explanations of second language learning and are situated within the positivist research paradigm. Language, in this body of research, is viewed as a mental construct, and learning as a change in one’s mental state (Larsen-Freeman, 2007, p. 780). It is therefore the goal of cognitively oriented research to identify and predict that which leads to change in one’s mental state and knowledge constitution.

The most salient aspect of the debate, as it relates to the studies above, is the assertion that studies like these are really investigations of language use, and therefore do not fall under the umbrella of SLA theory and research. Gass, for example, argues that her research goal has never been to understand language use, but rather to understand what kind of communicative interaction brings about a change in linguistic knowledge (Gass, 1998, p. 84). This distinction, reiterated in Long (1997), Gass et al (2007), and Kaspar (1997), attempts to differentiate between using a language and learning a language, which assumes use and learning are two separate and distinct processes. This raises the question about where informal learning contexts (such as workplace conversations) would be situated in this conception of learning. Part of the rationale of the research designs of Norton (2000), the ESF study (Perdue, 1993), Block (2007b), Goldstein (1997), and Teutsch-Dwyer (2001), is to understand the language learning that occurs outside of formal educational provision, of which many economic migrants, refugees and asylum
seekers participate in. The informal learning context, therefore, constitutes the learning space, and the study of this context and naturalistic data that constitutes its learning content, it would follow, could provide insight into learning with respect to these target learners. I would argue, therefore, that the studies reviewed above are equally advancing our understanding of second language learning, albeit primarily through the analysis of qualitative data, as they unpack the social context of learning by examining complex aspects of this context, such as identity, positioning and relations of power. Gass’ (1997) research on the other hand, like much of the research on interaction (e.g. Long, 1985; Mackey, 1999), controls for variables not germane to the study using experimental conditions, where the ‘social’ (the social realities of participants, their positioning in discourse, and how this interacts with social possibilities) in this respect is effectively nullified.

This line of argumentation emerges in part from Firth & Wagner’s call for a reconceptualised SLA, in which they urged researchers to take on more socially informed approaches that approach language research with an emic rather than etic perspective, that is grounded in the data rather than a priori hypotheses (Firth & Wagner 1997, 1998, 2007). This emic perspective implies certain types of methodological tools and data, of which conversation analysis has been advanced as one such tool to approach naturalistic, micro-level data inductively (Firth & Wagner, 2007; Markee, 2004; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2007). The distinction that cognitive/psycholinguistic researchers have advanced appears not to be founded in the empirical data, but rather at the epistemological level, taking issue with what counts as data with respect to the quantitative/qualitative divide.

3.3.3 Towards a synthetic approach for SLA

Much of the argument, unconvincingly and unproductively, has been couched in staking claims on the meta-narrative of the field, defining its parameters to support either cognitive or social orientations (Block, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 1998, 2007; Gass, 1998; Gass, et al., 2007; Kasper, 1997; Larsen-Freeman, 2007; M. H. Long, 1997). This line of argumentation is fundamentally counterproductive because, as Larsen-Freeman notes, the internal validity of the cognitivist argument for SLA research is consistent, “if you take language to be a mental construct and learning to
be a change in a mental state, then it makes sense to seek cognitive explanations”, likewise for the social orientations (Larsen-Freeman, 2007, p. 779).

Moreover, arguments have been advanced to deflate the value of this emerging social orientation (e.g. Gass, et al., 2007). Gass et al’s evaluation of the development of socially informed studies sought to quantify the impact of Firth and Wagner’s call for more socially informed SLA research, and concluded that the situation is just as it should be, unchanged, core constructs intact, with minimal uptake of socially informed approaches in the most respected conferences and publications. This assessment, its sampling techniques and approach to analysis, were, I would argue, short sighted for if one broadens their view of impact and value, it becomes evident that quite a bit of research has been devoted, more broadly, to a widening of SLA theory. Lantolf and Beckett’s recent review of sociocultural studies on second language learning show that this area of SLA alone constitute well over 300 publications in this area (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009). If we consider studies drawing on poststructuralist and postmodern theory (see Pavlenko, 2002 review), add studies investigating identity (see Block, 2007a; 2007b reviews), and research that applies conversation analysis (see Markee, 2000; Mori, 2007), it becomes evident that the landscape of SLA research over the last decade is becoming increasingly diverse.

Moreover, in addition to the quantity of publications as an indicator of impact and value, the contributions need to be considered with respect to the questions they answer in relation to learning: do we know more about second language learning because of this research? Rampton cautions with respect to interlanguage research, that it "runs the risk of remaining restrictively preoccupied with the space between the speaker and his grammar, rather than with the relationship between speakers and the world around them" (Rampton, 1997). Socially informed SLA research has helped to highlight an understanding of language learning that is contextually situated, unpacking identities and power relations that shape opportunities for discourse, and subsequently learning. Understood in relation to cognitive/psycholinguistic research, they add to what we know about learning and interaction, highlighting individual learner differences in differing social milieus.
One of the limitations of these bodies of research is that they are, for the most part, developing in isolation, rather than in tandem. A synthesis approach would be one in which these orientations would be taken as complementary, rather than better than the other. The position taken in is this research is that the breadth of cognitive and psycholinguistic research in SLA is critical for understanding learning when equitable relations of power exist. Socially informed SLA research helps to unpack the dimensions of the social context in which inequitable relations of power exist.

These studies, when considered together, begin to outline the shape and nature of linguistic exclusion and inclusion of migrants post-migration. While these studies examine various contexts for language learning and its production, they all seem to share the perspective that social space can be a function of institutions and practices at an organizational level as well as enacted, imposed or implied by individuals at the discursive level. It also points to a complexity with respect this target group of learners, that immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers have differential opportunities to use the target language. Structural factors and perceptual factors can serve to isolate or immerse individuals in the target language.

In the following chapter, I will review empirical research of social exclusion and inclusion in museums, and discursive studies of learning in museums.
4 The New Museology
Quite like the SLA field’s ‘social turn’, the museum sector has undergone a socially-informed paradigm shift that has, over the last couple of decades, repositioned the museum visitor from the periphery of research, policy and praxis towards the centre. As a result, the mission of many museums has shifted from solely that of collecting, preserving and displaying, to being institutions where the visitor is fundamentally at the centre of the museum’s policy and practice (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a).

Visitor-centred efforts have encouraged many museums and museum researchers to turn a critical gaze towards current knowledge of museum visitors. Consequently, much of the early research that has emerged from this paradigm shift focused precisely on this question, using visitor surveys to explore patterns of attendance, as well as investigating motivations underlying museum attendance (for example, see reviews of visitor studies in Falk & Dierking, 1992; Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a). The findings of these investigations have helped to shape a research agenda for the field, as well as informing the thrust of educational provision in museums, as this research brought to light museum visitor demographics, and likewise the profile of visitors who are significantly less likely to attend museums.

The trajectory of research that followed focused foremost on understanding museums as learning institutions. This was encouraged largely by the American Association of Museum’s (AAM) Excellence and Equity report, (American Association of Museums, 1992) and subsequently the 1998 report A New Cultural Framework from what was then the newly elected “New Labour” government (DCMS, 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, p. 5). Both of these reports, while not official policy, served as a call to action for the sector to capitalize on the educational potential of museums for the public good, which was taken up on both sides of the Atlantic as major intellectual undertakings producing rich, collaborative research (see for example the extensive and ever-growing corpus of research on learning in museums conducted by several museum learning research centres: Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (RCMG) at the University of Leicester, the National Museums Online Learning Project (NMOLP), as evaluated by the University of Edinburgh, the Institute for Learning Innovation (ILI), a non-profit based in the US, and the University of
Pittsburgh’s Center for Learning in Out-of-School Environments (UPCLOSE) in the US).

4.1 Towards a Theory of the Museum Experience

Conceptualizing the museum as a learning institution poses the question of whether existing learning theory could be used to help to explain the kind of learning that takes place within these contexts or whether novel explanatory theory is needed to explicate learning of this nature. For example, the question becomes: could the same theoretical framework be used for conceptualizing learning about historical figures in a formal classroom as for learning about the same figures through an exhibition of 18th century life masks at the National Portrait Gallery. Working towards theorizing museums as learning institutions, researchers began to generate novel and situated models of learning in these contexts as well as analysing museum practices in order to unpack theoretical assumptions underlying contemporary display practices and their implied theories of learning.

Analyses of contemporary display practices reveal implied theories of learning that span the history of scholarship on the science of learning, from behaviourism to constructivism and more recently, social constructivism (Hein, 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, Moussouri, & RCMG, 2001; Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998). Hooper-Greenhill describes display practices as communication models, or museum communication, which denotes the relationship between the museum’s message (from the curator), the mode of communication (wall texts, objects/artefacts) and ‘the receiver’ (the museum visitor) (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a, 1995, 2007).

Simple models of communication evoke behaviourist theories of learning, which imply a passive museum visitor (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994a, p. 46), that is one who simply receives the museum’s message as communicated through the design of the museum environment and display of its artefacts. More complex models of communication, contrastingly, imply the opposite, an active and participatory visitor engaged in constructing meaning about objects from the museum’s message but also drawing on their experience, knowledge and identities. Simple models of museum communication are unidirectional and uncontested, in which the voice of the curator
is privileged. Complex models are dynamic, and dialogic, ones in which the visitor plays a central and active role as learner in the museum. Moreover, complex models call into question the very notion of whether meaning of a museum object could be fully conceptualized without a visitor engaged in the construction of that meaning.

With respect to theory generation, Falk and Dierking (1992) advanced a model of learning in museums that, while debated and subsequently refined, has served as the bedrock of theoretical conceptualizations of learning in museums. Seeking to account for complexity and distinctiveness, what they viewed as characteristic of the museum as a learning environment, they generated a multidimensional model of learning that pointed towards a view of museum learning as constructed in nature. Their interactive experience model conceptualized the museum experience as a dynamic interaction of three domains of experience: the personal, social, and physical (Figure 4.1).

The personal domain refers to an individual’s background knowledge, prior experience, motivation, interests, and agenda in the museum. The social denotes the intersubjective dynamics between visitors and the people they engage with in the museum, e.g. friends and family, museum educators, etc. They argue that the social dimension is a defining characteristic of the museum experience because museum
visiting is often done with the company of others. The physical dimension encompasses the nature of the museum environment itself, and includes features such as the autonomy one has in a museum to choose what to view and what to take up from the museum’s intended message, what they refer to as the ‘free-choice’ aspect of museums.

This early attempt at theorizing learning in museums alluded to a ‘constructivist’ model of learning, although this theoretical framework by name was never referred to directly in their (1992) discussion of the model. The premise that one’s sociocultural context serves to mediate learning in the museum is one that does not fit well with simple, monologic models of museum communication, as has been described above. Rather, it seems to suggest a situated and dialogic model, in which a visitor’s background, motivation and identity are aspects that shape meaning making about objects.

Their model, however, has been criticized for what seems like an ahistorical and apolitical stance it takes with respect to knowledge and learning (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, p. 40). They do not consider differential access to museums and their cultural resources, which may be a product of social inequities. Another limitation that could be raised is the extent to which this model captures the distinction of museum learning as compared to other learning contexts. For example, if we use this model to describe learning that takes place in other informal learning environments, such as the workplace, one can readily see that the personal, social and physical dimensions are present, and likewise, for formal learning contexts such as schools.

However, regardless of these limitations, what could be seen as one of the advantages of their model is that it begins to conceptualize the learner as an active agent in the knowledge construction process, as well as beginning to consider the role of social ‘others’ in this process and how the nature of the learning space itself enables this kind of engagement. In this respect, the interactive experience model has served as a conceptual anchor for museum learning research that has followed in pursuit of further refinement of a theory of learning in museums.
In the following section, I will report on the findings of the systematic review of the museum literature that seeks to both unpack social inclusion within museums as well as examine discussion-based learning in these contexts.

4.2 Museums for social inclusion

The DCMS policy *Centres for Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All* ushered in a new generation of museum practice in the UK, tasked with advancing an educational agenda as well as a social justice one. This policy set out a framework for how museums could foster social inclusion and how they could evaluate it. First and foremost, the policy defined social inclusion as a high priority for the sector, and that inclusion should seek to widen access to museums, both through outreach services and a variety of measures within museums. In addition, museums should seek to understand the needs of excluded communities by partnering with them and with organizations that served them in order to meet their needs. The goal of exclusion, it was stated, should be working towards representational diversity, improving the lives of individuals that experience social exclusion, and learning (DCMS 2000, p. 5).

The scholarship that followed could be characterized by its focus on program development, the tensions around practitioner interpretations and implementation of socially inclusive work (Dodd & Sandell, 2001; Sandell, 1998; Tlili, 2008), the debate on the use of museums for inclusion and the value of evidence (e.g. Appleton & Institute of Ideas., 2001; Belfiore, 2002; Kawashima, 2006; Lang, 2006; Newman & McLean, 2004b; West & Smith, 2005), and empirical research on the evidence of the value of these kinds of initiatives (Gill, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill, Sandell, Moussouri, & O'Riain, 2000; J. Long et al., 2002; A. Martin, 2003; Matarasso, 1997; Newman & McLean, 2006; Newman, et al., 2005). It is the latter body of research that is the focus of this review, as it provides an evidence base for the current study of process and outcomes of being included in museums. However, despite this ever-growing body of scholarly research on social inclusion and exclusion in museums, research into the impact of inclusion in museums is disproportionately small.
4.2.1 Impact of social inclusion in museums

Like the research on language learning, definitions of social exclusion and inclusion vary across these studies, which raises considerable issues of measurement and synthesis of the evidence base, to the extent to which policy makers could be informed about the unequivocal contributions of museums for social inclusion (Hooper-Greenhill, et al., 2000). Despite disparate and often fuzzy interpretations of exclusion, the thread that weaves through these studies is the concept of access, or being denied access to participate in museums more broadly (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007; J. Long, et al., 2002; A. Martin, 2003), which might be explained by the museum sector’s alignment with “New Labour” social policy (West & Smith, 2005) that defined exclusion as the process of being denied access to rights and services (Scottish Office, 1999). Approaches to inclusion in the museum sector are characterized by working to increase access to museums and their resources (Dodd & Sandell, 2001; Hooper-Greenhill, et al., 2000).

The politics of evidence in light of the social inclusion agenda of the sector has had the effect of making one of the goals of museum learning research the generation of evidence of the value of museums, striving for outcomes such as learning, interest, retention and inclusion (Boylan, 2006; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, p. 3). “New Labour’s” support for the museum sector and its widening role of education for the public good, as well as for advancing a social justice agenda, created the need for accountability, that is, for museums to provide demonstrable evidence of their impact working towards achieving these wider societal goals. Likewise in the US, governmental support for museum learning research centres to provide evidence of the national educational value of museum in the US, has given shape to more evidence-based research, e.g. the National Science Foundation’s current informal science education research program in the US; Leinhardt & Crowley’s (2004) and Falk and Dierking’s (Falk & Dierking, 1995; Falk, Dierking, & Foutz, 2007).

Driven by the politics of evidence, a series of large-scale of studies aimed at producing measures of accountability, which would demonstrate learning, and the impact of learning in museums were conducted by the RCMG in the UK from 2001-2007 (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002; Hooper-Greenhill, 2004, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill,
Dodd, Clarke, O’Riain, & Selfridge, 2002) and the Museum Learning Collaborative in the US from 1997-2004 (Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998; Leinhardt, Crowley, & Knutson, 2002; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004). These data elaborate on the model of learning in museums described above, however the validity of the evidence this research has produced has been heavily debated in light of the politics within which this research is situated, along with epistemological differences with respect to the measurement of impact.

The Learning Impact Research Project (LIRP), the research program conducted by the RCMG (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002), sought to identify a global measure of short-term outcomes and long-term impacts of learning in museums, libraries and archives. Endeavouring to do so, they developed a measure that could account for all possible learning outcomes in these contexts, as well as one that could capture the diversity of experience and uniqueness. Hooper-Greenhill notes that the measures the LIRP drafted, attempted to address what they saw as limitations in Falk and Dierking’s (2000) conception of learning in museums, which they interpreted as an uncritical orientation towards knowledge and knowledge construction, with respect to gender, class and ethnicity factors (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007).

The measures were developed during a collaborative research initiative (Inspiring Learning for All), which enabled the researchers to draft and modify them with the participation of experts in the field that were involved in the research program (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007). In addition to the iterative cycles of development and refinement with participation of experts, they also conducted exit interviews with museums’ (libraries and archives) visitors, and reanalysed data from the centre’s previous evaluation studies. The measures, referred to as the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs), were then piloted in 15 museums, libraries and archives over a 5-month period, and while their results seemed to indicate a range of definitions of learning adopted by institutions, the researchers concluded that the measures could be administered in museums more broadly to identify the outcomes and impact of learning in museums (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007).
Like Falk and Dierking’s model, the GLOs are a multidimensional framework of learning outcomes. Their framework suggests that learning, conceptualized as the acquisition of knowledge, is but one aspect of the type of learning that could occur in museums. In addition, this framework includes other outcomes such as the acquisition of skills or “learning how to do something” (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, p. 54), changes in attitudes and values, enjoyment, inspiration and creativity, and changes in actions or ‘activity and behaviour’.

To generate a national picture of impact and outcomes, the GLOs were rolled out on a large scale to measure the impact and outcomes in four evaluation studies in England (Hooper-Greenhill, 2004; Hooper-Greenhill et al., 2006; Hooper-Greenhill, Dodd, Phillips, O’Riain, et al., 2004). These studies combined contained a sample of 3,172 teachers and 56,810 students visiting well over 200 museums across England. The research investigated perceptions of learning outcomes of participating school groups through exit surveys after schools visits. The surveys were constructed around the GLO framework, and designed to elicit from teachers their perception of student learning outcomes and teacher’s pedagogical approach to using museums for instruction; student surveys elicited student perceptions of their own learning outcomes. In-depth responses were gathered in focus groups with a subset of teachers in each of these studies. The final evaluation study (2007), with a stronger emphasis on community groups in addition to school groups, adapted the teacher’s survey so as to administer it to community workers, and the student survey for adult community-based education learners. In addition to survey methods and focus groups, the DCMS/DfMS (2004, 2005) studies included case studies of school visits to museums. The 2007 evaluation included case studies that were oriented towards museums’ educational initiatives, as such, these case studies included responses from museum educators, community workers, and learners alike on their perceptions of what was salient, with respect to GLOs, for the targeted learners by participating in these programs.

In order to analyse the extent to which museums in the evaluation study were working towards social inclusion, the research analysed postcode data along with indices of deprivation. Their analyses show that an increasing number of
participants consisted of a demographic that previous visitor studies have identified as less likely to visit museums.

Collectively, these studies represent a large population of museum visitors. The authors suggest that the data of these studies show two main findings. First, that learning in museums contributes to conceptual change. They report that learners perceived themselves as having increased subject matter knowledge from their museum visit, in addition to increased enjoyment and desire to ruminate on exhibition content. Teacher data from surveys and focus groups are consistent with these findings, predicting student outcomes as most likely to be increased knowledge and enjoyment. The second key finding advanced in the DCMS/DfES studies (2004, 2007) is that participating in museums facilitates social change. Increased access to museums, as evidenced through postcode analysis suggested a wider reach to previously underrepresented visitors, some which the authors refer to as ‘at risk’. Case studies of the educational initiatives of the museums participating in these evaluation studies, suggest that participation helped to foster cultural links between the museums and these groups, as well as contributing to cultivating a sense of belonging and social space and encouraging ‘positive’ identity development. The research program included two case studies of the target ESOL learner population, which I will review in some detail shortly.

The scale of the RCMG studies support the strength of their findings, that participating in museum learning can have a significant impact and learning outcomes for visitors. However, its limitations are threefold. First, the instruments used to determine impact might confound the findings, which raise questions of construct and internal validity. As I have mentioned, the survey instrument was developed during the development of the GLO framework, then piloted and implemented on a large scale in the subsequent national evaluation studies. The survey instrument designed to elicit student responses contains open-ended items, which are framed in a way that the assume learning as an outcome and the items strive to elicit what learning occurred, rather than asking a broader question, to determine whether learning occurred.
Second, it is difficult to disentangle the discourse on social impact, especially in relation to social inclusion, with diverse definitions of social exclusion and its indicators. Definitions of social exclusion at the national policy level conceptualize social problems such as unemployment, housing and skills as indicators of this type of deprivation (Levitas et al., 2007; Newman & McLean, 2004a). The research advancing the social justice role of museums through inclusive practice is often contested for not providing measures that address the social impact of this work, which seems to be in part a definitional issue. That is, defining disadvantage and exclusion and their indicators, in terms of the discourse on poverty that they are born out of, would mean that these institutions would need to provide evidence of impact with respect to addressing these same indicators, e.g. contributing to increased employment, housing, and skills etc.

The quantitative evidence provided in the DfES evaluation studies of GLOs are in the form of attendance demographics (school postcodes), which seems to suggest the assumption that if they attend, they are included. However, it is difficult to see how this addresses exclusion, if we use the aforementioned indicators of exclusion. In addition, by limiting indicators of inclusion to postcode indices, means that there is little evidence of the process of being included on those individuals these efforts aim to include. I would argue that an understanding of the nature of participants’ exclusion, along with the evidence that help to explicate the ways in which museums’ addressed exclusion and disadvantage, is needed to begin to understand the impact of learning in these unique learning environments.

This is where DfES evaluation studies’ qualitative case studies might help to fill the gap. However, one of the limitations of the qualitative evidence they provide, which will be discussed in some detail shortly, is that thick description of impact seems to be disproportionately distributed amongst community workers and museum educators, with rather small samples of those individuals to which inclusive provision is targeted. In addition, another limitation of this data, as I will highlight, is that secondary sources are relied upon for background evidence on excluded populations, rather than understanding exclusion in terms of the targeted individuals that participated in their study (e.g. Dodd in Hooper-Greenhill, et al. 2007). This is
to say, more evidence is needed of impact from those individuals inclusive work aims to target.

Thirdly, it could be argued that by exclusively targeting outcomes, in other words, summative evaluation of a museum visit, the researchers conceptualize learning in these contexts solely in terms of the saliency of recollection. In this sense, an understanding of what happens during the visit, *in situ*, as it were, is not possible with this data set. However, this is not to suggest that recollection is not valuable for understanding the experience. In fact, I will make the case in the subsequent chapters that analyses of recollection is a means by which we may observe how individuals code their experiences. But rather, I mean to suggest that additional data points, might help unpack what happens *in situ*, in order to understand the affordances of the museum for advancing social and cognitive learning outcomes.

The Museum Learning Collaborative’s (MLC) research program investigates primarily the ‘*in situ*’ of the museum experience in order to generate an understanding of museum learning (Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998). Specifically, their research has focused on ‘social interaction’ as it unfolds through conversation while visitors tour exhibitions (Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998, p. 5). Building on Wertsch’s interpretation of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mind, which is similar to Lantolf and colleagues’ application of sociocultural theory in SLA research discussed in the previous chapter, the Museum Learning Collaborative takes the view that knowledge is co-constructed through conversational interaction. Hein argues that if we take a constructivist view of learning, then knowledge cannot be conceived of simply as being “‘out there’ independent of the knower” (1991, p. 1), but rather, as constructed as we learn, both within an individual and through social interaction with others. In this respect, the MLC’s research investigates the process, by way of linguistic analysis of language used during this social interaction, specifically, interaction that is driven towards constructing an understanding of phenomena being viewed in museums. However, while this work begins to get at process, this body of research, conducted in a different socio-political context does not explore exclusion and what it means to be included.
Other research that has investigated the impact of social inclusion in museums suggests wide ranging impacts such as helping to construct social identities and a sense of belonging (Hooper-Greenhill et al., 2007; Newman & McLean, 2006), that museums can help alleviate barriers by engaging excluded groups and therefore helping to develop their self-esteem and confidence, which the authors argue help individuals become ‘active citizens’ (Newman, et al., 2005), increase their communicative competence (Gill, 2007), and help to increase attendance in museums, but mainly of those groups that are already considered ‘included’ (A. Martin, 2003). Sceptics argue, however, that definitional issues create attribution difficulties when trying to establish causal links between indicators of exclusion and museum work (Hooper-Greenhill, et al., 2000; J. Long, et al., 2002).

While these studies make claims of desirable social, cognitive and behavioural impacts, examination of experiences of excluded groups is primarily captured through exit surveys and interviews, which either prompt individuals to report on experiences of the immediate visit or generalize about their visiting. Research that elicits individual experiences of immediate visits, seem to conceptualize social exclusion as static in time, steady state-like in nature. It could be argued that research that elicits individual experiences of museum visiting more broadly through exit surveys and interviews, by relying on individuals’ interpretation of experiences recalled in the present, makes the establishment of causal links between museum visiting and social inclusion outcomes becomes a little less tenable.

Gill’s (2007) case study moves the field towards a process model, by examining talking in interaction in museums, but like the Museum Learning Collaborative research, this research was not conducted within the socio-political context of UK social exclusion and inclusion, despite focusing on ESOL learners as its target sample. While this research is not located within the same policy and research context, it is relevant for this discussion as it aims to question what happens when you bring a community of learners that visitor studies have identified as excluded groups into museums for learning about a second language. Through examining ESOL learners’ discourse participating in museum learning over a period of five weeks, Gill takes an ontogenetic perspective, examining change over time through
conversational interaction, arguing that engaging in discourse helped to foster the development of communicative competence.

Collectively the UK research that examines what happens when individuals participate in inclusion, limit their inquiry to outputs, outcomes and impacts, which could be explained by the necessity to provide demonstrable evidence of the value of museums for policy makers. However, the establishment of impacts through the focus on short-term outcomes or near transfer make problematic, the effect participation has on targeted outcomes such as ‘improving the lives of excluded communities’.

4.2.2 Case Studies of Social Inclusion in Museums: ESOL in museums

A subset of the impact of inclusion studies investigate ESOL learners participating in museum learning, which is particularly relevant to the current investigation. One of the case studies under the larger 2007 Inspiration, Identity, Learning evaluation study, was the Salford Museum’s Engaging Refugees and Asylum Seekers project (Hooper-Greenhill, et al. 2007). The Salford Museum had been working with the refugee and asylum seeker population in the Greater Manchester Area since 2003, and has developed, with the collaboration of national and civic museums, a range of programs and resources for this population, including ESOL resources.

The 2007 evaluation’s case study focused on the museum’s refugee and asylum seeker volunteer scheme, which enabled people from these communities to get involved with a range of museum work, e.g. managing databases, working on the museum floor, helping conduct research for exhibitions.

Using the GLOs as a framework for evaluating the impact and outcomes of learning in museums, the researchers conducted interviews with museum staff, former project staff, refugee and asylum workers, and two volunteers who were refugees/asylum seekers. Like the other evaluation studies run by the RCMG, which investigated teacher’s perceptions of student learning, in this case study, museum staff involved in the organization and implementation of these programs were interviewed about their perception of the impact of their refugee/asylum seeker volunteer’s participation in the program with respect to the GLOs. Refugee and asylum seeker
volunteers were interviewed about their perceptions of their experience, however, this interview was conducted in the presence of the volunteer program coordinator, a design choice, which the researcher suggests was made in case language issues emerged during the interview encounter (Hooper-Greenhill, et al., 2007). Secondary sources were used to provide background on refugee and asylum seeker communities in the UK.

While details of the analytical approach are not reported on in the research report, the researcher presents a thematic analysis of the interview content. The author suggests, that museum workers and other support staff perceived the voluntary experience of the refugee and asylum participants as an extremely valuable one, especially with respect to developing positive identities in the UK and sense of belonging, as well as work experience which might be valuable to increase their employability. The researcher presents similar findings from the refugee and asylum seeker volunteer data. In addition, the researcher suggests that having the opportunity to tell their story, or rather their version of the story represented in museum exhibitions, enabled the participants to communicate troubling experiences of flight for the first time, as well as help them to cope with them.

However, it could be argued that these findings are confounded by the intersubjective dynamics within the interview encounter. As I have mentioned, the interviews with the refugee/asylum seeker volunteers were conducted in the presence of their volunteer coordinator. While the presence of this additional party was intended to be benign, supportive at best, the presence of this additional party might have impacted the interview given their respective roles and positions within the hierarchy of the institution. In addition, the researcher does not provide information about the participants’ capabilities linguistically, instead secondary evidence of linguistic challenges migrants experience, in general, are presented.

A second case study of ESOL provision in museums was conducted under the 2007 Inspiration, Identity, Learning evaluation. The study was of an outreach collaborative between the Science Museum (London), Canal Museum and Beauchamp Lodge Settlement. The case study of this provision sought to understand
participants’ barriers to participation and how the program eliminated them. The collaborative have been developing their outreach programs since 2003, of which an ESOL program was but one of their community outreach efforts. The ESOL program entailed a tripartite session format. That is, the first session was conducted in a community setting, the second in the Science Museum and the third on a canal boat, affiliated with the Canal Museum. Unlike the approach taken in the previous case-study, the researcher approached former participants in this program retrospectively, months after having participated in the program. The researcher conducted retrospective interviews with learner-participants in the ESOL program, and their community-based ESOL instructor. In order to capture the museums efforts of eliminating barriers to participation, the researcher interviewed museum staff involved in the organization and implementation of the program.

While the researcher reports on the museum perspective as well as the learner perspective, I will limit my discussion here to the findings of the learner perspectives, which provide insight into the impact of EiM for vulnerable and isolated groups. The findings suggest that identity, cultural and attitudinal barriers hinder their participation in museum visiting more generally. Participants experienced low levels of confidence going into museums, and cultural barriers for this particular group of learners included the lack of a prayer room in the museum. The researcher argues that these particular institutions seem to adopt a superficial ‘barriers model’, which assumes that if the participants visit more than once (in this case 3) then they will benefit from ‘being there’ (Hooper-Greenhill et al 2007, 347), as opposed to developing the outreach model that engages the participants more substantively.

These studies begin to shed some light on social inclusion in museums and its impact on individuals that experience exclusion. However, these studies are limited to self-report data and a disproportionate amount of these accounts are from the perspective of service providers that work with excluded groups.

As discussed, the new museology is predicated on a dialogue between museum visitors and their conversational ‘others’. In the following section, I will examine the
research that moves closer to the museum experience by examining conversation in interaction. While the body of research that I draw on here is not located within the socio-political context of social inclusion in museums, it is particularly germane to the present study given the limited research on EiM in the context of social inclusion. It helps provide an evidence base for what happens when individuals participate in dialogue in museums, including the cognitive, social and affective outcomes of participation.

4.3 Understanding learning conversations in museums

The Museum Learning Collective project was conducted in two phases, spanning 1997-2004. The first phase entailed a series of validation studies to test constructs and inform the second phase, which consisted of the larger scale study of learning conversations in museums in which they developed a model of learning in museums through talk.

Leinhardt and Knutson’s model of museum learning, derived from their study of conversational interaction of museum visitors, but informed in part by Falk and Dierking’s interactive experience model (1992), conceptualizes learning as conversational elaboration: this they define as “the gradual enrichment of talk that adds to the skeletal form of a typical museum exchange with details of observation, comparisons, attachments to memories, and evaluations”, which they argue are the aspect of the museum visit that is most salient and remembered beyond the visit itself (Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004, p. 7). Their model suggests that conversational elaboration is driven by the learning environment, which they suggest consists of design and display choices of a given exhibition. Conversational elaboration, they argue is also informed by identity, which they conceptualize as the visitor’s relational identity with respect to the museum exhibit. Similarly, in a later more expanded version of the Falk and Dierking’s interactive experience model, Falk claims that identity is the driving force of the museum experience, shaping the interaction of these three domains (Falk 2009). Likewise, Leinhardt and Knutson’s model purports that identity and the learning environment inform conversations that
actually take place about the objects and collections as a whole, which they refer to as *explanatory engagement*.

Working towards a description of learning conversations in museums, (Allen, 2002) conducted an observational study of dyads in conversation in San Francisco’s Exploratorium. The study investigated how to distinguish *learning* in conversations that take place in museums from talk that is more general in nature. She focused on the question of what does learning talk sound like, what patterns present themselves in talk identified as ‘learning talk’, and how might it differ when the relationships between participants differ, e.g. adult-adult dyads vs. adult-child dyads. Another goal of this study was to understand how learning talk might be quantified.

The researchers approached visitor dyads to an exhibition. Forty-nine dyads consented to participate in the study, all of which were first time visitors to the exhibition, native English speakers and over the age of 18. Each dyad was given an audio recorder in a bag worn around the waist to record their discussion as they toured the exhibition. In addition, a researcher covertly observed the dyad’s movements and behaviour as they moved through the exhibition using an observation schedule.

Conversation analysis of the conversation data was coded for verbal evidence of learning in five categories: perceptual, conceptual, connecting, strategic and affective. Perceptual talk referred to talk that functioned to draw attention to an aspect of the collection; conceptual talk entailed some level of interpretation by the speaker; connecting, referred to the function of talk that made a connection to previous knowledge or experience; strategic talk referred to navigational talk as the visitors moved through the exhibit; and affective talk captured emotive and attitudinal talk. Data was parsed based on museum display, to analyse how orientation (mode of museum communication in Hooper-Greenhill terms) influenced talk. The data were also analysed to understand how much of the talk that occurred was learning oriented. In order to explore the differences between dyad types (adult-adult and adult-child), data of these respective groups were compared with respect to the aforementioned categories.
What Allen found through in this observation study of dyads in a museum exhibition is that the nature of most of the talk across dyad types was learning oriented, with a small percentage of silence or non-learning orientated talk. In addition, both dyad types had the same amount of learning talk overall, where the adult-child talk had a higher proportion of talk classified as learning talk. Of that talk, Allen examined the frequency of the occurrence of each of the aforementioned categories of talk out of the total number of exhibit elements engaged with by dyads. She found 70% of the talk was perceptual, 56% affective and conceptual, 28% connecting, and 20% strategic. Comparison of dyad type shows the same overall pattern. Comparison of exhibition type (live animal, hands-on, artefacts, readable) show that most of the dyads stopped at the lived animals exhibits, hands-on and artefact displays, with the least number of stops being at readable display. With respect to the talk at those stops, comparison of talk type by exhibition type found that the live animals exhibit elicited higher levels of all categories of talk except for strategic, when compared to the hands-on exhibit.

These findings help to generate an overall picture of conversations that take place in museums, where talk seems to be constructed around and oriented towards learning by way of making connections, interpretations and responding emotively to museum collections.

4.3.1 Learning conversations and the influence of identity
A series of studies, also aimed at characterizing learning talk, investigated ‘identity’ and how it shapes the kind of talk that occurs in museums (Abu-Shumays & Leinhardt, 2002; Fienberg & Leinhardt, 2002; Leinhardt, Tittle, & Knutson, 2002; Paris & Mercer, 2002; Stainton, 2002). Identity, as it is defined in this series of studies, refers to an individual’s prior knowledge and relational identity with respect to the thematic content of the exhibition. To illustrate, Fienberg and Leinhardt’s (2002) validation study into the construct, identity, conducted the study in the Heinz History Center in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, specifically in the Glass: Shattering Notions exhibition, which focuses on the glass making industry in Pittsburgh and its surroundings over the last two centuries. Identity with respect to this exhibition, as defined by the researchers of this study, refers to the respective prior knowledge and
experience museum visitors had with respect to the regional history, glass manufacturing industry, glass aesthetics and fluency as a museum visitor. This study tried to arrive at an understanding of how one’s knowledge and background would shape engagement and consequently the conversation in these spaces. In a sense, they sought an understanding of expert versus novice talk in relation to the thematic topic of the exhibition.

To investigate how ‘identity’ informed discussion, in this particular study Fienberg and Leinhardt observed 10 visitor groups, five of which were a purposive sample possessing high levels of these identity characteristics. The remaining five were randomly selected on site at the museum. Like Allen (2002), participants were given recording devices in a bag worn around their waists as they toured the exhibit and researchers recorded their movements and objects discussed covertly on an observation schedule. Pre- and post-visit interviews were conducted with visitor groups, and these data were used to map identity ‘levels’ for those participants selected randomly on site. The conversational data was coded using conversation analysis to capture the functions of talk, which in this study included identifying objects, expansion talk and evaluative talk. At a higher level, chunks of extended talk were coded for talk that functioned to analyse, synthesize and explain. In order to unpack the effect of identity on conversation, another layer of analysis examined those instances of extended talk, the objects this talk referred to and the relationship to the identity characteristics of the discussants.

They found that a disproportionate amount of the talk was coded as identification, which they argued could be evidence of a pragmatic feature of the discourse in museums, whereby the need for orienting conversational partners to the object of discussion is particularly needed. Less than half of talk was classified as higher order, e.g. expansion, evaluation and explanation. With respect to identity, comparison of high and low glass knowledge groups show the same overall pattern of talk, however, those with more prior knowledge were more likely to engage in extended discussion. They analysed these extended discussions for content to understand what affordances higher levels of ‘identity’ facilitated. They found that individuals more knowledgeable about the thematic content were more likely to
discuss technology and history than those coded as less knowledgeable. The less proficient visitors tended to focus their discussion on topics such as aesthetics, which the authors suggest required less technical expertise.

A comparison of high and low glass knowledge groups showed that low groups were more likely to talk that relayed personal narratives in their discussion of topics, a finding that I will return to in the discussion of the present study’s data. They also found that ‘low’ group’s extended discussion contained a substantial amount of synthesizing. The researchers concluded that overall expert and novices talk about exhibitions in similar ways, however background characteristics might influence learning outcomes of museum visits, as those with higher levels of knowledge are more likely to engage in more sophisticated, extended discussion. The finding that much of the extended discussion of the low groups functions to synthesize seems to suggest that this is process relied upon for groups assimilating foundational knowledge about thematic content.

Stainton (2002) and Leinhardt, Tittle, and Knutson (2002) conducted similar studies of the features of expert versus novice talk. Leinhardt, Tittle and Knutson, however, narrowed their analytic focus to expert talk. This study concerns itself with internal dialog made external through diary entries about museum visits. With a purposive sample of 15 individuals, known to the researchers and classified as regular museum visitors, participants were tasked with visiting 5 museums over the course of a six-month period and to keep diary entries of those visits. Structural analysis of these externalized internal dialogues parsed diaries into meaning units, such as ‘orientation’, ‘interpretive concept’, ‘main point’. They analysed relationship between the purpose of visits and the talk about those visits, directed versus exploratory time-killing. In addition, structural analysis of diaries coded for idea units for type of ‘cognitive tools’, in Greeno terms (1991), used to make meaning about museum visits, e.g. narrative, like Fienberg and Leinhardt (2002), analysis, argument, description or an integrated combination of these tools.

The authors suggest that identity, as conceptualized by the researchers as relational attributes with respect to thematic content of exhibitions, as well as what I would
argue could be a more psychological conceptualization of the self-concept, drove meaning making about objects and exhibitions. One of the characteristics of these entries is, according to the researchers, the personal nature of meaning making of participants as made evident through narratives.

Examining this last finding in more depth, Paris and Mercer hypothesized that museum visitors “seek and recognize features of themselves in the objects they encounter” (2002, p. 409). To test this hypothesis, they first conducted a pilot study in which 21 visitors to the Henry Ford Museum & Greenfield Village in Michigan, were shown a set of 5-8 photographs from the museums exhibits and asked to rate them on a scale from 1-5 on the extent to which these objects evoked features of identity, which in this study consists of five dimensions: gender, age/generation, ethnicity, self and family. They then conducted a study with a sample of 100 adult visitors to this museum and six photographs of objects from the collection, where participants were first asked to recall two of the most salient objects or exhibits in the museums, then asked to rate them on the same identity dimensions as the pilot study. 46 agreed to participate in a structured interview that was recorded. The interview schedule sought to elicit whether the museum visit had confirmed, disconfirmed or elaborated on dimensions of their identity. The predominant dimensions of identity that emerged from this study in this particular museum were found to be self, family and age/generation, which was more salient to the older visitors in comparison to the younger participants.

The second study, sharing the same hypothesis, utilized more open-ended methods to confirm the results of the previous study. They presented 51 participants 24 photographs of objects and were asked to classify them, using any typology they chose. They then randomly assigned participants to a prompt, which asked them to sort the photographs using one of dimensions of identity of the previous studies, identifying exemplars and non-exemplars of this dimension. They found that in the free-sort task 80% of the participants classified the photographs into categories that were related to ‘form and function’, e.g. transportation, with reference to some of the identity dimensions, while 20% of the participants used categories that the researchers describe as idiosyncratic in nature. The identity prompt data showed that
participants had a high level of fluency in connecting objects to these identity dimensions. This data also show that participants who had no personal narrative that related to objects, rated them low on their scales for identity dimensions.

While Paris and Mercer (2002) provide evidence for how individuals find self in objects, however, another study of identity in museum learning, McLean and Cooke (2000) provides evidence for how museums function to construct visitor identities. Against the backdrop of devolved Scotland and the founding of a national museum, the Museum of Scotland, McLean and Cooke (2000) investigated the interplay between national identity and self-concept, through an exit survey of visitor perceptions to the Museum of Scotland’s collection aimed at advancing a national narrative. Qualitative analysis of visitor responses suggest that visitors perceived the museum’s collection and displays as constructing a national identity, but rather than simple models of communication discussed earlier in the chapter conveying a singular narrative of Scotland, the participants in the study perceived the collection, architecture and display as one that enabled them construct an understanding of a Scottish identity (2000, p. 153). The researchers posit that museums like this may serve to produce identity, but visitors have the agency to negotiate and consume those social identities. They argue that “the museum can be seen as a place where people go to actively make and remake their identities, to selectively select and reject and manipulate the images and identities found within” (McLean & Cooke, 2000, p. 150).

While these studies of identity and museum learning seem to differ in their definitions of identity (identity as knowledge vs. social identities) and their theoretical orientation (identity as fixed state or traits vs. self as a reflexive project), together this collection of studies highlights how identity, however defined, shapes learning outcomes in museums. They seem to suggest that museum visitors actively construct meaning about objects and collections both through self as well as for self. That is, that self can be understood through engagement with objects and that objects can be understood through connections made to self and other.
4.3.2 Conceptual change through talk in museums

Another series of studies investigate how museums contribute to changes in prior conceptualizations of phenomena. These studies examine the role of prior knowledge and knowledge construction and reconstruction through active engagement in museums.

Leinhardt & Gregg’s (2002) study of pre-service teachers visiting the Birmingham Civil Rights Museum investigates how a museum visit and discussion could increase knowledge and conceptual understanding of the Civil Rights Movement. 50 pre-service teachers drew pre-visit concept maps on the central concepts in relation to the Civil Rights Movement. This was followed by group discussions on the Civil Rights movement, then a museum visit in two groups of 25 for a total of four hours. After visiting the museum, they participated in another group discussion, and finally completed another concept map on the same topic.

Analyses of the pre- and post-visit discussions with pre- and post-visit concept maps showed that the pre-service teachers increased their knowledge about the civil rights movement, made evident through more extended concept maps. In addition, conceptual understandings were developed further, as evidenced through greater complexity of connections and relationships on concept maps. The researchers note that discussion moved from a more superficial listing-type talk to more deep and personally connected talk, which provides further evidence of the personal/identity connections that seem to characterize conversations in museums. The study provides evidence for how understanding of the exhibit was enhanced through discussion with peers.

Crowley and Jacobs (2002) explored family learning conversations in museums, specifically investigating how family conversations scaffold learning about novel concepts and concepts about which individuals have some prior knowledge. They hypothesized that conversational interaction between parent and child contributes to building up, what they refer to as, ‘islands of expertise’. These are topics that children are highly interested in and seem to have a lot of knowledge and deep understandings of.
They conducted an experiment in Pittsburgh’s Children’s Museum in which 28 families were asked to interact with fossils (authentic and replicas). Index cards with information about objects were provide, e.g. name, age and excavation site. Following the discussion of fossils, the parents completed a questionnaire while the children participated in a post-test interview, where they identified the fossils. Parent-child conversations were recorded and analysed for conversational functions, which were analysed in relation to post-test interviews to determine relationships between differing levels of these conversational functions and outcomes on the post-test.

They found that higher levels of parental mediation talk about fossils was correlated with larger gains on the post-test identification task for children. While analyses show that parents used a range of types of mediation in their discussions with children, the type of talk that was associated with the most gains was talk that connected back to shared experiences.

The above studies provide evidence for the ways in which discussion in museums about objects can develop conceptual understandings about phenomena. Discussions in museums can both lead to more learning about a museums’ thematic content, as well as help to develop more sophisticated understandings of content through the negotiation of meaning in dialogue with peers and more capable others.

One of the limitations of the MLC research program is that recruitment methods for participants are limited to visitors, the so-called regular museum visitor, so it does not seek an understanding of those less likely to attend museums and the shape of those experiences. In addition, research participants were limited to native-like speakers of English, so these studies do not provide an understanding of the similarities and differences of dialogue in museums in and through a language being acquired, the ways in which learning talk through a second language contributes to identity development or the ways in which identities of second language learners shape learning talk and interpretation in museums. In addition, because these studies focus on native-like speakers of English, it is not clear the ways in which learning
talk in museums contributes to shifts in conceptual understandings about thematic content and about language itself.

In the following section, I will discuss the findings of this systematic review of the literature and their implications for the present investigation of EiM.
5 Implications of the Review of the Literature
The previous two chapters have reported on the findings of a synthetic review of the literature in order to provide an empirical basis for the present investigation of EiM in the context of social inclusion. In this chapter, I will discuss these findings, considering their implications for the present study of EiM.

5.1 Social inclusion and Social Space
As ESOL provision in museums has emerged out of the context of social inclusion policy that aims to combat social exclusion by developing programs that are targeted towards groups at risk of marginalization, the first question that the review sought to examine was:

- What is currently known about this target group of learners with respect to learning and social inclusion/exclusion?

The review comprised studies investigating individual learner differences, specifically socially situated learning of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers learning the majority language of their respective migration context. While none of these studies examine social exclusion or inclusion by design, the findings of these investigations point to the impact of these processes on identity, participation and acquisition of the target language. In doing so, they help to explicate a working definition of social exclusion and inclusion with respect to these target learners.

The literature reviewed suggests that social exclusion could be defined as a lack of (or limited) social space within which immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers can speak and be heard, which can be manifested through institutional practices and processes as well as interactional practices and processes. Social inclusion, as the literature seems to suggest, is the inverse, characterized by access to social space for linguistic production and reception, in which natural second language acquisition of talk is possible. Like exclusion, the literature seems to suggest that social inclusion in relation to immigrants, refugee and asylum seeker learners of a second language can be manifested through institutional and interactional practices and processes. Thus, a situated understanding of second language acquisition would be one that considers
social inclusion and exclusion by way of access to opportunities for linguistic production and reception.

Some studies provide evidence of the benefits of being included on linguistic production and acquisition (Baynham, et al., 2007; Gill, 2007). Baynham, et al. report that when the social space was opened in an ESOL class, the talk produced by learners was more sophisticated and lexically dense than teacher-led talk, although they report there was no statistically significant difference in curriculum-specific outcomes in classes where social space was opened. Gill, however, in a case study of one learner shows growth within discourse over time, observing one learners’ discussion over a 5 week period, in which utterances became more complex, drawing on a wider lexicon and speech acts at the end of the observation period. Both studies point to the significance of inclusion on linguistic development, but more evidence is needed in order to make this claim with greater confidence.

Many of the studies reviewed point to the negative impact of social exclusion on identities, agency and participation. However of the studies whose findings seem to report on the impact of inclusion on discourse and discourse development, there is no evidence of how this process impacts identities, agency and participation. If we consider social inclusion to be the inverse of social exclusion, will we find similar trends such as a positive relationship between being included and identity, agency and participation? More data is needed to explore these questions.

### 5.2 Social Space in museums, but to what end?

Examining the research in museums on social inclusion, the second question this review sought address was:

- What is known about the impact of social inclusion in museums on groups these programs aim to include?

While a lot of efforts have been documented on ways to promote social inclusion, which could be summarized as increased access, there is far less evidence on the impact of these efforts on the individuals these programs aim to include.
Hooper-Greenhill et al.’s large-scale evaluation studies (Hooper-Greenhill, 2004, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill, et al., 2002; Hooper-Greenhill, Dodd, Phillips, Jones, et al., 2004) provide indicators of increased access using postcode indices of deprivation. These data suggest that we have some evidence that museums are working to create social space with increased access to collections and educational resources, however there is limited data that explicates the impact of inclusion on the individuals these programs aim to include. More evidence is needed at the micro-level that examines what being included in museums means to the individuals targeted.

Case studies embedded within the larger RCMG evaluation studies report that social inclusion in museums lead to an increased sense of belonging, however sample sizes were small and design issues might contribute to bias in some of the results. Other studies (e.g. Newman & McLean, 2006; Newman, et al., 2005) indicate wide ranging impacts, such as self esteem, identity development and active citizenship. However, I would suggest that more data is needed to examine the micro-level impact of social inclusion in museums, such that the mechanisms that lead to these impacts is better understood, so as to provide sound empirically grounded evidence of the kind that could help explicate what the impact of EiM might be for immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers.

5.3 Cognitive and discourse development through discussion in museums

The final question that this synthetic review of the literature aimed to explore was:

- What is known about the relationship of discourse and learning in museums?

A body of research on learning in museums, with a Vygotskian orientation, has taken as its unit of analysis discourse, first to characterize talk in museums and second to investigate process outcomes (Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004). This research was examined to consider evidence that might help to explicate, or build an understanding of, the effects of ESOL discussion in museums on immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers.
There are several important findings these studies report that are significant to the present investigation. First, these studies show that talk in museums, between dyads, groups and the self, is oriented toward learning. Second, people draw on their prior knowledge (referred to as identity, in this body of research) as a resource for discussion to aid their interpretation and meaning making about collections. Third, talk in museums in groups and dyads can lead to conceptual change about phenomena represented in museum collections. These findings seem to suggest that learning about museum collections is possible when participating in discussion in museums. These findings, and those reported on by Gill’s (2007) single subject case-study, suggest that discussion in museums might lead to development in the discourse itself by participation in discussions, although more evidence is needed in order fully advance this claim. These findings also suggest that museum educators and ESOL practitioners alike could draw on individuals’ prior knowledge in order to facilitate engagement in discussion in museums about collections.

In order to fully understand second language learning in museums, more data is needed of second language learners’ talk in order to understand what happens in talk and what the affordances of museums for second language learner development might be.

5.4 Implications for an investigation of ESOL in museums

There are several implications for a study of EiM that the literature has helped to identify. First, more evidence is needed of the impact of social inclusion (in any learning context) on language learners. In addition, given what we know about the impact of social exclusion on identity, agency and participation, the impact of social inclusion on these factors needs to be researched. With respect to museum learning contexts, there is a paucity of micro-level data that helps to explicate what it means to be included in these contexts with respect to the voices of those these kinds of agendas aim to include. Future research on social inclusion in museums, should help to fill in the gap with objective empirical evidence that helps advance an understanding of the affordances or disadvantages of social inclusion, so as to advance social science, as well as to provide more data upon which policy and
practices could be grounded. Research that works towards this aim, could help to explicate the mechanisms that lead to the kind of impacts reported on in the literature. Studies of discourse in museums have provided evidence of powerful cognitive effects through participation in discussion in museums. In order to provide an understanding of benefits of EiM, more evidence is needed of linguistic growth as an outcome of participation in discussions in museums. Finally, in order to help unpack EiM, future research should seek to characterize the ESOL talk in museums, its affordances and the mechanisms that might enable learning talk or barriers to learning talk.

5.4.1 Research Aims, Objectives and Questions
In this section I will identify the broad aims of the project, research objectives, and questions. Following Blaikie (2000), the research objectives will explicate the kind of knowledge that needs to be generated in order achieve the research aims. Research questions will establish the scope of this investigation.

_Aim 1_: To understand the impact of social inclusion through EiM targeted towards immigrants, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers.

_Objective 1_: Develop an understanding of the target learners’ experiences of social exclusion and how these experiences change or remain the same over the course of the research. Develop an explanation for this change/stasis.

_Aim 2_: To understand the affordances of EiM for the target group of learners and its relationship to perceptions of social exclusion and inclusion and English language use.

_Objective 2_: Develop an understanding of participants’ perceptions of EiM and their behaviour in EiM.

_Objective 3_: Develop an understanding of the target group of learners’ experiences of participation in dialogue in museums
Aim 3: To develop resources for ESOL teachers and museum educators to inform their practice.

* Under aim 3, all of aforementioned objectives will have contributed to the generation of knowledge about EiM for immigrants, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers that will inform improvement to the course and materials developed for this study.

The above objectives have been blended into the following research questions:

1. What have been the learners’ experiences of exclusion and inclusion since migrating to the UK?
   a. How do these experiences interface with their English language abilities?
2. What are the learners’ views of the effects of their participation in the ESOL in museums provision in terms of exclusion/inclusion?
   a. What might be the policy, provision and practice implications of these views?
3. What occurs in interaction during ESOL in museums?

In the following chapters, I will outline the research design and conceptual framework that has informed the design and conduct of this study.
PART II: Methodology

6 Overview
The previous chapters have outlined the problem space of the current investigation: understanding language learning and social inclusion in the context of museums. Systematic review of the literature has identified areas where more data is clearly needed to understand the affordances of museums for social inclusion in general, and social inclusion through language learning specifically. In addition, more evidence is needed of the impact of inclusion on the individuals’ educational programs such as those who are at the centre of this study.

In this section, I will outline the approach I have taken to the present investigation, which will seek to examine these issues. This section will begin with the design, data collection and analytical approach taken, and will outline the research strategy, ontological and epistemological positions, aims and objectives of the research and questions guiding the empirical inquiry. This will be followed by a discussion of the conceptual framework that informs this investigation.

The subsequent section will explicate the methodological approach and conduct of the data collection. I will begin by first considering the implications of my conceptual framework on the methodological approach and conduct of data collection. This will be followed by an outline of data sources, types and forms, and the criteria used to select research participants and ethical considerations for the conduct of research with human subjects. I will then discuss in depth the analytical approach used to examine the data.
6.1 Research Design

In this chapter I will discuss the research design of the present investigation, outlining the research strategy, locale, target population and data sources. As all these design choices have been informed by my ontological and epistemological positions, I will begin this chapter by highlighting the views taken about what can be known about social phenomena, what counts as knowledge and how it can be investigated.

6.1.1 Ontology and Epistemology

The present study seeks to understand the benefits of language learning in museums, with particular focus on better understanding affordances within talk and its impact on individuals’ agency and identities. This means understanding experiences of social exclusion and inclusion, and how the museum experience might facilitate inclusion.

The ontological position being taken is a relativist one. That is, the assumption of what can be known about social inclusion in museums through ESOL programs with this target group of learners can be generated from the learners and educators themselves (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, pp. 110-111). In addition, this research is hinged upon a social constructivist epistemological position that suggests that the nature of knowledge production is socially constructed and therefore subjective. It is for these reasons that I have chosen to work within a qualitative research paradigm utilizing qualitative methods of investigation. Hakim argues that one of the advantages of a qualitative research paradigm is that it has the potential to provide in-depth understandings of people’s perceptions, perspectives and meanings (Hakim, 2000, p. 35).

In this section, I will outline the ontological and epistemological stances that guide the design of the present study. In chapter 8, I will revisit these views, considering their implications at the level of data collection and analysis in my discussion of the conduct of the study.
6.1.2 Research Strategy: Action Research

As the review in the previous chapters has highlighted, investigating social inclusion of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in the context of museums is a new area of both practice and inquiry. It is for this reason that this study, which will be described shortly in greater detail, was conducted in several phases, or cycles. This is one of the primary reasons for using Action Research as a strategy for the conduct of this study. The cyclical nature of action research, Lewin argues, does not make investigations using this research strategy “less scientific” but rather, akin to the developmental approach of scientific enquiry undertaken by engineers (1946, p. 35).

The growing number of studies in education, educational psychology and the learning sciences utilizing this iterative approach to inquiry, also referred to as design-based research strategies, provides some support for this paradigm as a powerful one for the development of teaching practice and practice-based theory in general (Barab & Squire, 2004; Cobb, Confrey, Disessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003; Sandoval & Bell, 2004).

Action research is an abductive research strategy, that is, one where knowledge about social phenomena is generated from research participants themselves (Blaikie, 2000, p. 114). One of the key principles of action research is that it helps to “assist people in extending their understanding of their situation and thus resolve problems that confront them” (Somekh, 2006; Stringer, 1996, p. 9). In this case, knowledge that is generated from individuals could provide insight into their experiences of language learning, social inclusion/exclusion and museums. These perspectives could be used to help guide action with respect to future ESOL programs within museum contexts as well as being potentially instrumental in shaping learners’ approaches to their own learning.

Another key principle of action research, which also functions as a principle reason for working within this research paradigm, is the view that “those whose lives are affected by the problem under study--should be engaged in the processes of investigation” (Stringer, 1996, p. 10). It is an approach to inquiry that aims to account for macro and micro-level factors that influence the research process, such as: history, culture, emotions and inter-subjective dynamics (Stringer, 1996). In this
respect, the researcher’s role in research is not a privileged one, but rather, researchers and researched are co-investigators, collaboratively constructing knowledge about the phenomena under study. This is a critical point, that I will return to in my discussion of analytical tools, as I have striven in this research to re-present the data in such a way that the voice of the researched, and interpretations derived from participant accounts were grounded in their expressions of experience, rather than solely that of the researcher’s.

This study operates at the micro-level, to understand and analyse individual perceptions, while taking into account macro-level contextual factors that shape them. There has been a generous amount of macro-level research regarding social exclusion and museums, some of which has been referred to in previous sections. This current project will aim to provide the foundations upon which micro-level understandings of social inclusion in museums might be derived. A micro-level analysis might help to generate knowledge about ESOL provision in museums that could aid practitioners in their efforts to promote social inclusion.

It is for the above reasons that a positivist paradigm would be unsatisfactory for this investigation, as it may not be able to provide the kind of insight into individuals’ lived experiences that might come from direct engagement with research participants. Again, the social constructivist view of knowledge and its production taken in this investigation does not claim objectivity, but rather acknowledges the subjective nature of knowledge and its production, and seeks to engage the researched in the production of what Lewin refers to as ‘actionable’ knowledge (1946).

This study is small scale by design, and seeks an in-depth understanding and analysis of the EiM. Due to the uniqueness of locale and target participants, it might not be possible to generalize the findings across all contexts. However, as it has been argued, instrumental case studies can help constitute an integral part of knowledge generation about phenomena that can lead to generalization through replication and comparison in future studies (Bechhofer & Paterson, 2000). This study hopes to contribute to what might become a corpus of evidence on EiM and social inclusion.
that, with other case studies, might help to provide a cumulative understanding of
this process of learning, towards generalizability of the findings.

6.1.3 Locale
The topic of this research has broadly pre-determined the choice of locale and target
population for this study, which I will discuss in this section.

Following Bechhofer & Paterson (2000, p. 51), I have attempted to utilize both
theory and utility to determine my choice of locale. In terms of theory, a UK context
was selected for this study given the socio-political context discussed in chapter 1.
While EiM (or target language learning in other linguistic contexts) is becoming
increasingly pervasive in museums around the world, the question of how EiM
contributes to, or supports, social inclusion for excluded individuals, is largely
unanswered. This question is particularly relevant to the UK context, which has
adopted and advanced this type of educational initiative towards combating social
exclusion.

In particular, Scotland was selected as the location within the UK to conduct this
study because of the immigration changes at the time this study was being designed
(Institute for Public Policy Research, 2005; Lewis, 2006, p. 8). Scotland was in the
midst of demographic changes that were a product of enlargement of the EU, and
with that, freedom of movement, and asylum dispersal policy, which had begun
dispersing asylum seekers to Scotland’s cities from 2000. Demographic changes had
an impact on educational provision, which had until then only served a small
minority of immigrants (Scottish Executive, 2005). In addition to education,
demographic changes, such as swift settlement of 2000+ refugees in Scotland, when
the Home Office’s asylum dispersal policy changed, had implications for social
cohesion, in what had until then been a largely homogeneous country in terms of
racial groups (Institute for Public Policy Research, 2005; Lewis, 2006). One of the
efforts instituted to promote social cohesion in light of the new diversity that
immigration created was the Scottish Government’s 2000 Race Relations
(Amendment) Act, which sought to eradicate racism and promote equality in
Scotland (Scottish Government, 2000).
In terms of utility, Edinburgh was chosen as a locale for reasons of accessibility, primarily because this was my place of study, and secondly because the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries agreed to partner with me, in order to better understand educational provision for underserved and underrepresented visitors. The City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries’ main remit is to conserve, display and provide educational programs about art and artefacts of the culture and peoples of Edinburgh. While much of the discourse on museums and identity has centred on the national museum context and its relationship to the populace, it could also be argued that the so-called ‘civic museum’ (Wittlin, 1949) fulfils a similar role with respect to the community in which it serves, which would make these museums an important space for an investigation of this kind. With the theme of local culture and history, these collections were viewed as ideal for the wealth of resources they could offer as learning content for new communities of Edinburgh to engage with.

While the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries, has a history of outreach (working with the local community to construct and display collections about the local history (Marwick, 1995), these museums and galleries remain under-attended by immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers (2003, 2007, 2010). National statistics of museum visiting, which would include both local authority and national museums, show that museums have low attendance in general by the target population of this study (Scottish Government & Office of National Statistics, 2009), representing a need for museums to build their capacity for this kind of inclusion work. Before this study was conducted, the City of Edinburgh Council Museums had commissioned the design of ESOL materials for use with their galleries by a local ESOL instructor, but at the time this research was conducted, those materials had not yet been implemented.

### 6.1.4 Target Population
Like locale, the target population of this study has largely been shaped by the topic of this investigation. The target population identified for this study were adults immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, who are learners of English (possessing a
mother tongue other than English language), who have migrated to the UK with plans to remain for several years. I will discuss all of the above criterion in turn.

Firstly, this study targets adults, as opposed to children, primarily because adults fall outside school-based provision aimed at providing social inclusion. That is to say, adult learners of English who migrate to the UK might be at greater risk of social exclusion because of lack of opportunities to engage in and through the language (e.g. as the studies reviewed in chapter 3 have reported (Ager & Strang, 2008; Liversage, 2009; Norton, 2000). While children may no less be as socially excluded as adults upon arrival, it could be argued that school-based inclusive provision, and English medium instruction may give children a greater advantage over adults with respect to language learning and social inclusion post-migration.

Secondly, this study targets adult learners of English. As the focus of the study is to understand EiM and its impact, engagement of adult ESOL learners as research participants would be critical to shed light on these lived experiences. Previous studies of social inclusion and EiM (reviewed in the previous section) have privileged the voice of museum educators and community workers and secondary data sources, over the subjects that directly experience exclusion or inclusion. This study takes the view that an understanding of social inclusion and exclusion and EiM can best be generated from ESOL learners directly.

Thirdly, this study targets immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers inclusively in order to gain insight into EiM. While it is recognized that adult immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers represent a range of reasons for migration, which may have differing implications for their respective post-migration settlement, this research recognizes these populations collectively represent precisely the populations at risk of social exclusion, as identified in the literature. In addition, these are the populations served by adult ESOL provision in community-based settings. These groups are more likely to access community-based ESOL provision rather than formal ESOL because other services are tied to these programs, aimed at fostering wider participation (e.g. crèche provision, evening classes). Thus, while the range of immigrant statuses might represent nuanced experiences of post-migration
settlement, collectively, through case study methodology, this target population might help to shed light on some of the differences and similarities of experiences post-migration.

Finally, this research targets adult ESOL learners who have migrated with intentions of staying in the UK for several years. This criterion, seeks to distinguish the sample from other groups of adult ESOL learners in the UK, such as international students and transnationals. While broader discourses and integration are outside the scope of the present investigation, this research recognizes that immigration status may impact intentions, needs and use of language. As a former expatriate for some years in Asia, I would argue that target language proficiency and social inclusion are important for people for all types of immigration statuses. However, this study focuses on those with some intention to remain, as it represents a critical challenge for social cohesion in the present and future generations in the migration context. In addition, research shows that transnationals and international students often maintain stronger ties to their home countries, which results in less engagement with the migration context’s local community (Harris, Leung, & Rampton, 2002).

### 6.1.5 Data Sources

For this research, I will draw primarily from primary sources of data, with some secondary sources for contextual data. Primary sources of data will be collected in both ‘natural’ settings through participant observation and ‘semi-natural’ settings through interviews and focus groups (Blaikie, 2000).

Observation enables an investigation of social phenomena *in situ*. In this sense, observation enables access to social phenomena that may not be accessible through self-report or conditions constructed in laboratory settings. Self-report data sources, such as interviews and focus groups, provide a different kind of insight into social phenomena, that which is comprised of layers of interpretation on the part of research participants. Observation, contrastingly, provides an account independent of participants’ interpretations, but can also be used to gain greater insight into participant accounts. Other studies of social exclusion, adult ESOL and museum learning, with the exception of Block (2007b), have drawn either from data sources in semi-natural settings (e.g. interviews and other self-report methods used in
Hooper-Greenhill, 2007; Liversage, 2009; Norton, 2000) or natural settings (e.g. observation in Broeder, et al., 1996; Gill, 2007; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004) to understand the phenomena under study. This study, like Block, aims to use both observation and self-report towards a greater understanding of EiM and its impact. Observations of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers participating in adult ESOL (phase 1) and adult EiM (phases 2 and 3) will be used to gain insight into these kinds of educational opportunities in action.

As the literature review has reported, some studies have used secondary data sources, such as postcodes of visitors, as indices of social exclusion/inclusion. The present investigation takes the view that social inclusion can best be understood directly through accounts of those that experience social inclusion (and exclusion). Interviews and focus groups allow for an understanding of the depth of experience of the target participants. Following McAdams (2006), I consider the need to interpret experience a fundamental aspect of the human condition, which can be accessed through interviews and focus groups. However, it is recognized that self-report does not constitute reality itself, but rather an account, or interpretation, of lived experience.

In addition to primary data sources, some secondary sources will be utilized to generate an understanding about the context, the learners, previous initiatives and experiences (Stringer, 1996, p. 67). I will utilize resources developed by the museums’ educators for adult learners, and explore in greater detail resources developed for the purposes of English language learning within these contexts. I will also review ESOL materials developed for immigrants, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers that are used in CE and FE settings. In addition, I will make use of the findings from visitor surveys conducted about City of Edinburgh Museums’ visitation (Audience business, 2003; 2007).

6.1.6 Triangulation

Yin argues that the construct validity and reliability of a case can be founded upon two main aspects of data collection: triangulation of data sources and thorough management of the data that has been collected (Yin, 1994). Triangulation allows one to examine the same phenomena in multiple sources of data. Multiple data
sources, as described above, will be used to examine EiM, including: interviews, focus groups, observations, and fieldnotes.

Interviews and focus groups provide insight into individual’s interpretations of their experiences. Interview data triangulation with observations of the experiences reported on provides the researcher with greater contextual information, but also further insights into research participants’ interpretations of lived experiences. Likewise, observation as the sole data source could only provide insight into events, but no understanding of participants’ interpretations. Triangulation enables enhanced understanding of phenomena under study through analysis of the same questions with respect to multiple data sources.

6.1.7 Limitations and further considerations
There are several potential limitations of the data sources and types identified above. First, linguistic barriers might pose limitations with respect to data accessed through self-report methods. I proposed to conduct interviews and focus groups in English, which will be a language that the target participant is acquiring. The ontological challenge that presents itself is whether accounts provided in a language that one is not yet fluent in, could adequately constitute an individual’s full account of their experiences.

Alternative options include photo-elicitation and interviewing participants in their mother tongue. With respect to photo-elicitation, Gallo’s study of immigrant learners’ experiences used this method in order gain insight into their lived experience (Gallo, 2001; Gallo, 2002), reporting that this approach afforded rich data sources of experiences. I would argue that while this approach might privilege the participant expressions of experience, it might rely too heavily on the ability (or skill) to communicate via visual means. In addition, without explicit words of the researched from which to ground interpretations, this type of data source might give license to interpretations well outside those of the researched. In this sense, this type of data source might create, what I would argue as too much space for a researcher’s own history, culture and experience to influence their analysis and interpretation of the data. Interviewing participants in their mother tongue, on the other hand, might prove extremely costly, as the target population for the present investigation includes
a diversity of language backgrounds. It is for these reasons that, albeit its limitations, this study will use English as the medium for interviews and focus groups.

Another limitation with the respect to the data sources selected for this study, is that of temporality. This research seeks an understanding of adult immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers experience using English in Scotland, thus elicits an account of events in the past, in the present. One could argue that this particular question relies far too heavily on memory encoding and retrieval. In Norton’s study of adult immigrant women learning English in Canada, her research participants kept a learner diaries to document their engagement with the language as they experienced it (Norton, 2000). This approach has the advantage of eliciting salient experiences from participants, as the task is longitudinal, which might over time raise participants awareness of experiences for the purposes of recording them. However, one of the limitations is its reliance on writing proficiency, which for some learners may not be possible. Block’s (2007) study gets closer, temporally speaking, to the experiences that are the focus of his study. For his study of post-migration experiences of language use, he asked participants to self-record their interactions in the target language as they occurred at home and in their leisure time. This produced some rich data on his case study that would otherwise not have been accessible. However, it does present a question of sampling, when data is recorded without the researcher, which raises questions of authenticity of the data. In addition, this also presents an expensive solution, as depending on the participant sample size, equipment and data processing costs might prove exorbitant, both in terms of time and money.

Studies of narrative, which, as an approach, will be reviewed in a subsequent chapter, provide evidence of the ubiquitous nature of storytelling about ones’ experience, in which salient experiences are encoded and interpreted by individuals. Thus, the present investigation will rely on self-report to elicit interpretations of the past events in the present.

6.2 Analytical Tools: Grounded Theory

Action Research is used as a research strategy to guide the development of provision in museums for the target group of learners. As I have mentioned, the research was
conducted in three cycles, the final cycle examines implementation of EiM for this population of learners in-depth. In this phase, and in the tradition of most qualitative research, it was my interest to generate an understanding of the issues being investigated from the data itself. That is, I approach the data guided by overarching theory and a conceptual framework (which I will discuss in the following chapter), and induce, *a posteriori*, an understanding of the phenomena under study from the data, rather than testing *a priori* hypotheses, what Glaser and Strauss refer to as *grounded theory* (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; and later modified in Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

The present study is informed by the latter reformulation of grounded theory developed by Strauss and Corbin (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). According to Corbin and Strauss, the aim of grounded theory is induce from empirical data “a theoretical explanation by specifying phenomena in terms of conditions that give rise to them, how they are expressed through action/interaction, the consequences that result from them, and variations of these qualifiers” (1990, p. 9). Grounded theory is an approach that builds into analysis three fundamental features for qualitative analysis: induction, rigour, and generalizability.

### 6.2.1 Induction

In a study like the present investigation, where *understanding* rather than *confirmation* guides the design and investigation, a departure from positivist deductive approaches to analysis is necessary. It is the direction of theorizing that distinguishes these approaches.

Deduction, used in positivist confirmatory studies, begins with grand theory, from which hypotheses about social phenomena are generated and tested in order to prove or disprove them. Thus deductive analysis seeks to fit data to theory. Contrastingly, induction, the analytical approach of grounded theory that was used in this investigation, generates theory from data. That is not to say that grounded theory studies are absent of theoretical conceptions of the social world by design, but rather grand theory serves as a conceptual framework from which investigations are designed. Glaser and Strauss argued fervently that grand theory needs to be interrogated, tested and elaborated on through empirical study (1967). They argued
that grand theories by the grand theorists of sociology had constrained the field, leaving it at a veritable standstill in terms of theoretical explanations of the social world. They urged the field, in their 1967 publication, to induce theoretical explanations of the social world from data, which might then inform macro-level explanations of the social world. Induction begins with some ideas of the social world that shape the design and sampling for the study, but theory about the phenomena under study is the product of the research. The research process is one where the concepts and themes are derived phenomenologically through systematic analysis of the data, from the ‘ground’ up as it were.

### 6.2.2 Rigour

The way in which theory is generated in grounded theory is through systematic coding of phenomena observed in the data. Inductive coding, starting with open coding, then clustering open codes into concepts and categories, allows the data to ‘speak’. Codes, concepts and categories require the researcher to describe features of the data as it appears in the dataset. Thus, inductive analysis using grounded theory pins down interpretations of the data and ties it to the data itself. It is this pinning down of interpretation, that Mishler argues, can help to facilitate the same level of rigour in qualitative analysis that is associated with quantitative analysis (Mishler, 1990).

### 6.2.3 Generalizability

Eisenhardt (2002) argues that one of the strengths of developing theory inductively is that it is possible to develop ‘novel’ theory, of which its constructs and hypotheses can be verified to test how it generalizes to other data, thus the theory generated is empirically valid. Thus the strength, or significance, measures used in scientific experimental studies, takes a new shape in grounded theory and qualitative research.

One of standard arguments against the value of qualitative enquiry, is whether it can generate adequate explanation if it cannot make claims of generalizability (Giddens, 1984). Generalizability, Corbin and Strauss (1990) argue, can be achieved by systematic examination of how concepts and theories generated through this inductive analytical approach generalize across different samples of the data. Generalizability, by their definition is the extent to which concepts, their conditions,
interaction and consequence are consistent across the dataset. A single instance of particular phenomena in the data, does not qualify as evidence, in this respect, but multiple instances that take the same shape and form, would. Grounded theory specifies the conditions under which particular phenomena are observed, thus it may be possible to generalize across populations, should those conditions be identical.
7 Conceptual Framework

In terms of the broad conceptualization of my research, this study is about participation in adult learning and how such participation might relate to participation in the wider society. In this respect, the learners are seen as nested within a learning community, which in turn is situated within other larger communities and the wider society (Figure 7.1).

As mentioned in the first chapter, one of the strategic goals pursued through social inclusion is that it strives to build up an individual’s capacity to enable ‘full’ participation in the wider society (Levitas, et al., 2007). In the context of EiM, language learning targeted towards migrants, refugees and asylum seekers is an approach whereby the linguistic capacity of the target population is developed so as to enable individuals to participate in their local communities and wider society, e.g. through work and leisure into the workforce, economy, and the political system.

![Figure 7.1 Contextualized learner](image)

Given this, one of the goals of this research has been to develop a conceptual framework within which the interaction between these levels (the learner, learning community and the wider community and society) could be interpreted. More specifically, because interaction is framed through use of one’s linguistic resources, it was necessary to conceptualize this research within a framework that drew on relevant theories of social interaction. In this section therefore, I outline the

7.1 Contextualizing linguistic competence and performance

In this section, I discuss Bourdieu’s theory of social interaction, which emerges in response to Chomsky’s linguistic theory that sought to describe the requisite knowledge for linguistic production (1965). Bourdieu’s situated theory of social interaction, articulated through his concepts of symbolic capital and symbolic power (1977, 1989, 1991), help locate language and language production within its social and historical context, which I argue is critical for examining the interaction between the learner, the learning community and society. In the following section, I will begin by outlining the key aspects of Chomsky’s linguistic theory, then discuss Bourdieu’s elaboration and its implications for the present study.

7.1.1 Competence/Performance

Setting out a theory for the study of structural linguistics, Chomsky made the distinction between one’s linguistic competence and one’s linguistic performance, the former being a “speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language” and the latter one’s “actual use of language in concrete situations” (Chomsky, 1965, 4). Performance is what can be observed, but he argued that competence was the underlying structure that one masters and puts into production.

This distinction provided the modern foundation for structural linguistics, but also helped in conceptualizing language for pedagogical purposes, such as for teaching English language. To that end, one of this distinction’s most significant contributions has been in stimulating a debate on what linguistic competence consists of, resulting in range of taxonomies of the requisite knowledge for linguistic performance (Canale & Swain, 1980; Chomsky, 1965; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hymes, 1972; Widdowson, 1978).
Chomsky equated competence with grammar, arguing that grammar is a description of one's competence (Chomsky 1965, p. 4). Subsequent elaborations have made arguments in favour of expanding the scope of competence, arguing that grammatical competence is but one facet of knowledge of a language (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972). Some linguists have argued that sociolinguistic knowledge, such as one’s knowledge of appropriate utterances for specific speech events, are equally aspects of one’s knowledge of language (Hymes, 1972, 55). In addition, interactional aspects of communication, such as managing topic shifts, clarifying, and or asking for clarification, or what has been referred to as strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980), have also been classified as a component of one’s knowledge of a language, as they are part of what speaker-hearers do in communication.

Others have disputed the terminology Chomsky uses for these concepts. Hymes argues that Chomsky’s model idealizes speech and one of its central limitations is that it lacks consideration of sociocultural dimensions of communication. As an elaboration, he advances the notion of ‘communicative’ competence to conceptualize schematic knowledge of talk, positing that communication is inherently a social endeavour thus a theoretical framework of linguistic schemata must encompass knowledge of the social norms of linguistic production (Hymes, 1972).

These atomistic models of schematic knowledge of language have identified a range of sub-competencies that are thought to be a requisite for communication. The question that emerges is how these sub-competences relate to performance, that is, one’s use of a language.

Chomsky’s conceptualization of performance draws, one might argue, a rather straight line between one’s competence and one’s linguistic production. It would follow that if one possesses linguistic knowledge, then this knowledge could be mobilized into production of language for communicative purposes (a quite austere characterization of language for communication). However, he qualifies this characterization suggesting that such a linear connection would embody ‘ideal’ speaker-hearers and that natural language data show evidence that the connection is
not as straightforward, e.g. false starts and deviations in talk (Chomsky, 1965, 4). It should be noted here, that so-called un-ideal speaker-hearers were not the subject of his inquiry, however despite this, it still remains that this characterization of performance seems to be lacking an adequate description of the social and cultural context in which linguistic production occurs.

It is the sociocultural context of speech that Bourdieu analysed and subsequently theorized (Bourdieu 1977, 1989, 1991) in his critique of Chomsky’s competence/performance distinction, which forms part of the conceptual framework for this study. Bourdieu posits that social factors are fundamental to all linguistic exchanges and that language (and linguistic production) must be conceptualized in terms of the social conditions in which that production takes place. In his theory of the economics of social exchanges, he sets out three key dimensions that mediate the relationship between competence and linguistic performance that are relevant to this study: symbolic capital, relations of symbolic power, and legitimate language.

7.1.2 ‘The illusion of linguistic communism’: Legitimate Language
In outlining a theory of social interaction, Bourdieu challenges ‘the illusion of linguistic communism’, that is, the blanket assumption of a ‘universal’ and homogeneous speech community, engaging in universally accessible communication (Bourdieu, 1991, 40). Instead, he argues quite the opposite, positing that language is hardly neutral space for linguistic expression. Speech communities are comprised of a range of linguistic varieties and relations of power can imbue certain linguistic varieties with a more or less legitimate status. Varieties considered more legitimate can dominate a given speech community. In the context of second language learning, such as the Salvadorian women who attended community based ESOL in New York mentioned in Chapter 1, Bourdieu’s theory suggests that standard American English spoken by the majority of residents in this New York suburb would have a more legitimate status when spoken in this context. It also suggests that the Salvadorian women acquiring standard American English are positioned in discourse by way of their variety of standard American English. The closer their variety of Standard American English is to that of majority Standard American
English speakers, the more legitimate status their discourse would be given in conversational interaction.

It would follow then that individuals that speak varieties that have a higher or lesser value in a particular linguistic community would have a corresponding level of linguistic capital with respect to that speech community, or ‘market’, using Bourdieu’s economic metaphor. Conceptualizing language as symbolic power implies that linguistic capital can give voice or authority to certain speakers of what is considered ‘legitimate’ discourse and silence others whose value in relation to the linguistic market in light of the social structure, is deemed less legitimate or less valuable. Thus, any linguistic analysis would need to take into account the social conditions that mediate identities, linguistic production and the social space for that linguistic production (Bourdieu, 1977, 1989, 1991).

7.1.3 Symbolic Capital
With respect to competence, Bourdieu argues that symbolic capital, or linguistic capital, are more appropriate terms for linguistic competence as the meaning that it assumes in discourse is inextricably linked to a speaker-hearer’s position within the social structure. In a linguistic context where English is the lingua franca, such as English in the UK, L1 speakers of English are positioned as possessing more linguistic capital than their counterparts for whom English is not a mother tongue.

Against the backdrop of contemporary European transmigration, economic migration and asylum, cities are becoming increasingly heterogeneous speech communities, both with respect to linguistic varieties and diversity of languages spoken. As UK immigration policy moves towards a model where pre-entry language assessments operate as shibboleth tests for entry (McNamara, 2005), these types of processes function to place a particular value on the English language in this particular linguistic context, a process that is primarily focused upon individuals from outside this linguistic context, who are aiming to join it. Thus a Polish migrant would have differing levels of linguistic capital that would be contingent upon which context they were operating in (speaking Polish in Poland versus speaking English in the UK with a less than native proficiency). The market, Bourdieu argues, determines one’s level of capital (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 654).
7.1.4 Symbolic Power
With respect to performance, Bourdieu posits that discourse is structured around relations of symbolic power. Thus relations between interlocutors mediate linguistic production. Relations of symbolic power are shaped by respective amounts of capital of individuals in conversational interaction, the recognition that social conditions grants individuals in that interaction, and the respective weight it affords one in conversational interaction (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 648; 1991, p. 72). This in turn, gives one what Bourdieu refers to as the “right to speech… [and] implies the power to impose reception (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 648, my emphasis). He notes that the greater the tension, the greater the self-monitoring of linguistic production.

Empirical data, reviewed in Chapter 3, supports this claim, providing evidence for how identities and social statuses shape conversational interaction or the perceived right to engage in conversational interaction with respect to the linguistic context (Norton, 2000; Perdue, 1993). This literature suggests that relations of symbolic power may be embodied through macro level practices such as immigration policy making, as well as in micro-level practices, e.g. in conversational interaction between interlocutors. This suggests that interactions between the 3 spheres described in Figure 7.1 (the learner, learning community, and society) are structured around relations of symbolic power.

This is a particularly significant point with respect to the present study, for if we consider interaction as one of the first and foremost conditions for acquisition of language (Gass, 1997; M. H. Long, 1980, 1983, 1985; Mackey, 1999), then it would follow that the lack of interaction or engagement with the target language that is shaped by these social factors might negatively impact second language acquisition.

Conceptualizing linguistic competence as symbolic capital or linguistic capital means framing language and social engagement with respect to the social structure in which it is embedded. This research is grounded in the view that learning, specifically language learning, must be understood in relation to the broader social context. Investigating EiM within the policy context of social inclusion means that it necessary to understand the social processes of exclusion and inclusion in relation to language learning and language use. To this end, this research is rooted, both
conceptually and methodologically, in literature on SLA that has helped to advance broader understandings of individual learner differences by unpacking some of the social and contextual factors that impact the learning process. Thus in contextualizing this study of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers as English language speakers/learners in Scotland, it will be critical to consider broadly how macro-level structures impact micro-level interaction, more specifically, (a) how these macro-level aspects of discourse relate to the issue of linguistic or social exclusion, and (b) how relations of power affect engagement in the language (thus, it will be important to understand participants’ experiences engaging in English in Scotland), and (c) how participation in discourse that provides social space for discourse affects/positions or repositions individuals’ power relations and their respective linguistic production.

7.2 Learning as a Socially Mediated Process

“…an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are internalized, they become part of the child's independent developmental achievement” (Vygotsky 1978, 90)

This study takes a sociocultural view of learning, which posits that learning is ‘linguistically mediated’ activity, referring both to self-mediation and collaborative mediation. Collaborative mediation is conceived of as learning, which is co-constructed through ‘dialogic interaction’ (ibid). Collaborative mediation, it is argued, forms the basis of what becomes self-regulated thought. This view of learning advances the idea that collaborative mediation is a site in which the learning process externalized through discourse and therefore made observable. Thus, discourse in interaction is conceived of as a central site in which learning can be observed.

It is this view of learning that is an organizing concept for the research design described in the previous chapter, and the methodological and analytical approach that will be described in the subsequent chapters.
7.3 Identities

…the discovery of the value accorded to one’s linguistic productions,… are doubtless one of the mediations which shape the practical representation of one’s social person, the self-image which governs the behaviours of sociability ("timidity", "poise", "self-assurance", etc.) and, more generally, one’s whole manner of conducting oneself in the social world (Bourdieu, 1977, 660)

Thus far, the discussion has focused on macro-level structures and micro-level aspects of social exchanges. However, what remains to be addressed is how these aspects of communication impact individuals and their sense of self, or identity. By virtue of the value that is placed on linguistic production, and a person’s realization of where they are situated within that particular linguistic context, Bourdieu contends, cannot but impact a person’s identity, which would then affect the manner in which they engage in social interaction.

A growing body of research in SLA, reviewed in depth in chapter 3, draws on theoretical insights from poststructuralist and postmodern thought to investigate identity in relation to language learning, as well as other social constructs such as gender, ethnicity and social class. The work on identity in particular, has contributed to the literature on individual learner differences by unpacking how these subject positions mediate their engagement and ‘investment’ (Norton, 2000) in conversational interaction, as well as influencing the nature of talk in these interactions (Block, 2007b).

Even a superficial review of identity will provide volumes on how illusive the concept/construct is, given the plethora of meanings that have been ascribed to it in the vast body of literature and empirical research in psychology, sociology and linguistics respectively (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000; B. Davies & Harrè, 1990; Giddens, 1991; Mead, 1967; Owens, Robinson, & Smith-Lovin, 2010; Tajfel, 1974). Thus it is important to delineate precisely what is meant by identity in the context of this study and the affordances of using identity as a conceptual lens for the present investigation.
In this study I take the position that identities, or subject positions, are at once how an individual sees oneself, and how the self is conceived of in relation to others. Taking a poststructuralist view of identity, I take the view that identities are constructed and multiple, and enacted in interaction. For example, a person might or more likely will have and present several different identities at once, e.g. mother, daughter, sister, researcher, student. Following a Giddensian view of identity in late modernity, this research takes the view that the self is a ‘reflexive project’, in which individuals are constantly engaged in creating and maintaining identities (Giddens, 1991, p. 32-33). Thus, identities are not viewed as fixed traits, but rather reflexively negotiated states.

While there are a range of perspectives capturing identity in empirical data (e.g. analysis of personal pronouns I/me/you (B. Davies & Harrè, 1990; Mead, 1967)), this research takes the view that identities could be observed through personal narratives (Giddens, 1991, 53). Thus, one of the analytical approaches taken in this research is narrative analysis, which I will review in detail in chapter 9.

In light of this view of identity and its relation to the concept of linguistic capital and relations of symbolic power, a critical aspect of this research will be to understand how identities taken up by participants shape or influence their engagement in English language. In order to understand participation in educational programs in museums and their relationship to the issues of social exclusion and inclusion, it will be essential to understand participants’ identity trajectories over a period of time of participation in EiM.

In the following chapter I will discuss how I moved from theory to methods, discussing how I operationalized these concepts into an investigation of EiM.
8 Data Collection

The previous chapters have been concerned with the overarching structure of the present investigation, the philosophical issues and theoretical views that shape the present study. This chapter will outline implementation of this study, summarizing how the philosophical positions, theoretical orientations and the research design have been operationalized for collection of data.

8.1 From Theory to Method

In Chapter 5, I identified several gaps in the literature, which merit further investigation, such as the present investigation proposes. To briefly reiterate, firstly there is a need for a study of the impact of social inclusion in museums, which examines this process at the micro-level in order to understand the impact on the individuals that are excluded. Secondly, there is a need to understand the impact of inclusion on identities, agency and participation, as much of the literature has focused on the impact of social exclusion on these concepts and behaviours. Thirdly, there is a need to understanding the advantages of museums for language learning.

While additional gaps were identified in the literature, including understanding the impact of inclusion on linguistic development and examining the relationship between linguistic growth and participation, I have chosen to limit the scope of the present study to understanding the relationship between EiM and social inclusion and exclusion. This is not because I consider these areas as divergent research goals, but rather incremental goals. As such, the scope of the present investigation is viewed as a necessary first step in understanding EiM, and thus will serve as a preliminary investigation whose findings can be used as evidence for a subsequent investigation of linguistic development through EiM.

Given these research goals, the following research questions have been generated:

1. What have been the learners’ experiences of exclusion and inclusion since migrating to the UK?
a. How do these experiences interface with their English language abilities?

2. What are the learners’ views of the effects of their participation in the ESOL in museums provision in terms of exclusion/inclusion?
   a. What might be the policy, provision and practice implications of these views?

3. What occurs in interaction during ESOL in museums?

Moving from theory to method means translating grand theory into approaches and methods that can generate the kind of data needed to investigate the above questions. In previous chapters, my discussion of theory, in particular, ontological and epistemological positions, were limited to how these views informed the overall design and conception of this study. In the following section, I will consider the implications of this research’s ontology and epistemology at the level of data collection.

8.1.1 Ontology and Epistemology Revisited: Towards Understanding

In Chapter 6, I discussed the philosophical stances that have informed the design of the present investigation. Operationalizing these views at the micro-level, as in the collection of data, necessitates a re-examination of these views and their implications at this level of the research process. Thus, in this section, I will discuss the implications of the philosophical, ontological and epistemological stances taken in this study on the data collection. To help elucidate the meanings these views take on the level of data collection, I will use excerpt 8.1, taken from this study’s dataset, to revisit the questions of (a) what constitutes knowledge (b) how it can be produced, and (c) investigated.

Excerpt 8.1 is a narrative told by Sarah, a recent migrant to Edinburgh from Algeria, of her post-migration experiences in Edinburgh.

The people are friendly, I like the people in Edinburgh but I have a problem with pronunciation. Because this morning at the shop, the person said ‘sorry?’ I can’t communicate… I just leave the shop.

Excerpt 8.1 Sarah’s story
Located within an Interpretivist philosophical tradition, this study takes the view that reality is socially constructed, and is not out there, independent of an individual (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). In this respect, Sarah describes an account of a social encounter, the meaning of which is created through interaction with the shopkeeper referred to in the story, and arguably also myself, as the interviewer who elicits this narrative of her experiences using English in Scotland. In this sense, this research takes the stance that there exists no objective truth about this encounter, as in, ‘this is what actually happened’, but rather there may be multiple realities constructed by the aforementioned individuals, in time, and situated within, and giving reference to a multiplicity of historical contexts. Sarah’s account of this experience is situated within the context in which this narrative was elicited, thus is informed by the intersubjective dynamics between the researcher, the researched and the research setting.

Sarah’s account of this interaction illustrates her point: that she has difficulties with her pronunciation through her interpretation of the shopkeeper’s ‘sorry’. However, many other versions of this encounter are possible. The shopkeeper could have said sorry because they simply did not hear Sarah’s query. ‘Sorry’ could have been used as a response to her query, e.g. if the shop no longer had what she was looking for. Likewise, it is possible that if the shopkeeper was interviewed, they may have provided an entirely different interpretation of the same experience. The point that I would like to make with this example is that an account is an interpretation of experience, which is constructed through interaction with others (Blumer, 1969).

Following the principles of symbolic interactionism outlined by Blumer (1969), this research takes the view that meanings about lived experiences come from social interaction. In this respect, the meaning that Sarah ascribes to the encounter, e.g. I can’t communicate, or that this is an exemplar of difficulties with pronunciation, is a meaning that Sarah arrives at through interaction with the shopkeeper and possibly myself as the interviewer. In addition, following Blumer, this research takes the view that the meanings that individuals ascribe to experiences inform their actions. In this case, Sarah’s interpretation of not being understood, could be the reason that she chose to leave the shop rather than redraft her question.
Finally, the view taken by this research is that individuals adapt meanings as a means of coping with lived experiences. This view advances the idea that central to human experience is the need to interpret and make sense of experiences, what some argue is a fundamentally human need to giving narrative coherence to lived experience (McAdams, 2006). In this sense, this claim suggests that the meaning that Sarah ascribes to the encounter, “I can’t communicate”, is an attempt to make sense of the interaction that stimulates “sorry?”, or possibly interactions that preceded this specific encounter.

Taking these views about knowledge and knowledge production, the question now becomes, what can we come to understand about lived experiences? Locating myself within a qualitative paradigm, I would like to argue that one of the contributions that qualitative inquiry can make, is to investigate the meanings that individuals ascribe to experiences, or what I will refer to as, how individuals code their experiences. In addition, observation of experiences triangulated with personal accounts help aid the researcher in unpacking the socially constructed nature of experiences. Thus, one of the overarching goals of this research is to work towards an understanding of how individuals interpret their experiences.

8.1.2 Reflexivity
Taking these views about the nature of social reality, the question becomes, what empirical methods or tools can be used to help elicit how individuals code their experiences. I would like to argue, that one of the critical tools that underlies all the data collection and analytical methods used in the present investigation is reflexivity.

Reflexivity is an approach that strives to take into account the researcher’s role in research, considering their impact on the research process (Finlay, 2002a, 2002b; Macbeth, 2001). Finding its roots in the paradigm shift that gave way to epistemological positions such as social constructionism (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003), reflexivity as a method brings to the forefront the instrumental role the qualitative researcher plays in shaping research (Finlay, 2003). Reflexive qualitative research brings attention to the need to understand the nature of one’s subjectivity in research practice, generating questions such as ‘how do I know?’, and ‘how do I
know what I know?’ and ‘how might this impact research?’, which has given rise to reflexive approaches as a means for addressing them (Pillow, 2003, p. 178).

Finlay defines reflexivity simply as “thoughtful, conscious self-awareness” which requires constant evaluation of subjective and intersubjective responses (Finlay, 2002a, p. 532). While various taxonomies of the dimensions of reflexive practice in research exist (see e.g. Finlay, 2003; Pillow, 2003), where they intersect, I argue, could equally be considered the core of reflexive practice in considering ‘positionality’ in the research-researched relationship. Positionality refers to the dual task of critical self-reflection on one’s own subjectivity as well as reflection on the intersubjective dynamics of the research relationship.

It has been suggested that subjectivity is shaped by the filters through which we view the social world, which might include culture, age, gender, class, social status, education, political praxis, language and values (Patton, 2002). In this sense, the researcher’s biography might be some of the motivation behind a research topic and these motivations might influence the kind of questions asked as well as steer the course of data collection. The researcher’s biography might also influence the way the data is analysed as well as written up. Reflection on self thus aims to make explicit these filters and dismantle their influence. With respect to intersubjective dynamics, reflexive practice aims to bring to light the researcher’s involvement and agency in the research process (Macbeth, 2001). It explores the dynamics of the researcher-researched relationship and strives to illuminate the nature of negotiation processes and their impact on research (Finlay, 2003).

Finlay suggests that “at a minimum level, [reflexivity] means acknowledging the existence of researcher bias and explicitly locating the researcher within the research process. At a more active level, it involves a more wholesale embracing of subjectivity, for example, by exploiting the researcher’s/co-researcher’s reflective insights and by engaging in explicit, self-aware meta-analysis throughout the research process” (Finlay, 2002b, p. 535).

At an operational level, reflexive practice that engages the researcher to reflect on positioning means not only adopting a heightened awareness of the researcher and
researched, but also the context in which lived experiences are elicited, which includes social histories, identities and positions within the social structure.

In this investigation, as I have mentioned, adopting Action Research as a research strategy means continuous engagement with intersubjective dynamics between the researcher and the participants of research, and how these dynamics shape the generation of knowledge. In this research, I have strived to take a critical stance towards the data and the understandings that can be drawn from it, in light of the intersubjective nature of its generation. With respect to analysis, adopting grounded theory as my analytical tool, means continuous interrogation of what I know, how I can know, and how intersubjectivity shapes the data.

8.1.3 Data Collection Overview: A study in 3 Phases
The empirical study at the centre of this investigation was conducted in three phases from the period between December 2007 and September 2008, summarized in Table 8.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Reconnaissance: Community Based ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Pilot: EiM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Ethnography: EiM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Study Overview

The first phase of the study aimed to understand the substantive issues with respect to learning and settlement of recent immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers to Edinburgh. A short ethnography of adult ESOL in Edinburgh was conducted from November to December 2007 to examine these issues and understand the target population prior to the main investigation.

The goal of Phase 2 was to pilot EiM materials in the target locale, with the target group of learners. This phase was conducted between February and April 2008. Piloting focused on trialing interview and observation schedules, and data recording methods. In addition, participatory action research engaged participants as co-researchers in the process of development and refinement of curricular material. My role in phase 2 was both as participant observer and teacher-researcher.
The goal of Phase 3, conducted from May-September 2008, was to study EiM in-depth. The curricular material developed in the previous phases were implemented by an ESOL teacher and teaching assistant with a new cohort of adult ESOL learners over a period of 3 months. Using ethnographic methods, the experiences of this cohort of learners was studied over a five-month period (beginning one month before participation in museums and ending one month afterwards).

In the following sections, I will discuss the data collection process of these three phases in turn.

### 8.2 Fieldwork Phase 1: Community Based ESOL

This phase of the study was a brief ethnography of adult ESOL in Edinburgh to inform the pilot learning and study materials development, recruitment of participants, interview and observation schedules, data recording and other logistical matters. In order to begin a study of EiM, a critical step was thus to first generate an understanding of the ESOL community in Scotland, who would be served by these kinds of programs, and community-based ESOL provision, to understand the kind of teaching and learning activities developed for this group of learners.

#### 8.2.1 Informal interviews with key informants

I began fieldwork by conducting a series of informal interviews with key informants: a senior social inclusion officer from a national museum in England, a museum educator from a national museum in Scotland and an ESOL teacher working in Edinburgh with the target population of learners.

The informal interviews (by phone and in person) with informants from national museums in England and Scotland elicited information about their education and social inclusion efforts and materials and programs that their respective museums developed to target exclusion. I conducted a series of informal interviews with an adult ESOL instructor in Edinburgh, who was – as I was - a recent graduate of the Masters in TESOL at the University of Edinburgh. In these initial information-gathering interviews, I sought to have a general picture of adult ESOL in Edinburgh. We met informally in a café near her home, and I asked her about a range of aspects...
of her teaching practice in Edinburgh including: descriptions of the learning materials, activities and curricula; frequency of instruction, outcomes and assessments; the profile of learners, including language proficiency, migration status. All of the above interviews were recorded using fieldnotes.

The informant taught two different kinds of ESOL that served this population of learners. The first was an ESOL for employment. Taught at a community centre in the area with a large population of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, the curriculum focused on employment skills, such as learning word processing programs, conducting research and giving presentations. Learners enrolled in this program were required to obtain employment after this course, thus it was only open to immigrants and refugees who have already been granted asylum. The second ESOL course that the informant taught implemented the National Institute of Adult Continuing Education and Stevenson College’s ESOL for Citizenship in Scotland curriculum, which focuses on reading, writing, speaking and listening for integration in Scotland. This course led to a qualification that certified proficiency in English. This kind of ESOL course community-based programs served primarily the minority ethnic, refugee and asylum seeker population, with very low participation of economic migrants.

8.2.2 Observations
In order to understand the nature of these types of provision and the learners they served, I conducted two classroom observations of these classes respectively. I obtained permission to conduct the observations from the teacher, the supervisors at the community centres where these classes were conducted and from the students in these classes. The focus of my observations at this stage of the study were broad, including, the general structure of these classes, class composition, learning activities, materials and noting additional salient observations and occurrences that might be relevant to the questions of the main study.

The instrument used to record the classroom observations was fieldnotes that captured the biographical and contextual information and activities during the observation period. I examined the structure of the written curriculum (Citizenship in Scotland) to gain more insight in the materials and learning content in the
community-based setting, beyond the two observations I conducted. Observation and interview fieldnotes, and analysis of the course curriculum helped to inform the development and refinement of materials to be used in museums in phases 2 and 3 of the study.

8.2.3 Focus Groups
During my second observations at these sites, the instructor gave me a few minutes to solicit participation for the focus group. I explained the purpose of the focus group, which was to learn about their experiences learning ESOL in Scotland and using English in Scotland, the amount of time the focus group would take, that their identities would be protected and pseudonyms used should they participate in the focus group, and that participation was voluntary and they could leave at any time. I also explained that voluntary participants would be remunerated for their time. With support of the University of Edinburgh, I was able to provide small gift cards as an incentive for individuals to participate.

Two separate focus groups were conducted with these respective groups to explore their experiences post-migration in terms of accessing learning opportunities, participating in ESOL learning, perceptions of learning needs, settling in the UK and using English. These focus groups helped to define some of the substantive themes for this population to explore in the one on one interviews in phases 2 and 3 of the study.

8.2.4 Participants
At the ESOL for employment course, 4 out of 13 of the students agreed to participate in the focus group, and at the ESOL for citizenship course, 6 out of 13 of the students agreed to participate. The ESOL for employment focus group consisted of 4 women from their early 20s-40s, from the Ukraine, India, Poland and Japan respectively. They ranged from pre-intermediate to intermediate level of English proficiency, and have lived in Scotland from a little as seven months to six years. The profile of participants from the ESOL for citizenship included, again an all female group (there was only one male in the class, who opted not to participate in the focus group), from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, China, Iraq, and Algeria. They also ranged from pre-
intermediate to intermediate level, were in their early 20s to mid-30s and have lived in the UK from 8 months to 10 years.

8.2.5 Materials
Prior to fieldwork, I surveyed EiM materials used in museums across the UK. This survey revealed wide ranging approaches and materials, and while some of these materials were designed to target ESOL learners, they did not seem to reflect contemporary ESOL pedagogy and SLA theories.

As a precursor to this study, in previous research (Clarke, 2006), I developed an English as a Foreign Language course aimed at promoting oral and aural fluency through the use of art objects as learning content, grounded in theories of second language learning and acquisition. Because of the paucity of ESOL material used in museums grounded in theories of second language learning, I decided to adapt this course for the target population of this study, implement and evaluate it collaboratively through iterative action research cycles, then finally implement a refined version taught by another instructor. The informal interviews, focus groups, observations and curriculum analysis in phase 1 of the study provide input to adapt these materials for phase 2.

8.3 Fieldwork Phase 2: ESOL in museums Pilot
There were several aims to the pilot study. This phase of the research was to be used to trial data collection procedures and instruments and collect preliminary data that could inform the refinement of the data collection protocol for the 3rd phase of the study, which investigates ESOL learners and their participation in museums over time.

8.3.1 Overview of Pilot
The City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries agreed to participate in this study, both to support their outreach and inclusion goal and to support empirical investigation of museum visiting, especially with respect to the target population of learners for the study. The Council’s Museums and Galleries include five museums all located in Edinburgh’s central Old Town quarter, which spans the spine of the historical district’s main thoroughfare, the Royal Mile. The City of Edinburgh
Council Museums Service made available their Education Room for the length of the study, which was used as a home base for the sessions before and after gallery visits.

Snowball sampling was used to recruit participants through gate-keepers that work with and have access to the target community of learners, e.g. recent migrants, refugees and asylum seekers to Scotland. A cohort of 8 participants were recruited, 6 after attrition, who participated in 5 weekly sessions, each week visiting a different one of the five council museums.

Sessions during the pilot were facilitated by myself, the researcher, in the five council museums. During these sessions, the materials I had developed were implemented and iteratively refined through cycles of planning, implementing and refining (Stringer, 1996) during the five weeks of the study. In addition, research participants were engaged in the process of refinement of materials using participatory methods at the end of each of the five sessions. Data from the sessions and participatory discussions were recorded through post hoc fieldnotes written at the end of each session. Pre and post interviews were conducted with each participant prior to the five sessions and just and after the 5th session. These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

In the following sections, I will describe the data collection procedure for the pilot phase of the study in detail.

8.3.2 Recruitment
The pilot phase began with recruiting participants for the project. Phase 1 had given me some insight into some of the issues I might have recruiting participants, e.g. need for childcare. Because the target population is hard to access, I used a variety of methods to gain access to this population.

Gatekeepers, such as local service providers were used to gain access to these populations, as well as serving as informants about the needs and interests of these populations. For example, during this phase of the study, I targeted community centres that were located in areas of Edinburgh where there was a growth of what I will refer to as new communities (emergent communities of immigrants, economic
migrants, refugees and asylum seekers). I contacted community workers at these centres and inquired about whether they offered ESOL courses. For those that did, I told them about my study and asked if it was possible to introduce the project to their ESOL learners during their ESOL classes. For profit courses, e.g. classes on offer through Stevenson College’s community-based ESOL program that is run at community centres throughout Edinburgh, were hesitant to advertise the study.

Other community centres, that offer free adult ESOL to serve the local community were very active in helping to distribute leaflets, make announcements about the study and put me in contact with other gate-keepers or centres that could help with the participant recruitment process. One community centre, for example, located in a predominantly working-class area of Edinburgh, with a growing community of Polish economic migrants served as a key informant for this phase of the study. This centre provided classes for the local Polish residents and weekly family nights, which were community-building socials where they served tea and cakes for parents and provided play space for children.

I conducted informal interviews with three community workers at this centre prior to the pilot run of the study. They informed me about the kind of work they did at the centre for the local community, what some of the issues were that arise in their work and how they communicate with the local community about the work they do. They informed me of best practices in terms of disseminating information to the local community. They suggested using posters and leaflets, which rely on a visual to help communicate the message for those from diverse language and literacy backgrounds. I developed posters and leaflets about the study accordingly, and posted them in six other community centres in Edinburgh. The posters and leaflets were used to make initial contact with potential participants, from which I would explain the purpose of the study and what participation entails, learn about their background and assess whether they fit the criteria for participants for the study. If they were interested in participating in the study and met the criteria after this initial phone call, they were invited for a face-to-face meeting whereby I obtained their informed consent to participate in the study.
This particular community centre also gave me insight into interests and concerns of the community that they served. These insights confirmed the findings from interviews and observations from phase 1 of the study. For example, they argued that from their experience, ESOL courses offered at the community centre had difficulty retaining students when they were focused on grammar and formal testing. They argued that what ESOL learners wanted was a “quick fix”, that is, English that can help them get around in everyday life and not necessarily classes that focus solely on grammatical structure. “Drop-in” classes, which focused on English conversation skills and did not require successive attendance, tended to be more successful with these groups of learners. They suggested that learners wanted to focus more on speaking and listening English skills than reading and writing.

In addition to posting leaflets in community centres, two community workers/informants offered to distribute leaflets to the target community of learners in their catchment area. In addition, I attended “family night” for several weeks at a few community centres that served the target group of learners to distribute leaflets, explain the study and recruit participants.

With the support of the University of Edinburgh, I was able to provide a certified crèche for participants that needed it, which was located at one of the museums. The findings from phase 1 and from informant interviews in phase 2 indicated that crèche provision was a major enabler for the target populations’ participation in adult education. I was able to recruit three participants on my first visit to a family night, with crèche provision being a major incentive for them to participate.

The third method of recruiting participants was through a social networking site. An informant from one of the community centres, who was an English teacher in Poland, informed me of a social networking website for Polish people living in Edinburgh. They translated the leaflet into Polish, which I had verified by a Polish speaking colleague at the university. The translated leaflet was posted on the social networking site for Polish migrants living in Edinburgh. It was through this website that several potential participants phoned about the course. One of them became a participant for phase 2.
Fourth, the ESOL instructor who served as informant in phase 1 of the study also distributed leaflets and posters in her places of instruction. Through this method I received one phone call with interest to participate in the main study. Lastly, I sent personalized letters with a flyer to all of the participants of phase 1 of the study and through this method was able to recruit one participant for the study.

### 8.3.3 Participants
For phase 2 of the study, I recruited 8 participants, 6 were from Poland, one from Algeria and one from Hungary. There were a total of 3 men and 5 women. Two participants that had agreed to participate in the study never attended any of the sessions. One of the non-attenders was the husband of one of the female participants, and the other was a Polish woman who continued to indicate that she would come each week, but never attended. Even though the informed consent procedure explained that participants could drop out at anytime during the study, these participants never officially declared they were dropping out. The Eastern European participants were economic migrants that had lived in Scotland for 5 years or under. They all have had very different occupations in their countries of origin from those they had taken in Scotland, which they felt was due to their level of English. The Algerian participant was an unemployed mother.

The participants reported diverse experiences with respect to interaction with target language speakers, from no contact at all to some. All of the participants reported that they had very little opportunity to communicate in English in Edinburgh.

### 8.3.4 Attrition and Retention of participants
Attendance in the sessions fluctuated throughout the pilot (8.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>Number in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 Participant attendance during study Phase 2

The low attendance in week 3, with no communication from participants about whether they were dropping out entirely or simply absent for that one session,
encouraged me to take proactive measures to maintain contact with participants throughout the remainder of the study. All of the key informants of the study in phases 1 and 2 indicated that attrition in adult ESOL was common problem and various methods were used to try and retain adult learners. Thus, I sent reminder text messages to participants the day before the 4th session. This served to keep the lines of communication open with participants, confirm their attendance, and their need for childcare services. The participants were responsive to this mode of communication and indicated if they were not able to attend, why, and in other cases, announced that they would be late to the session. The female participant that never came to the sessions, also never responded to the text messages sent on weeks’ 4 and 5. This retention method was used as a tool to encourage retention rather than enforcing it, as the participants had the right to leave the study at any time.

8.3.5 The Sessions

Two-hour sessions were held on Saturday mornings from 10am to 12pm for five consecutive weeks. Sessions were based in the City Art Centre’s 5th floor Education space, which is where the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries service held workshops and other educational programs related to their collections. Each week the sessions focused on a different collection from the five council museums: City Art Centre, Museum of Edinburgh, Museum of Childhood, People’s Story, Writer’s Museum. Table 8.3 summarizes the 5 museums visited during Phase 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Art Centre</td>
<td>Visual arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Edinburgh</td>
<td>History of the city and culture of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Childhood</td>
<td>History of childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Story</td>
<td>Oral history and reminiscences of peoples of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer’s Museum</td>
<td>Celebrating the literary history of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3 City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries

The crèche facility was provided in the City Art Centre, which served as the home base location, in a room adjacent to the education space. All of the museums visited were a short walk from City Art Centre.
One of the primary goals for phase 2 of the study was to develop and refine EiM materials that were informed by SLA theory and pedagogy, but also addressed the needs, goals and intentions of adult ESOL learners that may experience social exclusion. Materials adapted from Clarke (2006) served as a framework for the initial materials implemented, from which they were iteratively refined with the participation of the cohort of learners that participated in the study.

The learners that participated in the study agreed, through informed consent, to participate as learners as well as co-researchers. As learners they engaged in learning tasks in the galleries and education space for the first 1 ¾ hour of each session. As co-researchers they shared their insights into the process and their experiences during reflective discussions for the final 15 minutes of each session. Insights gained from these reflective discussions helped to shape the session for the following week. The cumulative effect was that each week the sessions moved closer to what they perceived was both good and what they needed.

Creating learner centred sessions was one of the key concepts of the course development after having surveyed ESOL materials developed in museums throughout the UK and after gaining insights from phase 1 and all informant interviews. Sessions were designed to be learner driven, where language is being generated from the learners themselves and opportunities for linguistic and grammatical input emerged from the context of discussions. By allowing the language for these sessions to be generated from the learners themselves this allows space for a power shift. The traditional power dynamic of the ESOL classroom, where the language is prescribed by language expert (teacher/policy maker), gives way and allows ESOL learners be user/experts, where the teacher’s role becomes resource person/facilitator.

In order to actualize this as well as capture the language generated in these sessions, which might be recycled/reused, two primary strategies were used. First, I created a ‘word bank’ in the education space. The word bank was a blank wall that learners and myself would collaboratively construct as new/relevant lexis were introduced throughout the sessions. In addition to the word wall, language would be recorded
on flipchart, which was related to the topic with a graphic representation of sense relations e.g. semantic maps. The language recorded in word bank and on the flipchart would then be used to make a handout given to participants at the beginning of the following session. The handout was used to give students a concrete record from week to week of their developing linguistic repertoire.

The City of Edinburgh Museums and Galleries collections and gallery spaces were used as a stimulus for language work and to provide opportunities for learners to ‘speak from within’ (Roberts and Cooke 2007). Research that has explored the spoken utterances of ESOL learners in Britain suggests that when learners ‘speak from within’, that is, communicate about their interests and experiences, they are able to operationalise their linguistic knowledge and generate more sophisticated and complex speech than when speaking is focused on pure grammatical tasks. This, in addition to those concerns expressed by participants and community workers in phases 1 and reconnaissance portion of phase 2, which suggested the importance of the language work being relevant to learners’ lives, is what guided my decision making in this respect. The tasks in these sessions were designed around establishing a communication gap, and therefore a real/natural reason to communicate in English. Gap activities that were used in these sessions were information gap, opinion gap, reasoning gap and perception gap. Gap activities allowed learners to connect the collections to their own experiences and knowledge.

From week to week during this pilot run of EiM, the time spent in the education space and the galleries varied. We trialled several visiting formats. In the end the learners’ consensus was that splitting time in $\frac{1}{2}$ between the gallery and education space was most ideal.

8.3.6 Observations and Interviews
In order to discuss the recording of data, it is important to acknowledge what was considered data for phase 2 of the study. As the primary aim of phase 2 was to inform the development of the materials to be implemented in phase 3, and pilot data collection methods, observation and reflections on teaching and learning constituted data. Likewise, the reflective discussions that occurred at the end of every session, which helped to inform the subsequent session, were recorded as data in fieldnotes.
The pre and post interviews conducted with participants with the aim of piloting the interview scheduling and interviewing technique, were considered data. These interviews were audio recorded. In addition, phone calls, emails, text messages and face-to-face conversations with participants and key informants were considered data as they provided deeper insight into the learners, their lives, experiences as well as the intersubjective dynamics of coordinating teaching and learning, and the study of teaching and learning. Logs of digital communications were transcribed and face-to-face interactions recorded in fieldnotes.

As a participant observer/teacher researcher, recording observations as they occurred was logistically impossible. Thus, I relied on post hoc fieldnotes to capture occurrences during the sessions. Using the blank page approach, I made mental notes of key incidents to record after the session ended. After the session ended I recorded observations of the entire session chronologically in my pilot fieldnotes. The notes are mainly descriptive, attempting to capture ‘what happened’. There were points however in my writing up where the process naturally gave way to my analysis of what I was recording. In these cases, I bracketed my thoughts so as to separate description from analysis. I found recording events chronologically a useful technique for recalling events that were significant as well as noticing those events that did not seem particularly critical at the time I was observing.

Pre and post interviews were recorded using digital recorders. Two of the preliminary interviews were lost due to technical issues with the equipment. As a safeguard for the rest of the interviews, I used different equipment and brought a back up device should technical problems arise. Three interviews were conducted in cafés due to timing and convenience for participants. These kinds of environments were unproblematic for informant interviews, but challenging to facilitate these in-depth interviews due to background noise. In addition, the background noise made these recordings difficult to transcribe. Subsequent interviews were conducted in quiet environments, e.g. in the museum’s Education Room to avoid background noise, which also helped to make participants feel comfortable speaking. While café’s do not constitute public speaking, per se, participants seemed observably anxious when I interviewed them in these locations.
8.3.7 Pedagogical and empirical issues
What emerged from the fieldnotes of the pilot sessions was that there were two main concerns, pedagogical and research issues, which have implications for the data collection protocol for phase 3.

Firstly, analysis of session fieldnotes revealed that some learners had difficulty completing learning tasks. Sessions include pre-gallery visit activity, which scaffolds the visit, then a gallery visit, and final a post-visit discussion. The limited amount of time of sessions, and the time needed to move between museum locations meant that sessions were rushed. More time was clearly needed for in-depth learning tasks prior to the visit, during and following the visit. More time for in-depth tasks prior to the visit will help to scaffold learning tasks and linguistic input for tasks.

Another pedagogical concern was the challenge of the participant’s varying levels of written literacy. Some activities required the participants to write, and these tasks were observed to be demotivating for some learners, who had limited to no knowledge of written English. For example, there were two participants who had learnt spoken English through living in Scotland and had no knowledge of written English. In addition, key informants have suggested that literacy skills in English are not as important to these learners as oracy. While I do not advocate curriculum development for this target group of learners to ignore literacy entirely, I would argue that informal learning, such as that in museums, provides natural opportunities for oracy that can be exploited for oracy development and experience for populations that experience social exclusion. It is for this reason, that in the refinement of materials, oracy over literacy became the focus.

Thirdly, managing the pair and group tasks was challenging in a mix-level class. As a teacher, I focused on those groups that needed the most support to do the learning task. Those groups tended to need more linguistic support. As a result, my fieldnotes overly represent those interactions, which narrowed the scope of my observation in those instances. The issue that this raises is the careful and delicate, if not extremely complicated, balance needed in practitioner research between supporting instruction and supporting enquiry. While in-depth interactions are no doubt helpful for research and enquiry, it was in those moments, where I was working to support only
a few learners that I was not able to fully capture, for research, what other learners
and events were occurring simultaneously. This was the primary reason for
changing recording methods for phase 3 of the study, in addition to my role in phase
3.

Other data recording issues include recording of gallery visits. These visits were
recorded using observation fieldnotes. Fieldnotes and observations highlight
interesting phenomenon that I would argue is specific to the museum. What was
observed was very limited social engagement during the museum visit proper, even
when the learning task required speaking. Instead, participants seemed to be
engaged in deliberative and contemplative quiet observation of museum collections.
In Hooper-Greenhill’s (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994b) terms, from the gallery
observations it is not clear if the learners were ‘actively’ constructing their
understanding of the objects or ‘passively’ receiving the museum message about
those objects. Another element that may contribute to the behaviour that I observed
in the galleries is that it might be an artefact of the social script that museums in the
eyear of the institution, enforced prescriptive ways of being in the museum.
Bennett’s (1995) history of the museums highlights the role that these institutions
played when used as an instrument for social reform and control. The adage ‘no
talking, no chewing, no spitting’ (Bennett, 1995), while no longer officially the rule
and the sense of ‘appropriate behaviour in museums’ could have been governing the
participants’ gallery visit behaviour.

The result was that post-visit discussions that took place when we returned to the
Education room in the City Art Centre, organically became the place where learners
exchanged and communicated about the collections. There was one exception,
however, the Museum of Childhood. Lay observation of visiting behaviour in the
Museum of Childhood reveals a very different interaction space than that I have
described thus far. A quick observation of museum behaviour in the Museum of
Childhood and it becomes evident that talking, laughing, touching and running are all
acceptable forms of behaviour within this space. Observation of participant’s
interaction in the Museum of Childhood included talk about objects, and in general
far more interaction than the other museums, which may be because the social norms
in this museum, as manifested in other museum visitors were distinctively more social.

Lastly, what was evident during the analysis of fieldnotes was that more transparency in written accounts was needed to be able to explore what happened during these sessions. In some cases vague terminology and subjective interpretations that were not partitioned out of the main body of the fieldnotes, in effect constitute these written accounts and limit the degree to which inferences can be made about observations, and likewise have implications on the internal reliability of interpretations made from these data. It is for these and the aforementioned reasons that the data recording protocol was revised for phase 3 of the study, in an effort to ‘pin down’ ethnographic data to enable in-depth and grounded analyses (Rampton, 2007).

8.3.8 Refinements
Following the limitations of the pilot iteration of this study, several refinements were made to the data collection protocol for phase 3 including: interview and observation schedules, observation recording tools, research roles and museums. These refinements and justifications will be discussed in the remaining part of this chapter.

8.4 Phase 3: Main Study
Phases 1 and 2 of this study, reported above, help to provide a context and served to pilot materials and procedures in preparation for phase 3, an ethnography of EiM, which will be described in depth in the following sections. It was in this phase of the study that I sought to answer the research questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, through systematic empirical investigation of EiM. I will discuss the conduct of this phase of the study in this section.

8.4.1 Overview of Main Study
This phase of the research sought to examine EiM in-depth using ethnographic methods of data collection and analysis. During this phase of the research, another iteration of EiM with an entirely new cohort of learners was implemented and observed. The same museums were used as the context for the study as in the previous iteration. However, this phase of the study was spread over a 5-month
period, with the middle three months consisting of weekly museums visits and the first and last months were when pre and post interviews with participants were conducted.

While the previous iteration used participatory methods to help develop materials, with the voice of the target group of learners, this phase was entirely observational, using interviews and observations as a means to understand the target populations’ experiences in this kind of educational program. My research role in the phase shifted from teacher-researcher, to participant observer, with sessions being facilitated by a voluntary ESOL instructor and learning assistant.

Snowball sampling methods were used again to access the target population for the study through gate-keepers such as community workers. 14 study participants were recruited, which reduced to 9 after attrition. Participants were from a range of national and linguistic backgrounds, including participants from Poland, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, China, Sudan, and Columbia.

Participants engaged in a variety of learning activities in museums over the three-month period. Sessions were held weekly for 3 hours on Saturday mornings. Each session was audio and video recorded, to allow for transcription and linguistic analysis of dialogue during the activities in the museums. In addition to observations, pre-, while- and post interviews were conducted with participants, one month prior to the museum visits, half way through the program of visits, and finally one month after museum visits. In addition, follow up emails were sent to all participants 3 months after the final interview. In addition, one focus group, facilitated by a colleague, was conducted at the end of the series of museum visits where participants evaluated the program of visits overall.

In the following sections, I will discuss the data collection process for this phase of the research in-depth.
8.4.2 Participants

8.4.2.1 Facilitators

In order to take the role of participant observer in the main study phase of the research, facilitators were needed to run the ESOL program in the museums. I recruited both an ESOL instructor and learning assistant to run the series of museum visits.

Several criteria were used to identify the best candidates to run the program. The most ideal candidate would be someone like myself, with both museum education, ESOL theory, pedagogy and practice experience, and degree in both Art History and TESOL. However, this is a rather unusual background to possess given the novelty of EiM, so I developed criteria that I felt would approximate the skills, attributes and qualifications I felt were needed to facilitate these sessions.

Firstly, and perhaps most importantly I sought a volunteer teacher. It is my belief that the altruistic nature of voluntary work is such that it attracts individuals who are driven by their desire to help others rather than by monetary compensation alone. The length of this phase of the study would require individuals who could commit their time for the full 11 weeks. However budgetary constraints limited the amount of monetary compensation that could be offered in exchange for their service. Thus, seeking a volunteer teacher would enable me to find a teacher who could both commit their time because they possessed a drive to help others in their spare time.

Second, I thought it was essential to recruit an individual with qualified teaching status. I sought a trained teacher with a CELTA, Trinity or TEFL qualification. These courses provide rigorous teaching training, which cover basic principles of methodology, developing language awareness and aspects of classroom management. These courses also include a practicum, in which teachers apply theories and methods of instruction with a group of adult learners and are supervised through this process to refine their practice. Their supervision meetings help to develop the attributes of reflective practice, which I consider highly desirable for any responsive educator, and essential for working with learners who experience social exclusion.
In addition, and not unrelated, I thought it was important for the ESOL teacher to have experience in Community-Based ESOL settings. Community-Based ESOL teachers will have had experience working with adult refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants and settled immigrants. These communities have specific motivations, language needs as well as pastoral care needs that shape the instruction of these learners, and I would argue that they are important for an instructor of this population to be aware of. I also sought an instructor with experience of working with mixed level adult learners specifically, which is a characteristic of community-based ESOL classes.

A logistical criterion was to ensure that the ESOL teacher would be available on Saturday mornings during the 3 summer months that the course would be run. Lastly, it was important for the teacher to have interest in the arts and culture, both of local culture and of the cultures of new communities in Edinburgh/Scotland. Development of materials in phase 2 and insights from learners and informants in phase 1, suggested that giving voice to the lives, experiences and identities of this population of learners is important. The approach used in these sessions, gives voice to the learners, their cultural and ethnic identities and their lives in Edinburgh.

It should be noted that being a native speaker of English was not a criterion for this position. If an instructor met the above criteria and had native-like command of the language, then they were considered an appropriate candidate for facilitating sessions during the study.

The teaching post was advertised through CELTA courses in Edinburgh: the well-regarded Randolph School of English and Basil Paterson. A job description of the teaching post was mailed to the CELTA trainers and they then emailed the post to their recently qualified cohorts. I received no response from these postings. I also emailed the job description to a Community-based ESOL teacher, who was a key informant on all stages of the project. She emailed the posting to the head of recruitment and placement for ESOL volunteers at Stevenson College. I was contacted by two of Stevenson College’s trained volunteers and interviewed them over the course of the weeks before the main study began. The first teacher that
contacted me had been teaching with Stevenson as a home tutor over the last year. She was a trained teacher from Holland. The second was a trained ESOL teacher who had been home tutoring for one year with Stevenson, working with asylum seekers who were undergoing the process of being granted asylum.

The position a learning assistant for the project was advertised through Edinburgh Volunteers, a kind of match-making service for volunteer seekers and voluntary workers. The post sought community volunteers with interest in education and working with new communities in the arts and culture sector. This post generated several responses, two of which were for ESOL qualified teachers, and the third from a qualified teacher in primary education, who had changed fields and was now a retired nurse with an interest in working in the community. For the ESOL qualified teachers, I gave them the option to interview for the teaching position or the learning assistant position.

The interviews tried to encourage teachers to reflect on some of the challenges they had with learners they have taught and some of their approaches to addressing these challenges. It also tried to get them to share what have been some of their positive experiences working with these learners to gain better insight into their approaches of teaching, what they found rewarding about teaching, and what motivates them to work with this group of learners, as well as some embedded ideologies that the teachers’ might have, which might affect the research, e.g. ‘Immigrants need to learn how to speak English properly’. This is because I have often witnessed statements of the like in the teachers’ lounge of language schools that I have worked in Scotland and abroad.

An ESOL qualified instructor who had met the above criteria was offered the opportunity to participate in the study. She was in her early 30s and had three years experience teaching adults and children in Japan. She was commencing a Masters in Art Therapy at a university in Edinburgh in the following autumn. For the learning assistant position, I offered the post to a retired primary teacher, raised in Edinburgh’s Old Town, who was in her mid 70s, with deep knowledge of culture and
history of Edinburgh and the artefacts on display in the museums contexts for the study.

I offered the position in a face-to-face meeting after all of the interviews with prospective facilitators were conducted. It was during this meeting that obtained their informed consent to participate in the study. I indicated what the level of commitment was required for this role in the study. In addition to facilitating the weekly sessions as instructor, I asked that the ESOL instructor and learning assistant engage in the research process as co-investigators, reporting on observations they made during the sessions that seemed salient. Weekly debriefings/briefings were held at the end of each session to discuss things that emerged during the sessions from their observation. These briefings were also used to discuss the lesson plans and materials for the following week’s session. The teacher was encouraged to adapt these materials as she felt necessary. In addition, as a part of the study’s participant retention strategy, the learning assistant was asked to send weekly text messages to all participants (who had not officially withdrawn from the course) to remind them of the homework task for that week and a message that she was looking forward to seeing them the following day. (This approach seemed to be successful in that there was more consistency in the attendance in this instance of the course than the pilot. In addition, when participants were not able to attend they sent messages to myself to explain why they were not in attendance and enquire as to the homework for the following week.)

Before the sessions commenced, both facilitators were given a 2 ½ hour induction, were we visited all the museums, discussed the session objectives, curriculum, lessons, materials and profile of learners who consented to participate in the study. This induction was an overview, where the weekly briefings were more fine-grained discussions about the materials and plans.

In short, this phase of the project was facilitated by an ESOL expert and learning assistant who was a collections expert by happenstance. The learner assistant’s cultural and historical knowledge was an unexpected plus, which meant that she functioned more like a docent than a learning assistant.
8.4.2.2 ESOL learners

For the ESOL learner cohort of the study, similar methods of recruitment as used in the pilot study were used to gain access to this population in this phase of the research. The leaflets used in the pilot were redesigned for the main study and simplified even further as there seemed to be some issues with the first and students just arrived at the museum without going through the informed consent process (Appendix H). Thus, the revised flyer for the main study sessions provided the details about the sessions, e.g. what it was, what might be some of the benefits of joining, and how to join. It was chosen to not provide details about the research in this advertising as the main purpose was the make the key information about the course accessible for learners of English. When learners contacted me by phone, the first thing I indicated was that the sessions were part of a research project for my doctoral study at the University of Edinburgh. I outlined what participating in the research meant in terms of level of their commitment and what the research entailed, e.g. interviews and observations. If they were still interested then I arranged a face-to-face meeting where I could then provide more detail about the sessions and the research and obtain their informed consent.

Like in the pilot, leaflets were sent to several locations to gate-keepers, along with details of the recruitment process and ethical procedures (Appendix H). Firstly, leaflets were sent to several community centres in Edinburgh that provide ESOL courses much like the one developed for this study and whose learners are the target learners for the study. Leaflets were also sent to local language schools, such as Wallace College. This language school offered classes and private tuition, but at greatly reduced rates from most of the tuition-based language schools in the city. According to the Director of Studies at this school, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers who study at the school often sign up and save up to attend, staying on waitlists for a few months. The Director of Studies gave leaflets to those on the waitlist.

Leaflets were sent to Stevenson College Community-Based ESOL, who, as their name suggests, offer community-based ESOL throughout Edinburgh. The head of placement and admissions said she would communicate the details to prospective
and existing ESOL students. Flyers were also sent to CLAN Edinburgh, who place ESOL learners in Edinburgh language schools and programs, the project worker I corresponded with forwarded the flyers to ESOL teachers in their partner organizations: NHS, Council of Edinburgh ESOL, 3 FE Colleges. Flyers were also sent to a Community-based ESOL teacher in Edinburgh who was one of the key informants on the project to date. She distributed flyers through her Stevenson Community ESOL courses and through Nisus Scotland, a charity working with the BME community in Edinburgh. Lastly, but most fruitfully, a leaflet was posted again on the Polish social networking website.

For study, and because of resources, e.g. time, the study sought to recruit 10 participants to form the cohort for this phase. Prospective participants contacted me by phone or email using the information from the leaflets, and these modes of communication were used to conduct an initial screening to identify whether they met the criteria for participants in the study, and to explain the purpose of the study, as mentioned above (e.g. form letter sent after initial contact Appendix D).

Several criteria were used to identify participants for the study. Given the research on economic migrants, settled migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, described in chapter 3, I sought a cohort of learners with these migrations statuses to participate in this study. In addition, I targeted adult learners, these are learners who fall outside of school-based language learning provision, thus might have less access to formal and natural language learning opportunities, and may experience exclusion, such as has been described in chapter 3. Thus I considered ‘adult learners’ to be 18+ years of age. It should be noted that international students at local universities were not considered as potential participants for several reasons. First, through university study they have access to English, as the medium of instruction, as well as additional learning opportunities, such as English for Academic Purposes provision. Second, this population of learners have different motivations for learning English, and often times intentions of returning to their home countries after 1+ years of study. Thus, may have less desire to engage with and possibly less investment in the target language culture and community. Similarly, it was important that participants selected for the study had planned to stay in Scotland for some time or permanently.
That is, the course was not targeting transnational migrants, a category of migrant that is a product of globalization, who is more mobile and more transitory. Transnational migrants may not have permanent plans of settling in Edinburgh/Scotland, and may migrate to another country after a short period of time (1-2 years), thus may have very different experiences of exclusion and motivations for learning, e.g. desire to engage with the local community.

It was also ideal that the sample of participants be from a range of nationalities, as was characteristic of the population of learners in community-based ESOL. During the recruitment process, it became clear that there could be overrepresentation of Polish participants in the study. However, I allowed for this, given they were at the time, the largest migrant population in Edinburgh, thus together they would constitute a representative sample of the population of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in Edinburgh. Another ideal criteria was to have a gender mix, so that one gender did not over dominate the group and so that I would be able to examine the process of exclusion and inclusion from both male and female perspectives.

Two rather important criteria were that potential participants were keen on participating and developing their English. Attrition in community-based education for this population of learners is common, thus a desire to participant in learning and the desire to learn English were key criteria I used in the selection process to reduce the likelihood of attrition over the 5 months of the study, which included the time of the course itself and the entrance and exist interviews. Advertising of the course, followed by pre-screening phone calls, and the informed consent process (described below) were approaches that helped to gauge interest.

Crèche provision was provided for this phase of the study as well, with the support of the University of Edinburgh. The same certified crèche providers were contracted, and used an adjacent room to the City Art Centre’s Education Room for childcare. This helped to make participation, especially over an 11-week period, more accessible for parents.

Candidates were not excluded based on their level of English as the study strived for a group of mixed ability, also a characteristic of community-based ESOL. However,
if language proficiency impeded the informed consent process, then these individuals were not included in the study.

If prospective participants did not meet selection criteria a letter was sent to them to thank them for their interest, which provided details of other ESOL provision in Edinburgh, e.g. through CLAN, Edinburgh City Council and Stevenson. Details were also provided about museums in Edinburgh, who offer a wide range of educational programs for adult learners.

8.4.2.3 Informed consent
As I have mentioned, if prospective participants met the above criteria during the pre-screening phone calls and were interested in participating in the study, then they were invited for a face-to-face meeting where I obtained their informed consent. In this meeting, the overarching investigative interest was explained to the participants, which I framed as an interest in teaching and learning in museums. I sought a middle ground in terms of describing what the study was investigating, so the participants were rightfully informed, without being so specific about the investigation that it might interfere, creating a Hawthorn Effect.

In addition to informing the participants about the research, the consent process informed them about what the research entailed, the length of the study, the option to exit the study at any time, and the level and scope of participation the study required, e.g. participating in 3 interviews. I explained how the data would be recorded, and why it would be audio and video recorded and assured them that their identities would remain confidential and that all names would be made anonymous in any write up of the study and transcriptions through the use of pseudonyms.

In addition, I gave participants the option to receive a summary of the thesis upon completion of the write up, if they wanted to learn more about the research after it was conducted and how they contributed to the understanding of learning and teaching in museums. Consent forms were written in a ‘plain’ English, so that it could be understood to learners of English. I made sure they understood the study and what their participation in the study meant, and that I addressed any questions
before the signed the form. All participants were given a copy of the consent form for their own record.

8.4.2.4 Sample
A total of 14 participants were recruited at the start of the study, allowing for attrition, with a target post-attrition sample of 10 participants (table 8.4). This surplus proved advantageous, as after attrition, there were 9 participants that participated in the full study (Figure 8.1). As Figure 8.1 indicates, there were fluctuations in attendance over the period of study in the museums, 11 weeks total. Five of the 14 individuals officially withdrew from the study. These individuals chose not want to participate in an exit interview, but through email and phone conversations, they indicated reasons why they were withdrawing from the study, which I included in their case study fieldnotes. While the remaining participants’ attendance fluctuated greatly over the period of 11 weeks, I consider these individuals full participants in the study because they made themselves available for the final interview, which by definition seems to indicates that they were still engaged in the research process five months after its commencement.
### Table 8.4 Main study sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Pre/Post Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agnieszka</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aruni</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cyryl</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Karol</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eliasz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fatimah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friderich</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lucyna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Natasza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tenzin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wei</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Zhaohui</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zofia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 8.1 Attendance over 3-month period of museum visits

#### 8.4.3 The Sessions

The sessions had a similar overall structure throughout the series of museum visits. Broadly, they were structured around a tripartite pre-, while- and post-museum visit activity structure (course overview appendix A, sample lesson plans appendix B).
Sessions were conducted weekly over a period of 11 weeks. Initially 12 weeks were planned, but the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries needed the Education Room for another program on the planned 12th week, so we reduced the sessions to 11. Four museums were included in this phase of the study: The City Art Centre, Museum of Childhood, Museum of Edinburgh and the People’s Story. The Writer’s Museum was excluded from this phase of the research because it was the furthest museum from the home base, the City Art Centre. In addition, this museum is not well equipped for individuals with physical disabilities.

Sessions were extended to 3 hours, following the suggestions of participants in the pilot phase of the study. There were 5 tasks in each session: homework/warm up task, pre-museum visit task, walking to museum task, museum visit task, post museum visit discussion. The homework tasks varied each week and involved some preparation on the part of the participants in relation to aspects of the museum collection that they would be visiting the subsequent week. Homework tasks provided a forum within which participants could communicate their identities, culture and interests. In the first couple of weeks of the course implementation, it became evident to myself, the teacher and learning assistant how significant this was for the participants. As the sessions progressed, more time was allotted to the homework presentations, and they often took the form of formal presentations, some of which were quite elaborate and well prepared. In the second phase of interviews, all of the participants commented on homework tasks without solicitation, and it appeared that these were a prominent part of their experience. They took a delight in learning about other cultures and countries and seemed to have enjoyed the discussions that arose out of these experiences. I encouraged the teacher and learning assistant to generate topics for the homework tasks to involve them in the course's development. This proved to work extremely well.

The pre-museum visit task was designed to arouse interest in the topic or collection of the museums. These tasks took back stage when more time was devoted to the homework tasks, and in many cases the homework tasks and pre-museum visit task had the same function, so that its omission was not significant. A range of materials were used for these tasks provided by the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and
Galleries. For the People’s Story Museum, audio cassettes of reminiscences with slides of photographs that accompany the reminiscences were used as a warm up to the gallery visit. The audio recorded reminiscences featured the voices, accents and expressions of local Edinburghe, which the learners enjoyed hearing. For the Museum of Childhood, their handling collections were used to generate language and interest in the collections before the visit. In these cases, the handling collections provided an opportunity for participants to ponder about the objects prior to the visit, then use the museum visit to learn more about the objects, reading wall texts and making note of other objects on display near these objects. Being able to touch real artefacts, as the museum’s handling collection contains mostly authentic artefacts that are the same or similar to those on display, from observations seemed highly motivating to the learners. In the last museum, the City Art Centre, digital slides of some of the museums’ painting and sculpture collection were shown to focus on aspects of the collection, e.g. portraiture. These previews, served to scaffold participants reading of the visual language of the art on display, prior to the museum visit.

Following the pilot study feedback that indicated that the walks to the galleries were time consuming, a task was created to fill in these spaces with talk. Two types of tasks were used. On every first visit to the a museum, an orienteering task was used. Participants were given a series of clues in text and a map of the area and had to work in small groups, under the supervision of one of the tutors, to navigate to the museum. The teachers had additional clues in the form of pictures of the buildings/landscape of the area to provide if the participants were stuck. These activities generated a lot of collaboration amongst the group and bonding opportunities. The second type of task was ‘small talk’, which was used on the weeks in between the first visits and was by far the most successful and memorable to the students. The participants were introduced to the concept of small talk on week 2, including taboo topics and acceptable topics. During the first few weeks they were given small talk topics to start a conversation and assigned a partner en route to the museums, with some useful language around that topic. As the students became more familiar with small talk, they were encouraged to initiate their own topics and find their own partner.
The museum visit tasks ranged from pre-assigned tasks to survey tasks. After observing the link between the museum task and the post museum discussion, I adjusted the museum tasks to mainly surveys which encouraged more learner choice and autonomy to pursue aspects of the collection that they found interesting. This change had a positive impact on the nature of the post-visit discussion. Students were encouraged to walk around the gallery in pairs and discuss. For some, this was a natural experience, for others, it seemed rather forced. That is to say that some of the participants wanted to talk about the collections and about things they found interesting and others were more contemplative and preferred to observe and then discuss after the visit. Towards the end of the series of visits, the tasks allowed students to navigate the gallery in their preferred way. Students were encouraged to write down things they found interesting as they explored. Most students were quite diligent scribes and spent a lot of time in the galleries reading and writing. When asked about what they wrote in the second round of interviews, they often said they were writing words they had not known or preparing for the post visit discussions.

The post museum visit discussions also evolved throughout the series of visits. In the beginning they were quite structured tasks in which students had to report back on what they did in the museum. This format was not successful for eliciting participation in discussions. These kinds of discussions had low levels of participation from the participants. When post museum visit discussions were driven by learners’ interests and observations, they were characteristically synergetic with high levels of turn-taking and a wider distribution of discussants. These discussions were also used as opportunities to focus on the language emerging from the discussion.

8.4.4 Data Collection Methods

8.4.4.1 Interviews

Several methods and instruments were used to collect data during this phase of the investigation. Firstly, time-series interviews were conducted with participants to examine their experiences post-migration and participating in EiM. The interview protocol is appended (Appendix I). These interviews were audio recorded and
transcribed in order to analyse emergent themes using NVivo qualitative analysis software.

8.4.4.2 Observations
Observations were conducted to understand what happens in dialogue constructed around museum collections with this target group of learners. One of the limitations of observations in the pilot study were that fieldnotes were the main instrument used to record events that happened during the sessions. This was adequate for the pilot because this phase of the research was primarily testing implementation of materials and data collection protocols. However, for the main study, more fine grain analysis was needed in order to understand the affordances of participation in museums. For this reason, observations were video-recorded, with audio recording used as a back up. In total, the data collection and recording of observation produced 33 hours of interaction in museums and their surroundings. It was not possible transcribe all of the 33 hours of video because of the amount of time it would take to transcribe multi-speaker dialogues. Instead, segments of the sessions were sampled to be transcribed, for conversation analysis, in which both the content of utterances and the interaction between interlocutors was analysed to understand the nature of dialogue within these contexts with these group of learners. The next chapter will discuss the analytical method used to analyse the data in more detail.
Analytical Frameworks

The analysis methodology that I will describe here occurred in several stages. The first analytical framework I will describe was applied to the interview data, themes generated, inter-rater reliability checked, and while analysis gave me a clear understanding of the data, a map of the data so to speak, it became clear, from my intuitive understanding of all of the data from conducting the interviews, that the analytical framework, could not adequately address some of the questions, nor fully represent the complexity of these accounts that post-interview fieldnotes marked. Thus, I chose to re-approach the data, applying a different analytical lens, which enabled me to both address the questions of interest and examine the complexities of these accounts.

In this section, I will describe this process, and the analytical approach used to generate the findings that will be reported in the subsequent chapter.

9.1 Interview analysis

In the tradition of the qualitative research paradigm, my analysis of the interview data sought to generate an understanding of the issues being investigated from the data itself. That is, I approached the data guided by theory and the aforementioned conceptual framework, and not with the aims of testing a priori hypotheses. Instead, the approach to analysis of interview data was inductive, or grounded theory following Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) concept. Eisenhardt (2002) summarizes some of the strengths of developing theory through cases are: that it is possible to develop ‘novel’ theory; the constructs and hypotheses developed can be tested and therefore proven or disproved; and that theory generated is therefore empirically valid (2002, 30).

Theoretical coding enables a researcher ‘to ground’ hypotheses in direct participants’ accounts, in other words, from the data itself. Thomas (2003) claims that the value of an inductive approach for qualitative data analysis is that (1) extensive data can be reduced into a more concise format (2) links can be made (and justified) between the raw data and the research’s objectives, and (3) theory or a model can be developed
that helps to explain the fundamental structure embedded in the raw data itself (2003, 1).

Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) outline an approach that I will describe below for grounded theoretical analysis of qualitative data, working with data from the ground up:

Research Concerns
Theoretical Narrative
Themes
Repeating Ideas
Relevant Text
Raw Text (adapted from Auerbach and Silverstein 2003)

Coding is a process whereby researchers “make judgments about the meanings of contiguous blocks of text” (Ryan & Bernard, 2003, 274). Theoretical coding of text begins, as Auerbach and Silverstein describe, with the raw text that has been transcribed from audio recordings. The researcher samples text with a clear focus on the research concerns (questions) and a theoretical or conceptual framework. With respect to this study, the conceptual framework of language learning, identity and positionality informed the study from its research design, research questions, interview questions and at this stage, the selection of relevant text. NVivo 8, a computerized qualitative data analysis software program, was used to help facilitate the analysis process. Data selected for further analysis included the following broad themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Experiences of EiM</em></td>
<td>Experiences of EiM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Identity</em></td>
<td>Self concept or social identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Life experiences</em></td>
<td>Experiences pre- and post-migration that might pertain to immigration and language learning and language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1 Free codes and definitions

The next phase entailed a close reading of the selected text in order to identify ideas that repeated within case and across cases. Next, I clustered text identified as
‘repeating ideas’ into categories that reflected shared themes. This was an iterative process in which I refine categories, reducing the number of themes, identify sub-themes or contrasting text (Thomas 2003, 5). Themes that emerged from the broader categories in Table 9.1 have been disaggregated into the following codes (Table 9.2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parent code of EiM</th>
<th>child code</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>experiences of EiM</td>
<td>Community of practice</td>
<td>desire to engage with or engagement with the local community or ESOL community in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural perceptions</td>
<td>perceptions of engaging with the cultures of the ESOL group and Scottish culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language learning</td>
<td>perception of language learning in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that kick</td>
<td>motivation to speak and engage in English from using objects as stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>self concept</td>
<td>as an ESOL user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confidence</td>
<td>displaying absence of or presence of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fear/anxiety</td>
<td>expressing fear or anxiety as a user of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tests</td>
<td>tests/qualifications in relation to self concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social identity</td>
<td>social identities, self in relation to other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attitude towards community</td>
<td>Scottish, ESOL or immigrant community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive attitude</td>
<td>positive attitude towards the community (ESOL, immigrant, Scottish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative attitude</td>
<td>negative attitude towards the community (ESOL, immigrant, Scottish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and employment</td>
<td>perceived connection between English, employment and social identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right to speak</td>
<td>perceived absence or presence of the right to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life experiences</td>
<td>social exclusion</td>
<td>Experiences isolation: physical, linguistic and imagined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social inclusion</td>
<td>experiences inclusion: physical, linguistic and imagined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2 tree codes and definitions

Coding was verified by testing the coding scheme on a sample of data to establish inter-rater reliability. A researcher, who had not previously seen the data, but was aware of the project, was given a sample of transcripts and the coding scheme to
apply the codes to the transcripts. High agreement between my assignment of codes and this researcher’s suggested that the coding scheme was reliable at capturing the emergent themes in the data and that they could be applied by researchers outside the project. In some cases, this verification process resulted in refinements to the definitions of some codes, aggregating some codes and disaggregating others.

The next stage entailed working with the themes to generate theoretical constructs that help to explain how the themes relate. Eisenhardt (2002) argues that this involves “(1) refining the definition of the construct and (2) building evidence which measures the construct in each case” (20). That is, returning to the data for a close analysis of multiple sources of evidence for that construct to help the researcher establish parameters for that construct and rule out instances of inconsistency. Validity is increased as evidence is found to support the construct within cases and more importantly across cases (Eisenhardt 2002, 21).

9.1.1 Limitations and Opportunities
Post-interview memos, the transcription process and grounded theoretical analysis of the interview data highlighted an embedded structure to the interviews. What emerged during this analytic process was that the interviews were a collection of stories about participants’ lived experiences. Through parsing text from these interviews into thematic groupings for grounded theory analysis, stories became lost to categories that stretched across cases, one of the limitations noted in the literature on inductive analysis (Dey, 1993, 152).

In an effort to capture these stories, I attempted to summarize these narrative accounts: stories of migration, post-migration and experiences of EiM. The issue of validity quickly emerged, given the lack of transparency of my process and therefore easily considered questionable interpretations of the data. Questions of how I was reducing data, what criteria were being used for data selection, and ultimately what were the bounds and limits of what constituted the stories of these lived experiences as I saw them were major issues that needed to be adequately addressed. In addition, the question of whose voice was being reflected in these ‘produced’ narrative accounts was no doubt problematic. Ultimately I had gone through a process of interpreting the account, re-structuring, re-wording and then re-writing them in order
to create a greater sense of coherence, with the effect of privileging my own voice as a researcher. What was clearly needed was a systematic process for the analysis of narrative and greater transparency of my analytic process to increase the validity of interpretation.

I turned to narrative analysis as a means of examining the case studies, their trajectory over time, that is across the series of interviews, and emergent themes across cases. In the next section, I consider the theoretical bases for narrative analysis.

9.2 Narrative Analysis

Riessman defines narrative simply as “talk organized around consequential events” (1993, 3). In this section, I will unpack this definition to highlight some key aspects of narrative as an analytical tool for understanding lived experiences.

First, narratives are coherent. Labov and Waletzky’s seminal work on the structure of narratives identified temporality in narratives as an integral part of storytelling that enables stories to be coherent (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Their analysis of a corpus of interviews, originally conducted for another study, recognized an embedded temporal aspect to stories that was realized through the chronology of events. That is, one thing happened, then another thing and then another thing. Ricoeur, however, argued that the concept of time and narrative needed further theorizing in order to account for subjective nature of temporality (Ricoeur, 1980). In other words, he argues that the subjectivity shapes the sequence in time. For example, in Bell’s study of diethylstilbestrol (DES) daughters she notes how the process of recapitulating past experiences in the interview encounter seemed to facilitate temporal ordering of experiences, which she argues, helped to give insight into how they interpreted these experiences. This suggests that temporality is constructed, and how temporality is constructed can provide a useful focus for the analysis of how people interpret the significance of their experiences.

The next aspect of narratives, which relates to the previous one, is that narratives have a point. If we return to the narrative introduced in Chapter 6, excerpt 8.1 to
illustrate, it could be argued that the point of this narrative about experiences engaging in English in a shop in Scotland was the idea “I can’t communicate”, the way in which Sarah interpreted the shopkeeper’s query “Sorry”. It is this point, or ‘plot’, that drives the chronological ordering in narratives, according to Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1980, 171).

A third aspect of narrating is that storytelling entails recapitulating past events in the present. In this sense, the past is recapitulated through the present insofar as the present is the lens through which one interprets the past. Kerby argues that narratives cannot be taken as replicating past events but instead, as representations of past events that reflect the narrators (Kerby, 1991, 23). Riessman (1993) contends that researchers do not have direct access to participants’ experiences, but instead, these representations of experience. With respect to focusing on these representations as a route to understanding peoples’ lived experiences, Riessman suggests that narrativization tells of lived experiences, but also it also tells of “how individuals understand those actions, that is, meaning” (1993, 19).

This aspect of representation also highlights the final point, which is that narratives are told to an audience. In this sense, narratives are co-constructed accounts, which help to shape the story (Riessman 1993, 20). The intersubjective dynamics that my elicitation of experiences engaging in English in Scotland helped foster, in the case of Sarah’s narrative in excerpt 8.1, shaped the choice of narrative, its point and with that its sequence.

9.2.1 Narrative Structure
As mentioned above, Riessman (Riessman, 1993) characterizes data to be analysed, be it talk, text or interaction as representations of experience, as researchers do not have direct access to participants’ experiences. Instead, what is generated in the collection of data are co-constructed accounts that serve to represent lived experiences. This conceptualization acknowledges the relativist ontology shared by most qualitative researchers, as well as the intersubjective dynamics that help to shape data. This conceptualization also highlights the possibilities with respect to an analytical framework for the analysis of qualitative data. That is to say, if data is taken as representations of experience, then an approach to the analysis of this kind
of data is to analyse how these ‘representations’ provide insight into lived experiences. Narrative analysis turns its analytic focus on the structure of these accounts and how that structure helps to provide a means for understanding the experiences of participants. Labov and Waletzky claim narratives have two primary functions, (1) referential, that is, referring to past experiences; and (2) evaluative, insofar as narrators interpret their experiences (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, 13).

Models of narrative analysis provide a framework in which to approach the narratives of the ESOL learners in this study. Labov and Waletzky’s seminal study sought to understand the structure of narratives through the analysis of a corpus of 600 interviews, and has provided an influential framework for narrative analysis (see Bell, 1988; Gee, 1989; Riessman, 1993). Their analysis identified six components of what constitutes a fully formed narrative: an abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution and a coda (Labov and Waletzky, 1967).

An abstract provides the listener with a summary of the narrative. In Riessman’s re-analysis of Bell’s study of DES daughters, she noted that the interviewer can provide the question frame that ultimately functions as the abstract of a narrative (Riessman, 1993, p. 41). The orientation provides the listener with details of the setting: time, place, participants, etc. to orientate the listener. Next, the complicating action is what Bell (Bell, 1988, 102) refers to as the plot of the narrative, the main idea, as it were. Next is the evaluation, which specifies the narrator’s perspective on the significance of said account, the “soul of the narrative” according to Riessman (Riessman, 1993, p. 20). Labov and Waletzky argue that the success of a narrative is contingent upon the whether the narrator has communicated their message through the evaluation clauses. The resolution, as Labov and Waletzky define it, appears subsequent to the evaluation, often includes a reference to what happened next. Finally, the coda returns the listener to the present and is often denoted by a temporal shift, e.g. ‘so now…’ or by use of present tense (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, p. 33, 39). Riessman and Bell note however, that a coda was not present in all of the narratives they analysed (Riessman, 1993; Bell, 1988). Drawing from a large corpus of data, Labov and Waletzky qualified some inconsistencies with respect to the structure of narratives with noting that the inconsistencies in their data could be
attributed to the narrators’ with ‘less verbal’ abilities (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, p. 32).

9.2.2 Interpretation from Narrative
Labov and Waletzky’s framework of narrative structure enables one to decode how stories are structured, and from that linguistically grounded interpretations of them can be made.

Bell (1988) appropriated Labov and Waletzky’s framework in her analysis of DES daughters, which she conducted in two phases. First she parsed the text using the components of narrative from Labov and Waletzky’s framework, excluding the evaluation clauses. This, she notes, enabled her to analyse the plot of stories first. Then, she restored the narrative to its whole with the evaluation clauses. Through analysing the evaluations in the second sweep, she suggests that it enabled her to then consider how participants were making meaning of their experiences. I would argue that exclusion and inclusion of parts of the narrative may in fact have been a gratuitous process given that the process of parsing text makes one aware of the evaluations which form part of the story. In addition, is not clear how looking at these aspects of the narrative separately could have enabled greater insight into the narratives themselves.

One of the questions that arose out of Labov and Waletzky’s study was whether or not multiple stories were within the broader narrative of the interviews as a whole. Bell’s study of DES daughters highlighted that there could be several narratives present within one interview and that these narratives could be analysed as a method to interpret how participants made meaning of their past experiences on the whole. Through the analysis of the multiple narratives within the interview, she interpreted the participants’ accounts of identity transformations (1988, 109). Bell suggests that these episodic accounts might mirror how participants have stored experiences in memory (1988, 102), that is, aspects of overall experience that are the most salient are then later retrieved for recollection.

In my own analysis of the interviews from the present investigation’s dataset, it became clear that grounded theoretical analysis would enable me to identify themes
in and across cases, however in doing so, decontextualizing the intersubjective dynamics that helped produce the interview, and at the risk losing how participants made meaning of their experiences, which was primarily expressed through storying their experience. I had an intuitive sense of the participants’ narrative plots from the interview encounter, transcription process and grounded theory analysis. However, I had no sense of how participants were structuring these accounts, nor what could be known from the analysis and interpretation of that structure.

In light of the limitations of my previous analysis, I conducted a pilot analysis of a sample of data using a narrative analytical framework in order to evaluate the affordances of this type of analysis to address the study’s research questions for the dataset as a whole.

9.2.3 Piloting Narrative Analysis
Having become extremely familiar with the interviews through interviewing, transcription and coding using grounded theory analysis, I had the sense that some interviews were quite natural storytelling, whereas others seemed to be structured around a question and answer format, usually with the answers being quite brief. For this pilot, it was my sense to select an interview that I suspected did not contain narrative to see how I might endeavour to conduct this form of analysis with this kind of data.

Having selected the preferred case, I started from the raw transcripts and highlighted text that seemed broadly to constitute a narrative account. Ten stories were identified in the selected interview transcript, which constituted the data for further analysis. The first level of analysis began by focusing on structure of the narrative and for the second level I focused on narrativity, that is, how the story is told and examining why it might be told in this manner.

I identified the structure of the narratives using Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) framework for the structure of narratives. What I found was that some narratives were fully formed in the sense that they contained all elements of the framework, while most contained only the orientation, complicating action, evaluation and often a resolution. Next, I re-transcribed the narratives, parsing text into clauses, which
Labov and Waletzky define as “the smallest unit of linguistic expression which defines the functions of narrative” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, p. 13).

I analysed each story on its own, then attempted to connect how they related. Instead of Bell’s approach of analysing the evaluation clause last, I used this as my starting point, to understand how the participants’ interpreted their experiences. Reading through the corpus of narratives, it became clear that some small stories were essentially irrelevant to the research questions. I reduced the data further to those narratives from the series that were relevant to the research questions. In this pilot, I kept all narratives and their sequence intact, so that if those narratives that seemed irrelevant to the research questions, became more relevant during the interpretive stage, I could return to them more readily. Through the process of interpretation of narratives, I interrogated my initial parsing and clarified the text by adjusting my classifications of text.

Next, I wanted to examine identities in narrative and how they might relate to social interaction in and beyond the museums. Drawing on Davies and Harrè (1990), this research takes the view that positioning by others and self positioning can be observable in dialogue, and also, following Bourdieu positioning and being positioned in social interaction impacts on identities (Bourdieu, 1977). Through the analysis of narratives, I sought to understand how individuals made meaning of their social interactions, also examining the ways in which they positioned themselves in these accounts of social interaction (Giddens, 1991). In order to examine identities in narrative, I coded the parsed narratives for markers of self-positioning and other positioning.

What follows is my analysis of Zofia’s narratives. Following Mishler (Mishler, 1990), in order to show the workings of my analysis, my interpretations and the original text is presented first, parsed in narratives (excluding those stories that did not directly relate to the research questions). The transcript is also parsed into clauses, and for the purposes of this discussion, it includes the annotation of complicating action and evaluation clauses.
Zophia’s Story

7 so I came to this country 4 years ago
8 but I could speak English before that
9 because uh... I learned it at school
10 and I also went to English classes
11 and eh at eh... a few years ago I decided to become an English teacher
12 because uh... I lost my job in my first profession
13 eh... I was a shoe engineer?
14 I worked in eh shoe factories for 15 years I think,
15 about 15 years
16 and eh... in the 90s you know
17 when the situation in Europe, in Eastern Europe, started to change,
18 it was difficult uhm to find a job,
19 many factories bankrupt one after another
20 and eh I decided... things that I do,
21 I can speak English,
22 but I didn’t have qualification
23 so I had to join a college
24 that’s a college for English speaking for eh... teachers of English
25 I was a good student
26 and then it was in 2004
27 when Poland and other countries were joined to the European Union
28 and uh... because of our financial situation was not very good
29 so my husband decided
30 that I will go to Scotland
31 because I could speak English
32 and it would be easier for me to find a job
33 to to understand people,
34 to live in a foreign country
35 and I did so,
36 he joined me a year later
37 and uh we want to stay in this country
38 because eh... though it is foreign country,
39 but I think life is easier here
40 even if you are a foreigner
41 and you start from the very bottom uhmm...
42 we started,
43 I started as a housekeeper,
44 my husband started as a cleaner
45 because his English was not good
46 and still is not good ehmm...
47 that life is easier in this country...
48 if you are not satisfied with your job
49 you can change it quite easily
50 if you are ready to work
51 you can find a job quite easily I think,
52 not very sophisticated one
53 but if you need some money to survive
54 I think it is easy to find something
55 and then when you eh feel more confident
56 you can look for something in your professional
57 or something more challenging and so on,
58 but I think with the money that we get here
59 it’s easier for us to pay rent, buy food,
60 have a trip to another town to see something interesting, much...
61 you can have more for the same money in Poland
62 so I learned English for several years [chuckles]
63 and I passed some examinations, GC and Advanced,

Excerpt 9.1 Zophia’s Story

64 they’re quite popular in Poland
65 ehmm... and now I would like to become a professional interpreter
66 but again I need some qualifications
67...
68 we are quite astonished
69 when we started,
70 we didn’t much marketing.
71 we just sent,
72 I don’t know, maybe 20 emails to this friend’s property agencies.
73 and some of them replied
74 and gave us job
75 and that’s how we started
76 and it’s eh- well,
77 we didn’t eh earn much money
78 but it was,
79 sometimes it was a little bit more than we used to earn in a hotel,
80 sometimes less,
81 it depends,
82 sometimes we had big jobs,
83 big decorating jobs to do sometimes just small jobs,
84 but we survived and... then we moved to Aberdeenshire
85 I was on the course
86 and when I was on the course
87 I applied for a job uh...
88 I thought that it would be forever
89 and so we thought
90 that it would be wonderful
91 because there was a tight cottage
92 and when we went there
93 it was the first time the countryside was so beautiful,
94 and we lived,
95 even not in a village,
96 it was outside the village
97 in the peace and quiet every time,
98 there was no traffic at all
99 we started,
100 and there was no harm for him at all
101 but eh then we resigned to the job,
102 my husband was not very happy
103 it’s partly because of his English,
104 because he couldn’t understand the people
105 and eh we were the first foreigners there
106 and they were not accustomed to foreigners
107 they- they didn’t realize
108 that sometimes they have to speak slowly
109 or explain some or show,
110 and I think they were a little bit annoyed with him all the time
111 and there was something bad-
112 I think that some people invented stories about him-
113 wanted to get rid of him-
140 I don’t know very well, but eh...
140 so we decided that we would resign
140 and come back to Edinburgh
140 or close to Edinburgh
144 and now we are in Linlithgow,
145 our our son is in a new school again [chuckling]
146 and eh... we are in the same business again...

Excerpt 9.1 Zophia’s Story
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Zofia’s story highlights perceived tensions and contradictions between legitimacy as a speaker of English and opportunities as a migrant to Scotland. Originally from Poland, she immigrated to Scotland 5 years ago, when Poland joined the EU and opportunities for economic migration presented themselves. She worked first as a housekeeper, then a self-employed gardener, gardener on an estate, and now as a translator in the courts. She is seeking further qualifications in Polish to English translation. She attended the museum sessions for one session and then dropped out, so her case includes her initial interview and email correspondence.

Her story begins by positioning herself as a ‘legitimate’ speaker of English. Here the term ‘legitimate’ is used to describe the sum of the function of clauses within Zofia’s narrative. That is, declaration of the number of years’ experience learning English (lines 08-10 and line 62), listing qualifications, including qualifications to teach English and proficiency test certificates (line 63) in sum seek to emphasize Zofia’s legitimacy as a speaker of English language. To further, if analysis of the these lines is considered within the context of the interview encounter in which it was generated, (that is, at the start of a project for language learners learning English in Scotland), prefacing her narrative of migrating to Scotland and living in Scotland with a full disclosure of her credentials serves to position herself as a legitimate speaker and also a proficient speaker of English outside of my own assessment of her abilities from having spoken with her. In addition, it is possible that the interview encounter itself, a pre-interview for English Language class may have positioned her as a language learner, whereby through a series of narratives she seeks to position herself in this encounter as an English speaker. This perspective serves to shed light on one of the themes that is persistent in her narrative, her husband Eliasz, who was also a participant in the study.

Contrastingly, she describes Eliasz’s English as “not good”, or rather what could be described here as an ‘illegitimate’ English. Here ‘illegitimate’ is used to signify the contrast between how Zofia positions herself as a speaker of English and how she positions Eliasz throughout her narrative. In addition to illegitimacy, she positions Eliasz as an active agent in her own narrative, one that has shaped the direction of her story. She indicates that Eliasz decided they would immigrate to Scotland and
that she would immigrate one year before he did. She also describes him as the agent that influenced the type of employment they acquired upon arrival in Scotland, which were low-skilled labour jobs [lines 41-45].

While the causal relationship between clause 42 and 44 lacks temporal coherence, given she migrated one year prior to her husband, the clauses seem to provide thematic coherence, that is, by virtue of their intimation that Eliasz was an active agent in her own narrative. This thematic coherence suggests Zofia perceived that Eliasz’s own illegitimacy affected her possibilities and opportunities post-migration. This interpretation is also supported by the *evaluation* that follows the episode where she describes acquiring jobs for them on an estate in northern Scotland:

114 I thought that it would be forever

The next story [lines 115-146] tells of the critical incident on the estate, which ultimately informs the listener why their tenure did not last forever. It is staged with a thorough *orientation* that contains a series of modifiers that set up wonderful scene and ultimately impending disappointment such as, *wonderful, beautiful, peace, quiet, no traffic, no harm*. Acting as active agent again, Zofia had to resign from her job on the estate because of Eliasz’s English. While it is not clearly stated what incident led to their resignation, her evaluation highlights her reasoning about the incident and how it could be attributed to his level of English [lines 129-140].

Having positioned herself as highly skilled and qualified, further tension arises when there is still a need to gain even more qualifications for work.

81 but ehm, I need [a translation certification] if I want to continue work as an interpreter,
82 I I have, I have to have it

The use of the words “need” and “have to” seem to indicate external forces and perhaps her perceived lack of agency in relation to employment. Conceptualizing lack of agency in relation to work within the framework of economic migration raises contradictions. One could argue that economic migration signifies agency, therefore the lack of agency signifies a contradiction in terms.
What connects the stories into a coherent whole is the theme of economic migration and career. Zofia is an economic migrant to Scotland, which is arguably the lens through which she sees her experiences prior to migration and post-migration. This is to be contrasted with other participants of a different migration and employment status, such as an unemployed asylum seeker.

Narrative analysis of this particular transcript, which I intuitively sensed lacked narrative, or a story, has helped to illuminate the complexity of Zofia’s experiences and the post-migration experience in general. Since there was only one interview with Zofia, because she left the study after the first session, I was not able to examine her experiences having participated in museum learning. However, this pilot analysis helps to unpack the interview account, highlighting the tensions she perceives in her life in Scotland with her husband as negotiated through English. The in-depth insight that this analysis has provided into this interview, is why I decided to re-approach all the interview data from phase 3 with this analytical lens to understand issues of social exclusion and inclusion in museums and Scotland in general.

In the following section, I will outline the method used to analyse the narratives in the corpus of interviews.

9.2.4 Narrative Analysis Methodology
First, like the pilot analysis described above, not all of the data was analysed. I first reduced the data to only those cases where there was a pre- and post- interview. That way, some analysis of trajectory over time could be done. In light of attrition, the data of 9 participants were included in this analysis.

To further reduce the data, relevant text was selected from the raw transcripts of the 9 cases included in the analysis. Raw transcripts were reread for each case to identify relevant text and the relevant text was then copied and pasted into a new document that contained narratives for each case. Parameters for what constituted relevant text for this data sweep were whether there was a narrative. Since narratives recollect past experiences, text that related to future hopes were excluded, unless they were part of a narrative, such as an evaluation, resolution or coda. I defined
narrative as text that included both a *complication action* (in other words a plot) and an *evaluation* (participant’s reasoning about the complicating action). As I have mentioned, Riessman (1993) and Bell (1988) note that narratives do not always include all six elements of the Labov and Waletzky’s structure. For the purposes of the present investigation, whereby I was seeking to understand participants’ experiences and their interpretations of those experiences, I considered the *complicating action* and *evaluations* as the core elements of the narrative. Thus, I parsed all text that contained at least these two elements. The third layer of data reduction was to limit the text for further analysis to those narratives that were relevant to the research’s questions.

In order to analyse the narratives, I parsed the narratives into narrative clauses, which were the unit of analysis. Narrative clauses were coded using Labov and Waletzky’s framework of the six features of narrative. Finally, the narrative texts were imported into Nvivo 8, for additional layers of inductive coding.

The next layer of coding focused on narrativity, analysing how stories were told and how coherence of narratives was achieved in and across narratives. In other words, this phase of analysis examined the trajectory and relationship between narratives within a case. Focusing only on *evaluations* in each story, enabled me to make inferences about how participants’ made meaning of their experience through evaluative clauses. Evaluations can be either externally or internally embedded within narratives (Cortazzi, 1993). External embedding explicitly states the point of the story outside of the story itself, e.g.

```
is first moment this
is to me no understand
[sighs] ah here is ok
```

Excerpt 9.2 Agnieszka’s 1st interview, narrative 1.5

In this case, the story is interrupted by the narrator’s evaluation of this particular circumstance. External evaluation can vary in its degrees of explicitness (Cortazzi, 1993, p. 48). Contrastingly, internal evaluation uses modifiers, intensifiers, comparators, repetition and various other linguistic devices to embed their interpretation of experience within the narrative itself, e.g.
so my husband decided that I will go to Scotland because I could speak English and it would be easier for me to find a job to understand people, to live in a foreign Excerpt 9.3 Zofia’s 1st interview, narrative 1.2

In this example, the narrator provides their interpretation using the causal clause “because I could speak English”. The clause is indexed with the conjunction “because” which indicates a relationship between this clause and the preceding one, and that that relationship is causally linked.

All interviews contained multiple narratives and the evaluation clauses were parsed to analyse the sequence of evaluation clauses across the corpus of narratives of a given case. I sequentially organized only these clauses for an entire corpus of narratives for a given case in order to make inferences about the relationship between the core of narratives within a single interview and across the series of three interviews for each participant. This sequential analysis of evaluation clauses also enabled me to make inferences about how to characterize the sum of narratives for a given case and make inferences about the relationships and similarities of story arcs across cases.

9.2.5 Limitations and Considerations
There are several limitations and considerations made for using this kind of analytical framework for this dataset. First, reduction of data using this structural method can edit out the voice of the interviewer, essentially editing how some of these stories emerged. It is equally important to consider how stories are generated, how an audience participates in narration. In some cases, my voice as interviewer was captured by the question frame, which provided the abstract of the story, as Riessman (1993) notes about Bell’s interviews. In other cases, I edited out my voice as interviewer where the story was interrupted simply for the purposes of clarification.

Second, some participants are storytellers (Labov & Waletzky 1967), they convey experience through stories. During the interview encounter, very little facilitation
was need with these participants, despite their language level. Most of the interviewer talk in these types of interviews seeks clarification of terms. However, in a few interviews, this is not the case. Labov and Waletzky (1967) attribute a lower proficiency at storytelling with a lower level of literacy, a theme I anticipated would be present in my own study with language learners, however this was not the case. For example, a participant whose oral production could be best described as Common European Framework (CEF) Reference Level A2, could more than adequately narrate her past experiences, in the three interviews for this case, there were a total of 42 fully or partially formed narratives.

The challenge presented itself with interviews that contained far less narratives. Participants might have been more proficient at oral production in general, but less proficient at narrating their experiences. What can be observed from these interviews is that there is far more facilitation by myself as interviewer to attempt to open up spaces for stories, some of which were successful and some of which were not as successful.

An added dimension to the lack of narrative in one of the participants’ accounts in the study was that she was hiding something, so perhaps she was monitoring herself in the interview encounter. I learned in the third interview, when this participant lowered her guard, that she had been an illegal immigrant in the US for many years before migrating to Scotland. It could be argued that the narratives produced in interviews 1 and 2 for this participant, were mediated by my nationality as an American. This confession, helped to shed light on the previous encounters, which were extremely curt. As De Fina points out, narratives are simultaneously “spontaneous yet highly structured” (De Fina, 2003, p. 6)

With respect to meaning units, what I chose as the unit of analysis is a clause, which Labov & Waletzky redefine as the narrative clause. What is characteristic about the clause is that it is a fully formed expression. However, in some cases, which I would argue are a feature of the second language narratives I have collected, I have parsed text as clauses where there is some ellipsis. For example, the participant Agnieszka, whose proficiency in English is comparable to CEF level 2, her expressions are not
clauses in the definitional sense. That is they may not contain a subject and predicate. However, it is possible to infer from her constructions what an absent subject or predicate might have been. For example:

\[135\text{ } \text{is two hours listen talk}\]

**Translation**

\[135 [I listened to] talk [for] 2 hours\]

Or in the following example:

\[80 \text{I eh… look room… to friend… in go living in Bo’ness.}\]
\[81 \text{Work [falling intonation]}\]
\[82 \text{Live [falling intonation]}\]

**Translation for analysis**

\[80 \text{I look[ed] [for a] room in Bo’ness [with my] friend}\]
\[81 \text{I work[ed] [there]}\]
\[82 \text{I liv[ed] [there]}\]

In these case of lines 81-82, a single word could function as a clause, wherein the falling intonation signifies the end of a statement. It is this hypothesis that informed my decision to parse clauses that contained ellipses in this manner. This could be considered a limitation of my analysis as it makes assumptions about what participants intended to say. Those assumptions may be influenced by my own investigative interests.

Likewise, with respect to structure, I have observed that some narratives do not follow the linear structure that Labov and Waletzky propose. That is, in some cases they do not start with an abstract, then orientation, complicating action and evaluation. Instead, many seem forthright in providing their evaluation (their meaning of events), then an orientation and complicating action. It could be possible that these second language narratives deviate from the standard structure because in the communicative act, participants could be primarily focused on conveying their meaning and/or their message and then work backwards to supply the details and the problem from which their evaluation emerged. More linguistic analysis of the structure of second language narratives is needed to fully advance this claim.

In the next chapter, I will report the findings of this analysis.
9.3 Museum observations: Conversation Analysis

Observation of sessions in the museums generated a corpus of 33 hours of audio and video recordings of EiM.

On the descriptive level, the video/audio recordings enabled post hoc analysis of various dimensions of EiM, which data recording in the previous iteration of the study (phase 2) made impossible, because those observations were recorded by fieldnotes, which were recorded after the sessions. While fieldnotes serviced the questions of that phase of the study well, this phase sought to conduct more fine grain analysis of interaction in EiM. Video and audio recording of the sessions made possible fine grain analysis of dialogue as a means to unpack the affordances of language learning in museums. The raw data in itself constitutes a large corpus of talk-in-interaction of this cohort of learners in museums. Following the tradition of ethnomethodology, this research takes the view that analysis of talk provides a lens through which to understand and characterize dialogue and its function between the cohort of learners in these informal learning environments. It is for this reason that I applied Conversation Analysis to the museum observation data in order to examine interaction in EiM.

Conversation Analysis (CA) has been defined as an analytic approach that systematically explores talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). That is, both talk and interaction are the focus of analysis. Conversation Analysis examines the structure of social accomplishments and focuses on how speakers exhibit their understanding of conversation. Emerging from Garfinkel’s (Garfinkel, 1967) ethnomethodology as a means to examine the social organization of interaction at the micro-level, CA is a method used by sociologists, educational researchers, psychologists and linguists alike to examine conversational interaction.

Several key assumptions provide a basis for CA as an analytical tool, which Silverman (2001) summarizes as (p.167):

- There is structural organization of talk. What is inherent in talk is consistent and orderly patterns that participants align with.
• There is sequential organization in talk. Talk is context-shaped and can be understood with reference to that context.

• Analysis can be empirically grounded in talk. One should not be constrained by a priori theory. Highly detailed transcripts enable one to explore structural and sequential organization in talk.

Finally, Hutchby and Wooffitt add to this the assumption that the talk being analysed is naturally occurring talk (2008). Working with naturally occurring talk as data, conversation analysts transcribe recordings in a way that captures every detail of talk-in-interaction that are often edited out of transcripts (e.g. see transcription conventions Appendix E). Details such as pauses, overlapping or contiguous talk for example, can provide insight into talk and how participants co-construct meanings through interaction. Transcription at this level tries to replicate the video or audio source to every minutia of detail, to enable these aspects of talk to be subjected to analysis. Hutchby and Wooffitt, classify CA transcripts as ‘representations of data’ (1998, 74), the raw data in this sense are the audio and video recordings. In this respect, transcription is an iterative process, in which analysts return to the raw data and detail more of the interaction through multiple iterations of transcription, which allow one to notice more detail of that interaction. Markee refers to CA transcriptions as a “working hypothesis” of how talk occurred in real time (2000, 54).

There are several key concerns for analysis in CA:

• turn-taking
• adjacency
• institutional structure

Turn-taking refers to how speakers take turns in dialogue. Turn-taking as a unit of analysis can reveal participants’ analysis of talk-in-action by focusing on how they respond to talk contingently, demonstrating understanding with relevant and fitting responses (Silverman, 2001, 168-9, Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998, 38). Adjacency refers to pair sequences of talk that display order, e.g. the conversational opener “How are you?” is collocated with the response “fine”. It would be unusual or in
some ways inappropriate if a speaker responded with something other than “fine”. In this respect, adjacency pairs can illustrate conversational norms and how participants align with them to accomplish things in talk. Finally institutional talk brings the context of talk into focus and examines how it shapes roles of participants, constrains talk or meanings that might be interpreted by not responding (Silverman, 2001, p. 171). For example, analysing classroom discourse can reveal power differentials that exists between teachers and students. This might affect who has the right to speak within these contexts and when (e.g. students can speak when the teacher selects them to speak).

9.3.1 CA for SLA
CA has been gaining currency as an analytic approach in second language acquisition (SLA) research in recent years. Advocates view CA as an ‘emic’ or grounded approach to the analysis of learner talk which can lead to understandings of second language learning and SLA (Firth and Wagner 1997; Markee 2000). Advocacy of grounded approaches to SLA research is situated within the aforementioned ideological shift in the field (for some) and the ever-increasing epistemological debate of what constitutes learning and thus how learning can be empirically investigated.

It is important to acknowledge this view, but also situate the present investigation is within this debate. I will argue, and demonstrate through analysis of dialogue in museums, how CA can be used to understand and unpack learning processes. However, it is not possible for me make claims about long-term retention and acquisition of forms of language in this analysis. As I will report, the present analysis examines cross sections of dataset over time. Therefore, it is not possible to decouple what might be ‘lexical boost’ priming effects (Reitter, Keller, & Moore, 2011) from long-term learning and retention. Instead, this analysis will seek to examine some of the features of the dialogue in museums that may lead to development of lexis and socially mediated aspects of learning.

9.3.2 Conversation Analysis Methodology
Taking an emic vs. etic approach to the analysis of the conversation data, I approached this data in a similar way to the interview data, using a ‘grounded’,
inductive approach that was a posteriori rather than based on a priori hypotheses. The initial goal of the conversation analysis was to understand the affordances of conversation in museums for language learning and with respect to inclusion. However, this analysis followed interview analyses, which lead to more specific questions of the conversation data that sought to link these data to the findings from the interview data.

In order to analyse the affordances of dialogue in the museums, I needed to sample from the corpus of 33 hours of recorded interactions to transcribe and then analyse these interactions. I selected dense areas of dialogue from each session to transcribe so that I might examine turn taking, adjacency and structure. It could be argued that one of the limitations of my analysis is that in sampling certain parts of these sessions for transcription that the analysis does not constitute the entirety of learning experiences in EiM. However, it is my belief that in sampling those dense areas of dialogue, it is possible to gain insight into the processes of dialogue in museums that constitutes the entirety of the museum encounter.

Post museum visits I generated contact summary forms (Miles & Huberman, 1994), a type of structured fieldnotes where I wrote a description of the session, then made notes of salient aspects of the encounter and questions I had about phenomena based on these observations. I used these fieldnotes as a starting point to select relevant sections of the dataset to transcribe and analyse further. Selected text was transcribed through several iterations of transcription in order to provide a robust account of the interaction in the transcript, e.g. overlapping and contiguous turns, length of pauses and a variety of aspects of the speech such as intonation and volume that help to characterize the interactions.

I wanted to analyse several dimensions of the dialogue: linguistic, dialogic and positionality. With respect to the linguistic dimension, I wanted to understand what was happening in the dialogue that might support language learning. I coded for the functions of utterances that might indicate linguistic support, including, repair requests, repair provision, uptake of repair provision or no uptake in the repair suggestions. With respect to repair provision, I also coded whether repair
suggestions were solicited or unsolicited as indices of whether teachers and peers were providing repairs on their own accord or fulfilling a request for assistance. The second dimension, which I refer to as the dialogic dimension, sought to examine the interaction between interlocutors in discussions. I coded for reference to previous turns, examining how interlocutors were referring back to their previous utterances or to other interlocutors’ utterance. In addition, I analysed the proximity of these adjacency pairs (e.g. previous turns =-1, -4, -9). Proximity was used as a marker to examine dialogicity, how individuals were building on their own and other’s utterances. The final dimension, positionality, sought to examine self and other positioning in dialogue as a means to link these data to findings in the interview analysis. The first level of this coding examined epistemic positioning (Muntigl, 2009) in utterances. That is, what sources of knowledge were interlocutors drawing on in the museum dialogue, e.g. teacher’s, museum’s or their own experiences and opinions. Coding for this emerges in part from contact summary fieldnotes which marked epistemic positioning as salient in the discussions. In addition, analysis of epistemic positioning in these data was informed by Baynham et al’s study of adult ESOL which found that off-task talk, that emerged from the learners themselves, rather than the teacher, facilitated rich dialogue. The other aspect of epistemic positioning that sought to understand the affordances of museum-based discussions in relation to narrative trajectories, was self and other positioning. That is, I coded epistemic positioning utterances for whether individuals were positioning themselves in the dialogue or were being positioned by others in the interaction.

9.3.3 Limitations and Considerations
There are a few limitations to this methodological approach to investigating social interaction. First, as Larsen-Freeman advances, in the course of a short-term study, it is not possible to answer the central questions of most SLA research: What is learned? How is it learned and why was it learned? (Larsen-Freeman, 2007). As such, it could be argued that this approach to analysing conversational interaction leads simply to rich description of interaction, at the expense of understanding learning and how it is learned. Longitudinal analysis of individual learners over time might help to understand acquisition over time, but process data, such as conversational interaction that this study analyses helps to unpack the features of
conversational interaction within these contexts that might lead to long term learning and retention.

In the next chapter I present and discuss the findings from these analyses.
PART III: Presentation and Discussion of the Findings

10 Findings Overview

The findings will be presented in several parts. The first part will present the cases that were the subject of analysis. The second part will present the findings of the analysis of data that served to address the study’s aforementioned research questions. As discussed in the previous chapters, I will draw on multiple data sources to address the research questions, including interview and observation transcripts, where the latter is used to triangulate the findings of the former.

Following the tradition of research located within the ‘social turn’ paradigm (e.g. Firth & Wagner, 1997; Norton, 2000; Block, 2007), this research is interested in the learner as situated within a social context of learning. Thus, I examine the individual learner and their experience in all its varied complexity to try and understand how these aspects of experience affect the learning process itself. I investigate learners with identities, rather than the generalized learner, thus I will begin this section by outlining the cases under study, then the substantive themes that emerge within cases and cut across cases to address the research questions.

Situating this research within a qualitative paradigm requires a set of practices to ensure trustworthiness and therefore the reliability of the analysis. Mishler (1990) argues that one of the ways in which this can be achieved is through providing exemplars. That is, articulating what is commonly conceived as tacit knowledge in research practice, but can serve to provide transparency in the researcher’s process and therefore exemplify the foundation upon which interpretations have been made (1990, 422). Mishler also suggests that exemplars provide a basis for replication, a criterion used in the hard sciences for reliability. Thus, in the following sections, I present the findings of this research, in doing so I will draw a connection between the raw data, interpretation and what is considered findings of the analysis.
10.1 The Learners

The narratives I will discuss are very much stories of migration and attempted resettlement, each one individual, yet sharing common themes with respect to their post-migration experiences and perceptions of self as users/speakers of English in Scotland. I will begin by introducing the case studies with summaries that are represented in my own words. These introductions present largely biographical information to foreground in-depth analysis. For each case, I have provided a proficiency level using the Common European Framework of References’ Qualitative aspects of spoken language use Scale (Appendix D). The scale acts as a marker of proficiency outside of the participants’ self-perception of their proficiency as an English speaker.

9 of the 14 cases are presented. The omitted cases are those that either withdrew from the study or for which there were missing data. The cases are presented in alphabetical order.

10.1.1 Agnieszka

Agnieszka immigrated to Scotland from Poland three years and two months prior to the study. She moved to Scotland in search of work, as she found it difficult to find work in Poland. She is in her early 50s, a recent divorcée and empty nester. In Poland she was a trained midwife, who practiced briefly then opened up a café. She then turned the café into a florist, and as the economic situation declined, closed the florist shop altogether. She is self described as having no exposure to English prior to arrival in Scotland. She spent her first two months learning English through self-study. Two months after her arrival, she obtained a full-time job working on the assembly line of a factory and a part-time job working as a cleaner in a take-away restaurant. Agnieszka had not previously been to a museum in Scotland, but attended all 11 sessions of EiM, as well as visiting several museums on holiday after the classes ended. After the project ended, she started a beginner’s level ESOL class. Using the CEFR scale, Agnieszka is an A1 in terms of range and accuracy, however an A2 in fluency, interaction and coherence.
10.1.2 Aruni

Aruni immigrated to Scotland from Brunei with her husband, though originally from Sri Lanka. She had been living in Scotland for a year before the study began. Trained as a doctor, she practiced medicine in Brunei for several years prior to moving to Scotland. Her husband, a structural engineer, attained a highly skilled migrant visa and she followed him shortly after he migrated. Aruni was in her late 40s and her main motivation to move the UK was the hopes of better higher education opportunities for their children. She studied English in school and speaks English in her home, as her children were schooled primarily in Brunei, the family considers English as their lingua franca. Aruni has not practiced medicine in the UK, which she attributes to problems she has had with English proficiency examinations. She has never been employed in Scotland, but volunteered for the BME community in Edinburgh. Before the study she applied for a Master’s degree from a university in Edinburgh in the hopes to find employment in the healthcare sector afterwards. After the study, she resat and passed an English proficiency examination, and was starting the Master’s program. Aruni only attended two of the EiM sessions. On the CEFR scale, Aruni’s proficiency level would be comparable to a C1.

10.1.3 Cyryl

Cyryl immigrated to Scotland from Poland with his partner one and a half years before the study commenced. He is in his late 20s and sought new job opportunities in Scotland as well as opportunities to learn English. In Poland, he was a travelling salesman for a large corporation. He described himself as a complete beginner of English language upon arrival in Scotland. He studied English at a further education college in Edinburgh, but withdrew shortly thereafter. At the start of the main study data collection, he was unemployed but by the second interview he had found work as a delivery driver. In Scotland, Cyryl has also worked in a slaughterhouse and as a cargo handler. Prior to the research study, he had not visited museums in Edinburgh, however, he attended all 11 sessions of EiM. Immediately after the project ended, he began a community-based ESOL class. On the CEFR Qualitative aspects of spoken language use Scale, Cyryl is a B2.
10.1.4 Fatimah

Fatimah immigrated to Scotland from Sudan with her husband three years prior to the study. She immigrated because her husband came to the UK to do a postgraduate degree and then find a job. She learned English at school and in university in Sudan, and because of the form of instruction, feels she is stronger at grammar, more than speaking, listening and writing. Fatimah is in her late 20s, with a toddler who was born in the UK. At the time of the study, her son was just beginning to speak English, which he was acquiring from his nurseries. In Sudan, she studied food microbiology at university. In Scotland she worked in a biscuit factory briefly, took care of her son primarily and attended some adult education and ESOL classes. She attended eight of the 11 EiM sessions. After the study, she began an adult education computing course. Using the CEFR scale, Fatimah would be a B1 on the cusp of a B2.

10.1.5 Friderich

Friderich immigrated to Scotland from Poland three years before the study began. He graduated from university in Poland in economics and went on a working holiday to Scotland, that turned into a permanent relocation. He is in his late 20s. He learned English for 5 years in Poland. He studied at a further education college in Scotland taking an English proficiency exam preparation prior to the study, but was disappointed and chose not to sit for the test. When he first moved to Scotland he was a kitchen assistant in a restaurant, then he got a job at supermarket shopping for orders from their online store. He visited museums in Scotland often, prior to the study and attended seven of the 11 sessions, regretfully missing four due to a holiday back to Poland. After the study, Friderich took on more hours at the supermarket and had considered taking another ESOL course, but at the time of the last interview, had not committed to any courses. Based on the CEFR scale, Friderich’s proficiency in English would be comparable to a B1.
10.1.6 Karol

Karol migrated to Scotland from Poland 8 months before the study with his wife Lucyna, also a participant in the study. He was interested in migrating to UK to learn English and also to ‘try something new’. He studied English in school but describes himself as not using the language outside of school. He was unemployed for the length of the study, but had previously worked in a warehouse for a month, then as a delivery driver for six months in Scotland. He was looking for work in Scotland as a bookkeeper, a position he was trained in and held in Poland. Karol attended 7 of the sessions, missing the last few sessions after his wife gave birth to their daughter. On the CEFR, Karol’s proficiency would be a B1.

10.1.7 Laura

Laura immigrated to Scotland from Columbia with her husband two and a half years before the study began. She immigrated because her husband started a PhD program at one of the universities in Edinburgh. She is self described as having begun studying English when she arrived in Scotland. She studied, what she refers to as, basic English in Columbia, which she felt was thematically related to the home and travel. Laura is in her late 30s with a toddler that started speaking since they have been living in Scotland, so English is his first language. In Columbia she was a doctor, but does not practice medicine in Scotland. She has attended several adult education and ESOL courses in Edinburgh, including one which entailed a work placement with the NHS. At the time of the study, she was finishing an MBA by distance from a university in Spain. She visits museums in Edinburgh sometimes with her children, and attended 10 out of the 11 EiM sessions. After the study, she was finishing up coursework for her MBA. On the CEFR scale, Laura’s proficiency level would be comparable to a B2.

10.1.8 Lucyna

Lucyna immigrated to Scotland from Poland 8 months before the study with her husband Karol. Prior to immigrating to Scotland she lived as an illegal immigrant in the United States with her husband, moving from city to city for 2 years in search of
work. She quit the US for Poland when she wanted to start a family, in order to live a more stable live. Shortly after returning to Poland, she immigrated to Scotland with her husband. She was a trained accountant in Poland, found work as a housekeeper when she first immigrated to Scotland, then found a job as a bookkeeper. Lucyna attended 7 of the 11 sessions, missed the last few after she gave birth to her first child. On the CEFR, Lucyna’s proficiency level is comparable to a B2.

10.1.9 Zhaohui

Originally from China, Zhaohui immigrated to Scotland from Germany with her husband two years before the study commenced. In Germany she integrated with the Chinese expatriate community there. She studied German for six months. She had two children in Germany and spent most of her time caring for them. She immigrated to Scotland because her husband acquired a research post at a university in Edinburgh. After having graduated from university, she taught computer networking at a university in China. She married shortly after she graduated from university and after her marriage, she has not worked. She studied English at school and at university, and has taken a variety of ESOL courses and adult education courses since moving to Scotland. Sometimes she visited museums prior the study, and she attended nine of the 11 EiM sessions. After the study, she had applied for jobs for the first time since living in Scotland, and had been offered a job as a carer, but had to decline the offer because of childcare issues. Using the CEFR, Zhaohui’s proficiency in English would be that of B2 in terms of range and fluency, and B1 with regards to accuracy, interaction and coherence.

10.1.10 Summary
To summarize, the participants of the study span a range of linguistic, educational, cultural and historical backgrounds. Participants of the study include Polish, Sinhala, Arabic, Spanish, Nepali and Mandarin speakers. They range in the level of proficiency in spoken English on the CEFR scale from A1 to C1, with most of the participants falling the middle of that scale. They range with respect to previous exposure to English prior to migration from none to years of formal schooling. Likewise, their post-migration language education ranges from informal, natural
language acquisition to formal structured language education such as through community-based ESOL or FE college ESOL.

A mixed ability, mixed language background cohort presents some challenges and opportunities in terms of pedagogy (Fathman & Kessler, 1992). In terms of challenge, it means that the instructor has to be sensitive to levels of ability. Adapting instruction especially for the high end and the low end of ability so that they develop and extend their specific level of ability will be important. In terms of opportunity, mixed ability means that higher levels of ability will help to provide some scaffolding through interaction with the lower levels of ability. In addition, the range of language backgrounds might present natural opportunities for negotiation of meaning through conversational interaction.

The following section will report on the findings of the analysis.

10.2 Understanding migration, social exclusion and museum learning

In these sections, I will report on the themes within and across narratives. In particular, I examine the nature of linguistic exclusion as evidenced by narratives of experience. Narrative analysis examined the internal logic of stories to understand how individuals interpreted their experiences. In this sense, by examining the nature of linguistic exclusion, I am attempting to unpack the sites, actors and structures that individuals perceive as constraining engagement with and through English. Thus, these findings report on micro-level data of the nature of linguistic exclusion by way of participants’ perspectives. Likewise, in examining the nature of linguistic inclusion, I am uncovering the sites, actors and structures that participants attribute to enabling their engagement with and through English language in Scotland. I examine how the museum, as a social and educational site, functions both as a hindrance and facilitator of linguistic interaction. In addition, through temporal analyses of the narratives, I examine how these relationships, conceptualizations and attributions shift over time.
10.2.1 The Nature of Linguistic Exclusion

In order to understand the nature of linguistic exclusion, interview data were selected and reduced based on features of their narrative structure. The ‘problem’ of narratives, or ‘complicating action’ in Labov and Waletzkian (1967) terms, were analysed for stories that expressed challenges communicating in English. Stories that expressed communication challenges were classified as linguistic barrier stories. This first level coding produced a corpus of 81 linguistic barrier narratives across the cases, which were coded further to uncover features of their structure and patterns with respect to the stories told and how participants were making meaning of their experiences. Structural features that were coded included the actors, locations, resolutions, and participants’ interpretations, which were embedded within the narratives. Actors refer to the interlocutors that participants referred to within the narrative. Locations were the sites in which the story took place, e.g. work, home, school, etc. Resolutions were the outcomes, if any, to the problem that the narrative defined (e.g. “so I don’t feel like a citizen”). Interpretations were any direct or indirect interpretations that the narrator ascribed to the problem and resolution the narrative accounts (e.g. “I felt ashamed”, or emotive expressions like “hard”, “difficult”). Finally, in order to examine temporal aspects of narratives, the narrative clauses were also coded for the time point in which the interview was conducted, e.g. pre- EiM (henceforth referred to as EiM), mid-EiM, or post-EiM.

10.2.1.1 Overview of Linguistic Barrier Narratives

Aggregating the narratives of linguistic barriers revealed some broad patterns in the data (Table 10.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Study</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Linguistic Barrier Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre EiM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid EiM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post EiM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1 Linguistic Barrier Narratives across study phases

Interviews probed participants’ experiences engaging in English in Scotland broadly and during EiM (in the case of the second and third interviews). What Table 10.1
shows is that there was a greater prevalence of narratives conveying experiences of linguistic barriers prior to their engagement in EiM. While this was expected, given the EiM program was targeted to support linguistic and educational inclusion for the target population of learners of which the literature suggests experience social exclusion, what is notable is the number of cases in which these kinds of narratives were present in across the period of study. Before EiM commenced, experiences of linguistic barriers were prevalent across all 9 cases, while during EiM, the number of cases reporting experiences of linguistic barriers decreased to 6. When participants were interviewed one month after EiM only three cases expressed experiences of linguistic barriers through their narratives.

If we take the view that narrativity provides a lens through which to see how individuals code their experiences, as this investigation does, then Table 10.1 suggests that participants perceived themselves as having less linguistic barriers over time. The decrease in the number of linguistic barrier narratives and decrease in the number of cases in which these kinds of stories were reported provides some support for this claim. However, it is necessary to examine the data further in order to be able to fully advance this claim.

**Negotiating a New Linguistic Milieu**

Most of the narratives of linguistic barriers were told in the first interview, before participants’ involvement in EiM, therefore I examined this set of narratives further to identify commonalities and differences with respect to linguistic barriers that participants reported having experienced. As these stories provide accounts prior to their involvement in the EiM, they provide some insight into the participants’ experiences of using English prior to the treatment. In addition, these narratives constitute vivid accounts of the complexities of migration as participants were negotiating a new linguistic milieu.

There are several features of the pre-EiM linguistic barrier narratives that I wish to highlight. First, many of the narratives reported participants’ very first encounters with English upon arrival in Scotland, regardless of participants’ length of stay in
Scotland at the time of the interviews. Second, they define the linguistic barrier problem as an inability to speak English. Third, these narratives convey participants’ conceptualizations of competency in English in purely deficit terms, i.e. I cannot speak, e.g. Excerpt 10.1.

Ref# Narrative clauses
108 when I came here
109 I not spoke in English,
110 really
111 in the airport,
112 I smoke ciggie some times ago,
113 now I broke away,
114 I smoke ciggie before airport
115 and someone told me
116 “it’s such a beautiful weather,
117 isn’t it?”
118 I like “what?
119 I didn’t understand you”.

Excerpt 10.1 Cyryl’s 1st interview, narrative 1.7

In Excerpt 10.1 Cyryl locates this narrative temporally and contextually in the airport, his port of entry into Scotland, and possibly his first experience as a migrant in Scotland. The point of this story, as Cyryl conveys it, is that he felt he did not speak any English upon arrival in Scotland. While the story is internally incoherent—he begins the narrative by stating that he spoke no English, then follows by quoting an interlocutor and his own response, both in English--the point of this narrative is not so much a factual account of his language proficiency upon arrival, but rather how Cyryl perceived himself upon arrival. He defined himself as not being able to speak English.

It is quite possible that this story, and stories like this, serve as an exemplar for how participants felt upon arrival communicating in English. Cyryl externally embeds his evaluation of the experience by quoting himself saying “I didn’t understand you” (line 119). I interpret this evaluation as Cyryl’s understanding of this event, attaching this meaning to his early experience as an immigrant in Scotland.
The second story that Cyryl uses to convey his early experiences as a migrant appears twice in the dataset. The first telling is during the first interview (excerpt 10.2), and the second is seven weeks later in the second interview (excerpt 10.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Narrative clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Another example,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>my first job was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Broxburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>it’s a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>small village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between Livingston and Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>And I go there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>First bus, eh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>12 number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>So I come to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>and I saw bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is 12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>I came to- I go-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>I’ll come to this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>but it wasn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>it was Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>I mistake buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>and I can’t talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>what is wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>you know what I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feeling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>I think now is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>because I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understand people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and explain,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>but it’s not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 10.2 Cyryl's 1st interview, narrative 1.8
When I came here I didn’t spoke English and work in Broxburn, it’s a some village outside Edinburgh, and I knew it, I need to take a 24 bus? 24 for example 24 bus, and I waited, waiting, waited for this bus at the bus stop and I saw “oh 24” and I take this bus, but it wasn’t First, First bus, just a Lothian ((chuckles)) and I bought a ticket, I bought a ticket “one ticket to Broxburn please”. Driver told me “this bus not drive to the Broxburn, not go to Broxburn”, I told him “yes, thank you very much” and I go to take the ticket and ((chuckles)) but uh after that I think that I make mistake and horrible, I haven’t money with me, just money for the ticket, so I must go back to home for money and back and take uh correct the bus.

Excerpt 10.3 Cyril’s 2nd interview, narrative 2.8

While the first and second telling vary in length and detail, the story is essentially the same. It tells of an experience Cyril had catching the bus in Edinburgh. It should be noted here that there are two main bus companies that offer service in and around Edinburgh, Edinburgh First and Lothian Bus. Often both bus companies serve the same bus stance. According to the story, Cyril embarked on the bus that appeared with the correct bus number, but happened to be the wrong bus company, and therefore the wrong route.
The first telling of this story is an episode that follows the airport story. This story begins with “another example”. For this reason, in my analysis I transposed the abstract of the previous story to analyse Cyryl’s point: “when I came here, I not spoke English” (excerpt 10.1 lines 108-109). In this telling, Cyryl externally embeds his evaluation of the incident, that is, how he understands the incident: he could not talk to anyone about being on the wrong bus. Taken together, the transposed abstract and evaluation clauses suggest that Cyryl interpreted this incident as one in which he needed help, but could not ask for it because of a language barrier.

The second telling begins with the same transposed abstract as the previous telling, which reminds the listener that this story is yet another example of how he could not speak English upon arrival in Scotland. The story is enhanced with some additional details: the narrator brings the listener onto the bus, where he asks for a ticket to Broxburn and the bus driver replies, to which Cyryl responds and subsequently takes his ticket (after depositing bus fare). This telling also extends this episode by telling of the consequences of the incident: Cyryl did not have any money on his person, so had to walk back home to get money to take the correct bus. Like Cyryl’s airport story, the listener cannot be completely certain that his quotes are accurate given the internal incoherence of the narrative. However, what seems to be significant about both versions of this story is the meaning that Cyryl ascribes to this experience. He views this incident as one in which he could not communicate in English, which in turn led to negative consequences and frustration. I interpret the repetition of this story telling as a possible archetype of linguistic barriers for this narrator. It is possible that Cyryl has used this story several times in the past in order to illustrate his experiences and frustrations of communicating in English upon arrival in Scotland given that in the context of this study, he tell this story twice (in seven weeks).

A similar pattern is observed across the cases in the pre-EiM narratives coded as linguistic barrier stories. When probed about their experiences using English in Scotland, participants located many of these stories in the early days of their arrival
in Scotland despite the length of time they had been living there. Expressions like the feeling of being ‘disabled’ in these initial encounters occur across these cases. Also, what is notable is that these themes are present in cases that reported previous exposure to English prior to migration. I would argue, that these initial experiences of engaging in English in Scotland were particularly salient to participants, and like Cyryl, these stories became exemplars of their challenges speaking and understanding in the new language.

In the mid-EiM interviews, that is, the interviews that were conducted midway through the museum sessions, there are some differences with respect to the characterization of linguistic barriers that participants perceived. While narratives of linguistic barriers in the pre-EiM interviews convey participants’ perceptions of their competency in deficit terms, the linguistic barrier narratives in the Mid-EiM category present a more nuanced perspective. These narratives differ insofar as participants focus on particular dimensions of linguistic competence that represent challenges communicating in the target language, e.g. Excerpt 10.5.

As a point of comparison, I begin by examining an excerpt from Karol’s 1st interview (excerpt 10.4). The point of this story that Karol is conveying is his perception of his fluency in English. In order to explicate this point, he offers a kind of ‘think aloud’ of his experiences of engaging in English. He argues that he knows what he wants to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref#</th>
<th>Narrative clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>so I’m communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I think very slowly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>so after when I want to say something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I must think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>and after that… talking speaking about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>but after a couple… no minutes, couple seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>but you know, it’s too late for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I know everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>But when I talking, speaking,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I don’t know what is,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Something wrong with my head maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 10.4 Karol’s 1st interview, narrative 1.3-1.4

Ellipsis is used to omit extraneous utterances in the narrative with respect to the features the narratives that the findings attempt to elucidate.
say, but somehow he is not able to convey his meaning in interaction. He attributes his inability to convey his meaning in these kinds of cases to some kind of cognitive problem. Again, conceptualizing linguistic challenges in deficit terms, i.e. lacking cognitive ability to adequately convey his meaning in English.

Ref# Narrative clauses
153  first, first couple of lessons, first couple of weeks, for me was very difficult,
154  I don’t know, to say something,
155  I I was uhm… not… not as good… not confident, something like that,
157  but I think the last two, three lessons, I’m more confident I think…
159  S: In those sessions where you felt less confident, did you have things you wanted to say?
160  yeah but, you know, I’m worry,
161  I’m worry about how I say something you know,
162  wrong grammar or something like that,
163  but just now I’m just- just talking and grammar is other thing
164  maybe this uh… right now
165  I’m more confident… about it,
166  I don’t know, maybe

Excerpt 10.5 Karol’s 2nd interview, narratives 2.2-2.3

In excerpt 10.5 from Karol’s mid-EiM interview conducted 7 weeks later, we can see a more elaborated, and arguably less bleak, conceptualization of his challenges engaging in English (e.g. 155, 160-162). He suggests that his confidence was a contributing factor to his linguistic performance as he was perhaps overly concerned with his grammatical accuracy when communicating. Again, the initial interview seems to define the problem in deficit terms, whereas the second interview conceptualizes the challenges with greater precision. Attributing challenges to confidence of grammatical competence makes a finer distinction of the problem than a general cognitive deficiency.

This pattern is observed in the other mid-EiM barrier narratives. This difference in linguistic barrier narratives by phase of the study might be explained by the aforementioned saliency of initial experiences in Scotland, and later, weekly engagement through EiM in the later set of interviews. The former serves as an archetype for a kind of experience, and the latter a reflection on interaction in the
recent past. It is also possible that the interview encounter itself may have primed participants’ reflection on their conversational interaction in the intervening weeks between the first and second interview, making the second interview a more elaborated and reflective articulation of the same phenomena. Nevertheless, what seems to be critical is that over the intervening weeks the problem, as participants define it, shifts from one of disability to one of proficiency.

This trend is persistent in the few cases that reported linguistic barriers in the final post-EiM interview, e.g. excerpt 10.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref#</th>
<th>Narrative clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>I haven’t to talk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>so every time maybe I have-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>I have-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>I haven’t the confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>enough to say something,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>maybe I will just ask my husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>to say for me,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>or my husband must uh stay with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>to go somewhere or do something,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 10.6 Zhaohui's 1st interview, narrative 1.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref#</th>
<th>Narrative clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>a lot of words I don’t know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>so I can’t express myself very effectively,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>I want to say something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>but can only say some meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>but can’t say all of the meaning…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 10.7 Zhaohui's 3rd interview, narrative 3.10

Again, for point of comparison, I include an early transcript from Zhaohui’s first interview, and the final post-EiM interview, conducted 15 weeks later. What can be observed from these excerpts is that the nature of the barriers described by Zhaohui are qualitatively different from the early to the later interview. The problem, as Zhaohui defines it in the early interview is that she does not speak English. She attributes her lack of engagement in English to her level of confidence using the language. As a result, she depends on language brokers like her husband to accomplish things on her behalf, rather than engage in English to do so herself. In excerpt 10.7, the linguistic barrier is defined very differently. In this excerpt, she is
reflecting on her experiences engaging in the EiM discussions. The problem, as she defines it, is not being able to adequately convey all of her meaning in discussions about museum collections, which she attributes to her lexical range. In this latter interview, lack of engagement is no longer the problem. She redefines the problem to adequate expression in English.

To summarize, the narratives of linguistic challenges that are told at the being of the study, prior to participants’ involvement in EiM define the linguistic barriers as an inability to speak. The narratives of linguistic challenges told later in the study shift the definition of the problem from one of disability to one of proficiency. These findings suggest that over the period of study of these individuals, there was a perceptual change in the problems that they experienced. In addition, as table 10.1 suggests, participants perceived less challenges in speaking English over time.

In the next section I will report on further analyses that seeks to understand the complexities of these narratives.

10.2.1.2 Unpacking the nature of linguistic barriers

In this section, I examine linguistic barrier narratives in greater depth. These narratives provide insight into the perceived nature of exclusion and its impact on identity and engagement in English. By tracing participants’ line of reasoning through narrativity, I report on the kind of events that participants marked as linguistic barriers, their interpretations of these events, and how these meanings influence their behaviour in English.

Linguistic Barrier Events

In order understand the nature of linguistic barriers, one of the analyses I conducted was to examine the kind of events that participants coded as linguistic barriers. The goal was to generate an understanding of the kinds of events that participants perceive as linguistic barriers and understand how participants make meaning of those experiences.
There were a range of events that participants coded as occasions of linguistic barriers, which I will discuss in turn, see Table 10.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Barrier Events</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL Talk</td>
<td>General linguistic barriers conveyed in narrative, which narrator interprets, but do not necessarily refer to specific interlocutors, occasions or locations in which these barriers were engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER Talk</td>
<td>Talk with peer group e.g. ESOL learners, migrants to the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKPLACE Talk</td>
<td>Talk with colleagues in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>Parenting in English in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering the workforce</td>
<td>Linguistic barriers to entering workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSACTIONAL talk</td>
<td>Service encounters, e.g. doctor visit, insurance phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSEUM Talk</td>
<td>Talk in museums with EiM cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2 Events participants coded as linguistic barriers

As can be observed from Table 10.2, participants reported two general types of linguistic barrier events: (a) barriers that are external to the individual, which I will refer to as institutional barriers and (b) conversational interaction. Institutional barriers, such as language assessments for example, participants consider a shibboleth to joining the highly skilled workforce. Likewise, the schooling of migrants’ children constitutes institutionalized linguistic integration for children, where parents see themselves as lagging behind their children with respect to their rate of language acquisition.

Unlike much of the existing literature on this population of learners, this corpus of narratives is primarily about barriers within dialogue. In these narratives, participants report on experiences engaging with particular interlocutors, in particular settings, for particular purposes. I examined these sets of narratives separately in order to analyse the similarities and differences between experiences in these various
theatres of conversational interaction. The prevalence of narratives that focused on conversational interaction might be explained by the interview protocol, which probed participants’ about their experiences using English in Scotland. This may have, in turn, contributed to eliciting more narratives of barriers within conversational interaction.

What most of these narratives have in common is that they report on the specifics of conversational encounters. In addition, they share the theme of affirming or reinforcing negative perceptions of participants’ linguistic ability (excerpt 10.8).

What we can see from this excerpt is the relationship between the conversational interaction and perception of linguistic ability (lines 279-280). This is a feature that I will elaborate on more as I report on further analyses of these narratives.

Narratives of this set that differ in form and function are the General Talk linguistic barrier narratives. In these narratives, participants report on linguistic barriers as a general condition, as in a state of being (see for example Excerpt 10.9).

---

**Excerpt 10.8 Fatimah's 2nd interview, narrative 2.3**

---
The state being defined in this example is homesickness. What can be seen as the narrative develops is Fatimah’s perception of the causal relationship between homesickness and her linguistic ability. We can see her reasoning in her usage of the conditional ‘if’ in lines 141 and 179, which serves to connect the condition of homesickness with her linguistic ability. What she also reveals through this telling is that she does not perceive her current state of homesickness as a permanent one. We can see the direction of causality that she perceives between the condition of homesickness and ability in lines 179 and 180, where she imagines how her sense of homesickness would change if her linguistic ability does.

To summarize, most of the events that participants describe as linguistic barriers are conversational interactions. Narratives of linguistic barriers through conversational interaction seem to reinforce, or support participant’s negative perceptions of their linguistic ability.

Examining the kinds of events that participants classify as linguistic barriers raises several additional questions. First, what are the kinds of meanings that participants ascribe to the aforementioned events? The general meaning of all the stories in this set are linguistic barrier events, but when these narratives are examined in more depth, do they convey more nuanced meanings of linguistic barriers? Second, from the perspective of the research participants, what are the factors that contribute to events being linguistic barriers? I will examine the answers to these questions in the subsequent sections.

The Meanings of Linguistic Barrier Narratives
One of the aspects of narratives, which is of particular interest in this study, is the interpretations that are encoded in a narrator’s storytelling. Analysis of the narrative structure enables one to parse these embedded interpretations, making them an object of enquiry in their own right. This is the analysis that I conducted as a means to examine the meanings that participants attached to their experiences. For the linguistic barriers narratives, I examined the meanings that participants attached to the aforementioned barrier events. I examined the similarities and differences within each type of barrier event in order to generate substantive themes with respect to the meanings participants attached to these events. The analysis revealed several kinds of meanings attributed to linguistic barrier events: (a) events that define ability in English; (b) emotionality of speaking English; (c) positioning in society vis-à-vis English; and (d) events about gaps in opportunities to engage in English.

**Defining English Ability**

Experiences, or linguistic barrier events, reveal to participants their own competency in English. Cyryl’s airport and bus narratives (excerpts 10.1 and 10.2 respectively) are examples of this type of story. These stories illustrate encounters in which Cyryl is confronted with his linguistic ability in English post migration. These stories are explications of the idea that ‘he spoke no English upon arrival’ in Scotland. It is possible that these perceptions are shaped by the perception of one’s capability in the mother tongue as compared to the new language, e.g. Excerpt 10.10.

140 I was sales representative in Poland
141 S: what do you mean?
142 A: it’s person
143 who is selling goods, yeah.
144 I worked in Cadbury
145 because in Poland is two factories Cadbury.
146 And I… sold sweeties,
147 like a chocolate and bars like this,
148 so language is my…
149 my job.
150 So you know,
151 I’m a person
152 who likes speaking to people,
153 but here when I came here,
154 I haven’t job
According to this narrative (excerpt 10.10), Cyryl suggests that language was a fundamental aspect of his work in Poland (lines 148-149). Further, he draws a causal link between language and his lack of employment upon arrival in Scotland (153-155). This seems to suggest that he understands his lack of English is responsible for his lack of employment in Scotland. However, if we recall the internal incoherence of Cyryl’s airport narrative (excerpt 10.1), it is unclear whether his perception of speaking absolutely no English upon arrival is an accurate evaluation of his ability.

It is not clear what standards or models participants employ to self-evaluate and define their ability in English, other than their own ability in their mother tongue, as we can see in excerpt 10.10. Nevertheless, these stories function as representations of their English ability, representations that are possibly informed by perceptions of their ability in English.

**Emotions Arising from Speaking English**
The second category of meaning that emerged from these sets of narratives were experiences that gave way to certain emotions with respect to speaking English. These include, feelings of shame, frustration, marginalization, and glossophobia (fear of speaking), all negative emotions arising out of engagement in English. The meanings conveyed in these stories were the emotions that participants felt when experiencing these events (and possibly afterwards as narrativization gives insight into how participants categorize aspects of their experiences). Excerpt 10.11 illustrates this kind of narrative.

Excerpt 10.10 Cyryl’s 1st Interview, narrative 1.9

---

148   at Stevenson College in the community program,
149   it was beginners class.
150   Just my husband come with me
151   and he speak all about my course
152   and was very-
153   for me it was a very strong experience
154   because I’m a professional,
155   I’m hard worker in many things
156   and I can’t,
What we can see in Excerpt 10.11 is how Laura’s sense of inadequacy and embarrassment drives the storytelling. In lines 152-153 she uses the intensifier “very” to emphasize the emotion of this experience. In addition, to further emphasize the emotionality of this experience she compares her normal modus operandi to what happened in this event “I can’t speaking” (lines 154-158). This juxtaposition also has the effect of conveying her sense of bewilderment from being unsettled by this experience. She closes this narrative with a coda that gives insight into the impact of such strong emotions on individuals, suggesting that this experience made her feel suicidal (line 180).

In narratives of this kind, the emotionality of the event drives the storytelling, and in doing so seem to suggest how participants understood those linguistic barrier events, e.g. ‘this is when I felt like…. ’ The kind of emotions that these narratives represent are entirely negative, which has implications for understanding the impact of these kinds of experiences on individuals and their subsequent engagement in English. In short, negative emotions about engagement arise out of experiences of linguistic barriers.
Position in Society vis-à-vis Language

The third kind of meaning made of linguistic barrier narratives, is that language positions one in society.

Excerpt 10.12 Agnieszka's 1st interview, narrative 1.10

In narrative 10.12, Agnieszka tells of when she first started working at a Fish & Chips shop. According to her narrative, she spoke only a little English when she first started working there. She implies a causal relationship between her linguistic ability at the time that she started and her positioning in the shop, in which she was relegated to back stage work in the kitchen. This can be seen in line 177 when she [her English proficiency] means she will not be able to understand customers, then later in lines 181-182 where one can infer the conditional ‘if you cannot understand customers, then you have to work in the back of the shop’. From her telling, it is not clear whether in the interview with her prospective manager she elected back stage work herself, or whether she was assigned to back stage work by her manager. She begins the story with a significant amount of hedging with respect to the amount of English she spoke when she started, and she does not actually attribute the decision to work back stage to any of the actors in the story. Nevertheless, this narrative shows the relationship she sees between her linguistic ability and her marginality in the workplace.

Another example, which attributes positioning to external determinants/agents, is from the case of Aruni. A substantive theme that runs through her narratives series is the IELTS test. She tells stories about how many times she has taken the test and her plans to take it again. In some stories, she tells of the unfairness she perceives in the
scoring of the test. In other stories, she seems to equate her score on the IELTS with her English language proficiency. Like many of the other narratives, there is some internal incoherence in her narratives about the IELTS. Through her narratives we learn how the test defines how she sees herself as an English speaker, but we also learn that English has been the lingua franca in her home, as her children were schooled in English. Regardless of the internal inconsistencies of her narratives, what is evident is the weight that she gives this assessment, and how she perceives it as an external force that influences her positioning in Scotland, e.g. access to opportunities, education and work. This last point comes forward in the following narrative (excerpt 10.13).

In this excerpt, we can see how Aruni perceives the test is a barrier to both the workforce, but also a more global barrier as a migrant in Scotland (e.g. line 84). In the General Talk linguistic barrier narratives, participants described positionality as a general condition living in the host country. For example, Zhaohui’s narrative about the role of language for migrants in Scotland, in which she argues that one must communicate with others to be apart of society (excerpt 10.14).

Excerpt 10.13 Aruni’s 1st interview, narrative 1.7

141 you live in the-
142 you live in the foreign country
143 and you must go into the sociality
144 how do you say?
145 S: society
146 ok society,
147 you must go into the
148 otherwise you will feel… feel mmm lonely,
149 so if you want have friends
150 want something more,
151 you must go into the society
and you must to have confident to communicate with others, so the conversation is very important …

I think that everyday you must use English otherwise you will dis-separated with the society everyday,

Excerpt 10.14 Zhaohui’s 1st interview, narratives 1.11, 1.14

Positioning stories show the saliency of English in the lived experiences of recent migrants. Where individuals perceive themselves as being situated on the proficiency and usage cline has a direct impact on their lived experiences in Scotland. In addition, the very nature of what one might refer to as external classification on the proficiency cline can, in effect, be hostile to settlement in the host country and is, to some extent, is seen as beyond one’s control.

**Opportunity Gaps**

The last category of meaning that participants ascribe to linguistic barrier events, are stories as exemplars of gaps in opportunity to engage in English. I have identified three kinds of opportunity gaps in this dataset: institutionalized opportunity gaps; overt, constructed gaps; and self-constructed gaps. For example, the nature of jobs that participants have taken on, which were primarily manual labour jobs, English was not needed at work. In other cases, children of migrant parents who are being schooled in the host country were a source of anxiety for mothers, who anticipated a not too distant future in which they would not be able to parent because of linguistic gap. I refer to these two types of meanings as institutionalized opportunity gaps as they are constructed by external, institutional bodies, e.g. economic and migration trends that inform employment; and ELL support in schools for migrant children. In some cases these kinds of gaps fuel a sense of frustration for individuals, who wish to have opportunities to engage. In other cases they seem to be a source of anxiety for participants.

Other opportunity gaps include those that are constructed through interaction. For example, Cyryl describes code-switching at work (excerpt 10.15):

Polish guys work there and some people some Scotsman people speaking strange accent,
so it is difficult learning two language,
one English
and second one Scottish English.
So when someone speak to me,
I must translate to English
and from English to Polish,
so it was difficult.
But for eh- sometimes
when they want really tell me something,
they use- used English.
But between Scotsman
they using Scottish slang,
so it was difficult to understand

In this case, the codes being switch are Standard English and Scots (or possibly Standard English with a Scottish brogue). In this narrative, Cyryl notices the nuance in his Scottish colleagues use of language. There seems to be an implied hierarchy in this narrative, in which the Scottish colleagues are in a management role, e.g. line 48. What Cyryl marks is that when the Scottish colleagues need to say something, perhaps when instructions are given, these colleagues use an English that is likely to be comprehensible to the Polish workers. However when they talk amongst themselves, they use either dialect or accents that are not comprehensible to the Poles. I refer to this kind of meaning as overt, constructed opportunity gaps. In this respect, there is no opportunity to engage with the Scottish colleagues when they choose to use the language that is incomprehensible to their Polish colleagues. Social engagement through English is beyond the participants’ control because they perceive a barrier is constructed in which there is no possibility for engagement. This kind of gap is possibly particularly salient to Cyryl, given that a theme that runs through his narratives is his strong desire to engage in English with British people and for them to hear the things that he has to say.

Lastly, self-constructed opportunity gaps are ones where the individual chooses to opt out of interaction that is on the table. This was a common theme across cases, particularly in workplace talk and transaction talk. For example, in Agnieszka’s narrative about calling her auto insurance company (excerpt 10.16):
What we can see in Agnieszka’s story, which is also common across these types of narratives, is that the individual’s perceived linguistic ability is a contributing factor to opting out. In this story, Agnieszka refers to being afraid of not understanding the auto insurance telephone representative (lines 332-333). Another feature that is common in self-constructed opportunity gaps is the reliance on language brokers when participants opt of talking (lines 327-328). These language brokers ‘stand in’ for talk that is needed in order to get things done. They are commonly used in transactional talk.

To summarize, experiences of linguistic barriers give rise to a range of meanings to participants. To these participants, English is the cause of shame, fear, and sense of not belonging. It decides opportunities and possible futures. Migration, as a process, seems to bring English into primary focus, where linguistic ability is given centre stage through these experiences. In addition, participants are negotiating their positioning in society and interaction, in which they are not always afforded opportunities to engage in English. Taking into account the kinds of meanings that participants attach to linguistic barrier narratives, it becomes clear through these stories that English is monolithic in these individuals’ lives, shaping their
experiences in the Scotland as well as their emotions and perceptions of self. To reiterate Grover (2006), for these individuals, English is ‘more than a language’.

In the next section, I will report on the findings of the analyses of participants’ perceptions of the contributing factors to linguistic barriers.

**Contributing Factors**

The findings reported thus far have focused on the kind of events that participants interpreted as events of linguistic exclusion and the meanings attached to those events. In my discussion of particular narratives, I have referred to some of the factors that participants perceived of as contributing to the meanings they attached to events, e.g. cognitive or linguistic problems, unfairness of assessments, etc. In this section, I examine the contributing factors of this set of narratives systematically, in order to understand how participants were constructing meanings of these events. Figure 10.1 summarizes participants’ conceptions of contributing factors to events of linguistic exclusion.
As figure 10.1 shows, participants attribute a range of factors to their experiences of linguistic barriers, from their perception of themselves speaking English to their understanding of English spoken by their interlocutors. When examining these factors as a set, what emerges is the prevalence of factors that are about the
participants themselves. For example, factors that contributed to participants’ fear of speaking (glossophobia) include participants’ confidence in speaking English, their perception of themselves speaking English, their fluency and accuracy in English. I classify these factors as internal, relating to the self, and perceptions of self as an English speaker. In this sense, these factors are aspects of and help to form the self.

To examine this theme further, I coded the contributing factors on three dimensions that emerged from initial analysis: (a) factors that were about the self, or self identity (b) factors about self in relation to others, or relational identities and (c) macro-level structural factors, or factors beyond the self. This analysis confirmed that most of the factors that participants identified as contributing to their experiences of linguistic barriers were about the self and the self’s relation to others. For example, as we saw in Cyryl’s airport and bus narratives, the problem of not being able to speak in these encounters was attributed to his lack of English upon arrival, according to his narratives. Lack of English upon arrival is a factor that is about himself as an English speaker. I interpret this as Cyryl conceptualizing himself as a primary barrier to his engagement in English. We can see the same phenomena in Agnieszka’s auto-insurance narrative, excerpt 10.16. In lines 332-333 she attributes her fear of not understanding the telephone agent to her fear of speaking on the phone about her auto insurance. Her fear of not understanding is a factor that about herself, her anxiety about listening to a native speaker of English, and possibly responding contingently in that interaction. Again, I interpret this factor as Agnieszka’s conceptualization of herself as a primary barrier to her engagement in English.

Moreover, the same phenomena is observed in narratives in which participants refer to their interlocutors’ perceptions of their English as a contributing factor to their linguistic barriers, e.g. excerpt 10.17.

Moreover, the same phenomena is observed in narratives in which participants refer to their interlocutors’ perceptions of their English as a contributing factor to their linguistic barriers, e.g. excerpt 10.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>I’m afraid is people good speak English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>maybe listen my speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>maybe think oh this no good speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>is a moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>I’m maybe to go to…. inside?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this narrative, Agnieszka refers to her fear of speaking to fluent speakers of English. She attributes this fear to how fluent speakers might perceive her English, lines 213-214. Her fear of other’s perception of her English is a factor that is about herself in relation to others. Thus I interpret this as Agnieszka conceptualizing her relational identity as a primary barrier to her engagement in English.

Other factors, such as the reliability of the assessment system, seem to be beyond the self. In the case of Aruni, excerpt 10.13, who conceptualizes the assessment system as a major barrier that is constructed to exclude migrants from participating in the workforce and society, the system is beyond the self. The system constructs the barriers and has implications on the self, such as her perception of her ability, which we see in other narratives of hers, but the system as a factor, is external to the self.

To summarize, these results show the primacy of identity(ies) as a factor that participants attribute to their linguistic barrier experiences. In this set of narratives on barriers, there is a preponderance of narratives in which participants attribute these events to internal, identity related variables, such as one’s linguistic knowledge, accuracy, confidence, how others’ perceive their linguistic knowledge, linguistic accuracy and general skill at speaking English. I argue that these identity related variables are parts of, and help to, construct identities, e.g. self as English language speaker.

These identities, self-concepts and relational identities, not only inform how individuals interpret linguistic barrier events, but they seem to be active in constructing the barriers themselves. That is to say that a fear of speaking leads to one not speaking. Conceptualizing one as having a cognitive problem leads to one not talking. Feeling like one does not belong leads to one not engaging in English with others.
The idea that identities construct barriers raises some fundamental theoretical questions and practical implications. What these findings suggest is a relationship between identities and behaviour, with two possibilities, identities informing behaviour or behaviour informing identities. The behaviour that this data is referring to is engaging in conversational interaction in English. In chapter 7, I outlined the conceptual framework guiding this study, in which I argue, following Giddens (1991), that identities are reflexive. Taking this view, I argue that these identities are not fixed, but in flux. This segment of the data focuses in on identities that seem to be negative in nature, and the same could be said of the experiences in which these identities are expressed. This raises the practical question, and practical challenge, of what might help to facilitate ‘productive’ identities, or identities that are positive in nature and help to facilitate learning and engagement. Is there a relationship between positive experiences and productive identities, or the inverse? This is a question I will return to later in this chapter.

As a first step towards answering these kinds of questions, in the next section I examine the relationship between perceptions and their outcomes or impact systematically in the linguistic barrier narratives. This analysis seeks to understand the impact of participants’ beliefs or meanings of events, as uncovered in the structure of the narrative itself, on outcomes, such as their engagement (reported in the narratives). In a subsequent section I will examine behaviour in dialogue in museums to try to understand impact through observed behaviour.

**Impact of Linguistic Barrier Events on Engagement**

This analysis focused on examining the evidence of impact of these linguistic barrier narratives on engagement behaviour, which I conceptualize as participation in conversational interaction. I coded linguistic barrier narratives for any indication of engagement related outcomes embedded within the narrative, e.g. coding scheme in table 10.3.
## Coding scheme for engagement outcomes of linguistic barrier narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Outcome</td>
<td>Narrative gives indication of likelihood of future engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Outcome</td>
<td>Narrative does not refer to any outcome of the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Outcome</td>
<td>Narrative gives indication of unlikelihood of future engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 10.3 Coding scheme for engagement outcomes of linguistic barrier narratives |

An example of a positive outcome can be seen in Zhaohui’s narrative, excerpt 10.18.

167 before I have not chance to go out,
168 I just stay here
169 and the children were still very young, yes,
170 everyday do a lot of housework you know
171 and it’s very boring
172 and very depressed at that time
173 and now I am very happy,
174 I have chance to go out
175 and talk with others, yes basically

**Excerpt 10.18 Zhaohui's 1st interview, narrative 1.13**

In this narrative, Zhaohui describes the isolation she felt being a stay at home mother. However, in her coda, she moves the narrative temporally into the present, in which she was being interviewed by myself ahead of her participation in EiM. The prospect of engagement through EiM, according to this narrative was a source of happiness, knowing that she would have the opportunity to talk with others. Thus, this narrative was coded as one where subsequent engagement in English was a likely outcome.

Cyryl’s airport and bus narratives are examples of narratives that were coded as neutral outcomes. There was no indication in the narrative itself of impact on future engagement. Impact in the storytelling, is limited, if it is present, internally to the narrative. For example, in Cyryl’s bus narrative he refers to how not being able to ask for help made him feel. Internal impact, in this sense, is the impact of the event on Cyryl’s feelings. Impact on engagement is external to the narrative, which the narrative tells or alludes to in the ‘so then…’ part of their story.

Negative outcomes are the opposite of positive. For example, Agnieszka’s narrative (excerpt 10.17, presented again below) shows a negative outcome of perception of how interlocutors might perceive her English.
Excerpt 10.17 Agnieszka’s 1st interview, narrative 1.12
She refers to the idea of a fluent speaker of English listening to her English as something that makes her retreat ‘go inside’ (line 216). Thus narratives of this kind are coded as ones where the event being described is less likely to result in subsequent conversational engagement.

In order to examine the outcomes that conceptualized self-identities versus relational identities as contributing factors to linguistic barriers, I examined all of the narratives along the dimension of impact and contributing factors. I parsed the negative, neutral and positive impact narratives, and tabulated the narratives with contributing factors (figure 10.1) that were related to self-identities versus relational identities. Thus, self-identity related variables included factors such as proficiency, fluency in English, cognitive problems, and self-perception. Relational identity related variables included fear of engaging with others, other’s engagement with the participant and being understood by others. These narratives were tabulated to examine the overall pattern of narratives. Within these sets of data I examined the pattern of outcomes coded as negative, positive and neutral, which is summarized below in figures 10.2 and 10.3.
There were exactly double the amount of narratives coded as self-identities as a contributing factor than there were of relational identities (54 and 27 respectively), which gives some indication of the weight of these aspects of identity (self vs. relational) on individuals’ engagement.

The same trend is visible in experiences of linguistic barriers, in which negative self identities or relational identities are a contributing factor and result in participants
being less likely to engage in English. However, in some cases, for those with positive outcomes, these negative experiences tended to fuel a motivation to learn English to overcome the barriers.

Again, this raises some fundamental questions. Can experiences change identities to positive or additive, or the inverse?

It should be noted that a limitation of this analysis on outcomes is that not all narratives include a coda, which gives an indication to the listener of the impact of the narrative. In addition, impact is inside the story itself, thus is perceived, as opposed to actual, engagement. Of course, actual engagement is not possible with respect to these narratives as they were recollections of events and experiences that predated the study of EiM. Nevertheless, examining outcomes as reported inside these narratives gives us an idea of the impact of these perceptions of experience on individuals.

10.2.2 Review

In this chapter thus far, I have examined narratives of linguistic barriers in order to understand how participants interpret their experiences. I have examined how these interpretations are constructed and encoded in narratives, and have examined the impact of these experiences on participants and their willingness to engage in English.

With respect to linguistic barriers, the data show that participants perceived themselves as experiencing less barriers over the course of the study. Most of the experiences of linguistic barriers reported by participants occurred in the period immediately following their migration to the UK. These experiences seem particularly salient to participants as they represent the first challenges participants had living and working in a new linguistic milieu. In these early narratives of barriers, participants conceptualize their proficiency in English in deficit terms, e.g. ‘I can’t speak English’, regardless of their previous exposure to English. However, the data show that these perceptions change over time. In narratives that are told later
in the study, after participants’ engagement in EiM, participants’ conceptualizations of their proficiency become more nuanced. These narratives instead, refer to particular aspects of competency in English that seem to impede communication.

Participants attached several meanings to these stories of linguistic barriers that are conveyed through their narratives. For example, some stories of linguistic barriers are exemplars of the negative emotions felt when trying to engage in English. Some of these stories represent defining moments, where the experience itself seemed to define themselves as a non-English speaker. Other stories seemed to represent to participants how society positioned them because of their linguistic ability. Finally, some of these stories were narratives that represent the lack of opportunity to talk and be heard in English. This is a simplification of the depth of experience made visible through narrative, but an attempt to classify these experiences in a way that captures the range of meanings these experience took for participants.

Examining the factors that participants attribute to creating or maintaining linguistic barriers showed that identity(ies) are central. Participants’ narratives primarily refer to self attributes, in particular their perceptions of themselves as English speakers and their perceptions of how they are perceived by others as English speakers. The findings also show the impact of these subject positions, in the context of experiences perceived as barriers, on engagement. Both self-identities and relational identities have a negative impact on engagement in English. In short, linguistic barriers beget further linguistic barriers and negative perceptions of self, a finding that is consistent with Norton’s findings (Norton, 2000, p. 111)

There are several points to make about the aforementioned findings. First, these findings provide initial evidence of change over time, in terms of reporting less experiences of linguistic barriers and changes in the nature of how these experiences are defined. Much of the existing literature that has focused on the experiences of this target group of learners and their experiences of linguistic exclusion has, with the exception of Norton, provided a cross-sectional view of exclusion. Even though Norton’s study examined learners over a period of 2 years, she only documents some
change in the nature of perceived exclusion and engagement in a single case of her
study. In this study, change is seen across cases. Previous research has limited its
analytical focus to unpacking the nature of linguistic barriers of this population of
learners, rather than intervening in order to change these experiences. Research
reviewed in chapter 4 on social inclusion in museums has been limited to single visit
studies, thus has not yet examined impact on particular individuals over time.

Second, the nature of the initial linguistic barrier narratives, in which participants
define these events as the inability to speak, might provide evidence that the
experiences immediately following migration were particularly salient to
participants. The data show that these stories were told primarily in the first
interview, prior to EiM, and were mainly about experiences immediately following
migration. These narratives together seem to provide a master narrative, e.g. I can’t
speak English, through which participants interpret their past. In this sense, the
master narrative is the organizing structure and interpretive lens through which they
experience the world.

However, as the data show, these narratives change in form and number over the
final two interviews, which provides some evidence of a change in the master
narrative itself. This might be explained by the fact that participants, who self
identify as having limited access to using English, were participating in weekly
museum sessions in which conversational interaction was a central part. Since more
elaborated descriptions of linguistic challenges are given in these later narratives
rather than wholesale deficits, it is possible that the weekly exposure and
participation facilitated participants’ reflection on the specifics of their linguistic
skills. Thus, while these master narratives seem to be a larger organizing principle
for experiences, the data provides some evidence that master narratives can be
ruptured.

The findings are consistent with some of the literature that shows that barriers occur
in conversational interaction (Block, 2007b; Broeder, et al., 1996). The findings add
to the literature by highlighting the relationship between conversational interaction
and negative perceptions of ability. This relationship interaction and negative perceptions of ability might be explained by the nature of the identity work that participants might be doing as they interpret their experiences. By definition, participants define these events as communication difficulties. What can be seen in the data is a propensity for participants to look inward, conceptualizing self as a contributing factor to the problem. In this sense, ‘the communication problem is because I can’t communicate’. This phenomena is consistent with what Gidden (1991) and Ricoeur (1980) refer to as the construction of coherence of the narrative from the lens of the present. In this sense, participants are constructing coherence with their master narratives.

Another aspect of the findings on linguistic barriers that I wish to highlight is participants’ perception of their positioning in discourse (and society as a whole) vis-à-vis language. This is consistent with Bourdieu’s concept of linguistic capital, in which one is situated within the social structure by way of the value placed on ones linguistic resources. In narratives that conveyed this perspective, the same motivational force can be observed, as what Norton (2000) refers to as investment. In this sense, recognition of where one is situated by way of one’s linguistic resources in comparison to the mainstream (in this case, native speakers) motivates the individual to develop their resources in manner of the mainstream.

Next, the finding which shows the harmful effects of linguistic barrier events on engagement is to my knowledge the first systematic micro-level examination of the impact of exclusion. The lack of willingness to engage in English as an outcome of these experiences might be explained by the manner in which participants conceptualize the problem: identity. It is possible that by defining self as the problem in communication, participants are in turn defining themselves as an illegitimate participant in comparison to the native speaker (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which makes them more likely to disengage. Excerpt 10.17 explicates this precisely.

Finally, the last point I wish to highlight of this part of the findings is the near absence of the museum as a site in which exclusion or linguistic barriers occur. In the
next chapter, I will report the findings of the analysis on narratives of linguistic inclusion.
11 Understanding Migration, Social Inclusion and Museum Learning

In the previous chapter, I discussed the nature of narratives in which the ‘problem’ was defined as communication challenges, or linguistic barriers. This section examines the opposite kind of narrative, that is, narratives about linguistic inclusion and engagement. In order to understand the nature of linguistic inclusion and engagement from this data, I conducted similar analyses of the interview data as reported in the previous section.

11.1 The Nature of Linguistic Inclusion and Engagement

As a first level of analysis, narratives were coded for whether they were stories of linguistic inclusion. Stories were considered ‘linguistic inclusion’ when the ‘problem’, that is, the main point of the narrative was conveying messages about ‘being included’ and engaging in English. In particular, stories about opportunities and facilitators of engagement in English were coded as linguistic inclusion narratives.

This initial coding produced a corpus of 119 narratives across corpus of interviews. These narratives were coded further to examine the structural features that give insight into how participants made meaning of experiences of inclusion. Structural features coded included the actors, locations, resolutions, and participants’ interpretations. In addition, to examine temporal aspects of these narratives, I coded each narrative for the time point, corresponding to the to that interview e.g. pre-EiM, mid-EiM, or post-EiM.

Following is an over of linguistic inclusion narratives coding by time point (Table 11.1).
Again, interviews probed participants’ experiences engaging in English in Scotland, and in the case of the later interviews, their experiences during EiM more specifically. Table 11.1 shows that there were more narratives that conveyed experiences of linguistic inclusion in the latter two interviews, after EiM had commenced. To some extent, this was expected for the Mid-EiM stories, given the intervention was targeted towards creating the conditions of inclusion. However, what should be highlighted is the preponderance of inclusive experiences after EiM, as the final interviews were conducted one month after their participation in EiM. This suggests that all participants perceived themselves as having inclusive experiences after their participation in EiM.

The density of inclusive narratives post-EiM raises a series of questions. First, what seemed to mediate the increase of linguistically inclusive experiences post-EiM? Second, was there an increase in experiences of linguistic inclusion post-EiM or an increase in individuals’ perception of experiences as inclusive? Finally, what is the nature of linguistic inclusion narratives, that is to say, in what ways are these stories similar and different to narratives of linguistic barriers?

As a second level of analysis, I examined some of the surface level features of these stories. Focusing on the sites in which events were reported in the narratives to have taken place. I found that most of the mid-EiM and post-EiM stories were about experiences in the museums (Figure 11.1). This suggests that the museum might be a critical site for linguistic inclusion. Moreover, for research purposes, the density of inclusion narratives set in the museum suggests that the museum may be a critical site in which to understand the nature and impact of linguistic inclusion. The interview protocol may account for the number of narratives about events in museums to a certain extent, as it probed participants about their experiences in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Study</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Linguistic Inclusion Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre EiM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid EiM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post EiM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1 Linguistic inclusion narratives across study phases
museums. However, it is important to highlight that it is the participants that coded events in museums as predominantly linguistically inclusive as opposed to linguistic barriers. It is precisely this point that merits further analysis to understand the nature of these experiences from the perspective of the participants.

Other sites reported as settings of linguistic inclusion events included Edinburgh in general, the workplace, schools and conversational interaction on the phone, Figure 11.1.

![Figure 11.1 Settings of mid-EiM and post-EiM linguistic inclusion narratives](image)

From Figure 11.1 we can see that the settings where most of the linguistically inclusive experiences took place were museums, Edinburgh in general and the workplace. These are the very same settings in which linguistic barrier experiences were reported to have occurred.

### 11.1.1 Unpacking the nature of linguistic inclusion

Like the narratives on barriers, I examined aspects of the linguistic inclusion narratives in order to unpack the nature of these stories. I focused on the kind of events that participants marked as inclusive, as well as the meanings they ascribed to these experiences and the ways in which these meanings informed their behaviour. In this section, I will report on the findings of these analyses.
Linguistic Inclusion Events

Examining the type of events that participants coded as inclusive revealed a substantial amount of overlap with the type of events reported as linguistic barriers. These events included general talk encounters, transactional talk, workplace talk, and museum talk. Where this set of narratives differs from linguistic barriers narratives is that these stories are entirely about conversational interaction. In other words, linguistic inclusion to these individuals occurs through engagement in English.

In excerpt 11.1, Fatimah describes the transition from conceptualizing a transactional encounter as a linguistic barrier to a nontreating, commonplace interaction.

930 and uh I remember my husband one time tell me
931 “I’m going to travel to Dubai,
932 and he stay in Dubai for six month
933 and you stay here,
934 when I come back
935 I find you speak English fluently,
936 because always you just tell me
937 ‘please do that,
938 please call ((for?)) me’”
939 because if I want to call the doctor
940 I say my husband
941 “call the doctor”
942 and he say “no, you can do it, no, you can”
943 now I can call myself
944 and I can speak in telephone
945 S: really?
946 yes, I can do anything by telephone,

Excerpt 11.1 Fatimah’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.14

The same event, which in this case is interaction with a doctor, is conceptualized at one time a linguistic barrier (939-941), and at another a commonplace interaction that one engages in (943-946). In this narrative, Fatimah describes a transition of thought from needing to rely on language brokers such as her husband, to being able to accomplish things on her own. It is not clear from this telling precisely what fostered this shift, but this narrative helps to illustrate how the same event can take on different meanings to participants.
Taking into consideration that the same kind of event can be coded as either a linguistic barrier or linguistically inclusive, it is necessary to understand what distinguishes these experiences from the perspective of participants. Moreover, this raises the question of whether participants’ classification of experience as either a barrier or inclusive is an outcome of time and experience, their perceptions and/or beliefs, and/or their participation in EiM. I will consider these questions in the subsequent sections.

**Meanings of Linguistic Inclusion Events**

Examining the meanings that participants ascribed to linguistic inclusion events revealed two broad meanings attached to these experiences, (a) recognition of linguistic ability and (b) enablers of talk. With respect to the former, the central theme of these stories was participants’ recognition that they could engage in English in a variety of ways. These include recognizing they could talk, understand others, be understood by others and participate in society. With respect to the latter, the meanings attached to experiences of enablers of talk are defining the mechanisms or structures that help to facilitate their participation in talk.

**Can talk**

632 is “hello, how are you?
633 fine Thank you”…
634 this eh talk to my manager to chips
635 is sometimes talk to start my work,
636 I talk,
637 no very big
638 is no time to friendly talk [chuckles]…
639 to factory is moment to break time
640 is time to talk…
641 before I talk to my Polish friends, Lithuanian friends
642 this is not to English talk [chuckles]
643 this moment is possible
644 I’m talk to my Scottish friends…

**Excerpt 11.2 Agnieszka's 3rd interview, narrative 3.4**

What is central in these narratives is the storying of exceptional experiences. These are experiences that contrast in some way with what participants perceive as the
leitmotif of their experiences, that is, not speaking. In this set of narratives, what is different is that these are experiences in which they notice that they can speak. In excerpt 10.20, Agnieszka marks the difference between talk at her two places of work, Fish & Chips shop and a factory. In lines 643-644 she highlights that previously she only spoke with her Polish or Lithuanian colleagues at the factory, but now she is able to engage in conversation in English with her Scottish colleagues. This is significant because Agnieszka began her sequence of narratives by describing herself as ‘disabled to talk’, especially to her Scottish colleagues at the factory. Five months on, however, she refers to them as friends (line 644).

**Understanding and Being Understood by Others**

Similarly, some of the narratives’ share the central theme of being moments of recognition that participants could understand English and be understood by others. In a story that immediately follows the narrative in excerpt 10.20, Agnieszka shares a salient moment when she spoke with a Scottish colleague.

645  this moment is possible I’m talk to my Scottish friends…
646  especial to one, one man to work to,
647  he work dry wash,
648  I work to cleaner,
649  this is similar uhm…
650  factory is production to food factory,
651  this is food factory,
652  is production to salad...
653  different salad,
654  is line,
655  woman stand to line,
656  is package this product,
657  I’m is cleaner to this factory,
658  I’m look is this clean
659  prepare to line…
660  my friend is worker to dry wash,
661  this is section is eh clean ehm boxes…
662  this is eh I’m hygiene,
663  dry wash is hygiene
664  similar time is to break…
665  this man is sitting to break
666  to me is talk,
667  he’s talk me “Agnes, you start here
In this story, Agnieszka’s Scottish colleague comments on the development in her English from when she started working there to the present. According to her colleague, she went from not talking to talking normally (lines 667-669). Agnieszka then comes outside the story to add an external evaluation that functions as her own perspective on her colleague’s assessment of her ability (line 670). She uses a rising intonation when she says line 670, suggesting her surprise by his assessment of her English as ‘normal’. She then highlights that both she could understand her colleague and he could understand her, which again gives insight into how she coded this experience.

What is important to highlight is that not only are these stories told, but the point in telling them (e.g. evaluation clauses) is marking that they recognize they can understand and be understood. The idea of normalcy is one that runs through Agnieszka’s narratives, which might be a reason why Agnieszka marks this incident, in which her colleague refers to her English as normal, as a significant moment engaging in English outside of EiM. In her early interviews she describes herself as not being normal or living a normal life because of her English. In the last interview she suggests that her experiences engaging in English are helping her to regain a sense of normalcy. These stories seem to be moments where participants recognized that they could.

**Participating in Society**

In other cases, this set of narratives focused on recognition that participants could participate in society.
but at first I get an interview for part-time base
but at last I got an offer is full-time offer,
it’s 38.5
I think it too much
*S: 38.5 hours a week?*
yes, so I think it’s too much for me,
I don’t think it’s very high level,
it’s just care assistant in care home,
I don’t think it’s very good- very good opportunity,
but anyway it’s first job
and I hope I can play a very-
play a positive role in this country,
uh so I’m looking for this job,

Excerpt 11.4 Zhaohui’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.1

*S: since you’ve lived here have you worked yet?*
no
the most difficult is the language,
I haven’t enough confidence in my language,
but now it’s better,
I will try,
I will try

Excerpt 11.5 Zhaohui’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.6

Excerpt 11.5 is an elaboration on excerpt 11.4. Excerpt 11.5 points out what is different, Zhaohui now has enough confidence to seek a job in the UK (lines 307-309). The impact of her lack of confidence in her English was that she did not try to find a job during the previous 2 years that she had been living in the UK. Now however, she suggests that her confidence in her ability is not as much of problem, and as a result, she started looking for work. These excerpts help to show the interaction between self-perception and engagement. Negative self-perception leads to less engagement, and positive self-perceptions leads to more engagement.

These particular narratives, however, show more than simply increased engagement. They show a desire to contribute to society (lines 252-253), which I would argue is greater than simply participation in talk. It suggests a commitment to and investment in being a member of the new society. This is important to highlight, not because Zhaohui lacked a commitment or investment in society, but because she previously did not feel she had the right to engage because of her perceptions of her English
ability. The idea of membership in society is a theme that runs through Zhaohui’s narratives, where she conceptualizes talk as the primary way to be a part of society.

In sum, the meaning that these inclusion stories take on is about one’s recognition in their ability in English. The second kind of meaning attached to inclusive stories are explications about what enables them to talk. These stories were primarily accounts of experiences engaging in talk in museums.

**Enablers of Talk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>it was just a four slides…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>and we can speak about this-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>about portraits,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>how we feel something,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>how it can be,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>how it is inside-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>in this, in this, not inside, in this picture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 11.6 Cyryl’s 3rd interview, narrative 3.12

From the perceptive of Cyryl, who was one of the more proficient participants in EiM, talk that was about interpreting art and artefacts enabled engagement in museum discussions (excerpt 11.6). In other narratives he comments that these interpretive discussions were the first time he had the opportunity to talk about something interesting in English. This is a critical point to make with respect to the experiences of recent migrants’ engagement in English, which previous research suggest are only afforded opportunities to engage in transactional English (Norton, 2000; Block, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>you giving me eh… questions… maybe one object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>this to small small fish…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td><em>S: (uh huh…) small talk? Small talk?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>eh eh eh… small papers this <em>transport…</em> you giving me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>this one word…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>topic this is…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>I’m know must go looking concrete to transport…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>this is eh… concentr- concentrated? concentration me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>is eh… <em>first</em> moment I look all…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>this is very motivated to me is this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>This I go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>I’m no look total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>I go look concrete one object one thema</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In excerpt 11.7, Agnieszka, who was had the lowest proficiency in cohort, explicates precisely what enabled her to engage in the discussion, the task. In this narrative, she describes aspects of the EiM learning task, in which participants were tasked with exploring specific themes in the museums’ collection, ahead of group discussions. To Agnieszka, the focusing task helped her to concentrate on particular aspects of the collection. In a later narrative, she describes how this focus, in which she examined the art and artefacts and museum messages about these objects, primed her participation in subsequent discussions. She suggests that listening to the group’s discussions about museums objects enabled her to connect the wall texts, her observations and opinions about those objects to what was being said. Drawing on these resources helps to concretize the talk and enables her to join in on the discussion.

at the first discussion I’m maybe a little bit panic for me,
but after we start I feel more rest ok?...
and I’m getting start to speak to speak to speak
and sometimes I speak English
and after I go back home
and say “oh that’s what I said? Oh, ok ok”
I don’t believe myself
when I speak for a long time,
you know what I mean?
When I speak and I speak and I speak, you understand?
...
S: Laura talked about Tom Dougherty, this man in the museum on display where he was homeless and everyone started talking about homelessness, and you started talking about homelessness in Sudan and you were actually speaking for maybe five-seven minutes
yeah yeah, because sometimes, some some some topics I feel it,
you know what I mean?
Yes some topic I feel it,
I don’t know how call it,
Like Cyryl, the topic of talk in museums stimulates Fatimah’s participation in the talk (line 440-442). In particular, when the topic connects to her, which she describes as ‘feeling it’, helps to mobilize her linguistic resources into linguistic engagement. In this example, she describes the need to correct possible misconceptions about her home, Sudan, as the stimulus to her participation in discussion about a diorama of a homeless man in the People’s Story Museum.

With varying degrees of specificity, these stories are reflective accounts of what enabled participants to engage in discussions in museums. These stories point to the importance of museum collections for providing the conditions for talk, and meaningful tasks in the museums to scaffold their participation in the talk.

**Contributing Factors of Linguistic Inclusion**

In the previous section, I describe the two primary meanings that inclusion events took on: moments of recognition of ability and explication of enablers of talk. In this section, I report on a systematic analysis of participants’ interpretations of the factors that contribute to linguistic inclusion in these events.
First, with respect to the enablers of dialogue, participants described three kinds of factors that contributed to experiences of linguistic inclusion: topic, task and time. All of these narratives were accounts of experiences in museums and the factors that they attributed to inclusion were fundamental aspects of EiM and museums themselves. For example, the topics of talk that participants referred to as being a gateway to their participation in talk were topics that emerged from the museum collections. In some cases these topics were given to them through the learning activities in museums, but in other cases, the topics that participants referred to emerged from their experiences, observations and interpretations of objects in the galleries, which were often drawn from their personal experiences and histories. The tasks were designed to structure participants’ engagement with the museum collections, and interaction with the EiM cohort. What can be seen in narratives like

Figure 11.2 Perceptions of factors contributing to linguistic inclusion
excerpt 11.7, the task gave participants a focus during gallery walks, and primed, if not prepped, their participation with the cohort in terms of the topic of talk. With respect to time, the narratives point to the density of time in EiM as an enabler to talk. The frequency and length of EiM sessions mean that participants who reported otherwise having little to no opportunities to engage in English, were engaging in English 3 hours per week for 11 consecutive weeks.

The factors that participants described as contributing to their recognition of their ability/capability to talk, understand, be understood and participate in society were the same, or similar to the factors identified in the barrier stories. For example, participants’ perception of their ability and linguistic knowledge, others’ perception of their ability and fear of their respective interlocutors, were factors that contributed to experiences being both linguistically inclusive and exclusive. Again, these factors are ones that are hinged upon participants’ perceptions of self, as well as perceptions of self in relation to others. This raises an important question about what distinguishes experiences from being exclusive or inclusive if the factors participants identify as contributing to determining these experiences are indeed the same. This is a question I will return to shortly.

Impact of Linguistic Inclusion on Engagement

Figure 10.6 summarizes narratives of linguistic inclusion for outcomes of these experiences from the perspective of participants. This analysis examined narratives for codas, in which the narrator conveys the result or impact of the experience. As with the narratives on barriers, these codas were coded for whether the experience suggested likely subsequent engagement in English (positive), unlikely subsequent engagement in English (negative) or no indication of the impact of the experience on future action (neutral).
From Figure 11.3 we can see that most of the experiences of linguistic inclusion had a positive impact, insofar as participants felt willing to engage in English as an outcome of these experiences. We can also see from this figure that few inclusion experiences had a negative impact on willingness to engage. These findings support the conclusion that perceived experiences of linguistic inclusion support participation and engagement in the target language.

**Positive Impact of Inclusion**

Following is an example of an inclusion narrative in which the participant conveyed greater willingness to engage in English as an outcome of this experience.

570 very very interessant was first visit to musée,
571 Musee to Edinburgh is very I’m very speedy go-ed
572 I’m looked this is first lesson
573 I’m remember… this is to me all time to me is stress
574 this all people understand and talk better me…
575 I’m look I is outside [chuckles] to my English…
576 I’m have stress to talk…
577 I know I no talk correct
578 maybe people no understand me
579 maybe is bad…
580 next time I’m go
581 “but no but I must talk” [chuckles]
This narrative is about engaging in English in EiM, in particular, what Agnieszka characterizes as opening up in English. The challenges to engaging in English are enumerated (lines 573-576), which include Agnieszka’s perception of other’s expertise in English, her perception of her own expertise and it’s effect on being understood, and her general anxiety about speaking English. Despite these challenges, Agnieszka resolved to join the EiM discussions in the subsequent sessions. As a result, in a subsequent session when she did not understand what
someone said, she asked for clarification. This moment of asking for clarification she marks as significant, she describes it as the moment she was able to ‘open’ in EiM (line 590). It is her joining in on the discussion that I code as inclusion, and it is the impact of this joining in that I code as a positive impact of inclusion. We can see the impact of her joining the discussion threaded throughout the rest of this narrative, in which she describes her newfound possibility for engagement:

597 this is moment to me
598 this moment is possible outside…
599 first moment this is class,
600 I’m thought is friendly
601 is possible talk to teacher
602 “please repeat me”…
603 this moment I’m open to all people
604 is possible people talk me very very speedy
605 I’m “please… excuse me,
606 please talk slowly, my English is no very-
607 please repeat me”…
608 I’m know this is possible…
609 this is ehm… people don’t know my, not know me,
610 not know my English,
611 talk very speedy,
612 I’m talk “sorry, please speak slowly”…
613 this is possible contact

Excerpt 10.27 Agnieszka 3rd interview, narrative 3.2 Bolded text=impact of inclusion on engagement

She recognizes it is possible to ask for clarification outside of EiM (line 598) and inside EiM (line 601-603). Recognizing that she can ask for clarification when she does not understand or people speak too fast means that it is now possible for her to make contact with others (line 613). Making contact is a theme that threads throughout her narratives in the last interview. It is this last line, about the possibility of making contact that was afforded by her newfound ability to ask for clarification, is why this narrative was coded as one in which subsequent interaction was likely because of the event that the narrative reported.

In this narrative, there seem to be two primary features associated with Agnieszka ultimately asking for clarification, which leads to her realization that clarification could be asked. First is her resolve, conveyed in line 581. Agnieszka, embeds an internal evaluation “but no but I must talk”, which functions as a ‘think aloud’ during
the moment that she is describing. This resolution follows her description of her anxiety level, accuracy and perceptions of how others perceive her. The challenges followed by her resolution to engage seem to communicate that despite these challenging circumstances, she has some determination to negotiate her way into EiM dialogue. The second aspect is her perception of the group, which she refers to as ‘friendly’ (line 600). Another possibility, which is difficult to confirm from this particular narrative, is that positive reception of her clarification request. If she had anxiety about not understanding English and asking for clarification, then asked and received the needed clarification, it is possible that this kind of engagement felt less threatening. My analysis of the conversation data in museums, helps to connect these kinds of findings in the narrative data to what occurred in interaction, which helps to explain these findings. This narrative, and narratives like this beg the question of what precisely enabled participants to join in on discussion given their previous perceptions of ability, structural barriers and the like.

**Negative Impact of Inclusion**

375 I’m think about going back to Poland,
376 in like one, two year’s time hmm mmm
377 S: why?
378 I think I don’t have talent for English,
379 so I’m not here- like citizen here,
380 in according to my language…
381 S: what makes you think that?
382 well I’m three years here,
383 so I should speak like you
384 S: well I don’t speak like Scottish people
385 you don’t have to ((chuckles))
386 uhm… mmm… well… that’s not easy decision so…
387 I love the city and the country
388 but it’s easy to leave uh…
389 sometimes I’m really really not in the mood for speaking English
390 and if I’m not speaking correctly
391 that makes me doubt as well
392 S: so how come sometimes you’re not in the mood for speaking English?
393 mmm… well when I’m totally exhausted
394 like, like, some customers for example
Excerpt 11.10 Friderich's 3rd interview, narratives 3.12-3.13

The larger point that Friderich means to highlight in these stories is that he has resigned himself to return to Poland (made explicit with the abstract in line 375). This point is illustrated with a series of episodes that describe Friderich’s continued frustration with speaking English and the alienation he feels because of it. Like other stories that I have described, Friderich’s perception of his English (lines 378, 383, 390-391, 398 respectively) seems to drive his engagement in English (lines 375, 389, 400-406). I coded this narrative as linguistic inclusion because he describes customers trying to engage with him at his job at a supermarket. His perception of himself as an English speaker, and because he says he is not able to understand any of the words that the interlocutor has uttered, he simply resigns, without an attempt to ask for clarification. He opts out of the dialogue, and literally walks away (line 406). Friderich is one of the negative cases, where there seemed to be no positive impact of EiM on his perceptions of self as a speaker of English and his engagement. Similarly, his behaviour during EiM sessions was very withdrawn up until the very last session, in which in a discussion about a particular photography exhibition at the City Art Centre, he interjected into the discussion amongst the cohort, providing a counter interpretation of the exhibition photographs they had been discussing. When asked why he finally talked in that final museum visit, he said:

Excerpt 11.11 Friderich's 3rd interview, narrative 3.10
Friderich initial rational, he offers jocularly, is that he wanted to make a strong finish (line 359), which suggests some interest in how his cohort perceived him. Then he elaborates by saying that he joined it because he wanted to change people’s perspective about the photographs (line 361), which I would argue, could be characterized as an authentic communicative move, one that emerged authentically through the participant’s engagement with the museum collection and cohort in EiM (line 362). Nevertheless, Friderich remains withdrawn over the course of the study.

In sum, the data shows that experiences perceived by participants as inclusive, are more likely to have a positive impact on their engagement in English. Participants are more likely to engage in English following experiences that they perceive as linguistically inclusive. This impact is seen across the cases, except for one previously discussed, Friderich.

11.1.2 Review

In the previous section, I have examined the narratives of linguistic inclusion in order to understand how participants understood these kinds of experiences. I have reported on the findings of analyses that have sought to examine the meanings that participants attached to these experiences, how they made sense of them, and their impact on their willingness to engage in English. The results of these analyses show that participants perceived more experiences of linguistic inclusion over the course of the study, with most of these narratives told during the course of EiM and one month following. In addition, participants identified conversational interaction in museums (during EiM), as a primary site in which they experience linguistic inclusion.

Participants interpreted experiences of linguistic inclusion as exceptional experiences. By exceptional, I mean that these experiences were ones that constituted a change in the leitmotif of engaging in English. This is made evident through their narratives in which they describe recognizing that they could speak English, could be understood and that others understood them. In addition, participants conveyed
stories in which they recognized that they could participate in society, because they could now speak English.

Participants’ accounts of inclusive experiences in museums enumerate the features, which are fundamental to museums and the design of EiM, that enabled them to participate in the conversation in museums. These include the topic of talk in museums, the tasks and the time spent in museums. With respect to the topic, participants reasoned that the museum objects provided a joint referent, which scaffolded their listening in museum-based discussions and grounded their participation in them. They reported how the these objects as joint referents for talk, enabled them to make observations and interpretations of these objects, which created an urgency to communicate their observations and interpretations to the cohort. Again, these experiences are coded to participants as remarkable encounters, which might be explained when considering the wider context of their experiences in English, in which engagement is limited and transactional in nature.

Like the narratives of linguistic barriers, the findings show the primacy of self-related factors in the meaning making that participants are engaged in as they reflect on the past. They attribute similar factors to ones identified in the barrier narratives, as enablers of talk, including their linguistic ability, knowledge, anxiety, confidence. In addition, they attribute self-in-relation-to-other factors as enablers, including their perceptions of interlocutors and how interlocutors might perceive them.

Analysis of the impact of linguistically inclusive experiences on future engagement shows the primarily positive impact these experiences have for these individuals. What is important to highlight is that the impact of these experiences, which are primarily in museums, transcends the museum itself. These experiences in museums facilitate the participants’ willingness to engage in English more broadly. In addition, narratives in the later interviews explicate how participants were negotiating conversational interaction beyond the museum, such as at the workplace, in Edinburgh in general, and on the telephone (e.g. Figure 11.1).
These findings bring several points to the fore. First, with respect to the increase of inclusive experiences over time, it is not surprising that mid-EiM interviews elicited more narratives of inclusion as a primary goal of EiM was to create the conditions of inclusion. The density of narratives of inclusion following the intervention, however, is an important finding to highlight. I would like to argue that the 11 weekly sessions in museums that these individuals participated in, individuals who self-describe as having limited opportunities for engagement in English, had a significant impact on their perceptions of their interactional encounters following EiM. The data indicate that participants perceived themselves as having more confidence in English over the course of the study. I posit that identities are the lens through which interpretations of experiences are made. The data show that the same events (interlocutors, places, purposes of conversational interaction, and contributing factors) are coded by participants as both linguistic barriers and linguistic enablers. This raises the question of how participants discriminate between experiences being either inclusive or exclusive? I would like to argue that identities are the distinguishing factors that help individuals to make sense of their experiences.

I would like to return to the concept of the master narrative. My discussion of linguistic barrier narratives points to the saliency of initial migration experiences and communication challenges in the target language. I posit that these experiences help to create a master narrative, which conceptualizes self in deficit terms, e.g. ‘I can’t speak English’ or ‘I’m no good at English’. The findings of the narratives of linguistic barriers shows how individuals marked these events as ‘remarkable’ encounters, remarkable insofar as they contrast what participants perceive is the standard experience: inability to speak English. I would like to argue that these experiences are perceived as remarkable insofar as they contrast with individuals’ master narrative. In this sense, these remarkable experiences challenge the master narrative. Giddens suggests that “letting go of the past, through the various techniques of becoming free from oppressive emotional habits, generates a multiplicity of opportunities for self-development” (Giddens, 1991, p. 78). I interpret this letting go as a means through which possible selves become available to the individual, e.g. ‘I can speak English’ or ‘I am an English speaker’. In this sense,
these experiences in effect reboot the master narrative, making different storylines available.

What I have discussed thus far has paid particular attention to the micro-level structures, as they occur in interaction, as these are the sites in which participants conveyed these experiences. I would argue that this contributes to theoretical and empirical accounts that outline the function of macro-level structures that influence micro-level interactions, e.g. one’s positioning in social structure informs social space (Bourdieu, 1991; Broeder, et al., 1996). These data seem to suggest that in addition to macro-level structures, identities influence social space. This suggests that identities and macro-level structures work in concert to shape social space for talk.

Finally the last point that I wish to highlight about this set of findings is the positive impact of inclusion on engagement. What is important to highlight is that is the impact on engagement beyond the museum. Participants expressed the wish to be a member of the host society. This is not because they were not in the past, prior to EiM. I would argue that prior to EiM they did not feel that they had the right to engage in talk (Bourdieu, 1977) because of their perceptions of self as a deficient speaker of English. Changes over time are consistent with Giddens’ notion of self as a reflexive project (Giddens, 1991).

11.2 Trajectories of self

In the previous section and chapters, I have examined participants’ perspectives on their experiences of linguistic barriers and inclusion. My report of the findings thus far has been limited to substantive themes across cases. In this section I report on within case analysis, which sought to examine the nature of identity shifts over the course of the study. This section will report on identity trajectories of three cases in the study that exemplify substantive themes across cases.

In order to investigate trajectories, I aggregated the entire set of narratives on linguistic barriers and enablers and examined stories by case. The data were reduced to core aspects of the narrative in order to examine themes of identity temporally. For this analyses, I focused on three dimensions of these narratives: a) the phase of the study that these narratives were reported, b) problem of the narrative
(complicating action), c) the result (evaluation and coda). I report on the substantive themes by case in the following sections.

11.2.1 Agnieszka – Becoming an English Speaker

Table 11.2 is a representation of Agnieszka’s narrative sequence told over the course of 3 interviews. In this sequence, Agnieszka’s identity trajectory can be observed. Each line in table 11.2 corresponds to a narrative that she tells in the interviews, which has been reduced to its core in order to examine substantive themes across the set. Together, these stories tell the story of becoming an English speaker, which I interpret as a positive identity trajectory.
In the first set of narratives (corresponds to line numbers 1-9) it is possible to see how identity is made evident through Agnieszka’s stories. The problem, as she defines it in several narratives (including 1, 4, and 6), is an inability to speak English, which I interpret as her belief that she is not a legitimate speaker of the language (Bourdieu, 1991). Moreover, narrative 7 defines the problem as having little English, which results in an inability to talk. The impact of these early narratives can be characterized as isolation, which is to some extent chosen by her. For example, in narratives 1 and 3 she reports staying at home because of her English. In narrative 2, she describes taking back stage work at the chip shop, which does not require her to interact with customers. Finally in narrative 5, she describes how the thought of others listening to her speak, which she conceptualizes as deficient, makes her retreat and not speak.

However, as her story develops across this set of interviews, it is possible to observe how these early conceptions of self give way to ‘productive’ identit(ies). This can be seen in the Mid-EiM narratives through her increased engagement, e.g. narratives 10, 17, 19, and 21 are some that refer to her increased engagement in English. This suggests that her belief that she cannot speak English might be changing, and as a result, her investment in the identity of ‘illegitimate’ speaker of English. There is also a shift in terms of her orientation towards engagement in English, e.g. 13 and 14 report less stress speaking. In the Post-EiM narratives, this shift is made more evident, e.g. narratives 24-30 all stress her opening up in English and recognizing that she can speak English. Moreover, in narrative 19, she refers to being asked to be a language broker for a friend, which may be evidence of a shift in her conception of self, where in her earlier narrative (narrative 3), she was the person who needed a language broker. Further, she refers to the moment where her colleague described her as now being able to talk normal (narratives 20 and 29), which by nature of narrating, might provide further evidence that her views of self are changing. These ‘productive’ identities seem to have a positive impact, she refers to being mobilized to talk (narrative 13), happy that she can ask for clarification and others can ask it of her (narrative 14), and is able to make contact (e.g. narratives 17, 22 and 23).
Together this sequence of narratives seem to show a positive identity trajectory, moving from a deficit view of self towards more ‘productive’ subject positions. Table 11.2 shows Agnieszka’s shift in how she sees herself as an English speaker moving from a view of being disabled to talk to becoming a legitimate English speaker. In addition, these changes seem to impact on her perceived ability to engage in English, and her actual engagement in conversational interaction.
### 11.2.2 Fatimah – Becoming Independent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>MAYBE IF I SPEAK OK</td>
<td>FEEL LESS HOMESICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>EMBARRASSED TO SPEAK ENG IN FRONT OF SUDANESE</td>
<td>SO I NEVER SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>I’M NOT HAPPY WITH MY SPEAKING</td>
<td>DON’T LIKE MYSELF WHEN SAY ‘SRY’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>IT’S DIFFICULT TO GO TO DOCTOR</td>
<td>MY HUSBAND HAVE TO GO WITH ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>CHILD WILL SPEAK BETTER THAN ME IN 3-5 YRS</td>
<td>I HAVE TO SPEAK, FIND A JOB, SPEAK WITH OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>I HAVE TO IMPROVE ENG</td>
<td>BECAUSE I WANT TO STUDY HERE AND CHANGE CAREER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MID-EIM</td>
<td>WHEN I WORK, I SPEAK ENG DAILY</td>
<td>WHEN I STOP WORKING, MY ENGLISH GET BAD, NO ENG LONG TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MID-EIM</td>
<td>IN GALLERY READING WALL TEXTS UNDERSTAND 20%</td>
<td>IN DISCUSSIONS, UNDERSTAND 80%, DISCUSSION IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 MID-EIM</td>
<td>I CAN SPEAK WITH DOCTOR</td>
<td>BUT I WANT TO SPEAK W/O BEING SORRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MID-EIM</td>
<td>I FEEL MORE CONFIDENT</td>
<td>I CAN START TALK WITH PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 MID-EIM</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>FEEL MY ENGLISH OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 MID-EIM</td>
<td>AT FIRST DISCUSSION MAKES ME PANIC</td>
<td>BUT AFTER IT STARTS, I FEEL MORE REST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 MID-EIM</td>
<td>AT FIRST JUST STAY AT HOME</td>
<td>I STAY IN THIS COUNTRY AND NOT SPEAK ENG, BUT NOW THINGS GETTING OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 MID-EIM</td>
<td>AT FIRST I THOUGHT EVERY SPEAK BETTER THAN ME, THEY CAN’T UNDERSTAND ME</td>
<td>BUT THEN I FOUND SAME LIKE ME, I UNDERSTAND, THEY UNDERSTAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MID-EIM</td>
<td>AT HOME JUST SPEAK ARABIC</td>
<td>MUSEUM GIVE CHANCE TO SPEAK ENG FOR 3 HRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 MID-EIM</td>
<td>WHEN I SPEAK FOR LONG TIME</td>
<td>WHEN I GET HOME, I CAN’T BELIEVE THAT WAS ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MID-EIM</td>
<td>SOMETIMES TOPIC I FEEL IT</td>
<td>SO I MUST SAY SOMETHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 MID-EIM</td>
<td>I HAVE THE CHANCE TO SPEAK ENGLISH</td>
<td>MAKE SMALL TALK IN STREET NOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 MID-EIM</td>
<td>ASK MY HUSBAND, YOU KNOW ABOUT BOBBY?</td>
<td>THEN I TELL HIM ABOUT HIM, IT’S NICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MID-EIM</td>
<td>WHEN IN MUSEUM I PREPARE WHAT I WANT TO SAY</td>
<td>BUT WHEN I SPEAK, I FORGET WHAT I PREPARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MID-EIM</td>
<td>LIKE LEARNING ABOUT CULTURE</td>
<td>WHEN PEOPLE SPEAK, I FEEL PROUD TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I LOOK FOR DATA ENTRY JOB</td>
<td>BECAUSE CONTACT W/ PEOPLE IS DIFFICULT NOW, I PREFER FOR NOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 POST-EIM</td>
<td>WHEN I 1ST CAME, IF SOMEONE SPEAK</td>
<td>I FEEL I WAS GOING TO RUN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 POST-EIM</td>
<td>IF I HAVE TO SPEAK</td>
<td>I CAN, I’M START TO SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I’M FINDING MY SELF SPEAK</td>
<td>THIS IS 1ST TIME I DO THINGS W/O MY HUSBAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 POST-EIM</td>
<td>MUSEUM EXP</td>
<td>BUILD CONFIDENCE, TALK LONG TIME, IMPROVE LISTENING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 POST-EIM</td>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>GIVE U CONFIDENCE, AND THEN START TO SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I LIVE HERE, NO IMPROVEMENT, I THINK GO BACK TO MY COUNTRY</td>
<td>BUT I FOUND, IT’S OK, I’VE GOT HOPE, I CAN IMPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I THOUGHT IT WAS DIFFICULT TO LIVE HERE AND NOT SPEAK ENG</td>
<td>BUT REALIZE COHORT IS OK, THEY CAN IMPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 POST-EIM</td>
<td>AFTER PEOPLE SPEAK WITH ME</td>
<td>THEY SPEAK SLOWLY, SO I CAN UNDERSTAND THEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 POST-EIM</td>
<td>USED TO GET MY HUSBAND TO DO COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>NOW I CAN DO ANYTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 POST-EIM</td>
<td>TAKE COURSE TO IMPROVE ENG</td>
<td>SO CAN FIND JOB. GOOD QUALIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 POST-EIM</td>
<td>WHEN I NEED TO FIND CRECHE</td>
<td>I CALL, I FOUND, DID THIS BY MYSELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 POST-EIM</td>
<td>FIRST DAY OF NEW COURSE UNDERSTAND NOTHING</td>
<td>2ND DAY START TO UNDERSTAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11.3 Fatimah’s identity trajectory**

What emerges from Fatimah’s narratives is an increase in agency over time, which leads to actions that enable her to be more independent in Scotland. In the early set of narratives, which correspond to lines 1-6, we can see that she is generally not
happy with her English. She refers to herself as not speaking ok (narrative 1), being embarrassed and dissatisfied with her English (narratives 2 and 3), and needing to rely on her husband to serve as her language broker (narrative 4), all of which seem to convey a deficient view of herself as an English speaker. In terms of impact, this orientation towards self she attributes to her homesickness (narrative 1), not speaking in front of the Sudanese community (narrative 2) and using her husband as her language broker (line 4).

Like Agnieszka, there is a notable shift in how Fatimah seems to see herself, and her engagement in English. Like many of the cases, Fatimah’s narratives show a growing sense of confidence in herself as an English speaker (e.g. narratives 10, 11, 17, 19). With respect to impact, Fatimah’s reports that she is able now able to talk to people, such as making small talk on the street (narrative 10), she surprises herself when she reflects on her utterances during EiM (narrative 16). She still reports experiencing anxiety speaking, however, this anxiety does not seems less salient and less of an interference over time. In the last set of narratives, Fatimah highlights that she is now able to accomplish in English, no longer relying on her husband as a language broker (narratives 24, 25, 31). One of these accomplishments was being able to find a crèche for her son. She remarks that she was able to call several places to locate crèche and to set up a place for her son in one, all by herself (narrative 33). Being able to communicate in order to accomplish things might be particularly important as she remarks in one narrative:

> In my country we have- have-
> I don’t know what you call in English-
> but always we say
> “if you want to feel safe other people,
> you have to know their language” yeah
> but uh because I stay here
> I need to- have to improve my English
> and speak the same like- [you]
> sometime problem happening in in our my building
> so the police come and ask me,
> so I can’t can’t explain to him,
> just I say “my English is not ok, not ok”
> you know what I mean?
so I have to.

Maybe while I was walking the street,
while while while I was walking in street
some bad happen to me or my child
so I need to- ok?
You know? Yeah

Excerpt 11.12 Fatimah's 2nd interview, narrative 2.17

It is possible that her identity trajectory might also work towards her feeling safe living in Scotland.

In addition to being able to accomplish things in English, Fatimah seems to take pride in learning about and being able to talk about aspects of history and culture that she engaged with in the museums. A recurrent narrative, told first in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} interview (excerpt 11.13), and then again in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} interview (excerpt 11.14), is her story of walking in Edinburgh’s Old Town and coming across the statue of Greyfriar’s Bobby\textsuperscript{9} in situ, and asking her husband what he knew about Bobby and telling him what she learned in the museum.

Tahir [husband’s name] sometimes I ask my husband,
“do you know something like,
do you know Bobby?
Oh I will tell you” you know ((chuckles))
“so I will tell you about that”
“oh”. aye… yes,
it’s very nice
Actually I like about, you know history,
also I like to know,
I would like to know also about culture.
Because always I compare between here and here,
between culture and here and in my country,
sometimes I find something same,
so it’s very interesting to me,
I like to know about history,
because when we speak
or chat with other people
and they speak about something
and I feel proud

\textsuperscript{9} The original plaster cast and other artefacts from the legend of Greyfriar’s Bobby are housed in the Museum of Edinburgh’s permanent collection.
The second telling of this same narrative occurs 8 weeks later in her 3\textsuperscript{rd} interview:

750  And uh... ok, sometimes
751  when I was walking the street
752  I find Bobby,
753  yes ((chuckles)) tell my husband
754  “Bobby, do you want me to tell you about Bobby’s story?”

Like Cyryl’s recurrent bus narrative, I argue that repetition of narratives that are spread out in time like these might function as exemplars for certain events. In this sense, it is likely that Fatimah has told this story before, and perhaps will tell it again as a representation of her experiences and learning during EiM.

In sum, Fatimah’s narrative sequence shows a positive trajectory of self over time. She moves from a general view of dissatisfaction in her English, which causes her to be reliant upon others as language brokers towards a more confidence sense of self as an English speaker. As a more confidence speaker of English, she notes that she no longer needs to rely on brokers and is able to accomplish things on her own in English. In addition, and possibly more importantly, this shift in self may contribute to her feeling safe living in Scotland.
11.2.3 Friderich – Resignation, ‘No talent for English’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>SPEAKING ON PHONE IS QUITE CHALLENGING</td>
<td>IT’S A CHALLENGE FOR PEOPLE TO UNDERSTAND ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>I WANT TO BE ABLE TO PARAPHRASE</td>
<td>WHEN SOMEONE TELLS US 2 SENTENCES, I’M EXPLAIN W/ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PRE-EIM</td>
<td>I HAVE PROBLEM WITH MY GRAMMAR</td>
<td>BUT COURSE WASN’T ENOUGH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 MID-EIM</td>
<td>PEOPLE MAKE SMALL TALK ALL THE TIME AT WORK</td>
<td>BUT I’M NOT CONFIDENT TO REPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MID-EIM</td>
<td>IF I SPEAK CORRECT WAY</td>
<td>I WILL BE MORE CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MID-EIM</td>
<td>I LIKE TO GET USED TO NEW SITUATIONS</td>
<td>SO I’M QUIET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MID-EIM</td>
<td>I DIDN’T LEARN WORDS</td>
<td>I DON’T SEE MUCH PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MID-EIM</td>
<td>MY TEAM LEADER IS USED SCOTS</td>
<td>NOW I KNOW WHAT SHE’S SAYING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 POST-EIM</td>
<td>IF I HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY, AND IT HAPPENS SUDDENLY</td>
<td>I’M NOT PREPARE, FOR UNEXPECTED CONVERSATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 POST-EIM</td>
<td>WISH TO HAVE BETTER ACCENT</td>
<td>FEELING LIKE NOT A CITIZEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 POST-EIM</td>
<td>UNDERSTAND ANY WORDS</td>
<td>THERE’S NO POINT IN ASKING FOR CONTEXT [CLARIFICATION]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 POST-EIM</td>
<td>UNDERSTAND ANY WORDS</td>
<td>I JUST SAY ‘ALRIGHT’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 POST-EIM</td>
<td>MY MGR SAYS I ALRIGHT</td>
<td>I REALIZE IT HAS LIKE 10 MEANINGS!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 POST-EIM</td>
<td>UNDERSTANDABLE WAY</td>
<td>GROUP UNDERSTOOD, SO MY AIMS WERE ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 POST-EIM</td>
<td>[ENTERING DISCUSSION ON PHOTOS]</td>
<td>CHANGE THE WAY PEOPLE THINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 POST-EIM</td>
<td>IF I’M NOT SPEAKING CORRECTLY</td>
<td>MAKES ME DOUBT, NOT IN MOOD FOR SPEAKING ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I HAVE NO TALEN FOR ENGLISH</td>
<td>I WILL GO BACK TO POLAND IN 2 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 POST-EIM</td>
<td>I’VE BEEN HERE 3 YRS</td>
<td>I SHOULD SPEAK LIKE YOU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.4 Friderich’s identity trajectory

Friderich’s case represents the only negative narrative trajectory, and arguably rigid identity within this dataset. He was reticent in his interviews and almost entirely absent in discussions in museums, despite being there for 7 of the 11 sessions. Table 11.4 shows the saliency of linguistic accuracy across his narratives (narrative 5 and 16). In particular, his narratives convey his desire for lexical accuracy (e.g. narrative 2), grammatical accuracy (e.g., narrative 3), and phonetic accuracy (e.g. narrative 10). These perspectives of self stay stable across the time points in which the narratives are told, however, their impact seems to change over time.

In the early narratives, we can see Friderich’s shyness, which results in him either not speaking (e.g. narratives 4, 6). However, in the final interview, that shyness seems to give way to resignation. For example, in narrative 10 Friderich reports not feeling like a citizen because of his English. Further, when customers make small talk with him at his workplace, he reports not even trying to understand them, saying
that ‘there’s no point’ (narratives 11 and 12). He elaborates in narrative 16, in which he says that not speaking accurately makes him doubt himself, and as a result, not in the mood to speak English. Finally, in narrative 17 he suggests that he has no talent for English and thus will return to Poland.

His narrative represents a counter case of EiM and its impact. His case is one where his identity as an English speaker remains stable over the period of study. However, over time his narratives show that his engagement shifts from naught to negative as he expresses resignation in the final interview in light of his English.

11.2.4 Review

These case studies in which I analysed narrative sequences over time help to highlight how conceptions of self and engagement are associated. Agnieszka and Fatimah’s narratives articulate a positive relationship between identity and engagement. As their conception of self seems to shift from a deficit view to a productive sense of self, their narratives also report engaging in English more (and a sense that they can now engage in English). Friderich, however, presents a contrast case. What can be seen across his narratives is a rigidity in his sense of self. In terms of engagement, he shifts from no engagement to giving up on speaking English entirely.

I attempt to visualize these trajectories in Figure 11.4. With respect to the y-axis, the values are not meant to quantify identity or engagement, but stand as a proxy for the patterns of both identity and engagement that can be observed in narrative. Therefore these positive-to-negative values are meant to represent the range of identity (from deficit to productive) and engagement from resignation to participation.
I now turn to the question of how these trajectories might be explained through existing theory. In addition, how can Friderich’s case, which articulates a negative trajectory, be explained? First, the shifts in identity that can be seen in Agnieszka and Fatimah’s case are consistent with Giddens’ notion of identities as reflexive (Giddens, 1991). At its most fundamental level, the data support the idea that identities are not stable constructs but that individuals are constantly engaged in the making and remaking of the self.

However, what these data seem to contribute to these ideas is the principle role of interaction or engagement in this reflexive identity work. That is to say that engagement seems to help to facilitate these changes in identity. For example, if we compare the positive and negative cases, where they differ is engagement. Agnieszka and Fatimah both report increased engagement in conversational interaction, both in museums, but perhaps more importantly beyond the museum. Friderich however, engaged very little in English, as was observed by his interaction during EiM and has he conveys in his narratives. In this sense, the rigidity of his identity might be explained by his lack of engagement.

All of the findings reported this far provide some insight into participants perspectives of EiM and how these experiences impact on them in the museums and
beyond. In the next section, I will report the findings of the analysis of conversation during EiM sessions, which helps to explicate the nature of these experiences and how they might have contributed to the aforementioned perspectives and impacts.

**11.3 Conversation Analysis of ESOL in Museums**

As mentioned in Chapter 9, in this section I will report on the findings of a subset of the dialogue data in order to highlight some substantive themes of EiM discussions. My fieldnotes made note of some of the dynamics of the interaction in the museums. In this section, I report on systemic analysis of these interactions to uncover the functions of this dialogue in order to help explain the aforementioned findings.

I examine two museum dialogue transcripts, one recorded on the 4th week of EiM, and the second recorded on the 11th week. The following is a brief overview of the two sessions that are the focus of my analysis.

**11.3.1 Overview of the sessions**

**Session 4 (Appendix F): The People’s Story Museum** is an oral history museum located on the Royal Mile in the historic Toll Booth Building. Developed as a civic museum, the City of Edinburgh Council worked with the aging Edinburgh community to capture oral histories of Edinburgh peoples from the late 18th century to mid-90s. The collection is based entirely on oral reminiscences of Edinburgh residents. Several reminiscence groups were established in the early 90s to explore the four thematic areas that now constitute the museum’s collection: housing, leisure, social moments and work. Objects and artefacts were donated to the museum by the Edinburgh community through a city-wide drive. Displays consist of objects/artefacts, oral accounts (written and audio recordings) and dioramas.

Session 4 is the group’s first visit to the People’s story. The museum’s tape/slide collection *Memories and Things* was used for the pre-visit work to activate their schematic knowledge of themes of the museum. *Memories and Things* included stock photographs of the period focusing on leisure accompanied by an oral history from one of the reminiscence groups. During the museum visit participants
conducted a self-guided survey of the collection, which lasted 40 minutes. The teacher and learning assistant mingled with the participants, often mediating their understanding of wall texts and engaging with participants when solicited.

The post-museum visit portion of the session is located back at the home base (City Art Centre, Education Room). Participants were sitting in one group in semi-circle formation. The teacher and learning assistant facilitated a discussion about salient aspects of the collection. The segment of the discussion that will be presented focused on a diorama in the museum’s collection of a man, Tom Dougherty, who used to live in Edinburgh but became homeless when a hotel was developed where he had lived.

**Session 11 (Appendix G): The City Art Centre** is a fine art gallery located in Edinburgh’s historic Old Town. The gallery displays a permanent collection of Scottish masters and houses temporary international contemporary art exhibitions. The collection consists of paintings, sculptures and works on paper. The temporary exhibition, *Unseen China: a photographic portrait* was curated by Guangdong Museum in Guangdong, China. The exhibition included the work of 250 Chinese photographers and 590 photographs of life in China.

Session 11 was the group’s first visit to the Unseen China temporary exhibition. As homework, the participants prepared small presentations to provide a portrait of their respective home countries. Prior to the gallery visit the group did some prediction work, brainstorming what they thought the exhibition might contain based on the title. Some ideas generated were: famous architecture, famous people, artists, China’s landscape. During the gallery visit, participants conducted 45-minute self-guided surveys of the exhibition focusing on concepts, themes and interpreted meanings of the images displayed. The teacher and learning assistant mingled with the participants, often mediating their understanding and engaging with participants when solicited.
The post-gallery visit portion of the session is located back at the home base (City Art Centre, Education Room). The teacher and learning assistant facilitated a discussion about participants’ reactions to the exhibit. The segment of the discussion that will be represented here focuses on the participants’ discussion about representations of China, and representation more broadly.

11.3.2 The dimensions of dialogue in EiM
As mentioned in Chapter 9, conversation analysis is an analytic tool for examining naturally occurring talk. My analysis attended to several aspects of the dialogue: turn-taking, adjacency and institutional structures, in order to examine the nature of these sites for talk, in particular, learning and speaking English as a second language. Taking on these analytic lenses to examine this data, three dimensions of the dialogue in EiM emerged: linguistic support, co-construction and epistemic positioning.

I define the linguistic support dimension as the aspects of the dialogue that might help support language learning. Again, my fieldnotes and observations made note of how participants were supporting each other in the dialogue. As a result, I examined these data systematically, attending features of the turns such as participants repair requests, repair provision, uptake of repairs or no uptake of repair suggestions.

The second dimension, which I refer to as the co-construction dimension, sought to examine the interaction part of talk-in-interaction. Again, my fieldnotes highlighted how participants were building on each other in what became rather complex discussions of art and artefacts. This analysis sought to examine this aspect of the talk systematically by focusing on aspects such as co-construction of utterances, in particular how ideas where co-constructed over time.

The third dimension, epistemic positioning (Muntigl, 2009), sought to examine the sources of knowledge drawn on in participants’ contributions in the dialogue, and how they positioned and were positioned by others in the talk. This coding again emerges from my fieldnotes, which marked that participants seemed to be drawing
on a range of resources in these discussions, including the museums’, as well as their own culture and histories.

As a first level analysis of the discussions, I examined who did the talking in these transcripts. In both sessions, 6 out of the 11 students were present and all 6 participated in these segments of discussion. I examined the distribution of talk between teacher and learning assistant and the students. Each conversational turn in these transcripts were counted in order to examine the distribution of turn-taking (Figure 11.5).

![Turn-taking in Discussions](image)

Figure 11.5 Teacher - Student Turn-taking

In session 4, the segment of transcript includes a total of 99 conversational turns and in session 11 the segment includes 63. While the segments are approximately the same in terms of length of time, the length of turns in session 11 are considerably longer. In both sessions, we can see that the learners doing most of talk.

### 11.3.3 Linguistic Support

With respect to the linguistic support dimension, I examined the nature of help-seeking and help-giving in these two discussions. Figure 11.6 summarizes the coding across the two sessions.
Analysis reveals a few noteworthy patterns of the repair data. First, solicited repair requests are always followed by repair suggestions. For example, a participant might word search. These turns are always followed by a suggestion of what the word might be. Repair suggestions are mostly followed by uptake. By uptake I mean that in the subsequent turn, the individual uses the suggested repair to finish their idea. This is observed in all of the turns that follow a repair request, and mostly after unsolicited repair suggestions. By unsolicited repair suggestions, I mean that an individual provides a suggested repair without being asked to do so.

I found that most of the repair suggestions were provided by the teacher and learning assistant, however, all other participants also provided help when it was solicited. A notable difference between the nature of the dialogue in session 4 and session 11 is that in the former, the teacher and the learning assistant’s turns seemed to be in the role of a language authority. However, in the session 11, they two became active participants in the discussion, and even contributed to the ideas that were being developed.

What is important to highlight about Figure 11.6 is that there are less repairs requested and provided in the session 11. In session 4, most of the participants had requested or received help in the discussion. In session 11, only two out of the six
had requested or received help. The participants seemed to be deeply engaged in the discussion about the exhibition, and made use of their linguistic resources in order to do so.

I also coded the repair suggestions for the kind of linguistic help they were providing. Figure 11.7 summarizes this analysis.

What figure 11.7 shows is that most of the repairs were lexical. This is somewhat surprising given how the participants defined themselves as speakers of English through their narratives. Excerpt 11.15 is one of the 2 repair exchanges (a sequence of turns) in session 11.

In excerpt 11.15, Zhaohui requests pronunciation repair, which is provided by the learning assistant. What is important to highlight here is the complexity of Zhaohui’s
utterances as they emerged from a discussion of the exhibition, and the simplicity of the repair. All of the repairs take this form: brief clarifications.

11.3.4 Co-construction
The second dimension I examined in this data was the extent to which turns were contingent upon one another, in other words, co-constructing utterances across turns. Contingency entails both comprehension of other speakers and relevant responses that both display understanding (negotiation of meaning) as well as keeping the conversation going (Silverman, 2001, 168). For example, repair requests, suggestions and uptake are utterances that are contingent upon one another, that is, each subsequent turn in some way depended on the previous one. Again my fieldnotes highlighted this as a salient aspect of the discussions from my observations during the data collection. In addition, the narratives, especially from the latter part of the study highlight participants’ perceptions about their experiences in museums, including noticing that they could speak, understand and be understood. I would like to argue that analysis of contingency and co-construction are a lens through which the same phenomena can be examined in the dialogue itself.

Some of the contingency that can be observed in the transcripts is the kind that one might expect to see in a classroom, where the teacher poses a question and the student responds. However, the interaction in these discussions moves far beyond this standard form of classroom interaction (e.g. Figure 11.8)
Figure 11.8 Co-construction: contingency in dialogues

Figure 11.8 shows the two primary kinds of contingency that can be observed in the transcripts. The kind of contingency that appears the most in these segments is contingency to other’s utterances (corresponds to contingent other in Figure 11.8). Excerpt 11.16 provides an example of this kind of contingency.

Excerpt 11.16 Session 4: Contingent to other

In excerpt 11.16, we can see how participants are constructing an interpretation of the museum’s message together. In particular, the idea of whether life in the past is
really different from life in the present. We can see that in turn 10, Agnieszka argues that through the museums’ collection, she now realized that life in the past is very similar to life now. Karol, argues in turn 11 that you cannot compare how things were 200 years ago to how things are now. Cyryl, however, supports both Agnieszka’s notion that things are indeed similar and Karol’s idea that they have changed in turn 13. In this turn, he refers to a diorama in the museums collection of women putting labels on whiskey bottles 15 (but I believe he meant 50) years ago. Now, he argues that Polish people are the ones doing the labelling, so in that sense, things are different, but what is the same between time past and present is that these jobs still exist. Cyryl’s contribution builds on both Agnieszka and Karol’s and in doing so, gives voice to their ideas.

We see the same kind of co-construction in the following excerpt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>//yeah I think that// most people work for example in the centre of China work in this factory and all money to create people go to hundred place Beijing to build something and Chinese people are proud because they’ve got a building that is a great city but people in the centre have no- nothing and if this country will be federation then people in the centre can be redistribution of taxes I believe=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI:</td>
<td>=there is a lot of progress in China yes I know but everything China has made great progress there will be better than before and uh the other country also is a lot of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>so what would you like to see in this exhibition, what other- is there anything that they could do to make this exhibition more (++) what would you like to see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI:</td>
<td>uh I hope the photographs has has different background to see all sides of China, the shortage of progress, the developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>FRIDERICH:</td>
<td>I think the other point of view of that exhibition like I found (?) pictures in a book which were artistic didn’t show anything any background any social background, just artistic like uh (+++) HEAVY RAIN! or it’s (+++) people uh on a bike? or a bus and uh (2) it’s uh (2) HIGH BUS uh with the ad showing (1) STRONG RAIN! so the rain rain was only show on the bus advert not on the::: whole picture uh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>T1: that’s an interesting point actually, is can you can you distinguish between the value of the exhibition in terms of ART? and creativity, did you like the photographs? did you find value in the photographs were they were they appealing? Uh the message maybe isn’t something that you agree with but did you think some pictures were very artistic and interesting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>FATIMAH: uh ehm ((clears throat)) ((inaudible)) show us uhm the worker in China and and I I think uhm the people in China are very active working but they are too many people in China and all of them like like work cause uh they work a lot(t) nothing stop them from work even uh bad weather or even they have disability because I found a picture a man has lost his arm his leg in the war and he’s writing he’s still writing and other women she’s lost her hand and she’s working with her leg so that means uh they they like work and=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>T1: =I also agree the the message I got from that was RESILANCE people were very resilient, very you know- sickness and poverty didn’t doesn’t push down the spirit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 11.17 Session 11: Contingent to other

In this example, the contingency that participants are doing, is providing counter interpretations of the photography exhibition. In this segment of the discussion, Zhaohui was making the case that the exhibition was misrepresenting China, creating a sort of caricature of her home country, a perspective that Cyryl seemed to be in agreement with. In line 64, however, Friderich interjects, making the case that the photographs are works of art and not necessarily a social commentary. This is followed by Fatimah’s contribution in turn 66, which supports Friderich’s idea, but also extends it by arguing that these pictures are really about China’s national spirit. Again, these turns are building upon one other to interpret the exhibition.

The second kind of contingency, which Figure 11.8 shows occurred less in the data, were utterances that were contingent to one’s own utterances. In these segments of the transcript, we see individuals building ideas across conversational turns. This might indicate how individuals might be planning ideas, which takes several turns in order to adequately convey. Excerpt 11.17 is an example of this kind of contingency.
In excerpt 11.17 we can see how Fatimah is building the notion of homelessness as a product of civil war in Sudan across turns 84, 86, 88, 90, 92 and finally 94. This segment of the discussion launched through the discussion of a diorama in the People’s Story museum. What ensued was a cross-cultural comparison of the sources of homelessness and supports for homeless people across their respective national contexts. What the transcription annotation helps to show is the pace of this discussion, in which there is literally no gap between speakers (indicated by an = symbol) and in some cases overlapping speech (indicated with // symbol). What we
can see in turn 84 is that Fatimah interjects to add her perspective. At turn 88, she restates her perspective, this time, saying it louder. Then in turn 90, we see her develop her contribution further elaborating on the conditions of homelessness in Sudan.

Overall, figure 11.8 shows that across the two sessions sampled, the same level of contingency is found, with more utterances that are contingent others than contingent to themselves.

11.3.5 Epistemic positioning
The epistemic dimension, a recurrent dimension in dialogic models of classroom talk (Lefstein & Snell, 2011; Muntigl, 2009) relates to those aspects of talk that pertain to what counts as knowledge, the sharing of knowledge and who possesses knowledge. In the context of these discussions, I analysed the sources of knowledge for teacher and student turns. Inductive coding produced four categories of knowledge: object observations, student knowledge, teacher knowledge, museum messages. Objective observations refers to utterances that referred to their direct observations of museum objects. Student knowledge refers to utterances that referred to the students’ knowledge, history or experiences. Teacher knowledge refers to utterances that refer to the teacher or learning assistant’s knowledge, history or experiences. Finally, museum messages refer to utterances that refer to information that the museum provided about the exhibits, e.g. through wall texts and labels.
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**Sources of Knowledge**

- **object observations**
- **student knowledge**
- **teacher knowledge**
- **museum msg**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Knowledge</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum msg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of utterances
Figure 11.9 illustrates some important findings from this data. First, that much of the talk in these segments drew on participants’ own knowledge, histories and experiences. Second, some differences can be seen between sessions 4 and 11, which may be attributed to the kind of museum and exhibit that were the subject of these discussions. For example, there are more utterances that refer to museums messages in session 4’s visit to the social history museum versus the art gallery. The history museum’s display included more curatorial input than the photography exhibition had. This could also be due to the objects themselves, diorama’s and historical artefacts versus photographs.

Analysis of the transcripts shows that the teacher and learning assistants were positioning the learners in these discussions, taking very much a guide on the side stance in these dialogues, which may have helped to bring forward the learners ideas in these discussions. In addition, the students were positioning each other in these dialogues as knowledgeable contributors to the discussion. This is made evident in the co-constructive turns in which they build upon one another, which I would argue function to place value on what the previous interlocutor has said.

### 11.3.6 Review

In the previous sections, I outlined the findings of the analysis of the discussions during EiM in order to explicate the nature of the talk in these settings and how these experiences might relate to the findings I have reported earlier in this chapter, as in the previous one. The findings reported focused on three dimensions of these dialogues: linguistic support, co-construction and epistemic positioning.

Analysis of the linguistic support dimension shows that there is some linguistic help seeking behaviour occurring in these dialogues. Students are both requesting support and providing it to others, as well as the teacher providing support. Help that is requested is always followed by repair suggestions, and often in the subsequent turn, the requester uses that suggestion in their next utterance. Most of the repairs that are occurring in these transcripts are lexical, e.g. providing single word assistance.
With respect to the co-construction dimension, the findings show that there were two kinds of contingency occurring: contingency to self, and contingency to others. Most of the turns were contingent upon another’s turn, which provides some evidence for negotiation of meaning and co-construction of ideas in these turns. In these turns we see individuals responding to ideas presented by another, sometimes refuting, in others showing agreement, and in others providing linguistic support. Less turns were contingent upon one’s own utterance. In these turns we can see the individual building an idea across a sequence of turns.

The findings on epistemic positioning show that most of the talk in these segments of the museum session were built upon the participants own knowledge, experience and history. The data show that the learners drew on the museum’s messages more in the social history museum, in which more curatorial input was provided as part of the exhibition. Finally, in the dialogues, both the learners and the teachers were positioning the participants as knowledgeable contributors in these discussions.

There are a few aspects of these findings that are particularly important to consider. The previous chapter reported on the findings of the interview data, in which participants reported deficit views of themselves as English speakers before EiM. Considering the findings of the conversation analysis within the context of those findings, what seems important to highlight is the nature of the linguistic repairs. In particular, the repairs that were requested and provided could not be characterized as communication breakdowns, but rather short stalls that were quickly repaired so that the ideas that were trying to be expressed were uttered. This seems particularly important to highlight given the participants perceptions of themselves as English speakers. I would argue that participants, at all language levels, were extremely articulate in their expressions and extremely deep in the ideas that they were putting forth into the conversations.

This last point I will take up further. What is distinctive about these discussions is the depth of concepts that participants are exchanging and engaging with. To briefly summarize, these discussions included a host of ideas such as: homelessness as a concept, cross national comparisons of the causes and supports for homelessness,
portraiture and representation, artistic value of photographs and a few others. The talk was about the ideas and that emerged from the language, rather than about the language itself.

Engagement in active listening and speaking is significant, I would argue critical, with respect to language learning and adult ESOL learners, as it can lessen the gap between classroom discourse and real-world interaction. Van Lier notes that one of the qualities of discourse in the language classroom is its unnaturalness, and argues that practitioners should be striving for authenticity (van Lier, 1996). In this respect, active listening models real world listening and entails negotiation for meaning, which utilizes one’s grammatical, lexical and pragmatic knowledge to decode and encode talk between interlocutors. Likewise, natural language, that is naturally occurring language used for authentic communicative purposes, produces relevant yet unpredictable talk, expresses identities and conveys personal meaning. Because this particular group of learners might have limited opportunities to engage in English outside of the classroom, opportunities for authentic discourse, within the classroom are crucial.

Research on classroom discussion has helped to illuminate the forms of institutional talk that exist in educational settings, such as those that are pedagogically aligned to evaluate uptake of learning content, but also has sought to explicate what happens when participants are engaged in discussion. Various taxonomies of classroom talk have subsequently emerged, with the aim of explicating the conditions in which learning through discourse could take place (Lefstein & Snell, 2011; Michaels, et al., 2008). What these taxonomies highlight is the co-constituted nature of discussion, in which participants build upon each other’s contributions, and how this assists interlocutors to construct meaning and reasoning within these discussions.

What the findings of the co-construction dimension of these dialogues help to show is how participants are giving voice to each other’s ideas and contributions. I would argue that this is critically important for learners who experience social exclusions.

The last aspect of the findings that I would like highlight are the patterns of epistemic positioning in these dialogues. Students being positioned as knowledgeable
is not a common feature in the language classroom, where the default condition is
that teachers are the authorities of the subject of the language classroom: the target
language. The complex ideas and utterances we find these transcripts, where the
participants are primarily drawing on their own knowledge resources, is consistent
with the surprising findings that Baynham, et al (2007) found in their best practices
in adult ESOL study. They found that when students were given opportunities to
‘speak from within’, that is, about things that mattered to them such as lived
experiences, the language that learners produced was far more lexically dense than
the more structured and controlled language learning tasks. Both this study’s findings
and Baynham et al provide some evidence for the importance of language learning
tasks in which individuals can build on their knowledge resources to develop their
linguistic ones. In addition, these findings are consistent with research on talk in
museums that show that individuals build on their prior knowledge to make meaning
of museum collections (Leinhardt, et al., 2002).

In the final chapter, I will present the conceptual model that helps to explain these
findings and their relationships. I will consider the study’s implications and finally
make recommendations for practice and further empirical work.
12 Conclusion and Recommendations

12.1 Revisiting the Research Problem

Situated within the context of social, immigration, cultural and education policy that is targeted towards addressing marginalization of segments of the population, this study sought to examine EiM and its impact on immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers. In the last decade, museums have repositioned themselves as institutions for learning and agents of social justice, placing an emphasis on widening access to segments of the population who are underrepresented as museum visitors and learners. EiM emerged from this context, and although these kinds of programs are becoming increasingly common across the UK, Europe, Australia, and the North America, they are understudied. There has not yet been significant study of the affordances of museum learning for this population of learners, nor has there been significant study of its impact on inclusion.

This study looks across the extensive body of research in the areas of language learning and acquisition, museum learning, and social exclusion and inclusion respectively, to provide an empirical basis and conceptual framework for the present investigation of EiM. The literature provides evidence that immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers have limited access to opportunities for engagement in English, which are structured at the institutional and interactional level by power dynamics. Limited access to opportunities to engage in the target language impacts these individual’s identities and their investment in the target language. In addition, the literature on the second language acquisition, would suggest that limited access, engagement and investment in the target language would impact the acquisition of the language. Studies of this population of learners that has examined opportunities to speak show the positive impact it has on linguistic production, in which individuals are able to not only make use of their linguistic resources, but do so with increasing linguistic complexity over time. Like the literature on lack of opportunities to speak, the few studies that examine opportunities to speak show how these opportunities are structured at the institutional and interactional level, albeit by non-coercive relations of symbolic power.
The literature on museums and social inclusion shows that while there is a considerable amount of literature on how to promote inclusion through museums, there is considerably less on the impact of these efforts on the individuals that they aim to include. Proxy data, such as postcodes, are used as an indicator of inclusion. Data of this kind provide evidence that the target demographic is visiting museums, however, they do not provide evidence of the impact of participating in museum learning on exclusion, which is precisely what these kinds of initiatives aim to address. A few case studies report on the positive impact of inclusion, however design issues weaken the strength of these claims. I argued that more evidence was needed to understand the target population’s experiences of exclusion and inclusion and the extent to which participating in museum learning could address these issues.

Finally, the review of the literature sought to highlight the evidence on language learning in museums. However, as this area of enquiry is emergent, I looked towards neighbouring areas of enquiry that might help to shed light on language use and learning in the context of museums. I reviewed the literature on talk and learning in museums. This body of evidence shows several important results that are germane to the study of EiM. First, these studies show that talk in museums, between dyads, groups and the self, is oriented toward learning. Second, people draw on their prior knowledge as a resource for discussion to aid their interpretation and meaning making about collections. Third, talk in museums in groups and dyads can lead to conceptual change about phenomena represented in museum collections. Fourth, a single subject case study of language acquisition in an art museum showed that participating in discussion in museums lead to development in the discourse itself.

While these findings provide some promising evidence for EiM, more evidence was clearly needed. In particular, direct evidence of EiM and its impact. In addition, given what we know about the impact of social exclusion on identity, agency and participation, the impact of social inclusion on these factors needs to be researched. With respect to museum learning contexts, there is a paucity of micro-level data that helps to explicate what it means to be included in these contexts with respect to the voices of those these kinds of agendas aim to include. The literature points to the need for further research on social inclusion in museums that can help to explicate
the affordances or disadvantages of social inclusion, so as to advance social science, as well as to provide more empirical evidence upon which policy and practices could be grounded. Finally, in order to help unpack EiM, future research should seek to characterize the ESOL talk in museums, its affordances and the mechanisms that might enable learning talk or barriers to learning talk.

12.2 Overview of the study

This doctoral thesis posed three primary questions:

1. What have been the learners’ experiences of exclusion and inclusion since migrating to the UK?
   a. How do these experiences interface with their English language abilities?
2. What are the learners’ views of the effects of their participation in the ESOL in museums provision in terms of exclusion/inclusion?
   a. What might be the policy, provision and practice implications of these views?
3. What occurs in interaction during ESOL in museums?

Conducted in collaboration with City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries Service, I conducted two pilot investigations of the target learners and EiM, followed by a 5-month ethnography of EiM, examining the experiences, perceptions and processes of a cohort of adult migrants, refugees and asylum seekers engaging in EiM. In order to investigate participants’ experiences of social inclusion and exclusion, in-depth time-series interviews were conducted at three time points over the 5-month period: before EiM, 7 weeks into EiM and 1 month after EiM. Narrative analysis of interviews was used to examine how individuals interpret their experiences through storying their experiences. Structural analysis of these stories helped uncover the meanings that participants attributed to their experiences and how they constructed these interpretations. Structural analysis of these narratives helped in examining substantive themes across the cases, as well as within cases. Examining within case themes, structural analysis of narratives over time was used to examine the nature of narratives over time and the temporal dimensions and trajectories of
those stories. In addition, 11 museum visits were audio and video recorded, a subset of which were transcribed and analysed using conversation analysis to examine what occurred in talk, the interaction between interlocutors and its functions. Conversation analysis enabled the investigation of turn-taking patterns, contingency across conversational turns to undercover some of the dimensions of talk in museums and how this talk might help to support language learning.

12.3 Summary of the Findings

12.3.1 Pilot investigations

One of the aims of this research was to produce what Lewin refers to as ‘actionable knowledge’ (Lewin, 1946), which is engaging the researched in the generation of knowledge about their experiences. Engaging the researched in the generation of knowledge about their experiences means that the knowledge generated to inform the development of interventions to better help the circumstances of the research derives from the population that the research seeks to affect. In the case of this study, this meant generating knowledge that could inform the development of potentially transformative learning experiences for this population of learners. The two pilot investigations have helped to generate this kind of knowledge, informing the design and implementation of EiM, which was the subject of investigation in the main study of this doctoral research.

These preliminary investigations produced several key findings. First, with respect to this population of learners, women in particular find it difficult to access learning opportunities as the need for childcare is a key barrier to engagement in language learning post migration. Second, with respect to language learning, this population of learners, as well as key informants, reported the importance of language learning provision that was relevant to this population’s daily lives. As such, provision that focused on literacy over oracy was generally less successful at retaining this population as learners. In addition, service providers, such as community centres found that drop-in classes with crèche provision were the most successful for this population of learners.
In addition, EiM provision surveyed in museums across the UK found that many of the materials being developed for this population of learners was being developed in isolation from current theory of second language acquisition and pedagogy, and to some extent museum learning theory (e.g. communicative language teaching). This had several important implications for the development of provision that was the focus of investigation in the main study, including learner-centredness, focus on oracy through communicative language teaching, and crèche provision.

12.3.2 Main Study

Investigating social exclusion and inclusion of the participants and their engagement in EiM systematically in the main study produced several key findings. Consistent with previous research, this study found that the participants’ experience of social exclusion, with respect to this population, is manifested through limited access to opportunities to engage in English post-migration. Like previous research has found, access is to some extent institutionalized through practices and processes, such as through opportunities to work and the kind of work available to migrants post-migration. These kinds of jobs are characterized by limited to no target language demands.

In addition, the findings of the present investigation extend the findings of previous research in that it provides some evidence for how social exclusion can also be constructed at the interactional level. In particular, the findings highlight the relationship between identities and engagement, in which perceptions of self as a speaker of the target language, and how the target language community might receive their ‘talk’, influence individuals’ engagement and willingness to engage in English. In this respect, some language barriers and opportunities to speak are interpreted and chosen by way of perceptions of self. The findings show how individuals perceived less linguistic barriers, and less social exclusion over time.

With respect to social inclusion, the findings show participants perceived themselves as experiencing social inclusion, primarily in the context of museums through EiM. Over the course of the study participants perceive themselves as having more experiences of linguistic inclusion, and there is a corresponding effect on their
willingness to engage in English. This effect is persistent in the interviews that were conducted one month after EiM, which provides some evidence of the impact of EiM beyond EiM. Participants’ narratives of linguistic inclusion refer specifically to encounters in the museums that provided ripe conditions for talk and ones in which participants were able to observe their skills at speaking English.

The findings of the analysis of dialogue in EiM shows how individuals are positioned and position themselves as ‘knowers’ in these discussions. While these discussions show some linguistic support occurring, in the form of repair requests, suggestions and uptake, linguistic support is not a central aspect of these dialogues. Rather, participants are actively and collaboratively engaged in the process of making meaning of museum collections as English language speakers. In doing so, participants at all levels of English proficiency were drawing heavily on their knowledge resources to engage their linguistic resources in talk.

There were several outcomes with respect to the impact of EiM on participants. First, over time, participants perceived themselves as having greater confidence in English, which in turn seemed to give them more agency as speakers of English. Increased agency can be seen in participants’ narratives, where they convey greater willingness to engage in English with others. Secondly, over the course of the study, most participants’ identity trajectories shift from negative to positive. Participants’ conceptions of self as speakers of English shift from ‘disabled’ to capable and legitimate speakers of English. The exception was one participant, Friderich, whose trajectory remained negative, leading to his resignation, in which he reports deciding to return to Poland.

12.3.3 Engaging the findings with theory: claims on the impact of EiM

These findings merit further analysis. In particular, the findings lead me to postulate two claims that I will examine in this section by putting them in conversation with existing theoretical insights.

Claim 1: Participation in EiM facilitated shifts in identity trajectories.

Claim 2: EiM served as a bridge to engagement in English beyond the museums.
12.3.3.1 Claim 1: EiM and identity trajectories

To recapitulate, like previous research, the findings of this study show how identities are not stable, but rather are in flux. This is consistent with Giddens’ notion of identity as a reflexive process in which individuals are continuously engaged in the process of making and remaking of the self. The data show how participants’ identities as speakers and users of English change over time, as do perceptions of linguistic barriers that create exclusion and enablers that create inclusion. The data show that participants perceived themselves as experiencing less linguistic barriers over time and more enablers of engagement over time. We see a corresponding effect on identity, where over time, participants seem to show more positive perceptions of self over time, whereas at the beginning of the study, they displayed more negative views of self as speakers of English. These findings suggest an interrelationship with conversational engagement and identity, where conversational engagement might be a mechanism that helps to make identity work happen.

This leads me to make the following hypothesis: discursive engagement, with respect to this population of learners, is the collaborative construction of the self. Figure 12.1 attempts to visualize this hypothesis.

In order to unpack this hypothesis, I will discuss some of its components. First, the findings suggest the notion of levels of identity. In this sense, while individuals are continuously engaged in making and remaking of identity, some of this identity work seems to be operating at the micro level and some at the macro-level towards identity maintenance.

With respect to the macro-level, Giddens (1991) argues that through narrativity, individuals are seeking coherence of the self. I interpret the stories that participants tell as explications of their perceptions of self as part of this process of identity maintenance and the search for coherence in the life story. For example, the findings show that participants developed identities early in the migration process that took on negative views of the self, that is, self as a deficient communicator of English. Participants told a series of stories that seemed to support this storyline. I refer to storylines in this thesis as a master narrative, which is an overarching narrative that
seems to organize experiences, or in Giddens’ terms, provide a coherent narrative. In this sense, I posit that the storyline is the interpretive lens in which participants assimilate new experiences.

One explication of this can be seen in Sarah’s story of a shop encounter (except 8.1). In excerpt 8.1, Sarah interprets the interaction with a shopkeeper, in which the shopkeeper says “sorry?”, through her master narrative or storyline. Sarah suggests that the reason why the shopkeeper said ‘sorry’ was because she was not a good English speaker and could therefore not be understood. In this sense, her storyline of ‘I am not a good English speaker’ is the interpretive lens she uses to make sense of this encounter, which in effect reifies that master narrative. In this sense, the encounter provides for her yet another data point to support her storyline, thus perpetuating the storyline.

However, the findings from these data also point to the notion of micro-level identity work, which can run counter to the master narrative. I posit that the accumulation of micro-level identity work that challenges the master narrative, can help to disrupt it, changing the course of the narrative/identity trajectory. EiM and the museums themselves seemed to create the conditions that enabled participants to interact in conversational encounters as a fully-fledged member of a community of English speakers. I posit that these experiences enabled participants to see themselves in a different light as a contributor to that dialogue. I suggest that this is the micro-level identity work that occurs in interactions. Thus, when micro-level identity work runs counter to the master narrative, such as the experiences participants had in EiM, versus the experiences that they had had elsewhere prior to EiM, these micro-level interactions can disrupt the master narrative and change one’s storyline. In its simplest expression, if I believe that I cannot speak English, but I use English and my beliefs are not reified (that is, others can understand me and I understand them), then this new condition of my conversational interaction serves to challenge my storyline as a non-English speaker.
Figure 12.1 attempts to visualize this relationship, where discursive encounters on the left are sites in which identity work occurs at the local level that can serve to reify or disrupt the master narrative.

This model also helps to account for the case of Friderich’s negative identity trajectory. In this sense, it could be argued that his lack of willingness to engage even in the context of EiM, in which his speech could be positively received, meant that he never had the opportunity to see his competency in a different light, thus any interaction he did have served to reify his storyline as a deficient communicator in English.

A fundamental characteristic of interaction in EiM about museum objects was the emphasis on language use over linguistic form. Use over form in effect gave primacy to what students knew and could already do to make meaning of collections. With respect to individuals that perceive themselves as ‘not knowing’ and ‘not being able to do’ this may have been particularly empowering. In seeking further theoretical support for the above proposition, I return to Bourdieu’s capital theory to consider what might be happening in these micro level discursive encounters that lead to these shifts in identity trajectories.

In Bourdieu’s theory of capital, he argues that capital is conferred to one. With respect to linguistic capital he argues that “utterances receive their value (and their sense) only in relation to their market… the value of the utterance depends on the relation of power that is concretely established between the speaker’s linguistic
competences, understood both as their capacity for appropriation and appreciation” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 67). Adopting this understanding of linguistic capital in relation to the population of learners in this study, the context of the study and the findings suggests several things. First, with respect to the value of utterances, it is possible that for this population of learners who had few opportunities to engage in English post-migration, the engagement with interlocutors in the museums, which took the form of contingent responses, questions and extensions, possibly functioned to place ‘value’ on individuals’ utterances in these interactions. This might be particularly significant for individuals who have limited access to conversational interaction in English and low confidence in their abilities. If we take this view, then the context of EiM functioned as a linguistic market in which participants’ utterances had value. Value, it could be argued, could have been negotiated through relations of power in these contexts. As I have reported, both teachers and students were actively engaged in positioning others as knowers and contributors in these interactions, thus the traditional power relations between the language teacher and language student, in which the teacher is the primary authority on the target language, was disrupted in these interactions. The findings show how participants solicited and gave linguistic support to each other, in addition to the teachers. In short, I posit that through participation in EiM (a linguistic market), and the conversational interaction in these museums, participants gained linguistic capital.

Further, as I have mentioned in chapter 8, Bourdieu contends that an individual’s realization of where they are situated within a particular linguistic context impacts on their identity. In short, this suggests that the nature of discursive engagement in EiM and the value it is afforded in that linguistic context helps to change how individuals see themselves. I argue that it is the accumulation of moments like this that lead to a revisioning of the self, and thus a change in one’s master narrative.

12.3.3.2 Claim 2: EiM bridges discursive engagement beyond museums

As the findings report, participants perceived their encounters in the museums as inclusive, enabling them to engage in talk. The findings also show that over time, individuals felt more capable and willing to engage beyond museums and report
engaging with colleagues, strangers and service providers in new ways than they had before. This leads me to the claim that EiM scaffolds or bridges discursive engagement beyond the museum. However, this is a puzzling aspect of the findings when we consider it in relation Bourdieu’s theory of linguistic capital.

As mentioned in the previous section, Bourdieu argues that linguistic capital is relative to the linguistic market. If we take the view that EiM was in effect its own linguistic market, comprised of learners of English with more or less the same level of English, how does this explain individuals’ and their interaction beyond the museum, arguably a different linguistic market? I would like to argue that this can only be explained by the linguistic capital gained in EiM and its effect on how individuals perceived themselves as English speakers. Thus, the new master narrative in which individuals see themselves as capable and legitimate speakers of English, becomes the new interpretive lens they use to make sense of subsequent interactions, and those interpretations are reported in their narratives. Again, Bourdieu argues that the realization of the value of one’s capital with respect to the market (context of linguistic production) impacts how one sees oneself. I would like to argue that these revised subject positions in light of capital gained in the contexts of museums, had an enabling effect on participants as they negotiated conversational interaction beyond the museum.

12.3.4 Engaging the findings with empirical methods

In Chapters 6 and 8, I discussed the ontological and epistemological stances that have informed the design and formulation of this research, as well as the methods used to collect data. Situating this research within an Interpretivist tradition, which takes the view that reality is socially constructed and not independent of an individual, I used two primary methods to examine individuals’ lived experiences: interviews (using focus groups in the first phase and in-depth individual interviews the 2nd and 3rd phases) and observation.

It is important to acknowledge that while interviewing the participants in this study has helped to elicit accounts of their lived experiences using and learning English, these accounts do not constitute the absolute truth about these experiences. Rather,
they constitute accounts about how individuals interpret their lived experiences. Taking this understanding of the data that this study has generated, in my analysis I have attempted to unpack the reasoning structures that are embedded within what people say about experiences. Examining the reasoning structures in these accounts helps to understand the lenses through which individuals interpret their experiences. I have used this analysis of reasoning structures to examine individual’s interpretations of their experiences along several dimensions: the meanings they attribute to experiences, perceptions of the factors that contributed to those experiences, and the impact of these interpretations on social engagement. All of these dimensions are embedded within the stories that individuals tell about experiences. Thus, these analytical methods help to move closer to understanding the socially constructed nature of experiences, towards an understanding of the phenomena that is the subject of this investigation: impact of EiM.

Observation methods, in particular recording spoken interaction between participants in the context of EiM, helped to triangulate the interview accounts. Observations of conversational interaction, using transcription methods that attempt to provide very detailed accounts of the dynamics of social interaction, helped to slow down live interaction for analysis. Thus conversational analytic transcripts have enabled me to make the dynamics of social interaction, as it unfolds, an object of enquiry in its own right. In addition, these observations of interaction in museums helped to provide an additional lens through which to understand participant accounts of these experiences, and the socially constructed nature of these accounts.

12.4 Implications

The findings of this study help to underscore some of the linguistic challenges that migrants, refugees and asylum seekers experience post migration and their impact. However, they also point to a critically important role education can fulfil to support these learners and their settlement after migration.

*Revisiting the contextualized learner*
In Chapter 7, I introduced a framework, drawing on conceptualizations of social exclusion and inclusion, for thinking about the learner in relation to the wider society in which they engage their linguistic resources (represented in figure 12.2). The findings of this study help towards describing the nature of this relationship.

![Figure 12.2 Revisiting the contextualized learner](image)

The findings of the main study seem to suggest that the learning community can play a distinct and important role in facilitating interaction beyond the learning community. In particular, they can provide social space for individuals that experience isolation, specifically linguistic isolation. In addition, they can help learners to foster the confidence in their linguistic skills necessary to participate in society and can help to bridge this participation. At a more fundamental level, as we saw in the case of Fatimah, confidence can serve to help immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers feel safe in the host country after migration. The findings also point the interconnected nature of identity and engagement and the importance of opportunities to engage that education can provide for learners.

With respect to the use of museums to tackle social exclusion, the findings provide some evidence that museums can play a critical role in fostering social exclusion for this population of learners. However, the impact of EiM described in this thesis, might be limited to initiatives that support sustained engagement with museum visitors. A single visit model might make some impact, but as I have posited, it may be the accumulation of discursive encounters like this that are responsible for the impact.
Regardless of the length of engagement museums foster with visitors, the structure of the interaction may also play an important role in the impact learning in museums can have on issues like social exclusion. Tasks that structure linguistic interaction and engagement with collections might help to provide scaffolding for learners like those in the present study. I would argue that scaffolding for the engagement with the collections and scaffolding of engaging with others about the collections are important for individuals that do not normally visit museums. This might help to support them linguistically, but also help to support their sense of belonging in museums, engaging in museum talk.

As the findings noted, when I compared talk in the art museum to talk in the social history museum, participants drew on different resources for the talk. This might have some implications for the kind of activities that museums use to support social inclusion in various types of museums. That is to say, some types of museums, e.g. art museums, might be more effective with particular tasks than others.

Another important implication is that the impact that these unique informal learning institutions can have for individuals, can occur well beyond the museum. This has important implications for how we measure impact of museum visiting, which has hitherto been primarily limited to exit surveys or observed processes during museum visits. Some studies have tried to examine impact beyond the museum visit (Falk, 1989), but through recollection, which may come with its own set of measurement complexities, e.g. do these methods capture impact of the visit or just what facts individuals remember. Thinking beyond current practice on impact might be needed to fully understand the kind of impacts engaging in museums might have. To reiterate Tett (2006), how social exclusion is defined has implications for policy and practice, and I would add measurement.

Finally, it is possible that other sites of informal learning can provide the similar support for learners as reported in this study. It may be that there are some features of EiM can function to support social inclusion if used in other settings. For example, the nature of the tasks and the nature of the interaction between participants might be
critical features for social inclusion work for this population of learners more broadly.

12.4.1 Pedagogical/Androgogical Implications
The findings of this investigation help to highlight the importance of opportunities for oracy skill development for this population of learners. Not only may they provide opportunities for learners to develop their skills for use post-migration, but the identity work that learners were engaging in through oracy in EiM seemed to have an important impact on their sense of self as speakers of the language. Developing a positive sense of self as a second language speaker may be a critically important step for migrants, refugees and asylum seekers for future learning, engagement with the language and participation in society. Informal learning opportunities, such as those in museums can potentially play a critical role for this population of learners. However, this is not to discount the contributions of formal learning opportunities to develop these same skills.

12.4.2 Implications for Policy, Provision and Practice in the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries
As previously mentioned, one of the goals of this investigation was to be able to produce ‘actionable knowledge’ (Lewin, 1946). Taking this study of EiM as a whole, there are several implications for policy, provision and practice in the City of Edinburgh Council Museums and Galleries. The findings of this investigation point to the potentially important role that the City of Edinburgh Council Museum and Galleries can have to help promote social inclusion, with respect to the population that were the target of this study, and within the comprehensive and integrated range of services that the City Council is obliged to provide (including education, culture, learning and social welfare: see www.edinburgh.gov.uk). The City Council’s museums provided an opportunity for this population of learners to engage with the local culture, history and art. This might be particularly important for individual that experience isolation, who otherwise have had limited access with the local community post migration. Participants referred to the opportunity to learn about the local culture as a particularly salient aspect of EiM. These kinds of experiences might help to foster a sense of belonging. The museum discussions show how
individuals were making connections between the collections and their own histories and experiences.

Policy targeted towards social inclusion in local authority museums should consider the potentially important role that they can have for the local community, including new migrants. Policy that is targeted towards supporting learning and social inclusion should consider the potential impact that longer term engagement with new communities, as well as existing communities, could have for wider goals such as social cohesion.

As previously mentioned, immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers are underrepresented visitors in the City of Edinburgh Council Museums. Engaging these communities of learners can be particularly challenging as they are a hard to reach population. Policy that is seeking to engage this population of learners might consider partnerships with gatekeepers such as community centres to help promote the educational services that museums provide, in particular the opportunities that target this population of learners.

12.5 Limitations of the study

There are several limitations of this research that need to be acknowledged. First, and as with most qualitative enquiry, the scale of this study and the uniqueness of its locale and participants mean that it is not possible to make claims of generalizability. However, it begins to shed light on some important aspects of this population of learners and their engagement with English, museums as a learning setting and the kind of impacts that informal learning can have. In this sense, this research provides some important findings that further research can examine in more depth.

Second, and related to the first limitation, this research’s design did not include examining outcomes in terms of language learning outcomes. In this study, I opted to examine the context and these learners in depth, and as a result have been able to collect a rich sample of data that provide great insight into the processes of EiM and their impact in and beyond museums. Thus, I hope that this research provides some
evidence that can help in the design and formulation of future research that might examine language learning outcomes in these contexts.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge a limitation with respect to the collection of data that pertains to question of how researchers might access individual’s lived experiences through interviews. Two cases were particularly challenging for the analysis, Lucyna and Karol. These participants were a married couple, both from Poland. They participated in most of the sessions and all three interviews. However, I noted in my research diary that these interviews were incredibly challenging to facilitate. Since these were in-depth interviews, I used open-ended questions, that would help them to articulate their experiences. In the time leading up to the second and third interviews I considered interview strategies that might help me to elicit their experiences from them, e.g. wait time, considering that I might not have been sensitive enough to possible linguistic challenges that participants may have had in these interview encounters. Initial analysis of these interviews had not revealed anything salient about their experiences.

However what is most interesting about these cases is how they demonstrate so clearly that interview encounters generate co-constructed accounts of experience. In the third interview, one of the participants, who seemed to feel more comfortable around me, revealed their ‘real’ narrative of migration. In this interview, I learned that they moved to the UK after having spent several years in my home country illegally. This was not revealed in any way in the previous interviews, and as the participant said in this third interview, she now felt she could talk about it, before she could not.

This occurs to me as a clear example of how the actors, setting and social context can help to shape what is communicated in the interview encounter. It demonstrates how participants construct a narrative for themselves, which may be contingent upon who the story is being told to, where the story is being told, the power relations and power dynamics. For example, The first two interviews were conducted in an institutional setting, which perhaps acts to reaffirm my association with that institution, the final interview was in an informal setting, after six months of our acquaintance, which
perhaps may have made my position less authoritative, and therefore potentially less of legal threat, so they could reveal this version of their story. This episode seems to me to be a testament to the choices that narrators make in their telling, to position themselves with respect to their audience. This example is also useful when considering what type of knowledge interviews generate and therefore what data can be subject to interpretation.

12.6 Suggestions for Future Research

This investigation has opened a wealth of new questions for future research, some of which I will enumerate in this section. First, to what extent are these findings limited to museum contexts? The findings highlight the affordances of these unique learning institutions for participants. Future research could examine the extent to which educational provision of this kind in other contexts can support this population of learners in the same way. Second, to what extent are the outcomes of this educational provision limited to this specific population of learners? Future research might explore the extent to which educational provision in museums can support other populations of learners in similar ways.

Third, to what extent do participants get better at speaking English through participation in learning in museums? Future research could examine the impact of EiM on language acquisition, examining learning outcomes, but also dialogic processes, such as in Gill’s (2007) study. One of my interests for the future will be to fully transcribe the 11 3-hour session dataset of museum visits and examine the data developmentally for how individuals’ linguistic performance changes over time.

Finally, one of my current areas of interest is whether the same kinds of linguistic barriers, and their impact on identity and engagement occur in other varieties of language. For example, do native English speakers experience similar phenomena when they are acquiring and learning how to use academic English? What is the impact of identity on engagement of academic discourse, and experiences of engaging in academic discourse’s impact on individual’s identities as members of a discourse community.
APPENDIX A: ESOL in Museums Course Overview

**Brief summary of the course**
3 months (12 weeks)
conversation course
3 hour sessions
once per week

**Learning spaces**
Museum of Edinburgh (museum of Edinburgh from pre-historic times to present)
People’s Story Museum (oral history museum of the people of Edinburgh)
Museum of Childhood (museum about childhood)
City Art Centre

**Objects of learning**
Museums and their collections serve as a stimulus for discussion and language work
Paintings, artefacts, sculptures, drawings, diorama, labels, wall texts and museum buildings

**Learners**
This course is designed for new communities in Scotland (settled immigrants, economic migrants, refugees and asylum seekers)
Mixed level of ability
Mixed nationalities
This instance of the course
10 learners
ranges from lower intermediate to upper intermediate levels)
includes Poles, Chinese, Sudanese, Sri Lankan and Bhutanese
languages spoken include Polish, Mandarin, Arabic, French, German, Hindi, Nepali, Bangladeshi and English
ages range from late 20s to mid-50s
learners have learnt English in both formal (English as a compulsory subject in school for 4-5 years) and informal settings (community education, on the job).
Learners have lived in Scotland from 0-6 years
None of the learners are taking English courses at the moment of writing
Some learners are working in Edinburgh and others are not working but hope to

**Resources**
10 students: 1 ESOL teacher and 1 Learning Assistant

**Need for the course**
recent demographic changes in Edinburgh and Scotland
the need for relevant ESOL provision for new communities in Scotland
Many students lack access to ESOL provision
To promote social, linguistic, intellectual and educational access to cultural resources and museums
To promote the use of authentic texts (as a broad and inclusive term) for the teaching of English as an additional language
To understand English language learning and teaching
To promote language courses that are motivating for learners and develop positive attitudes towards language learning and use
To develop a course that is sustainable and adaptable to learners and museum contexts

**Principles relating to the overall design of the course**
To Develop an ESOL course
- that uses museums and their collections as a stimulus language work
- that promotes oral/aural fluency development
- that makes museums and their collections accessible to new communities in Scotland
- that is relevant to the needs and interests of the learners
- that gives voice to the learners and builds on their current linguistic knowledge
- that creates a positive classroom environment and therefore encourages risk-taking
- that explores identities and culture
- which creates authentic gaps of communication which encourage learners to converse
- in which pair/group work are central to the classroom organization
- that incorporates learners’ experiential knowledge and meets learners at their level

**Course structure**
4 units, each lasting 3 sessions
- Each unit explores a different museum collection
- Classes meet once a week for 3 hours
- Thematic content – identities, Edinburgh’s history, people and culture and the learners’ histories, cultures and identity
- Task-based approach
- Developing speaking and listening skills
- Learners’ provide most of the language input to promote learners’ empowerment
- Language emerges from discussion and is captured in classroom resource/reference places (e.g. language bank, hand-outs)
- The teachers’ role is facilitator, language resource person

**Goals and objectives**
- Learners will develop their speaking and listening skills
- Learners will work collaboratively in pairs and groups
Learners will describe, express opinions and justify, share experiences and perceptions.
Learners will use strategies in conversation to help facilitate understanding
Learners will develop confidence speaking and listening with others
Learners will speak from 'within'
Learners will develop their ability to use strategies in conversation
Learners will become aware of compensation, social, affective, cognitive and mnemonic strategies
Learners will practice using compensation, social, affective, cognitive and mnemonic strategies
Learners will reflect on their use of compensation, social, affective, cognitive and mnemonic strategies.
Learners will gain awareness of the target language culture and the global community
Learners will reflect on their own culture
Learners will engage in discussions of other cultures represented in the classroom
Learners will learn about the target language culture/context through museums and museum objects.
Learners will reflect on the target language community’s cultural norms of conversation
Learners will develop confidence as a speaker and listener of English
Learners will utilize their existing knowledge and reflect on their experiences
Learners will speak and listen about things relevant to their lives
Tasks and collections will motivate learners to speak
Learners will negotiate with peers
Learners will use language learning strategies
Learners will collaborate in pairs and groups
Learners will be encouraged to take risks
Learners will develop their ability to transfer their knowledge and skills developed to contexts outside of the classroom setting
Learners will reflect on language use of the target language community in their lives outside the sessions
Learners will develop confidence to utilize language and skills developed during the sessions

Outcomes
Learners enjoy themselves and are enriched and inspired by the experience
Learners use the museums to develop their knowledge and understanding
Learners further develop their communication skills as a result of using the museums
Learners become more self-confident, questioning, motivated and open to others' perspectives
Learners decide to do something different in their lives
Learners feel welcomed, respected and supported in their learning and use of the language
Learners have access to language learning opportunities in museums
Skills
Talking to peers about experiences
Asking for and giving information
Expressing opinions
Justifying opinions
Describing objects, people and places
Listen for gist
Listen for detail using key words
Listen to identify main points
Listen and respond appropriately
Be able to follow a discussion
Be able to clarify statements
Be able to ask for clarification when needed

Assessment
Learners will create their own learning goals on individual learning plans and well evaluate their level upon commencement of the course
Learners will reflect on themselves as learners and users of English throughout the duration of the course and beyond
Classroom sessions will be video and audio recorded
Formative assessment will be conducted on a weekly basis through teacher and researcher observations.
Learners will make a summative assessment of their learning the course at the final session.

Architecture of Each Session
10:00 – 10:30am Warm-up – introduce theme, generate language, explain task
10:45 – 11:00am Walk to the gallery (small talk themes)
11:00 – 11:45am Gallery task
11:45 – 12:00pm Walk back to City Art Centre
12:00 – 12:45pm Post Gallery task
12:45 – 1:00pm Reflections/homework

Unit 1: Museum of Edinburgh (May 31st, June 7th, June 14th)
Unit 2: People’s Story Museum (June 21st, June 28th, July 5th)
Unit 3: Museum of Childhood (July 12th, July 19th, July 26th)
Unit 4: City Art Centre (August 2nd, August 9th, August 16th)
### APPENDIX B: Sample Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2: June 7th</th>
<th>Museum of Edinburgh Identity of a city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Purpose:**        | • To think about objects and their meanings  
                      • To explore themes of identity  
                      • To share experiences and opinions  |
| **Skills focus:**   | **Opinion gap**  
                      Talking about objects  
                      Talking about opinions  
                      Thinking critically  
                      Talking about experiences  
                      Listening and responding to others  |
| **Materials:**      | Flip chart  
                      Markers  
                      Language wall cards  
                      Blue tack  
                      Some examples of objects that represent Edinburgh (from T and LA)  
                      “Small talk” cards  
                      small talk dialogs  
                      Picture of Edinburgh (Highet or woodcut)  
                      Museum task assignment cards  |
| **Procedure:**      | **Warmer**  
                      1. Review talking about objects (10-15 minutes)  
                          • Ss present objects brought in for homework assignment  
                          • Recycle some of the language from previous week  
                          • Discuss Ss’ meanings, e.g. why they thought this object represented Edinburgh in some way  
                      **Pre-museum visit task**  
                      2. Brain storm what Ss think is unique about Edinburgh city (10-15 mins)  
                          • Might be good to discuss the concept of identity first to illustrate  
                          • Might be good to do this in groups with flip chart paper, one student in the group could be the scribe and the T and LA could mingle and facilitate in the groups  
                            o Then round up for whole class plenary comparison of the groups and discussion  
                            o This might also generate some interesting cross cultural discussion where Ss compare Edinburgh with their home cities  
                      3. Introduce the museum task: exploring the identity of Edinburgh through objects at the Museum of Edinburgh (5-10 minutes)  
                          • Look at a picture of Edinburgh city from a particular vantage point (either Highet’s painting of the Royal Mile or an 18th century woodcut)  
                            o Think about what is shown in the picture and why the |
artist might have chosen to these vantages as describing Edinburgh city.
  o Explore what the Ss think is part of a city’s identity.
  o LA can write down these components on the flip chart to revisit after the museum visit
• For the museum task students will explore the theme of Edinburgh’s identity in one aspect of the collection.
  o For the purposes of this task, the museum will be split up by different galleries, so essentially each pair of students works in one gallery.
  o Ss will survey what is in the gallery
  o Ss will discuss how this might relate to the city’s identity.
  o Ss should prepare to share this with the rest of the class when we return to CAC.
  o It might be good to check if everyone understands what they have to do at the museum.
4. Introduce the walk to the museum task: small talk (3 and 4 can be reordered if you like) (10 mins)
  o Each week on the walk to the museum try to encourage Ss to engage in small talk with each other. This might help to bolster their confidence in speaking, make the walk to the gallery entertaining, and help to build up a classroom rapport.
  o During the first couple of weeks we will use “small talk” cards. These are prompts which might help to get conversation going. But as the weeks progress, we will stop giving them the cards and try and encourage them to initiate their own “small talk”
  o For the first week it might be good to demonstrate small talk, maybe using one of the advanced Ss in the example or the LA. Small talk involves listening and responding appropriately, sometimes taking several turns. Some Ss may find the responding part difficult, some Ss might find taking several turns difficult. In this first introduction to small talk try and encourage the Ss to think about what it is, what kind of things you usually talk about, what are some things that aren’t appropriate for small talk etc (some of these will be cultural).
    o You might also want to discuss the structure of conversation, e.g. how do you keep a conversation going? (e.g. responding to the interlocutor with an answer or opinion and asking another related question)
    o You decide how much scaffolding for small talk based on student responses.
  o Another extension task (if you see fit) is a small talk dialog that Ss work together in groups to put in the
right order.
- This might be good for working in groups and providing some structure for the beginner Ss that might find small talk difficult
  o T and LA choose a partner for small talk as well during the walk.
5. Walk to the museum (15 minutes)
   **At the museum (40 minutes)**
   o T and LA mingle with Ss
6. Walk back to the CAC (15 minutes)
7. Coffee/Tea/Biscuits break (15 minutes)
   **Post-museum task**
8. Information exchange (20 mins)
   - Arrange the Ss into two groups (splitting up the partners that worked together in the museum) and talk about what part of the collection they looked at and how they felt it spoke about an identity for the city.
9. In the same groups, have Ss consider if they feel that this is a full picture of Edinburgh city’s identity. (10 mins)
   - What could they add?
   - What objects might they add to the collection? Why?
10. Round off the session in plenary highlighting some of the discussion from number 9. (2 mins)
11. Homework: (3 mins) Try to make small talk with someone this week. (could be a stranger, colleague, acquaintance).
   - Ss should make note of it, what topic, how they felt it went, and how they felt about the experience in general.

**Abbreviations**
T=Teacher
LA=Learning Assistant
Ss=Students
CAC = City Art Center
APPENDIX C: Access to Participants: Letter to Gate Keepers

RE: ESOL in museums

Dear [Name],

Thank you again for assisting me in communicating information about the ESOL in museums course in the City of Edinburgh Councils Museums and Galleries to prospective ESOL students in Edinburgh.

The course starts Saturday May 31st, and will run every Saturday until August 16th. It is a free course and we have a free crèche available in the museum. There are limited places for the crèche, so if people are interested in the course and need childcare, they should contact me as soon as possible.

The course is a part of my doctoral research at the University of Edinburgh, Moray House School of Education. My research is interested in understanding language learning in museums. Thus, I am interested in students’ experiences learning English in museums. I will interview each student 3 times throughout the course to discuss their experiences (before, during and after). I will also conduct classroom observation, and will use video and audio recordings of class sessions to help facilitate my analysis of classroom observation.

If students are interested in the course, they can contact me and I will provide information about the course, research project, and outline my ethical procedure, which I will detail below.

I will ensure all participants that I will follow the highest ethical standards for conducting research. Below are a list of measures taken in this research to ensure high ethical standards:

I will obtain informed consent from all participants in the study, which will ensure that they understand what the study is about, what it entails, and ethical procedure.

I will ensure that each participant understands that they can opt out of the study at any given time if they feel they want to. I will explain that if they choose to opt out that I would like to conduct an exit interview.

I will ensure that all participants understand who might be interested in this research and where it might be read/presented: ESOL providers, ESOL teachers, museum educators, policy makers; journals, conferences, academic books.

I will ensure all participants that their identity will be kept confidential in the write up, and that I will use pseudonyms where necessary to replace their name.

I will ensure all participants that the video and audio data will be used for analysis purposes only and not included in dissemination.

I will make the completed thesis, or a summary if preferred, and other publications available to all participants if they would like me to.
Please let me know if you any additional questions and thanks again for your assistance.

Best regards,

Sherice N. Clarke
PhD Student
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
0131-651-6695
sherice.n.clarke@education.ed.ac.uk
### APPENDIX D: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment

#### 1.3 Qualitative aspects of spoken language use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>ACCURACY</th>
<th>FLUENCY</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Shows great flexibility in reformulating ideas in different linguistic forms to convey finer shades of meaning precisely, to give emphasis, to differentiate and to eliminate ambiguity. Also has a good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.</td>
<td>Maintains consistent grammatical control of complex language, even while attention is otherwise engaged (e.g. in forward planning, in monitoring others' reactions).</td>
<td>Can express him/herself spontaneously at length with a natural colloquial flow, avoiding or backtracking around any difficulty so smoothly that the interlocutor is hardly aware of it.</td>
<td>Can create coherent and cohesive discourse making full and appropriate use of a variety of organisational patterns and a wide range of connectors and other cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Has a good command of a broad range of language allowing him/her to select a formulation to express him/herself clearly in an appropriate style on a wide range of general, academic, professional or leisure topics without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.</td>
<td>Consistently maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare, difficult to spot and generally corrected when they do occur.</td>
<td>Can select a suitable range of grammatical forms and sentence patterns with memorised routines.</td>
<td>Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints on most general topics, without much conscious searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.</td>
<td>Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make errors which cause misunderstanding, and can correct most of his/her mistakes.</td>
<td>Can initiate discourse, take his/her turn when appropriate and end conversation when he / she needs to, though he /she may not always do this naturally. Can help the discussion along on familiar ground confirming comprehension, inviting others in, etc.</td>
<td>Can use a limited number of cohesive devices to link his/her utterances into clear, coherent discourse, though there may be some “jumpiness” in a long contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current events.</td>
<td>Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used “routines” and patterns associated with more predictable situations.</td>
<td>Can keep going comprehensively, even though pausing for grammatical and lexical planning and repair is very evident, especially in longer stretches of free production.</td>
<td>Can link a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Uses basic sentence patterns with memorised phrases, groups of a few words and formulae in order to communicate limited information in simple everyday situations.</td>
<td>Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes.</td>
<td>Can answer questions and respond to simple statements. Can indicate when he/she is following but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord.</td>
<td>Can link groups of words with simple connectors like “and”, “but” and “because”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Has a very basic repertoire of words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations.</td>
<td>Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorised repertoire.</td>
<td>Can manage very short, isolated, mainly pre-packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication.</td>
<td>Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like “and” or “then”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

APPENDIX E: Conversation Analysis Transcription

Conventions

Transcription Conventions (adapted from Markee, 2000 p. 167-8)

Simultaneous Utterances
AGNES: //yes// Simultaneous overlapping talk by two or more speakers
CYRYL: //uh huh//
FATIMAH: //yeah//

Contiguous Utterances
= indicates no gap between the end of one speaker’s turn and the beginning of
the next speaker’s turn

Intervals Within and Between Utterances
(+) a pause of between .1 and .5 of a second
(+++) a pause of between .6 and .9 of a second
(1)(2) a pause of between 1 or 2 seconds

Characteristics of Speech Delivery
? rising intonation, not necessarily a question
! strong emphasis, with a falling intonation
. indicates falling (final) intonation
, indicates low-rising intonation suggesting continuation
go::d colon indicates lengthening of the preceding sound; each additional
colon represents a lengthening of one beat
- indicates an abrupt cut-off
because indicates marked stress
HABIT capitals indicate increased volume
*cannot* degree symbol indicates decreased volume
<hhh> deep inhale breath
hhh exhaled breath
>falling rain< indicates noticeably faster talk than the surrounding talk

Commentary in transcript
((laughs)) comments about actions noted in transcript; including non-verbal
action
((inaudible)) indicates a stretch of talk that is inaudible to the analyst
… (here) single parentheses indicate unclear or probable item

Other symbols
Tom Daugherty bold font shows material which is subsequently re-used in talk
later
APPENDIX F: SESSION 4, People’s Story Transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>UTTERANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-open discussion about ehm (++) what you (++) thought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>nice building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>//((laughs))//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>nice building ((chuckles))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>yeah very historical (++) I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I liked the stairs and different places to go <em>and</em> (3) anything else? Did you learn anything //from=//=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>//((inaudible))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>because PEOPLE is very very intéressant I’m look is BIG CHANGE no this year is very very big change life people twenty (++) uh two hundred years ago (+) people LIVE <em>to</em> different to live (+) this moment (++) is uh, this moment is life is GÖ up is uh (2) no very very (+) long time ago? (+) people have money, &gt;have work&lt;, have ((inaudible)) to life, have time is (+) maybe no very diff- diff- diff- life is difficult old time, <em>this moment is</em> maybe late late life is (++) nice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAROL</td>
<td>but is different no in compare yeah, I don’t know, what ((speaks quietly in Polish to LUCYNA, perhaps searching for language))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCYNA</td>
<td>((to KAROL)) how is life? ((inaudible)) (++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>I saw a picture when some women put labels (+) on whiskey bottle it was (+) I think (+) fifteen years ago? uh now Polish staff put labels on this bottle ((grins)) (2) so? uh everything are changing (++) but we do some jobs=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>=same? Yeah they do similar jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>((nods head)) yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>how does? uh some of what you learned and saw in the gallery (+) how does that compare to your own countries your own experience of- do you remember uh earlier we talked about the tickets you had transport (+) eh shops (+) entertainment //jobs//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>//jobs// uh to jobs is very very (3) is uh (1) time ((points behind her)) ago is life is different from men to women women no have uh (3) chance? Chance to work, no have laugh to ((speaks Polish to self, possibly word searching, e.g. how do you say?))=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>=vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>to vote, no vote (++) women go to demonstration to go to (3) vote to life is very very big industrial change, no chance to vote, this life is time work is shorted is no possible Saturday to go to six six weeks- six days this moment is five day is day work old ago is no live people work all day all week is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>=but in in your own country how does it work is it everyday or is it five days a week? //((inaudible))//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>//we could// we could five ((inaudible)) people don’t it doesn’t matter we have time ((chuckles))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>//((chuckles))//</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAURA //ah-// I think that for me the most important thing is when I compare it the Edinburgh history with my country or with another country in South America the point is that here the people live eh doing many things that another country just continue doing the same the (++) because here there are people live three hundred years ago not very bad for three hundred years ago because is good evolution evolution?

T2 evolution yes

LAURA evolution of the people, the country? And the people working together eh:: gain many things, good things for everybody but is good for:: evolution

FATIMAH //eh/

LAURA //because// if you read the history of another country you can’t compare it, some countries are living terrible circumstances than than is:: very good to all the people working working doing many things, join together, creating, you see? All this is in team, in a team

T2 yeah

LAURA you can see whiskey industrial, goods industrial, many many things, is very very interesting (2) because in Columbia they are contrast some people are rich, very rich and medium medium is the most class the country no rich no poor (++) medium the people are professional, go to university, study eh:: has house, car and (++) good education normally the poor people there are people but no is not a lot people poor but when the people is poor is real poor, it’s real real poor

T2 it’s really poor

LAURA you can’t imagine some people from Columbia friends can’t imagine that for example depends the job you can you can go to you can go there and not help the people living when I when I for example when I study medicine eh I know very very bad place that you can’t imagine that but it’s the country the cities the places are divide areas live medium medium class and other areas ((shakes head left to right)) but I guess very very bad and another high class no? ((nods head left to right)) it’s not they are in industries produce big but here they are evolution I think is a good experience here

T1 so I was very much interested in- Mai and I had a good discussion about- do you remember fashion? There’s a there’s a dressmaker model where we discussed about

FATIMAH uh yes, in my country now people buy fabric and go to dressmaker to design what you want uh we prefer that it’s more expensive go to the shop but it’s not expensive like here yes it’s too too too expensive ((chuckles)) but in my country yes it’s expensive than go to shop but you can do it you can buy you can buy fabric from shops and go to the dressmaker to tell them do you want and we prefer that because you can make a unique one, no one can (+) trace same like here especially the wedding special occasion yes=

T1 =here you know people tend to like the same //as// the next person, everyone likes to wear similar clothes, we definitely can’t afford to get things made ((chuckles))

FATIMAH //same// yes, but in my country it’s better to go buy fabric and go to ((inaudible))=

T2 =sometimes here for say a wedding //dress//

T1 //yeah for a wedding dress//

T2 but it’s very very expensive

FATIMAH because I try do ((chuckles)) no no

T1/T2 //((laugh))//

T1 does anyone want to talk about anything they really liked? That was interesting?
I don’t know, the homeless? (+++) the homeless. //They are// (2)
but … it’s the contrast. Because the homeless here (+++) I don’t know, I don’t know many many people from the street=

=you know there is ((inaudible)) Tom Dausherstey living on Brought House. In (+) this is information that Edinburgh is 7,000 – 10,000 homeless people.

uh
7-10,000
but it’s a (+++) a (+++) now?=
=now. This is Tom Daugher-, “Daushertee”?
Daugherty, is it? Tom Daugherty.
Daugherty?
Tom Daugherty
the man who lived in the hostel?
Yes, yes. Lived the hostel. This uh…(3 sec) this hostel this moment is changed to exclusive hotel.
//yeah//
this is no no long way. This is changed 1986.
yeah. It’s because the homeless here are different. I don’t know in European no, but I mean America in South America it’s different. Because the homeless here (+++) this people may be with mental problems, depressive, yeah?
because the people can work=
//but/
//they can rent/=
=the people can’t go go works
//yeah//
it’s because the people don’t want. They don’t want to go to job, the people is depressive, the people feel alone, yeah? Because you can speak with the people sit down in the road with the (+++) with the (+++) the blanket. but it’s not a crazy
//uh huh//
it’s not (+++) it’s not the ((inaudible)) people. In our countries the homeless (+++) is people that the people haven’t ANY opportunities in the life (+) (4) It’s different= so in (+++) uh, before the do the (+++) in the streets of Edinburgh you see you quite often see homeless people begging cause I’ve=
//((inaudible))!!//
//((inaudible))!!//
=because the people to eat something with. The people is not aggressive. The people study, go to the Council, go to any program go to lunch or breakfast and the people say ok I want to job maybe 2 hours early people help (+++) and the people (+++) that people, I I comparison, has
//so that people are lazy??//
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>has the opportunity to go to school because they speaking was in school but the people are more depressive and more (inaudible) anything else but no no when you compare it to our countries and homes this is because a people born (++) very very poor (++) very bad place (++) ANY opportunities (++) any (++) and they haven’t options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>no choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>no choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>/is it the same in your countries?/ (referring to the other participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>the same in your country? (referring to the Poles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(laugh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>yeah we’ve got homeless because eh (++) we earn (++) we earn not enough. Someone work eh (++) they get for example 200 per month (++) pound per month. It’s uh little, minimum. So if someone works still and got flat everything will be ok but if someone eh lost his job and family can’t help him, he maybe stay homeless. But there are all types of family helps, you know wife helps husband, husband helps wife, grandmothers helps her children –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>KAROL</td>
<td>= but not government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>CYRYL</td>
<td>not government ((chuckles))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>KAROL</td>
<td>not government=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>= but here (inaudible) government help the people=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>= (inaudible) agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>= homeless people in my country but not the choice because This the example of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>//corruption in our country//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>=war. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>CORRUPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>Yes. IN MY COUNTRY IS AN EXAMPLE OF WAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>Yes so many peoples they don’t have homes they don’t get good opportunities for education and eat as well (++) umm but it’s not their choice same like here cause if you want to do something you can do anything. You can find more opportunities, so if you don’t think this is your choice and this is your freedom then this is your fault. But in my country the people (++) (inaudible) because it is the center of war and (++) but never mind ((chuckles)) yeah so we don’t have more opportunities to do something. But when, just people in the town, ok, but in (inaudible referring to a region) area and south Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>//countries//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>//Yes//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>//Darfur//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>FATIMAH</td>
<td>yes, yes. So I come, I have been to Darfur before so too far from Khartoum but I see in the TV so if I if I now I will go home so just see from the TV. And hear the ((inaudible)) so (++) it’s not their their fault this is a centre of war (++) yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>my goodness this is a serious discussion for a Saturday morning!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>ok &quot;eh&quot; I’m sorry that was quite (2) brief quite rushed it’s quite a big exhibition. (laughs) but PLEASE go ba::ck to it? “ehm if you want to” and what we’d like to do no:::w? is have a class discussion. your opinions. on the exhibition. and please just, just (1) be honest? What- what were your feelings. did you like it, did you not like it. ehm what interested you, what confused you ehm just be as honest as you can so would anybody like to open with their-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>((crèche worker passes through space to crèche with children))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>uhm //I think I start//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child:</td>
<td>//mommy mommy//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>I think eh (+++ this exhibition was eh (+++) wrong idea because (+++) picture was- were eh (+++) mixed ((gesture with one hand)) +with text+. and I saw picture, from 1957, about and the second one was from 2007 so:: it’s wrong idea if we see ehm (+++) China (+++) mix- mix picture like this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>perhaps what- eh cause I noticed that too like something from 1980 and something from 2003? and you think why is that sat next to each other- MAYBE it’s uh to do with themes? Eh maybe it’s laid out in a certain way=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>=but I saw this book when people wrote about what they think an::d everybody wasn:::'t (2) happy? or you know=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>=CRITICAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>critical not about (+++) uh this picture but about life in China, it’s so cruel, the people and something. but is not we [s-]aw picture 50 years old, so:: it’s old part, we we don’t see:: “China for= China WHAT IT LOOKS NOW! “because it’s completely new you know what I mean= and people don’t understand this precise so is good everybody and everybody think the poor people living there an::d use children for work of art &quot;something like this&quot; it was 50 years ago &quot;exactly&quot; and now it’s uh another day=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES:</td>
<td>=and now? change uh more (3) is NO FINISH is not totally change=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>=uh yeah I- I- is just example (+) I mean I know in some parts people work uh but maybe not in the farm? they work in the factory. So: it’s (+) it’s another but at the same time 50 years ago, is my opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>I mean what’s your GENERAL? feeling about the exhibition. was it positive or negative, eh::: do you think it shows China positively, negatively=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>=but I think it’s a one point exhibition. it show a ((inaudible))=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>=that’s a really good way of saying it, a one point //exhibition//=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>//yeah//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRYL:</td>
<td>=just uh just a fields life and uh:: workers life, workers people life an::d field life, &quot;life in the fields&quot;=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>=so do you agree?=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHAOHUI:</td>
<td>=no (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T2: so=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: I think it is //very negative//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MING: //((nods head)))/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: for us ((gestures (here) pointing finger down)) downstairs it’s not the all parts of China (+) because China has changed a lot. and I think every country there are very dark! dark sides and bright and //good things// and this one downstairs ground floor is always the topic=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T1: =yeah … at what point was it not positive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MING: MOST of MOST of::: is negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: and because you know China China have a lot of people and I think if put all of people more than one billion people into another country US or UK I don’t think they can do better than China because a lot of people. and in this society it is so: difficult to li:ve “you know” very difficult to li:ve very! Very difficult (cut throat) the wheat must! in field, but in China the geography is not “you know” suitable is not enough field so::: bad! food, bad! clothes you must keep warm. Many things wrong, you can’t take that, so it’s so difficult for people live there and (inaudible)) so! Everything you have (made) ((inaudible)) worry progress during the 30 years and most people - I don’t know //((inaudible)))/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>((crèche worker passes through with one of the children))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Child: //MOMMY! MOMMY!/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: //((inaudible))/ coming outside then work in the city, so I can see, I know a lot? of people (depressing) this information. Everything? China have much more city than the UK, even more than that, I really think so=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T1: =yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: they have future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T1: in the exhibition did you SEE that at all. Did you SEE //modern, positive//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: //I have ((inaudible)) oh no/ and the photograph I have seen them is not positive it is just very (+++) I think it’s not normal (+) isn’t (+++) some daily life it’s not normal daily life. If I take photo in Edinburgh, everything much more very best scenes of Edinburgh I- I think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T1: this is- this is a good point actually, I think that we’ve talked about this ((gesturing to T2)) (+) why do you think the exhibition takes photos of this kind?=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: =because I think China is very low international status because umh the foreigner like to see- like to see the photograph here and if the if someone take “right away” the photograph like this downstairs, then the foreigner will say “yes yes it’s China, China just like this”, (+++)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T2: //mmm mmm mmm//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>T1: //mmm mmmm//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: because it just might be China just! like this, it’s not uh a equal (portrait?) I think “you know® It’s not, it’s not fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T2: it’s like, it’s like uh Scotland as (+) as a man in a kilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>MING: yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: //everything- yeah//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T2: //nobody wears kilts// only the foreigners wear kilts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ZHAOHUI: every nation has very good people and very bad people living a different way and uh for example I go take part in take part in the the festival I think festival uh ceremony it’s calav- calacade?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>T2: cavalcade, yeah=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZHAOHUI: =cavalcade, it’s just yeah and in front there is a lot of Scottish- they are not friendly, they put their things (gesturing making a perimeter)) to keep a very a very large space and other people they can’t even have take two people //space//

T2: //right//

ZHAOHUI: =but they is stay here themselves, so every nation mmm that every nation there are good people and live there work there don’t uh don’t see it’s very wonderful but I think it is not good because they they told us they say “you go back, (take away) your country, we’re Scottish” blah blah blah like this well I think ((chuckles)) it’s no good because I didn’t mention the foreigner is not good //just our//

CYRL: //so you should make a protest?//

MING: //((chuckles))//

ZHAOHUI: //(chuckles)// just own nation is the best in every people I think so, of course me too, I think China is very united and very strong and I am proud of them and

T1: //so you-//

CYRL: //I think I think// a lot like before I think Soviet countries like in Czech, (inaudible/possibly names several Soviet countries)), like these things ((inaudible)) just uh should be federate uh like uh federation like states, like united you need to make uh one point one center=

T2: =yeah

CYRL: one decide one decided center it would be one (?) and difficult place like Tibet, I have been to Peking- Beijing, it’s so totally different places, so uh China is the one country but should be federation, it would be better for people who live in this uh unknown places in different places because I think just uh west side west coast is rich place but center China is a poor place, I think, I’m not sure ((looking at ZHAOHUI))

MING: ((giggles)) (2) China bigger, very big it’s a lot a::: regions, it’s true, it’s very very poor, it’s true but uh MOST much better //than photographs//

CYRL: //yeah//

FATIMAH: //yeah//

T1: //yeah//

T2: //yeah//

MING: yeah yeah Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou are very modern city people //~live//

CYRL: //yeah I think that// most people work for example in the center of China work in this factory and all money to create people go to hundred place Beijing to build something and Chinese people are proud because they’ve got a building that is a great city but people in the center have no- nothing and if this country will be federation then people in the center can be redistribution of taxes I believe=

ZHAOHUI: =there is a lot of progress in China yes I know but everything China has made great progress there will be better than before and uh the other country also is a lot of progress

T1: so what would you like to see in this exhibition, what other- is there anything that they could do to make this exhibition more (++ what would you like to see?

ZHAOHUI: uh I hope the photographs has has different background to see all sides of China, the shortage of progress, the developing
| 64 | **FRIDERICH:** | I think the other point of view of that exhibition like I found (?) pictures in a book which were artistic didn’t show anything any background any social background, just artistic like uh (+++) HEAVY RAIN! or it’s (+++) people uh on a bike? or a bus and uh (2) it’s uh (2) HIGH BUS uh with the ad showing (1) STRONG RAIN! so the rain rain was only show on the bus advert not on the::: whole picture uh- |
| 65 | **T1:** | that’s an interesting point actually, is can you can you distinguish between the value of the exhibition in terms of ART? and creativity, did you like the photographs? did you find value in the photographs were they were they appealing? Uh the message maybe isn’t something that you agree with but did you think some pictures were very artistic and interesting? |
| 66 | **FATIMAH:** | uh ehm ((clears throat)) ((inaudible)) show us uhm the worker in China and and I I think uhm the people in China are very active working but they are too many people in China and all of them like like work cause uh they work a lo(t) nothing stop them from work even uh bad weather or even they have disability because I found a picture a man has lost his arm his leg in the war and he’s writing he’s still writing and other women she’s lost her hand and she’s working with her leg so that means uh they they like work and= |
| 67 | **T1:** | =I also agree the the message I got from that was RESILANCE people were very resilient, very you know- sickness and poverty didn’t doesn’t push down the spirit |
Appendix H: Consent Form

About the Research

I am an English Teacher researching about language learning in museums. Your participation in the project will be very helpful for me to understanding this. This course will run weekly on Saturdays from 10am-1pm from May 31st to August 9th.

Doing the research

There will be 12 English sessions in museums as a part of this research. As this course is part of my research, I will do several things to help me know more about learning in museums. First, I will ask you about your experiences learning and using English. I will also ask you to think about your experiences during the course in museums. I will audio record these conversations. In addition, I will observe the course in museums. I will audio and video record these sessions. The audio and video are for research purposes only. I will also take notes during the course about what is happening. If you would like to see these notes, I would be happy to show them to you after the classes and interviews are finished.

If at any point you would like to leave the research, you may do so. If you agree, I would like to ask you about your experiences before you leave the research.

Writing about the research

When the course finishes, I will write a report about the experience. This report (thesis) will be read by people that work in museums, English teachers and university lecturers and researchers. Your name will be kept confidential and I will use a pseudonym in its place in all reports of this research. If you would a summary of the final thesis, please indicate this below.

If you agree to participate in this research, please sign below:

______________________________  ______________________________
Name                                           Date

Would you like a summary of the final research?

Yes [ ]     No [ ]

Sincerely,
Sherice Clarke
PhD Student
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
0131-651-6695
sherice.n.clarke@education.ed.ac.uk
Appendix I: In-depth Interview Protocol

1st Interview

The purpose of this interview is to learn about your background with English. I will ask you a few questions about your experiences learning and using English in Scotland. I will record this interview with this audio recorder. Just to remind you, in all reports of this research, your identity will be kept confidential and I will use a pseudonym to replace your name. If you feel uncomfortable at any time and would like to stop the interview, please say so and I will stop the recorder. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Biographical

1. Name
2. Age
3. Nationality
4. First Language
5. Other languages learnt formally or informally
6. Proficiency in additional languages
7. How long have you been in the UK/Scotland/Edinburgh?
8. What motivated you to move to the UK/Scotland/Edinburgh?
9. What did you do at home as a profession?
10. What do you do in Scotland for a living? (Is it different from what you did at home?)
11. How long have you learned English?
12. How have you learned English?

Using English

13. How much interaction do you have with people in English?
14. Where do you interact with people in English? Probe the nature of interaction.

Self assessment

15. How would you assess your current ability in English?

Learning goals

16. What do you feel you need, with respect to your English language development? Probe why.
17. How would your life be different if you developed these skills further?
18. Any personal learning goals for ESOL in Museums course? Expectations?
**2nd Interview**

The purpose of this interview is to touch base with you after a couple of weeks about your experience on the course and beyond. It is not meant to be an evaluation of the course, but instead we will talk about some of your experiences since joining the course. I will record this interview with this audio recorder. Just to remind you, in all reports of this research, your identity will be kept confidential and I will use a pseudonym to replace your name. If you feel uncomfortable at any time and would like to stop the interview, please say so and I will stop the recorder. Do you have any questions before we begin?

*Experiences of ESOL in museums*

1. Tell me about your experiences in the museums during this course. (*remind if necessary that this is not meant as an evaluative question)*

*Using English*

1. Follow up question: What have you been up to since the course started?
2. How much interaction do you have with people in English?
3. Where do you interact with people in English? *Probe the nature of interaction.*

*Self assessment*

4. How would you assess your current ability in English? *Probe differences from 1st interview.*

*Learning goals*

5. Revisit the goals they identified in 1st interview and ask them to elaborate on them if appropriate.

---

**3rd interview**

The purpose of this interview is to touch base after the course to talk about your experiences since it finished. Again, this is not meant to be an evaluation of the course, but instead we will talk about some of your experiences since joining the course and since it finished. I will record this interview with this audio recorder. Just to remind you, in all reports of this research, your identity will be kept confidential and I will use a pseudonym to replace your name. If you feel uncomfortable at any time and would like to stop the interview, please say so and I will stop the recorder. Do you have any questions before we begin?

*Experiences of ESOL in museums*

1. What do you remember most about the course? (*remind if necessary that this is not meant as an evaluative question)*
2. Probe their reflections on critical incident of their participation in museums from fieldnotes.

**Using English**

3. Follow up question: What have you been up to since the course ended?
4. How much interaction do you have with people in English?
5. Where do you interact with people in English? *Probe the nature of interaction.*

**Self-assessment**

6. How would you assess your current ability in English?

**Learning goals**

7. Revisit the goals they identified in 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} interview and ask them to elaborate if appropriate.
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