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Abstract

The face of the average Australian is changing from monolingual English speaker of British heritage to one more multicultural and diverse in heritage and home language as a result of increasing migration to Australia of people from non-English speaking backgrounds (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2017a; Queensland Government, 2013). This migration to Australia, and the children of established migrants, brings with it increasing numbers of students in Australian schools for whom English is not their first language (Adoniou, 2013; Hammond, 2014). This places additional pressures on their learning in the English-speaking classroom and may lead to their not developing the appropriate skills, such as reading, that are needed throughout their school life (Haager & Windmueller, 2001). The implications of such constraints, in lesser outcomes and thus limitations on lifelong outcomes, are also well known. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2017a) over 300 languages are now spoken in Australian homes with about 28% of the population speaking another home language besides English.

While Australian and Queensland education policies aspire to meet the unique needs of all students, including those from linguistically diverse backgrounds, a first step in achieving this aim must be a clear identification of such children. Many children from previous migrant families as well as new arrivals to Australia come from homes where at least one parent is from a language background other than English and where this other language is one of the languages spoken in their homes. Some of these children move through the different levels of education and receive little, if any, additional Standard Australian English support because their linguistic diversity is unknown. While education systems acknowledge the additional needs of these students, a first step in implementing such strategies is a full appreciation of actual student needs.

This exploratory research, undertaken in five Queensland state high schools, firstly sought to identify if there were students in the schools from homes where languages other than English were used. All students classified as having English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D) were profiled, providing a comparison between those identified and those not identified through the system. Finally, the school organisational and learning experiences of these students were then considered from
both student and teacher perspectives, including the identification of possible challenges to the children and also particular strategies and classroom environments seen as conducive to learning.

The study accessed survey responses from 2,484 students and 337 high school staff from the five schools included in the study. Additionally, interviews were undertaken with 68 students and 21 staff completed emailed surveys to explore and provide an understanding of the learning environments and experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse students within Queensland junior secondary classes. Results showed that 79.5% of the students were from homes where only English was spoken. Of the remaining 20.5%, 10.5% were classified by their schools as having EAL/D and the remainder of the students were also from bi/multilingual homes. These findings, complemented by additional details obtained from school records and individual interviews, were used to profile the characteristics of students in junior secondary classrooms.

This exploratory research provided a rich picture of the cultural and linguistically diverse composition of five Queensland state high schools. While the recognised inclusion of a marked proportion of students identified as EAL/D was found, a further group of students from bi/multilingual homes was also identified. The student groups covered a diverse range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds and student achievement profiles. Examination of these two groups, their backgrounds, and school experiences provides insights into the support that such students might receive and the strategies that support their learning.
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACARA</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSI</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/multilingual</td>
<td>Bi/multilingual does not mean that the individual has to speak, read, and write both languages fluently but rather that they can communicate fluently in one aspect of the language(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNMS</td>
<td>National minimum standards, as referred to by NAPLAN, represent minimum performance standards in literacy and numeracy for a given year level; below NMS students (BNMS) will have difficulty progressing satisfactorily at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD, CLD</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Culturally responsive teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>English as an additional language or dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs</td>
<td>English language learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>English only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/D</td>
<td>English as a second language/dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English for speakers of other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>The language a person has been exposed to since birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>Head of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSEA</td>
<td>Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBOTE</td>
<td>Language background other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Limited English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>Language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTELLees</td>
<td>Long-term English language learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN</td>
<td>National Assessment Program – Literacy And Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>Non-English speaking background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMS</td>
<td>National minimum standards, as referred to by NAPLAN, represent minimum performance standards in literacy and numeracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One School</td>
<td>In 2007, an Education Queensland team built this application to store comprehensive information about students to help enhance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student learning. Staff can only gain access to information relevant to the students at their school.

**Pasifika**  
Pasifika peoples are those living in New Zealand who have migrated from the Pacific Islands and who identify with Pacific Islands because of their ancestry or heritage (Ministry of Education, 2009).

**PD**  
Professional development is learning undertaken by school staff to improve their skills, professional knowledge, and competencies.

**PI**  
Pacific Islander

**Primary language**  
This is language that is spoken the most in the current context

**QCT**  
Queensland College of Teachers

**RTI**  
Response to intervention

**SAE**  
Standard Australian English

**SES**  
Socioeconomic status

**TESOL**  
Teaching English to students of other languages

**UK**  
United Kingdom

**Undefined**  
Students from bi/multilingual homes not known to their schools

**USA**  
United States of America

**World Englishes**  
Varieties of English spoken in non-native English-speaking countries
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“Our future rests on the promise of the next generation. Accordingly, we must develop the capacity to respond to an increasingly diverse student population and ensure that these and all children develop to their fullest potential. By building on the cultural wisdom and linguistic knowledge students bring with them, we can help all children succeed” (Brown & Doolittle, 2008, p. 71).

1.1 Introduction

The face of the average Australian is changing from a monolingual English speaker of British heritage to one more multicultural and diverse in heritage and home language. Increased migration to Australia, and the children of established migrants, brings with it increasing numbers of students in Australian schools for whom English is not their first language (Adoniou, 2013; Hammond, 2014; Queensland Government, 2013). This change places additional pressures on their learning in the English-speaking classroom and may lead to their not developing the appropriate skills, such as reading, (Haager & Windmueller, 2001) that are needed throughout their school life. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2017a) over 300 languages are now spoken in Australian homes with about 28% of the population speaking another home language besides English.

The implications of such constraints, in lesser outcomes and thus limitations on lifelong outcomes, are also well known. If students are not fully engaged and their cultural and linguistic needs supported while in school these students may not be prepared for productive futures after school (Cree, Kay & Steward, 2012; Waldfogel, 2012). While Australian and Queensland education policies aspire to meet the unique needs of all students, including those from linguistically diverse backgrounds, a first step in achieving this aim must be a clear identification of such children.

The additional pressure for learning on students where English is not their first language is well documented (Au, 2006; Menken, 2013). The implications of such constraints, in lesser outcomes and thus limitations on lifelong outcomes, are also well known (Crosnoe & Lopez Turley, 2011; Spinelli, 2008; Waldfogel, 2012). While education systems acknowledge the additional needs of these students (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2016; Queensland Government, 2012) a first step in implementing such strategies is a full appreciation of
actual student needs. How well this preliminary step is undertaken and how well the level of real needs of each student is assessed requires exploration. Do we know, for example, how many students in Queensland state high schools, who are not learning disabled, are struggling in various ways with the rigours of the English language in their day-to-day classes? Research suggests that this is not always recognised, that some of these students are coming from bi/multilingual homes (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002; Olsen, 2010).

The exploratory research is focused on expanding our understanding of the linguistic and cultural diversity of students in junior secondary classes in the state school sector in Queensland. Perspectives on these diverse learning communities, from both staff and students, provide insights of their teaching and learning experiences and enhance our understanding of their current learning experiences and potentially future needs.

1.2 Background and purpose of the research

With globalised and increasing migration to Australia (ABS, 2017b), there are increasing numbers of students in schools from bi/multilingual homes (Adoniou, 2013; Hammond, 2014). The recognised needs of these students are reflected in the policy from Education Queensland (Queensland Government, 2013) and from the Australian Curriculum documents (ACARA, 2016) which make special provision for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. All federal and state governments are recognising that this is an issue and have policy positions to ensure the best outcomes for society and these students.

Mobile worldwide workforces, immigrants seeking new and better lifestyles for their families, and refugees are increasingly moving to English-speaking nations. Families who came as migrants to these countries 20 to 40 years ago are now established in the new home country and into their first or second generation of children, where one parent is from a language background other than English (ABS, 2017a) and, for many this language, not English, is the language of the home. Some of the children from these families may move through the different levels of education systems and receive little, if any, support with their English language usage. The variations in needs and strategic support for some of these students need to be identified and aligned for the benefit of the students.
The use of the English language has spread worldwide. It has become one of the most influential language mediums around the world (Xue & Zuo, 2013) and, in many countries, it is the official language of business and education. English-speaking Westernised countries, such as the United States of America (USA), the United Kingdom (UK), Australia, New Zealand (NZ), and Canada are at the forefront of change brought about by technological advances. Such countries have adapted and are continuing to adapt to the global changes while trying to ensure that their educational systems can accommodate this new diversity in classrooms.

Research since the 1980s has targeted trying to understand identified English language learners (ELLs). There is available literature on the challenges these learners present in the ever-changing classroom and on the best strategies for administrators and teachers to adopt so that all students, regardless of cultural or linguistic backgrounds, will have the opportunity to achieve to their fullest potential. While many ELLs may not be in high-need groups, some recognition of their language learning situations could still support and enhance their learning experiences and outcomes.

This exploratory research seeks, through a mixed-methods study conducted in several Queensland state high schools, to provide a greater understanding of the characteristics of students from bi/multilingual homes. It also explores some of the school and classroom experiences and challenges encountered by students from these homes. Finally, it focuses on the pedagogical practices that staff and students identify as being of assistance for educational learning needs.

1.3 Research questions

This research is focused on exploring the linguistic and cultural diversity of students in junior secondary classes in the state school sector in Queensland. Firstly, it seeks to ascertain the characteristics of students in Queensland secondary schools who are from bi/multilingual homes and then to understand their school experiences, also identifying educational strategies perceived as positive by both students and staff. The following research questions (RQ) are used to guide this exploratory research:

RQ 1 What are the characteristics of students, in Queensland state high schools, who are from bi/multilingual homes?
RQ 2 What school and classroom experiences, relevant to learning, are reported by students who are undefined by their school communities as being from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 3 What perceptions of school processes are reported by staff and undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 4 What pedagogical practices do teachers and students identify that may result in addressing the educational learning needs of undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

1.4 The researcher and her impetus for undertaking this research

During my years as an English teacher and teacher-librarian in a large state high school (1500+ students) in southeast Queensland, a noticeable change occurred in the cultural and linguistic makeup of the school’s student cohort. It became more diverse, changing from a predominantly monolingual English-speaking group of students to a multicultural community of over 50 cultures – a very diverse community, culturally and linguistically. Lack of knowledge and experience about the area of second language acquisition and applied linguistics motivated me to undertake postgraduate studies in this area and the knowledge gained helped me to understand some of the linguistic challenges that some of these identified students were having with Standard Australian English (SAE).

After undertaking further studies in applied linguistics postgraduate studies with a teaching colleague, the range of students who were from bi/multilingual homes was discussed with the school’s administration team. Permission was given to undertake basic cultural and linguistic surveys of the whole student body (Girdwood & Gilmour, 2004) to try to identify students from these homes, as many did not cite another home language besides English on their enrolment forms. The resultant data showed that over 20% of the students were from over 50 different cultures and spoke as many languages at home. After further postgraduate study, opportunities arose at this school to write and present appropriate professional development (PD) for staff about teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Reflections centred on some former students (from more than 8 years ago) have enabled me to ponder what may have been done differently if it had been known earlier that in a student’s background was another home language besides English. One Year 8 male student, here called Sydney, brought home this issue to me. He
presented very well, always did his work, and was a pleasure to have in class. Sydney was receiving Cs (on an A-E scale) in all his assessments in all subjects. I am unable to state whether these Cs were a true indication of his capabilities as they were never assessed taking into account his other home language. One day an incident happened in class and he asked if he could stay and talk. It transpired that, though his name was very English, Sydney had only been in Australia for 10 years and, on arriving here, the family had changed their name to a near-English equivalent. Sydney’s father was Iranian, his mother Brazilian. His father left the family and, as a result, Sydney then spoke only Spanish at home with his mother, grandmother, and sister. This student was the “man of the house”, having to make decisions way beyond his years and, in many instances, he acted as interpreter for his mother and grandmother. I still wonder today what that young man ended up doing with his life and what difference it could have made to him if I, and my colleagues, had known and understood his cultural and linguistic background from when he entered school.

Before that time, I had not received any teacher education or PD centred on the cultural and linguistic diversity of multicultural classrooms or second language acquisition. This lack of understanding meant that all my lesson preparation was primarily aimed at English-speaking students, and little, if any, consideration was given to contextualization of the material to help students who had another language at home besides English. After leaving state school teaching and working privately with five state school administrations, I made inquiries to try to ascertain the number of students in these schools who had a language other than English as their other home language. Findings suggested that between 8% and 12% of the junior secondary cohorts, from each school, were students who were undefined as coming from bi/multilingual homes.

These experiences and concerns have motivated me to undertake this research that focuses on students from bi/multilingual homes. I chose to focus on junior secondary students (Years 7-9) for two reasons. Firstly, I am familiar with school procedures at this level and secondly, I believed that by the time students had reached high school, their linguistic and cultural diversity would be documented in some way and known to their school communities. Much research is already available about students in schools who are known as coming from diverse backgrounds; the research
reported here will complement that and add to the discussion about those who have not been identified or documented as coming from bi/multilingual homes.

1.5 Queensland perspective

While the focus of this thesis is on Queensland state high schools, it is important to contextualise this within the Australian context. The Australian Government has a significant investment in national education (Australian Government, 2016) though the states and territories are responsible for its delivery, whether through government or non-government regulatory bodies. All levels of government have aspirational goals for education and in Australia, and Queensland, these goals are underpinned by decisions taken in three ministerial education conferences in 1989, 1999, and 2008. One such goal, providing high-quality education for all (MCEEC, 1989), was affirmed and expanded in the Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century (MCEEC, 1999). This declaration also aspired to achieve equity in schools and schooling that was socially just and free from any form of discrimination. Further, Section 3.5 of this declaration gives the broad direction that all students should “experience … understand and acknowledge the value of cultural and linguistic diversity, and possess the knowledge, skills and understanding to contribute to, and benefit from, such diversity in the Australian community and internationally”.

All Australian states and territories accepted these aspirational goals and the Australian Curriculum guidelines; further, all have produced their own strategic goals based on these Australian guidelines. The Education Act 2006 (Queensland Government, 2017a) in Part 3 lists that one objective is to make high-quality education available to all children. To do this, Education Queensland employs more than 36,000 teachers and caters for around 500,000 students (around 66% of all students eligible for education in Queensland) in 1,230 primary and secondary schools (Queensland Government, 2016a). The remainder of students attending church-based or independent schools or are home-schooled. To be employed within the Queensland state school sector, teachers must be registered with the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) and comply with all their requirements. One of the requirements is continuing PD that is mandated by the Queensland Government, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005 Section 30(1).
Education Queensland’s Strategic Plan 2013-17 states goals of “Engaging minds. Empowering futures” which have a focus on “lifelong learning and global citizenship” through developing “creative thinkers shaped by inspiring and challenging learning experiences” (Queensland Government, 2012, p. 2). This focus suggests that there will be “improved outcomes for all students” (Queensland Government, 2012, p. 2) and further, that “the unique needs of each student will be recognised to ensure their successful transition through each phase of schooling and to further study and work” (p. 6). A further stated goal of Education Queensland has been to improve the quality of educational experiences for all students in Queensland state schools (Queensland Government, 2014a).

In trying to support linguistically and culturally diverse students reach these educational goals Education Queensland has recognised the diversity of cultures, and therefore languages, that form an important aspect of the cultural capital of these people (Coleman, 2010). Some speak no English, some little, while others are very competent in this language and others. Education Queensland acknowledges that many state school students have English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) and some support, depending on individual situations, is offered to members of these groups once they are identified (Queensland Government, 2013) and classified as needing additional English language support. There is a range of support offered and access is dependent on the initial assessment of the child and if the family self-identify as being from a home where English is not the first language.

The Education Queensland website shows that 11.7% of state school students who are from bi/multilingual homes are classified as EAL/D, with many coming from Pacific Island countries or being refugees or migrants (Queensland Government, 2013). Education Queensland’s definition of whom this may include states, “EAL/D learners are most proficient in a language or dialect other than Standard Australian English and require additional support to develop proficiency in Standard Australian English” (Queensland Government, 2013, p. 1). These identification criteria are outlined in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1 *Nominated EAL/D Groups in Queensland State School Sector*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Identification criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students</td>
<td>Evidence needed such as birth certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Maori or Pacific Islander backgrounds</td>
<td>Evidence needed such as parental passports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Australian South Sea Islander backgrounds</td>
<td>Evidence needed such as birth certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants to Australia, or temporary visa holders</td>
<td>From non-English speaking countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of migrant heritage</td>
<td>Children born in Australia; English is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>spoken at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian born students returning from living abroad</td>
<td>Between 3-5 years from arrival in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of deaf adults</td>
<td>More than 2 years abroad; schooling not in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auslan used as the first language at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From non-English speaking backgrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For most of the above groups, identification criteria are specified. Guidelines as to the length of time that the students may receive additional English language support are also detailed; however, the processes through which they can be identified are less specific. Recently arrived students to Australia, such as refugees, immigrants, and temporary visa holders, are reported through the Australian Government Department of Immigration and Border Protection and thus are automatically identified. For other students, the system relies on self-identification. Students such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, and students from South Sea Islander backgrounds and the Pacific Islands (PI) and New Zealand, often identify on enrolment at schools.

Anecdotal evidence from several Queensland state high school principals indicates that some families from bi/multilingual homes do not identify as such and thus go undefined and do not receive any strategic English language support. It is not known why parents may not identify their children as being from another cultural and linguistic heritage. One reason is that the parents want their children seen as part of the majority group and by not identifying their children’s cultural and linguistic heritages they believe this is more likely to occur. This was evidenced in the work of Dobrenov-Major, Kearney, Birch, and Cowley (2004) when researching the ties between Samoan communities and schools in Logan City, Queensland. When the researchers were sharing with parents about literacy, one Samoan mother said that English was spoken
in their home and that “Samoan is a small language, not that important at all. It is important only to us … English is more important. Just look at how many people speak English!” (p. 16), suggesting a limited understanding of the impact that their child’s other home language may have on their learning and the importance of the school having this knowledge.

1.6 Reciprocity

As the design of this research involved the participation of some administration and teaching staff, it is acknowledged that all participants wanted to know what would be gained from involvement in the research. As well, they sought to know how the students’ involvement would be of benefit to them individually and to the school collectively. This issue of reciprocity needed consideration from the beginning of this research - as Glesne (1999) suggested, “the degree of indebtedness varies considerably from study to study and from participant to participant” (p. 126) so clarification was essential. In initial discussions with the principals, each asked how this research would benefit their school community and one even asked what it would cost him, in dollar terms, and whether he would receive the equivalent amount in return! All were assured that the benefit to the school community should outweigh any “cost” incurred by them.

From this research, schools will have access to information, in the form of the final thesis, about the cultural and linguistic diversity of the junior secondary student cohort. This information will be of importance to staff and students alike and may assist with the refinement of identification procedures for these students as well as better processes to support future planning to assist those who may be having difficulty with SAE expectations in the classroom. It may also encourage classroom teachers to seek information about the challenges these students may face in a classroom where all instruction and assessment is in SAE. The appropriate PD could then be sought by teachers. By doing so, they would gain relevant knowledge about dealing with these CALD students, knowledge that will then assist them on their journey of becoming culturally and linguistically responsive teachers (Amaro-Jimenez, 2012; Brown, 2007; Gay, 2010; Griner & Stewart, 2012; Lenski, Crumpler, Stallworth, & Crawford, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Merryfield, 2000; Reeves, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
1.7 Overview of thesis

Terms utilised through the thesis are summarised and explained in the Glossary at the beginning of the thesis. Chapter 1, Introduction, provides the background and purpose of this research. It outlines the research questions and the researcher’s motivation for undertaking the study. Further, it positions the research in Queensland state high schools. To provide broader context to this issue, the Literature Review in Chapter 2 focuses on literature from three English-speaking countries – the USA, the UK, and Australia – that have cultural and educational similarities. With regard to staff, preservice education and ongoing PD relevant to teaching CALD students as well as pedagogical practices used by teachers were reviewed. This review then covers the diverse backgrounds and characteristics of students identified as English language learners and some language learning strategies.

This exploratory research utilised a mixed-methods approach and Chapter 3 outlines the focus of the research, the research questions, the research design, and the researcher’s insider/outsider perspective. The settings and participants are discussed as well as data collection and management and finally this chapter documents ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 focus on the presentation of the results from the collected data. In Chapter 4, the student participants are explored in relation to their demographics as well as their language competencies and school results. Further, information from interviewed students reveals some school and educational experiences. Results relate to shared experiences from both staff and students on school enrolment processes are presented in Chapter 5. Staff also shared information about their preparedness, from preservice education and PD, to teach in culturally diverse classrooms and, as well, some teaching strategies. Interviewed students reported their learning strategies and those their teachers used in class that assisted their learning.

Chapters 6 and 7 bring the research to its conclusion. Chapter 6 is utilised to focus on discussion of the results presented in the preceding two chapters. Chapter 7 provides the conclusion and offers limitations of the research and implications for future practice, policy, and research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This research is focused on the educational systems in Australia to gain an understanding of the identification process and support being offered to children from bi/multilingual homes. The scoping of the review has been broadened from just Australian research to include research from some other officially monolingual English-speaking countries – the USA and the UK – that have similarities in cultural and educational processes. Processes in the USA, UK, and Australian systems will be the focus, with some reference to the educational systems of NZ which is a bilingual nation. This review has not been extended to cover NZ’s approaches to education and the variation in policies and procedures that results from this.

Firstly, this chapter identifies the characteristics of persons who are known as English language learners and the terminologies used to describe these learners as well as the influences of their diverse backgrounds on their learning. This chapter will then examine the understanding of school administrators about students from CALD environments. Teacher preparedness for diverse classes will be examined as will the importance of teaching English in all content areas. Some of the characteristics of English language learners (ELLs) will also be identified. An understanding of how pedagogical practices are employed by teachers to assist these CALD students will then be explored as will the learning styles of and strategies utilised by ELLs. The issue of second language acquisition (SLA) is included in the review; however, a full analysis of this aspect is outside the scope of the thesis which is focussing on the classroom experiences and associated strategies for classroom teachers.

Rapid advances in technology in the late 20\textsuperscript{th} and into the 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries have drawn world economies closer than ever before (Au, 2006). Worldwide travel, instant communication, and a mobile workforce caused by opportunities to migrate have seen an increase in cultural and linguistic diversity in the USA, the UK and Australia. This phenomenon known as globalisation influences the way that business, education, and indeed everyday life now operate (Blake & Blake, 2005; Levy & Murnane, 2004). Attempts by Steger (2014) and Stromquist and Monkman (2014) to define globalisation pointed to a new connectedness and a bringing together of all aspects of life in all countries across the world, whether developed or developing. Globalisation,
therefore, may be seen as the process by which a wide range of societies, regional economies, and cultures assimilate through a global network of social, political, educational, and economic ideas via communication, trade, and transport networks.

These mobile workforces and global migration of workers have affected all countries, according to Spring (2008), with the flow being from poorer countries to rich Western nations. Many people have benefitted greatly from this flow to technologically advanced Westernised countries (Miller & Benjamin, 2008), but some have little job security or stability in their workplaces (Countinho, Dam, & Blustein, 2008) as they seek a better life in a new country. One of the major impacts of the development of globalisation has been that people around the world are now communicating in the form of one language (Xue & Zou, 2013). Garcia (2009) affirmed the importance of the English language in the globalised world, claiming that language “is more important than ever in education” (p. 31). English has become a global language with a notable number of people having it as either their first or second language. Emigrants from the British Isles moving to the USA and Australia helped to spread the English language and this saw the emergence of American Standard English and SAE; the latter has developed its “uniquely Australian varieties of English” (Lo Bianco, 1987, p. 7). In 2013, it was estimated that there were approximately 380 million native speakers of English, 250 million using it as another language and around 1.5–2 billion people currently learning English (Xue & Zou, 2013).

Being educated and trained in the English language is a necessity for current and future students, regardless of cultural or linguistic backgrounds, to ensure future growth in the USA, the UK, and Australia. When English is the language of education, the ability to understand and apply the knowledge acquired relies on the learner’s capability to comprehend this language. It is, therefore, important that policymakers and educational administrators have a clearer understanding of these ELLs.

2.1.1 Theoretical framework

How a child’s development is affected by the relationships around them, and therefore their environment, is related in a bioecological theory developed by Bronfenbrenner in the 1970s. Bronfenbrenner believed that a child’s development was influenced by different levels within their environment and these he labelled
microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem as shown in Figure 2.1. This model provides an overarching theory that will assist in understanding the influences within the lives of secondary school children (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1989).

The first of the four levels in Bronfenbrenner’s model is the microsystem and this is the level closest to the child – their family, home, school, work, and church. This level, Bronfenbrenner claims, is the most influential on a child and the one in which they interact the most. The mesosystem level provides the various interactions that occur among the child’s microsystem settings – such as those between the child, parents, and school. The exosystem does not involve the child participating in any way but the various structures, such as parents’ workplaces, parents’ role in a church, or teacher relationships with parents do influence the child’s development through decisions taken. The outer layer in a child’s development, according to Bronfenbrenner’s model, is the macrosystem that relates to the values, customs, and
laws within which the child operates. These bigger picture principles may influence some of the interactions of the other layers.

Schools and teachers have an important role in providing a sense of relationship but the long-term primary relationship must come from parents. Bronfenbrenner (1977, 1989) asserts that many of the issues that arise in the school emanate from the family and the workplace. Schools and teachers, he suggested, should work to provide a supportive environment not only for the students but also for their families. This theoretical engagement will assist in contributing to a better understanding of these students.

2.2 English language learners

Gottlieb (2006) suggested that ELLs are “a national resource that adds to the richness of our schools. A careful examination of the unique characteristics of English language learners helps teachers understand how language, culture and prior experiences shape the identities of these diverse learners” (p. 6). An understanding of these learners’ diversity assists administrators and teachers when deciding the allocation of strategic support for them as well as a selection of appropriate teaching strategies. In schools, ELLs come from diverse backgrounds. New arrivals to an English-speaking country need to learn not only a new language but also about the culture of the nation (Lo Bianco, 1998) in which they live and may seek employment at a later time. Au (2006) stated that ethnicity, first language, and socioeconomic status (SES) are all indicators of the diversity that ELLs bring to communities and schools.

This section reviews literature in relation to the terminology used by the USA, the UK, and Australia for describing ELLs. New learners of the English language come from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Literature about this diversity, in regards to student ethnicity, family’s statuses, and primary language is also discussed.

2.2.1 Terminology

Today, classrooms in English-speaking countries have become more diverse and students bring with them many cultural and linguistic differences (Spinelli, 2008). There is a rich tradition of European-based education in the three English-speaking
countries of the USA, the UK, and Australia; however, each is now faced with this mobile, globalised world and with that comes cultural and linguistic diversity in both society and the classroom. These changes have resulted in all three countries experiencing similar challenges within their classrooms and all have adopted a variety of terms, as summarised in Table 2.1, to help identify these ELLs.

### Table 2.1 Terms Used to Identify English Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>First language other than English; non-native speakers of English</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELLs)</td>
<td>Those learners who had another language; not yet proficient in English</td>
<td>USA, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term English Language Learners (LTELLs)</td>
<td>Learning English for more than 7 years</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Bilinguals</td>
<td>Alternate term to LTELLs which does not emphasise the deficit</td>
<td>USA from 2008+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL)</td>
<td>Those who did not speak English but had another language and were learning English</td>
<td>UK, Australia (from about 1970s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as an Additional Language (EAL)</td>
<td>Those who had another language and learning English</td>
<td>UK from 2000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Background Other Than English (LBOTE)</td>
<td>Term changed from ESL</td>
<td>Australia – since 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English-speaking Background (NESB)</td>
<td>Anyone who was not English monolingual</td>
<td>Australia – since 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as an Additional Language/ Dialect (EAL/D)</td>
<td>Acknowledges other linguistic abilities</td>
<td>Australia – since 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States of America

In the USA, the terms Limited English Proficiency (LEP), English Language Learners (ELLs), and Long Term English Language Learners (LTELLs) are used to describe learners whose first language is not the dominant language – in this case, Standard American English (see Table 2.1) – in the country in which they reside. LEP simply refers to those whose first language is not English (Abedi, 2004; Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002). In 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act was implemented in the USA, and since then attempts to more appropriately define ELLs have been made.

Some researchers (Black, 2006; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; Garcia, Jensen, & Scribner, 2009) found the LEP term was too deficit orientated and preferred to use the term ELLs to emphasise positive notions of language and learning. Other
research has also affirmed the use of the term ELLs for these reasons (Au, 2006; Black, 2006; Blake & Blake, 2005; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Hertzberg, 2012; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). In the USA, particularly in official documentation, the term ELLs is used. Some, however, found this term still has deficit connotations. Since 2008 another term, emergent bilinguals, coined by Garcia, Kleifgen, and Falchi, has been in use to describe students who are learning English and thus becoming bilingual. Menken, Kley, and Chae (2012) also use this term in their research on LTELLs as it focuses on the learner’s development of the native and the English language. Thus, the term emergent bilinguals emphasises the preservation of the native language of a person who, at the same time, seeks to improve their mastery of the English language. Many of these ELLs in America are in the middle or secondary school years; Luster (2011) suggested that these students “are the forgotten population of non-proficient English students making up more than 30% of school populations” (p. 71).

**United Kingdom**

The terminology used in the UK has varied little over time and English as a Second Language (ESL), English as an Additional Language (EAL), and English Language Learners (ELLs) have been the most commonly used terms (see Table 2.1). The assimilation policies in the UK in the 1950s and 1960s sought to integrate non-English-speaking children as quickly as possible into the British education system (Costley, 2014; Leung & Franson, 2001) – to become British as quickly as possible (Hamilton & Hillier, 2007) – and that included speaking English.

ESL was the term used to describe these learners and this led to adult programs such as English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Leung (2001) stated, “up until the 1980s pupils from ethnic and linguistic minority families were seen as ‘outsiders’ in a new language environment and English teaching was at the heart of their induction into the new country” (pp. 38-39). By early 2000, students whose home language was not English were referred to as having English as Another Language (EAL) (Creese, 2005; Creese & Leung, 2003; Leung, 2001). EAL was seen as a neutral term as English may have been the child’s second, third, or fourth language. Recent literature suggests that the term ELLs is the predominant one currently in use in the UK (Costley, 2014; Hamilton & Hillier, 2007; Strand, Malmberg, & Hall, 2015).
**Australia**

In Australia, the history of language policy “has been one of constant shifts and realignments with both socio-cultural ... and socio-political ... underpinnings” (Djite, 2010, p. 5). The terminology used has changed and the history of the phrase English as a Second Language (ESL) (see Table 2.1) can be traced back to the early 1970s (Martin, 1978). This term reportedly described the language proficiency of new arrivals in Australia who did not speak SAE and needed to learn this language to participate actively in the community. Terms more recently used in Australia have been English as a Second Language (ESL), Non-English-speaking Background (NESB), Language Background Other Than English (LBOTE), and English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D).

The Discussion Paper on an Australian Literacy and Language Policy for the 1990s (Australian Government, 1990) refers to the fact that the English used in Australia is SAE. It stated that “English as a Second Language (ESL) refers to the learning of English in Australia by people whose first language is not English” (Australian Government, 1990, p. 4). The terms NESB and LBOTE have been in common use in ESL curriculum documents since the 1970s (Curriculum Corporation, 1994). The My School website (ACARA, 2009) also refers to LBOTE. Ho (2011) suggested that the inclusivity of the term LBOTE recognised all language minority groups in Australia.

The Australian Curriculum draws on The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (MCEETYA, 2008) and promotes equity and individual attainment. Further, it noted that some students who have English as another language might “require specific support to learn/build on English language skills needed to access the general curriculum, in addition to learning area-specific language structures and vocabulary” to achieve to their potential. The developers of the Australian Curriculum stated, “although Australia is a linguistically and culturally diverse country, participation in many aspects of Australian life depends on effective communication in Standard Australian English” (ACARA, n.d.).

The term currently used in Education Queensland’s policy document (Queensland Government, 2013) is EAL/D and this refers to those students whose first language is not English and who require assistance to develop SAE proficiency.
Hertzberg (2012) suggested that this term “validates that the person does have an existing language(s) and/or dialect(s)” (p. 7). She further suggested that these words should lead to an acknowledgement that this learner brings a wealth of linguistic knowledge to their community. EAL/D learners are not a homogenous group (Matthews, 2008) but come from CALD backgrounds. The 2011 census data (ABS, 2013) showed that 47% of Australians were either migrants or were the first-generation children of migrants (5.3m [27%] born overseas; 4.1m [20%] one parent born overseas). In 2016, nearly half (49%) of all Australians were born overseas or had one parent born overseas and 28% were first generation (born overseas) of migrants (ABS, 2017a).

These English language learners come from bi/multilingual homes. The Linguistic Society of America (2012) and Shin (2013) suggested that to be bi/multilingual does not mean that the individual has to speak, read, and write both languages fluently, but rather that they can communicate fluently in one aspect of the language(s), and this definition is the understanding adopted here. This research, undertaken with students and teachers’ participation, has a specific focus on the students in junior secondary classes in some Queensland state high schools. The term EAL/D used by the Queensland school system is used in this research to describe students who have been classified by their schools as speaking another home language besides English and needing assistance to develop SAE proficiency.

2.2.2 Diverse backgrounds

Learners of a new language do so for a variety of reasons and for many in today’s globalised world it is because they have moved to a new country seeking employment or a better future for their families. Whatever one’s cultural background, first language, or SES, they all may impact in some way on all learners. For some who move to the English-speaking countries of the USA, the UK, and Australia, this diversity brings a variety of challenges, one of which is learning the English language. Many ELLs are born in these English-speaking countries (Slama, 2012) and children of these previous immigrant families, where the language of a parent/grandparent is still the language of the home, face other challenges in acquiring English language proficiency.
A person’s national origin impacts greatly on their cultural and linguistic abilities (Au, 1993) and this cultural heritage gives a person their cultural identity which influences their learning and the way that they engage in learning language (Perez, 1998) and developing their literacy skills. Cultural identity, according to documents from the Queensland School Curriculum Council (2001) (now Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority), is “an individual’s perception of self that is developed through belonging to particular ethnic, religious or social groups” (p. 8). Waller, Wethers, and De Costa (2017), discussing the concept of identity said, “they [identities] are dynamic and it is up to the teacher to recognise and allow multiple identities to flourish in and out of the classroom” (p. 6).

The term *ethnicity* refers to communities of racially similar origins. These are large enough to establish their behaviours, values, and language (Jandt, 2013) and from these elements are established cultural identities. Within each ethnic group there are beliefs, values, attitudes, and customs that have been passed down from one generation to the next. Sharing these practices helps an individual to feel that they belong to or identify with a particular group or culture. Perez (1998) suggested that,

all literacy users are members of a defined culture with a cultural identity and the degree to which they engage in learning or using literacy is a function of this cultural identity. Literacy cannot be considered to be content-free or context-free for it is always used in service of or filtered through the culture…. literacy is always socially and culturally situated. (p. 4)

Perez implies that one’s heritage plays a vital role in the ability to engage in learning and to become functional in a language whether it be the first or second language. Culture, and therefore one’s identity, plays an important role in learning. Cultural heritage is shared by lifestyles and this belonging to a cultural group implies there is a heritage language that the person will know. Parents’ language skills may affect the language learning of a child. For many immigrants, their children are spoken to in the parents’ native tongue and it will be with their parents that they have most language contact in their early years (Hernandez, Macartney, & Denton, 2010). As discussed by Crosnoe (2010) in his research about immigrant parents’ involvement in their children’s education, parental involvement with preparation for, and during, formal schooling is a vital element for a child’s language to progress.
Freeman et al. (2002) had found that students from families where translanguaging was common had greater cognitive flexibility, improved language skills, and better syntactic skills necessary in English language learning. Translanguaging means the ability to switch from one language to another – whether at school, home, or in community settings. Garcia et al. in their 2008 report about equity issues for ELLs commented on this issue of translanguaging, suggesting that students who are translanguaging at home not only have competence in speaking but also have numerous metalinguistic, sociolinguistic, and cognitive advantages when compared to monolinguals. These researchers concluded that “there are cognitive benefits to be bilingual” (p. 31). Brown and Eisterhold (2004) found that “bilingual children frequently keep their languages separate by imposing boundaries by person (speaking to grandparents in one language, friends in another) or domain (speaking in one language in school, another at home)” (p. 69). Students also act as the “go-between” for parents who neither speak nor understand English.

Language and socioeconomic background are two of the key elements that may affect the educational outcomes for non-native English-speaking students. Those who do not succeed as well as others, according to Schmid’s (2001) research into factors affecting ELLs’ progress in school, are from lower socioeconomic groups and minority cultural groups that may perceive schooling “as an alienating force that provides unequal opportunities” (p. 82). Mills (2008) investigated perceived inequities in the education system for lower-SES families and reported that unless these families, including the children, were helped to understand the vagaries of school systems, they would continue to see the system as an alienating force.

People’s achievements regarding occupation, education, income, and therefore social position all contribute to a person’s SES (Bornstein & Bradley, 2003; Considine & Zappala, 2002; Jandt, 2013; Waldfogel, 2012). Some research has suggested that a great deal of variation exists in the levels of the SES of American ELLs and that there is a higher percentage of ELLs in the lower levels (Au, 2013; Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; Murnane, Sawhill & Snow, 2012). Further, the gap between those in the advantaged SES levels and those in the disadvantaged levels has been widening (Countinho et al. 2008; Falk & Guenther, 2002; Murnane et al. 2012). Some of these second-language families have been able to succeed in English-speaking countries while others,
according to Crosnoe and Lopez Turley’s (2011) research into education outcomes for immigrant youth, have experienced inequality and social disadvantage.

Reardon, Valentino, and Shores (2012) revealed that, in the USA, “while the racial and ethnic disparities are smaller than they were forty to fifty years ago, socioeconomic disparities are growing” (p. 32). Further, they found there were considerable gaps in the literacy skills levels of students by “race, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status” (p. 32). A family’s economic, social, and human capital may influence the way they prepare their child for school and their ability to provide the child with educational opportunities (OECD, 2003). According to Crosnoe (2010), families of Asian heritage find ways to have resources for their children’s education. Crosnoe also revealed that many might be perceived as not being involved in the school, but they are active outside school organising tutoring and other support for their children.

Another factor that may influence ELLs’ academic performance is that the Westernised methods of preparation for schooling may be unfamiliar to new arrivals to a country. Monkman, Ronald and Théramène (2005) suggested that social and cultural capital helped minority groups know how to act in the school community to get benefit. Goodall and Montgomery’s (2014) research revealed that even though families from low-SES and cultural minorities were unsure how to become involved with their children at school and generally with education, they would have liked to have been involved had they known how.

A combination of family SES, first language, and cultural norms for general aspects of life, all tend to influence whether or not a student will be able to succeed academically in the English-speaking environment. Knowledge of each of these elements is vital in helping to understand the learner and knowing how each will contribute to an ELL’s ability to succeed in learning the new language. The key to success has been an appropriate education for all learners regardless of the influence of these elements. No matter what a family’s ethnicity or SES, a good education for their children is something that all families and/or carers consider vital (Reay, 2009; Vera et al. 2012).

Students from backgrounds different from the majority culture may face linguistic and cultural challenges in their new learning environments. Armed with this
knowledge about students in their school communities, it is then important that administrators and educators gain a better understanding of these ELLs who are now increasing in numbers in previously monolingual English-speaking classrooms and how their inclusion influences the teaching and learning environments.

### 2.3 Teaching and learning environments

“Education is now considered an undisputed pathway to increased social mobility and works in the global imaginary as key to economic competitiveness of countries,” argued Stromquist and Monkman (2014, p. 8) in their writing on globalisation and education. Suggesting that education should be able to unlock the door to success in this globalised world, they tempered their statement by saying that a person’s SES will still affect access to relevant education. While the globalised world has resulted in increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in school classrooms, particularly in English-speaking countries, the challenges that Au suggested in 2006 are still apparent.

The challenge for educators is to create new patterns in schools that capitalize on the strengths of students, families and communities. A major issue is that systems in place tend to rely on strengths more typical of mainstream students, rather than on strengths held by many students of diverse backgrounds. (p. 8)

As ELLs move to English-speaking countries, they bring with them various forms of capital that they can share with all in their school community. Schools are meeting places of cultural and linguistic diversity (Miller, 2000), places where many languages are used and, in some instances, where English is learnt as an additional language. In every classroom, there are challenges to accommodate the learning needs of those who are not native English speakers.

In research focussed on educating ELLs and offering them equal rights, Hakuta (2011) suggested the importance of English language competencies and reported that even though “English language development takes time – we can be more focussed and direct, but it still takes time. Long-term English learners demand particular attention” (p. 171). This attention to the needs of ELLs was reinforced by Menken et al. (2012) from their extensive research with long-term ELLs; they suggested that “it is essential that policies which impact schools, educators and emergent bilingual students acknowledge that language learning is a process that takes...
time” (p. 137). English education for ELLs is vital and needs both time and money to allow these learners every opportunity to succeed.

In the following section, literature about schools, their administrations, and teachers in CALD educational facilities and the roles of all staff in helping ELLs to be not only appropriately identified but also appropriately supported in their educational pursuits, are explored.

2.3.1 School administrators

Educational administrators and teachers all play a vital role in ensuring that each student receives every opportunity to perform to their potential. Many educational facilities, which previously accommodated only monolingual English speaking students, are now culturally and linguistically diverse communities, with much of this resulting from globalisation. There are concerns for educational administrators who now have many students who do not speak English as their first language (Gearon, Miller, & Kostogriz, 2009) in their school communities. School administrators are responsible for the education of all students within their communities and thus appropriate teaching and learning strategies for their diverse communities need to be initiated (Au, 2006).

As Au (2006) stated, many administrators have had to rethink their traditional views on the teaching of literacy and the process of learning. English language support programs in high schools in the USA are designed for new arrivals to this country, not for long-term ELLs (Kim & Garcia, 2014). According to Xu and Drame (2007), many children from CALD backgrounds “come to school with different expectations and behaviors that are closely connected to their culture, but schools often just have one standard for them to follow” (p. 308). These authors further suggested, “children’s home cultures, if not being ignored completely, are often not part of the school activity planning” (p. 308), an omission which should be of importance to administrators in considering cultural and linguistic diversity.

A person’s cultural perceptions may also temper the way each interacts with others from different cultures and this is particularly relevant to those in a school community. In his research on cultural differences between school administrators and CALD students, Chamberlain (2005) suggested that school communities would be
enhanced if administrators were able to recognise and build on the vast diversity within the different cultures. Nieto’s (2010) research on culture and learning also found that “students’ identification with and maintenance of their native culture and language can have a positive influence on learning” (p. 154) as they will then feel as if their heritage is being identified and respected. This recognition and informing the wider school community of the diversity within it does have a positive impact on the educational outcomes for ELLs (Menken, Funk, & Kleyn, 2011; Nieto, 2010). Further, Nieto’s research into the aspects of identity found that school administrators needed to rethink some of their policies and practices, previously focused on English-speaking students only, so as to cater for the cultural and linguistic diversity of their cohorts – to be totally inclusive in their practices. This would require, she suggested, a complete school rethink “if we are serious about affording all students an equal chance to learn” (p. 155) – a sentiment not unlike Au’s in 2006.

Knowledge of the language of the classroom and that of society is vital for ELLs if they are to succeed in school and life. In his review of literature relating to responding and recognising cultural differences in students, Chamberlain (2005) acknowledged the importance of knowing the language of education in preparation for formal schooling: “language is the tool we use to communicate, so obviously students who do not understand the language of the classroom will have great difficulty learning” (p. 196). Therefore, being identified early as an ELL is of paramount importance for the student so that staff can assess and then strategically support the learner to master not only the English language, which will lead them to become competent communicators, but also the content of their school subjects.

Practices for identifying ELLs vary within schools and countries. In research in California, Olsen (2010) found that there was inadequate student information before enrolment or on the enrolment documentation. As a result, many students were not being identified as an ELL or were being misidentified as having learning difficulties rather than as being a bilingual student. Of the Californian system, Olsen reported that most Californian secondary schools lacked ways of identifying ELLs and most of these students “tend to go unnoticed in secondary schools” (p. 11).

American research by Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002) in relation to students from minority language groups in mainstream classes revealed some concerns in that
“LEP/ELL students are not identified, that their linguistic differences have been ignored” (p. 21). Further, some of these students were attending mainstream English-speaking classes without ever having their linguistic abilities tested. It is, therefore, important that all ELLs are identified and assessed early so that they can be strategically supported with their learning. For some students in Carrasquillo and Rodríguez’s study, additional support was not forthcoming and the only assistance received was from the classroom teachers who may or may not have been aware that the students had English as another language. Compounding the problem, the majority of teachers have not received any education in dealing with CALD students, an aspect further explored in the following section.

Pitt (2005) suggested that, in the UK, while there have been some bilingual programs in the past, the emphasis was on monolingual English-speaking classrooms. The UK’s solution to this CALD student population has been to place all students in mainstream classes (Costley, 2004; Leung, 2001; Pitt, 2005). British education policy has been inclusive, regardless of cultural or linguistic backgrounds; all students were included in “mainstream educational processes where they should be able to benefit from the publicly funded educational provision” (Creese & Leung, 2003, p. 4). Similar to what occurred in the USA and the UK, Australian ELLs are placed in mainstream classes with a varying degree of support available for their particular needs if they have been classified as EAL/D.

In 2008, from her research about appropriate evaluation tools for measuring ELLs’ progress, Spinelli suggested that there was “a disproportionate number of students with cultural and linguistic differences, English Language Learners (ELLs) who are misidentified as learning disabled” (p. 101). She found, however, that they were not learning disabled, but that the students’ language difficulties had resulted from the fact that they were from non-English-speaking backgrounds and this had not been recognised. Spinelli (2008) further reported that because these students had been misidentified, they had not received the appropriate English language support. She suggested that if misidentification occurred, some students could be limited in their curriculum access, negatively impacted because of the label attached to them or limited in their future career choices.
Research from the USA by Sheng, Sheng, and Anderson (2011) identified some factors that may have caused ELLs to stay away from or drop out of school. Some of the absences may have occurred because students had been incorrectly identified or perhaps not appropriately supported in their learning environments. The reasons suggested by Sheng et al. were English language proficiency or lack of it, family SES, and cultural differences; they claimed that any of these individually or collectively may in some way contribute to the students’ success or failure in educational pursuits. They further stated that ELLs in the USA are the fastest growing group of students, a view shared by Luster (2011). Each group of ELLs, in every school, is different and presents “a unique set of linguistic and academic needs” (Callahan, 2006, p. 5). This presents administrators with another challenge as each student should have equal opportunities to succeed academically. Another challenge is to create culturally and linguistically appropriate learning environments that will assist all students, regardless of their cultural or linguistic backgrounds (Au, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) to achieve to their full potential. As schools seek to move with and adapt to the demands of the technological community (Blake & Blake, 2005; Levy & Murnane, 2004), providing appropriate learning environments becomes even more difficult. This is acknowledged as a key challenge faced by school administrators and teachers to help all students prepare for the globalised world environment.

Another factor of which administrators need to be cognizant is the creation of barriers, knowingly or not, which may restrict parental involvement within a school community. In an American study by Weiss, Bouffard, Bridglall, and Gordon (2009) on families and their engagement in school, it was found that barriers were created because of the difference in the cultural and social capital between many of the ELLs’ families and that of the school and its staff. Weiss et al. suggested that many of these parents could benefit from literacy and English language support similar to what their children require. The outcomes, they suggested, would be that the parents would then have a better understanding not only of what is required of their children but also of how to become involved with their schooling (Chen & Harris, 2009). According to Crosnoe (2010), “parents who do not speak (or are uncomfortable speaking) English may not know what is available to them or is expected of them” (p. 4), about school, and this in itself creates a barrier. Papapolydorou (2016), in research on involving parents in their school communities, showed that parents from the lower-SES group
trusted the school’s teachers but did not want to be involved as they were not confident enough to participate in school community life. They accepted the role that teachers play in the lives of their children as facilitators of their learning.

2.3.2 Teachers

The importance of acceptance and valuing of students from diverse cultures by teachers has its rewards (Kumaravadivelu, 2008), the greatest of which is having “the opportunity to contribute to the development of their learner’s cultural identity” (p. 27). According to Brown and Eisterhold (2004), many of these students are seen as “different from those in the dominant group, they are often perceived as lacking in skills, preparation, intelligence or some other quality” (p. 6). Students from diverse backgrounds seek to be valued, by their teachers, as individuals who have much to offer any classroom (Flores, Kley, & Menken, 2015). In their study on the identification of long-term ELLs, these researchers found that if acknowledgement was made of these students’ skills and their cultural heritage, across languages and cultures, it would also assist them in developing their English language skills. The changing role of teachers requires them to be aware of the cultural and linguistic diversity of all their learners as this may influence each student’s learning.

In her research focused on understanding the diverse cultures and languages in schools, Nieto (2010) affirmed that the primary role of teachers of CALD students in English-speaking classrooms is to act as “cultural accommodator and mediator” (p. 155). By doing so, teachers will help students to settle into the new environment and should assist in facilitating their learning. Teachers in multicultural schools must face the challenge of learning about their students’ diversity. Further, they need to learn how to engage them and then “see them as capable learners” (Villegas & Lucas, 2007, p. 1). Brown’s (2007) research, about creating culturally responsive teachers (CRT), suggested that all teachers must believe that most students in the minority groups want to learn, and must move away from the deficit model which many teachers hold about these students.

2.3.2.1 Teacher education to assist working in CALD classrooms

Teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms is challenging for some teachers who have received no education to accommodate this changing mix. Schmid (2001), Brown (2007), Kumaravadivelu (2008), Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron
(2011), and Xu and Drame (2007) all suggested that there are too many teachers who are not fully prepared or qualified for this change within classrooms. In their research about culturally diverse students in mainstream classes in the USA, Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002) found that the majority of these ELLs were being taught by teachers who “had no specialised training in this area” (p. 3). Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011) affirmed that teacher education in the USA still did not help “teachers learn about the linguistic challenges of the content areas” (p. 13). They noted that without the appropriate education, teachers may be “limited to instruction in vocabulary or decontextualized language features” (p. 13) when what they required was appropriate education in how to support their diverse student groups.

**Language Acquisition**

Harper and de Jong (2004) raised concerns that teachers of ELLs did not have the appropriate understanding or education to effectively teach students from diverse backgrounds. Most teachers, these researchers reported, had no education in relation to the differences in a student learning their first language and any subsequent language. Harper and de Jong further suggested that teachers needed to have an understanding of this second language acquisition process which would then assist them to look at how they used language in their classrooms. They related that “teachers frequently report having observed L2 [second language] learners who seem to pick up language needed for social purposes quickly and easily while they struggle with academic language and literacy” (p. 154). This misunderstanding perhaps highlights a lack of education and/or knowledge about the difference between how a person acquires their first and second languages and how an ELL acquires informal language earlier and more proficiently.

Reeves (2006) found, in her research on secondary teachers’ attitudes to ELLs, that most teachers felt they were inadequately trained to work with the diversity in their classrooms, with about half indicating they would be open to receiving more education in this area. Verdugo and Flores’ (2007) research about teacher preparation for developing students’ academic development highlighted four areas of concern – credentials, language, cultural sensitivity and understanding, and race and ethnicity. They found that few teachers in the USA had appropriate education for this diversity and that most of the teachers were native monolingual English speakers. Many had no knowledge of a student’s background, their culture, or other languages and many held
low academic expectations for these ELLs. To alleviate these concerns, Verdugo and Flores suggested there needed to be staff PD linked to students’ needs and specific programs. Further, they suggested that teachers’ skills needed to be developed and their expectations raised to be able to assist these students effectively.

From his research in teaching ELLs in middle and secondary schools in the USA, Luster (2011) highlighted that most teachers are only trained for mainstream teaching and this may lead to a lack of skills and responsiveness towards the cultural needs of students from diverse backgrounds. Research by Premier and Miller (2010) in an Australian university in relation to preparing preservice teachers for CALD classrooms found that the secondary preservice teachers felt that “their teacher education courses lack[ed] a focus on cultural and linguistic diversity in schools” (p. 35). They further suggested that the preservice education programs in their state “do not effectively prepare teachers to meet the needs of CALD students. Consequently, many preservice teachers do not have the relevant skills, or confidence in their ability, to teach CALD students” (p. 47). Further research by Miller (2015) about teachers in multicultural teaching environments highlighted this concern in Australia in relation to preservice teacher education. She suggested that the system does “not train primary or secondary teachers in these language focussed skills, understandings and competencies, or in the cultural and social aspects of highly diverse classrooms” (p. 118).

Moloney and Saltmarsh’s 2016 research, which assessed the teacher education preservice practice of one university in Australia and its preparation of preservice teachers for teaching in a CALD school community, found such preparations were lacking and have since created new intercultural learning modules in the courses. From interviews with the preservice teachers, they found that “more than half of the cohort expressed anxiety in feeling unprepared to teach in a CALD classroom” (p.88). An understanding of the students in their classes is critical if teachers seek to help all students reach their potential.

Flynn (2015) further explored monolingual and multilingual pedagogies from her research in England and expressed concern that universities are not teaching about ELLs in their curriculum subjects for preservice teachers. She suggested that teachers are responsible for “delivering successful teaching and learning for children with EAL … rather than those who design the curriculum” (p. 23). Flynn concluded that teachers
are “perhaps unaware of how much they should understand about second language acquisition and how much they don’t know” (p. 23). In the classroom, where students are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, teachers need to be responsive to this changing demographic and reskill to become culturally responsive.

Further, in Reeves’s (2006) research about teachers’ attitudes to PD to help with teaching ELLs, many teachers said, “no special professional development is needed to work with ELLs. In other words, PD would be unnecessary for educators who believed that differentiated instruction for ELLs is inappropriate or ineffective” (p. 138). This highlights a general misunderstanding that mainstream teachers appear to have about the importance of having an appreciation of second language acquisition and the relevance of such knowledge in helping them facilitate learning for their CALD student cohort. A final comment from Reeves revealed “a teaching force struggling to make sense of teaching and learning in multilingual school environments” (p. 139). One way to assist teachers to develop the appropriate skill set is to train them to become culturally responsive teachers (CRTs), and this is explored in the next section.

2.3.2.2 Preparing teachers for CALD classrooms

The acquiring of academic English presents challenges to many students, whether native speakers or ELLs (Slama, 2012), but for the latter they have the struggle of becoming proficient in the English language while maintaining another language at home. Teachers need an understanding of the diverse learners in all of their classes and Villegas and Lucas (2007), in their research in this area, further suggested that some focus should be placed on retraining teachers so that they become culturally responsive. By receiving appropriate education, these authors suggested that teachers would have the knowledge and skills which would enhance students’ achievements and also assist in creating better learning environments for all students. This approach should be backed by school administrators if they are aware of CRT practices; as Brown (2007) suggested, there should be support for teachers’ efforts “to transform their teaching, classrooms and schools so that they will be more responsive to the students they serve” (p. 61). Preparing students in today’s classrooms has become more difficult because of the diverse learning styles that are a reflection of the diverse number of cultures in classrooms (Blake & Blake, 2005). To become a CRT requires education, either when a preservice teacher or through ongoing PD within the

In an American report on Californian ELLs, Olsen (2010) reiterated that there was a shortage of teachers prepared with the knowledge and skills to teach long-term ELLs. Hélot & Ó Laoire’s (2011) research found that many teachers “easily underestimate the complexities of the multilingual classroom and on the other hand, even if they are aware of such complexities, they might not always know how to best exploit the potential of plurilingual students “(p. ix). Without an understanding of differences in ethnic and cultural behaviours, teachers could also misinterpret students’ behaviour and this could lead to misunderstanding and challenges with classroom management (Au, 2013).

An important element of becoming a CRT relates to understanding and reflecting on one’s culture and values. Chamberlain (2005) suggested, “all teachers regardless of cultural background can benefit from understanding how cultural differences influence the education of students” (p. 196). Au (2006) shared the importance of this when she suggested that many teachers “differ from their students regarding ethnicity as well as social class, although they may share the same primary language” (p. 10). Further, she suggested that some “teachers of mainstream backgrounds who have been raised in mainstream communities may not have had the opportunity to reflect on their cultural identities” (p. 10). If they did, she suggested, this could not only assist them to understand students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, but also assist them with their learning. Chamberlain (2005) also noted that “cultural differences between educators and culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students can have negative effects on the education of CLD learners” (p. 195). It is, therefore, important for educators to become culturally knowledgeable and responsive.

Understanding the individual needs of these ELLs and interacting positively with each individual is part of learning how to be a CRT (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez 2002). To be able to do this, all teachers must adopt a role as “instructors of language and should thus be exposed to training in working with this student population” (Sheng et al. 2009, p. 102), as elaborated in the following section.
2.3.2.3 English language teaching and the relevance to all subjects

Teachers, across all subject areas and year levels, are teachers not only of their subject area content but also of the English language and its application within their content area. Acknowledging this and applying this within all classrooms will benefit all students, not just ELLs. Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011) found that when teachers in secondary schools discussed content and English language usage in classes and utilised scaffolding techniques, all students, not only ELLs, benefitted. Flynn (2015) noted the value of proficiency in the English language when she reported, “English has enormous value internationally, but native users of English are not necessarily consciously aware of this” (p. 223). This enormous value of English, Flynn suggested, “will affect the perceptions and interactions of native speaking teachers with children who do not speak English in ways that they may not be sensitive to” (p. 223).

Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011) affirmed the cultural and linguistic diversity of students in secondary schools in the USA and found they had a range of academic results across challenging school subjects. These authors continued, “this means that the language they most need to develop is what is referred to as academic language, the language through which school subjects are taught and assessed” (p. 3). They further expressed concern that “many mainstream content-area teachers do not see themselves as language teachers” (p. 14) even though it is at secondary level that the more complex content is taught. The language demands of the content in subject areas become more difficult as a student progresses through high school and teachers need to reflect on not only the general language demands but also any particular challenges these may present for ELLs. Olsen (2010) also found that teachers needed to have an understanding of all their students and then look at the language that is being utilised within the classroom situation. Understanding students’ cultural heritage may lead to teachers adopting or changing their instructional strategies.

Many teachers do not see themselves as teachers of language and focus on their subject area only, not realising that many students do not have basic English skills. Many ELLs learn the English language and subject content concurrently. Luster (2011) found that while many teachers may focus on English language teaching for mainstream students, they do not know or understand that many ELLs lack many of the language skills needed to succeed. Harper and de Jong (2004) found that the
majority of secondary teachers in the USA were concerned by the lack of basic literacy skills possessed by many ELLs. They concluded that many of these teachers did not see that it was also necessary to teach an understanding of the language of their content area, reporting, “most teachers (and particularly secondary-level math, science or social science teachers) are not accustomed to thinking of themselves as language teachers. English is invisible because its role in teaching and learning academic content is assumed rather than made explicit” (p. 156).

Luster (2011) reinforced these findings and stated that incorporating language and content objectives in each lesson should be a priority. Adoniou and Qing (2014) reported similar results when researching the teaching of the language of mathematics to EAL/D students in Australia. They found that as well as the need for literacy skills, there was a need to deliver and teach content language; they considered that lacking in many classes. If ELLs are to acquire the English language effectively, they must be subjected to content concepts that are directly linked and based on the curriculum objectives (Garcia et al. 2008). Their findings reinforced the research of Harper and de Jong (2004) who found that “teachers need to draw students’ attention to the structure of the English language used in specific academic contexts and provide appropriate feedback that ELLs can use to further their oral and written academic language development” (p. 154).

2.3.3 Students

Families, and the communities which surround them, help children with their language acquisition and literacy skills and this may influence a child’s learning (Murnane et al. 2012). Schmid (2001), in her American research on external and intrinsic factors that contribute to this achievement, found many factors which influenced an ELL’s educational achievement. These included the students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, family expectations, economic resources, and the school environment. Further, she suggested that “the progress of today’s second generation appears to be related to the human and financial capital that their parents brought with them from their home country and the ways in which they are able to implement these resources” (p. 72).

Adding to the problem for some students, there may be literacy gaps in their first language knowledge and skills when they start school (Cree, et al. 2012). Some
from the lowest SES level in the USA were found to be nearly a year behind their middle-class peers by the time they entered school. Waldfogel (2012) endorsed these findings by noting that there are disparities in socioeconomic resources between native and non-native speaking students, many of whom are in the lower SES strand. The following section explores further the academic testing of ELLs and some of the characteristics of these students.

2.3.3.1 Academic testing of ELLs

Menken (2013) suggested that testing and accountability is “indeed a global phenomenon, greatly impacting schools in many different countries, and thereby intensifying the challenges that emergent bilinguals must face in secondary schools” (p. 443). For ELLs, this is another challenge to which they must rise: In English-speaking countries, all testing is undertaken in that language and for many ELLs that means that they need reading and writing skills, not just oral proficiency. All students are measured with the same expectations, and no allowance is made for those whose first language is not English. Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002) found that for many students from minority language groups in mainstream classes, their results in school subjects were lower in comparison to those of native English speakers. Freeman et al. (2002) reported that some teachers had given students pass grades simply because they handed in work – potentially giving these students a false sense of how well they were progressing.

According to Menken (2006), many English language learners in the USA are performing at a far lower level than native English speakers on national tests and, as a result, are being left behind in disproportionate numbers and becoming LTELLs. Further, she found this outcome was compounded by the fact that many teachers are now teaching to the test that is required by language policy in the USA rather than teaching to the students’ needs. Menken et al.’s (2012) research also revealed that many of these students have “until now, largely remained invisible in research and practice nationally” (p. 122). These students, they suggested, may display oral proficiency but their “reading and writing is well below grade level in both languages and they often experience poor overall academic performance” (p. 124).

Slama (2012) explained that acquiring academic English, for ELLs, could take between four and eight years to gain proficiency. Further, “even after many years in
the United States, both US-born and foreign-born high school ELLs may still struggle to develop academic English proficiency” (p. 266) and this may influence their academic outcomes. Kim and Garcia (2014) explained how many LTELLs in secondary schools in the USA had limited opportunities to improve their English language skills, noting that for many this resulted in “undesirable educational outcomes, including low engagement and high retention and dropout rates” (p. 301). For many of these ELLs, testing in the English language may not actually measure their ability.

Within Queensland, all state high school students undergo tests on a term basis – approximately every 10 weeks. These tests are across all subject areas and results are recorded on the One School database. Additionally, all students in Years 3, 5, 7, and 9 undergo NAPLAN testing in May each year. These tests cover a range of skills such as reading, writing, spelling, grammar, and numeracy (ACARA, 2011). When received, individual student results are also recorded on the One School database.

2.3.3.2 Some Characteristics of ELLs

By the time many long-term ELLs – those who have been in American schools for more than seven years – commence high school, Olsen (2010) suggested that they present with very distinctive characteristics. Most have successful social language skills even though their academic results are poor. Olsen reported that there are “significant deficits in reading and writing skills…. Long Term English Language Learners have significant gaps in academic background knowledge. Also, many have developed habits of non-engagement, learned passivity and invisibility in school” (p. 2). Freeman et al. (2002) had previously reported that many ELLs “have a lower level in reading and writing and may give a ‘false’ perception of academic achievement” (p. 4). Like Olsen (2010), Freeman et al. had found that these long-term English learners often displayed oral proficiency; however, their ability to produce appropriate year-level academic work and content which will result in mainstream proficiency and success is often found lacking (Menken et al. 2012).

Harris’s (1997) research about the use of self-assessment tools in formal secondary and university settings, suggested that self-assessment of language competencies is as “a key learning strategy for autonomous language learning” (p.12) and saw it as a positive for many learners in helping them realise they have to take
some responsibility for their own learning. Saito (2003), in her paper about the use of self-assessment suggested that “because self-assessment is performed through complex cognitive processes which are affected by many uncontrollable factors, there still remains much disagreement in the discussion regarding the effective use of self-assessment” (p. 3). Other research by Butler and Lee (2010), with year 6 students in South Korea learning English, acknowledged that if self-assessment of language skills was implemented regularly then students did improve over time with regular practice in using this skill. Menken et al. (2012) found in their American studies of ELLs that many students self-assessed that they spoke both English and their other home languages well. However, when questioned further, both teachers and students identified that English literacy was a challenge for many. Lado (1957) found, when researching across cultures in relation to language acquisition, that

individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture — both productively and when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and culture as practiced by natives. (p. 2)

This transfer, Lado (1957) suggested, does impact on the learner’s ability to competently learn another language beside the person’s primary one. Cummins’ (2001) research, about the role of the mother tongue for bilingual children, suggested “children’s knowledge and skills transfer across languages from the mother tongue they have learned in the home to the school languages. From the point of view of children’s development of concepts and thinking skills, the two languages are interdependent” (p. 17). Cummins (2005) further stressed the importance of ELLs’ heritage language as a resource for learning. This suggested that if all competencies in the first language were of a sound level then the student would be able to accommodate learning the second language more easily. However, for some ELLs, negative linguistic transfer may occur. O’Malley and Chamot (1990) suggested that a negative transfer occurs when the first language patterns are different from those in the language being learnt and this may result in errors and disrupts the person’s learning of the other language.

Children learn in their homes and acquire the language and the culture of their families and it is from this foundation that they build when they enter school. Diaz-
Rico (2004) suggested that it is in homes and communities that children learn the values of their culture as well as social customs, ceremonies, and beliefs. It is also in the home where they learn about the role of their home language and the educational system that they will attend. ELLs will utilise all this learning to guide them in their selection of language use when learning another language and even new behaviours and thoughts. For ELLS, negative cultural transfer is another area that may affect their learning a new language; that is, negative cultural transfer occurs because of cultural interference caused by cultural differences. When children start school in the majority language, Diaz-Rico further stated that, for some, “many of these [school] practices may not support the type of learning to which students are exposed in schools” (p. 273).

A concern expressed by Murnane et al. (2012) centred on the fact that language-minority Hispanic children are being born into disadvantaged USA communities at a faster rate than non-Hispanic children (who currently have higher literacy rates). Unless the literacy skills of the former are enhanced rapidly, they will be less literate than the current workforce. This dire prediction is similar to findings by Skills Australia (2010) and the Leitch Review of Skills (2006) in England. Both found that there are many unskilled workers in both countries and unless the skills of the current group of students are enhanced, there will be continuing high levels of poverty and unemployment.

Findings in Australian research by Miller, Keary, and Windle (2012) reported that for students in three secondary EAL/D classes in Victoria, the literacy levels ranged from lower primary to junior secondary levels, demonstrating literacy capability well below that of their peers. In earlier research, Miller (2000) reported on Brisbane metropolitan students who were children of migrant parents from Asian non-English-speaking backgrounds; these students were either born in Australia or had lived here most of their lives. She found that they did not associate with newly arrived Asian students and that “through their native-like use of English, the majority language, they represent themselves as part of the Aussie gang, as mates and not as NESB students” (p. 70).

Pasifika families are one example of migrant families with Australian-born children. Samu (2006) suggested that many Pasifika peoples move to Western countries to enhance the quality of life and expand outcomes for their families. Samu
further explained how students from NZ and Pacific Island nations add to the diversity in schools and they bring differences in gender expectations, home languages, and cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. Some Pasifika students struggle with English being the language of instruction as they have difficulty equating their Pasifika or Maori home languages with SAE (Fletcher, Parkhill, Fa’afoi, Taleni, & O’Regan, 2009).

As this section has illustrated, students come from a range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. An understanding of this diversity will assist those charged with facilitating their school and classroom learning experiences. Further, teaching and support staff will not only be able to allocate strategic support to students from bi/multilingual homes, but they will then be able to consider a range of pedagogical practices that will assist in the classroom. The follow section reviews literature about teaching and learning strategies.

2.4 Pedagogical practices

To reinforce the necessity for teachers to adopt a range of practices to address the particular needs of all students, Oxford’s (2003) advice is salient:

styles and strategies help determine a particular learner’s ability and willingness to work within the framework of various instructional methodologies. It is foolhardy to think that a single L2 methodology could possibly fit an entire class filled with students who have a range of stylistic and strategic preferences. Instead of choosing a specific instructional methodology, L2 teachers would do better to employ a broad instructional approach, notably the best version of the communicative approach that contains a combined focus on form and fluency. Such an approach allows for deliberate, creative variety to meet the needs of all students in the class. (p. 16)

Teachers develop their own styles of teaching just as students develop their own learning styles. Teachers of students from bi/multilingual homes need additional strategies in their toolbox to accommodate the learning styles of these students who may or may not be familiar with the processes used in English-speaking countries. No matter what term is applied to these learners of English from bi/multilingual homes, “they share a common need to learn English and the content of the school curriculum at the same time” (Mohan, Leung, & Davison, 2001, p. 1). Different students utilise different learning styles to address the underlying concepts in the curriculum. This use
of a range of styles ensures that students are actively engaged throughout the learning process. To achieve this, appropriate teaching strategies must be utilised in all classrooms that will benefit all students regardless of their cultural or linguistic heritage. Fletcher et al.’s (2009) research about Pasifika students related how, as cultural and linguistic diversity increases in classes, it “challenges educators to ascertain pedagogical practices that more effectively meet the needs of the growing number of learners with diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds” (p. 25).

Teachers’ pedagogical practices, for many, are acquired in preservice teacher education courses and then through ongoing PD. For ELLs, the strategies utilised in learning the English language, as well as the content of their various school subjects, may vary according to cultural heritage. Learning strategies utilised by students are discussed further in Section 2.4.2.

2.4.1 Teachers

Most educators enter the classroom with teaching strategies that are aligned with the norm – the monolingual English-speaking student – with little application given to preparing for CALD classrooms. Utilising evidence-based practices in classrooms does assist ELLs, but some evidence (Garcia et al. 2009) from the USA has suggested that some of these practices were poorly implemented in the past and many ELLs have not progressed. Strategies that may positively influence the learning of ELLs include educating CRTs, the use of explicit teaching strategies, and lesson preparation that plans for the needs of various cultural groups.

2.4.1.1 Culturally responsive teachers

Menken (2006) maintained that the teaching of ELLs is unlike any other teaching activity and should come from within, by first understanding one’s own lived experiences that can help project interest into the lives of ELLs. Teachers who have the ability to be responsive to these learners by acknowledging their cultural heritage were found to be a positive influence for students. Brown (2007), however, acknowledged there was still some progress to be made before teachers were appropriately trained and able to be culturally responsive in every classroom. Coleman’s (2010) research into primary school teachers’ classroom responses to immigrant children suggested that CRT can reconceptualise their teaching strategies and develop culturally relevant techniques that will cater for the needs of their diverse learners.
Knowledge of the differences between first- and second-language acquisitions is important for teachers of ELLs. CRTs should have this knowledge and as a result would be able to provide appropriate “assistance with the language of classroom discourse and small group participation” (Harper & de Jong, 2004, p. 154). Au (2013) reinforced these findings when she stated that to be able to implement CRT practices, educators needed to understand the ethnic characteristics of students from diverse backgrounds to tailor instructions to help students’ learning needs. Many CALD students have “strong ties to their family’s country of origin, yet have transnational sensibilities that can be simultaneously developed” (Flores et al. 2015, p. 130). These researchers suggested that educators, therefore, must see the “strengths they [the students] bring to school and those must be overtly valued and embedded into classroom instruction” (p. 130). To be able to undertake this successfully, CRT teachers would need to learn about cultural issues and the students’ place in their culture. If this learning was undertaken by teachers, then they suggested that students’ overall learning would be enhanced.

Most teachers critically reflect on their daily lessons. In doing so, a CRT teacher would consider various factors, including cultures and SES, to consider how they shaped students’ thinking. On reflection, a teacher may also consider including literature that is culturally relevant to class members in lessons. Flores et al. (2015) suggested the importance of culturally appropriate literature and said that this “reflects the fluid bilingual practices of students [and] is one way to allow students to see their backgrounds as a part of the school curriculum and allow them to be embraced, rather than chastised, for not fitting within a specific mold” (p. 130). This again emphasises the importance of recognising all students as individuals and showing that each culture is valued. Many CRTs who are able to respond in appropriate ways to their diverse classroom cohorts use explicit teaching strategies (Brown, 2007; Luke, Iyer, & Doherty, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2007) which assist all students regardless of their cultural or linguistic heredity.

2.4.1.2 Explicit teaching

According to Brown (2007), one of the keys to opening the doors for these second language learners to learn English is explicit teaching. Simple exposure of a student to a new language is not enough to help them become competent users of it; they need to actively participate in their learning (Harper & de Jong, 2004). Harper
and de Jong further reported that ELLs needed, “explicit opportunities to practice using the new language to negotiate meaning in interactive settings” (p. 154).

Verdugo and Flores (2007) further found that “practicing newly acquired skills is important and providing opportunities for practice sharpens one’s skills. Staff can provide opportunities for students to use or practice their language skills in a variety of school activities” (p. 172). This may be through set routines that highlight the instructional methodology that has been found to be useful for American ELLs; as Goldenberg (2006) reported, these learners benefitted from “clear goals and objectives, active engagement and participation, and information feedback” (p. 36). In the USA, the term *sheltered content instruction* refers to ELLs being out of the rigours of mainstream classes; teachers are then able to assist students to learn the language through explicit language teaching using a variety of methods that are adapted to meet their linguistic needs. Echevarria and Graves (1998) noted that sheltered content instruction for ELLs helped these students adapt to and learn English. Gay (2010) found that through effective sheltered instruction, the curriculum designs used ensured that English learners were taught in strategic ways that made the concepts comprehensible.

### 2.4.1.3 Strategies for specific groups

Strategies utilised within Australia for those who are classified as EAL/D have varied. The Far North Queensland Indigenous Schooling Support Unit (FNQ ISSU), which has other units in Townsville, Rockhampton, and Brisbane, supports the language and literacy needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) students. These units provide support, run numerous programs (e.g. Crossing Cultures, Remote Area Teacher Education Program) for students, and help train teachers involved with Indigenous students. Education Queensland’s website has suggested that this organisation is strongly committed to improving Indigenous education outcomes (Queensland Government, 2017b)

For Pasifika students who enter Australia on a New Zealand passport, as long as one parent was born in a non-English-speaking country they may be entitled to additional English language support. For such students, Samu (2006) advocated contextualised teaching that takes into account the cultural mores of the Pacific nations and relates them to the classroom. She emphasised the importance of cultural capital in
their lives, which, she suggested is shaped outside of the educational facility and influences what each student brings into the school community. These students’ views are moulded, Samu contended, by their SES, religious beliefs, whether they were raised in Australia or were recent migrants, and by their gender and family relationships. These views were confirmed by Fletcher et al. (2008) who also stated that teachers’ understanding of cultural issues and knowledge of the students’ place in that culture were other strategies which teachers could use to enhance the students’ overall learning. They further emphasised the importance of acknowledging the role of cultural capital possessed by these Pasifika families that is brought with the students into school settings. These values place a high emphasis on the roles played by the church and families and the importance of giving respect to elders (including teachers).

van Leent and Exley (2013), when researching the role of a literacy coach in a large multicultural primary school south of Brisbane, Queensland, found what they termed “hidden ESL/ESD students” (p. 23). The researchers noted that these students were primarily from Pasifika families and that they spoke much better than they read and wrote English. They clarified the hidden term when they wrote:

an example of hidden ESL is when a family identifies as speaking English on the school enrolment forms, but the student’s experiences are limited to, for example, speaking the English that their caregivers learnt as English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners in the Pacific Islands. Because the family did not tick the ESL box on enrolment forms, the student’s ESL needs are neither accounted for in systemic data nor does the student receive specialist support from an ESL teacher. (p. 24)

Some students from CALD backgrounds are assessed as having special education needs (Spinelli, 2008) when, in fact, they have been wrongly assessed and are students whose learning has been interfered with because of their non-English speaking backgrounds. A special education strategy, Response to Intervention (RTI), has been implemented for use with ELLs in some areas in the USA since the early 2000s. Brown and Doolittle (2008) explained that this RTI system operates on a multi-tiered approach with each having increased support for individual students – as is appropriate. Further, they suggested that the implementation of this system for ELLs could effect change for individual students, but its implementation would need
“culturally and linguistically appropriate instruction no matter what the educational setting” (p. 66).

The three-tiered system includes baseline screening for all children (100%) and then research-based instruction adjusted as needed for students (Tier 1). Teachers monitor all students’ progress. If there is no recognisable improvement in a child for whom classroom work has been adjusted, then specialist educators are included and early intervention through additional support may be provided (Tier 2 – about 15% of students). If there is still no discernible progress, then the child moves to the next tier (Tier 3) and further screening is undertaken and interventions that are more intensive are offered; this would occur for about 5% of students.

Orosco and Klingner (2010) said of RTI that it “potentially provides a way to support English language learners when they first show signs of struggling with reading” (p. 270) but they also found that many teachers lack appropriate education to implement such a strategy. Brown and Doolittle (2008) had previously noted this lack of trained teachers in the area of “differencing language difference from learning disability” (p. 66). When discussing RTI and its dependence on quality teachers, Xu and Drame (2007) went further, suggesting that “traditional teacher education programs and in-service professional development cannot fulfil teachers’ needs in providing high quality instruction for all students in general and ELLs in particular at general education settings” (p. 310).

The current debate in the USA over an expanded use of RTI with ELLs centres on appropriately trained teachers, quality facilities and appropriate resources, and the application of some of the interventions. Hamayan, Marler, Sanchez-Lopez, and Damico (2013) have suggested, however, that

RTI approaches can benefit all students by providing timely support in the classroom as identified. If employed appropriately and carefully in a culturally and linguistically responsive manner, RTI can also introduce high-quality instruction into general education classrooms across the grades. (p. 69)

Awareness of the different elements in cultures and languages will assist teachers to respond to the varying needs of the students within their classes. Utilisation of a variety of teaching strategies will benefit all students and help them attain their
best possible educational outcomes. Further, an understanding of the learning styles of and strategies used by students will also help teachers to respond to the needs of individual students. These are discussed in the following section.

2.4.2 Students

When investigating the learning styles of students in a multicultural class, De Vita (2001) found that a student’s cultural, and therefore educational background, played an important role in developing their learning styles. His research affirmed that there were a variety of learning styles used by the students and these varied within the cultures. This reinforced earlier work by Triandis (1989) and Pratt’s (1991) studies in western and Chinese cultures on self where they showed that heritage impacted on an individual’s learning style.

In Dörnyei’s 2005 work on understanding language learner’s characteristics, he referred to learning styles as “a profile of the individual’s approach to learning, a blueprint of the habitual or preferred way the individual perceives, interacts with, and responds to the learning environment” (p. 122). He saw them as individual ways that each person developed a way of learning that was effective for them – a learning style. Oxford’s (2003) research centred on language learning styles and strategies used by ELLs and she stated that learning styles are general approaches such as “global or analytical, auditory or visual” (p. 2). Global learners need all the information about a task, the big picture, before beginning whereas analytical learners prefer small pieces at a time and enjoy learning deconstructing information. Auditory learners learn best by listening and by being given clear and concise instructions. They also respond to a systematic logical approach. Visual learners need to look, to read and see words and pictures. Further, Oxford suggested that students use strategies that reflect their learning styles and teachers can help students by introducing a variety of strategies into any classroom to cater for the various learning styles.

According to Bialystok (1978), “language learning strategies are defined as optional means of exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language” (p. 71). Rubin (1987) went further by stating that “learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect the learner directly” (p. 23). O’Malley and Chamot (1990) asserted that learning strategies are “the thoughts and actions that learners
apply to help them remember, learn and use new information” (p. 1). Oxford’s (1990) definition of learning strategies suggested they are “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to new situations” (p. 8).

Language learning strategies are therefore the actions learners take and the tools that they use to learn new information. It can also be seen as a series of steps that can be repeated over and over again to solve a problem and complete a task, in this instance acquire better language skills. O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzaranes, Rupper, and Russo (1985), in their research into learning strategies used by high school ELLs, reported a range of strategies which they classified into three groups – metacognitive, social affective, and cognitive. Their research suggested that students utilised parts of all three groupings of strategies, which they clarified in the following.

Metacognitive strategies involve thinking, planning, monitoring, and evaluating a task. That may involve managing the whole process and structure which allows the learner to manage meaning. These may include tasks such as identifying, planning, gathering, arranging a study space, preparing a study schedule, or evaluating tasks. Interactions with others who may assist with an ELL’s learning are classified as social affective strategies; these include how an ELL feels about learning and these may be influenced by personality factors. Social affective strategies also relate to being able to identify mood and anxiety levels and talk about feelings. Using these strategies also entails asking questions, seeking clarification, asking for help, or talking with native speakers. Magogwe and Oliver (2007) found that younger learners favoured social affective strategies while adolescents preferred metacognitive strategies.

The third group of strategies, working with information and manipulating materials supplied for learning, are defined as cognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies relate to how students think about learning and how they actively control material. This also relates to how people process information that leads to the forming of mental representations of people, objects, and events. Included in this group are tasks such as repetition, resourcing, translation, note taking, use of imagery and transfer. Repetition occurs when a new language model is repeated several times while resourcing refers to using translation resources to assist in understand new words. Translation occurs when
a learner used their first language as the basis to gain an understanding of the new language and here the process of transfer occurs. Other learners write notes to help with their learning while some prefer the use of visual prompts.

An ELL uses many learning strategies and there are many variables that may impact on them such as a person’s age, gender, motivation, and their cultural heritage. An ELL’s motivation for learning another language may be either intrinsic or extrinsic (Chen, 1999; Dornyei, 2005) and this will influence a student’s participation in classroom situations. Motivation may be influenced by a person’s culture and the fact that people from different cultures do tasks differently. This is exampled in some Asian ELLs who rely heavily on dictionary use (Hu, 2014) and are very time conscious (Li & Suen, 2015) when compared with students from other cultures. Affective factors such as a person’s personality type and sociocultural factors, such as a learner’s attitude to the new language and new culture, will also influence the new learning and the learning strategies that the learner will develop.

Their cultural and linguistic heritages and the various learning environments to which they have been exposed will influence how students learn in a classroom setting. Richards and Rodgers’ (2001) research on methods used in teaching second language learners commented that “silence is considered the best vehicle for learning because in silence students concentrate on the task to be accomplished and the potential means to its accomplishment” (p. 83). They further suggested that it helps “alertness, concentration and mental organization”. Olivo’s (2003) research, about conflicting language ideologies in an ESL classroom, found differing teacher opinions about the use of silence and the role that talk played. One student of Afghan heritage, when questioned in Olivo’s research about students talking in class, said, “I wish everybody would be quiet”. When questioned further he said, “then it would be easier to do your work”. This student needed silence within his learning environment whereas for others interviewed in Olivo’s research, talking in class was just a normal thing to do.

Research about the effect of classroom noise on ELLs, by Nelson, Kohnert, Sabur and Shaw (2005) suggested that “the presence of background noise affects children more negatively than adults” (p. 219). They found that in a typical American classroom “linguistically diverse children receiving primary instruction in English …
do, in fact, experience double jeopardy with respect to the negative impact of noise” (p. 227). For children in American classrooms they suggested that ELLs appeared to be at a disadvantage when trying to listen in these classrooms because of extraneous noise. A British study by McCallum, Hargreaves and Gipps (2010) investigated the primary school student’s understanding of learning and one aspect presented the students’ voices in relation to classroom conditions. No description was given as to the participants’ cultural or linguistic heritages. They reported that some of the children preferred a quiet environment as it helped them to learn. The participants reported, “they could not listen if other children were making a noise and so they could not learn” (p. 281). The year levels of these students ranged from Year 2 to Year 6 and they noted the importance of quiet for learning.

### 2.5 Summary

The reviewed literature acknowledges that there are many students studying in English-speaking environments whose home language is not English. It also shows that there are many issues in educational settings about dealing with these known English language learners. Some of the educational challenges faced by three major Western countries, the USA, the UK, and Australia, are similar and this chapter identified some of these challenges as well as some strategies being used to help close “the literacy achievement gap [which] is critical in the current era” (Au, 2006, p. 17). All three countries are multicultural nations and their Western natures have put them in the forefront of educational and technological challenges. As the reviewed literature has shown, the increasing number of students whose cultural and linguistic backgrounds are not the same as the country in which they are living presents educators “with unprecedented challenges” (Au, 2006, p. xi) and this situation is occurring in increasing numbers in modern classrooms (Spinelli, 2008).

This chapter has shown that ELLs can be misidentified, not identified at all, or simply placed in mainstream classes even after being identified as non-native English speakers. Without identification and strategic support, some of these CALD learners will continue to perform at a lower rate academically than native speakers or remain at a static lower rate of performance. While the students referred to in this literature review are from the USA, the UK, and Australia, and had been identified as English language learners, it can safely be assumed that there remain many who have not been
identified. This may have occurred by choice by the parents or through lack of appropriate processes on enrolment at school. If students are to be given every opportunity to achieve educational excellence then all students, regardless of cultural or linguistic backgrounds, should be correctly identified. Once awareness is gained that a student is from a bi/multilingual home then they should be assessed appropriately and supported strategically so that they can reach their full potential and participate in all that society has to offer them.

The research reported firstly acknowledges that there are many more students in schools from bi/multilingual homes than may have been identified, and secondly recognises that they need appropriate assessment. This encourages further research as to why students are not being identified as being from bi/multilingual homes, and then as to how policy makers “label” them and allocate support, and whether this support is strategic. A further concern that has been highlighted in this chapter relates to the appropriateness of preservice teacher education and ongoing PD in schools to prepare staff for the changing cultural and linguistic diversity within the modern classroom.

From this review, it is clear that there is little literature about the undefined students – those from bi/multilingual backgrounds who are not identified and therefore receive no additional English language support within their school environments. This research will add to the body of knowledge about ELLs through investigating the current ELLs in some state high schools in southeast Queensland. Using an exploratory mixed-methods approach, as set out in the next chapter, this study will examine characteristics of students in junior secondary classes who are from bi/multilingual homes. It will also examine some of the school and classroom experiences of some of these students. Pedagogical practices employed by teachers of CALD students will be explored as will strategies that some students adopt to assist them with their learning.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

Blaikie (2000) suggested that research questions help give boundaries to the research and that through them, the researcher is able to establish the what, why, and how questions related to the topic. Yin (1994) advised that designing the research questions should not be undertaken in haste, as this is one of the most important elements of the research design. Some questions may result from the researcher’s own experiences or background, others from perceived social or practical issues (Flick, 2011). Regardless of whether the research is quantitative or qualitative, the research questions “narrow down the purpose statement to specific questions which researchers seek to answer” (Creswell, 2012, p. 110). The research questions should be clear, of importance, and convey the need for a mixed-methods approach (Plano Clark & Badiee, 2010). O’Leary (2014) proposed that the development of well-defined questions is essential because it “defines the project, sets boundaries, gives direction and acts as a frame of reference for assessing your work” (p. 45). The following research questions guide this study:

RQ 1 What are the characteristics of students, in Queensland state high schools, who are from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 2 What school and classroom experiences, relevant to learning, are reported by students who are undefined by their school communities as being from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 3 What perception of school processes are reported by staff and undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 4 What pedagogical practices do teachers and students identify that may result in addressing the educational learning needs of undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

These questions seek an understanding of the linguistic and cultural diversity amongst these students and the strategies used to enhance the students’ learning. The theoretical framework used, Bronfenbrenner’s bioecological model of development, identifies that to understand the child, one needs to understand their family, their teachers, their school and the society of which they are apart. This study, therefore, while it focuses on the child, accesses information both from the child directly and particularly from the teachers and the school, therefore the design of the data to be collected is consistent with Bronfenbrenner.
This chapter presents the methods used in this exploratory research. The overall research design is explained followed by an explanation of the insider/outsider perspective of the researcher. After the research context is identified, the participants are overviewed. This section is followed by a description of the instrumentation used. Data collection and management are then detailed along with analytical approaches for quantitative and qualitative data. Ethical considerations are presented before concluding the chapter.

3.2 Research design

This research methodology adopted the philosophical ideals of pragmatism. As suggested by Creswell (2013), pragmatists utilise and advocate the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods within a single piece of research. It is contended by Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2005) that “research methodologies are merely tools that are designed to aid our understanding of the world” (p. 377) and as such, pragmatic research advances the philosophy that the use of methods should be driven by the research questions. Further, Creswell (2013) and Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) commented that research underpinned by a pragmatic paradigm that uses a mixed-methods approach places the focus of same on the actual research problem which, in this research, is the views and experiences of students from bilingual homes and the teachers who work in culturally and linguistically diverse school environments. By taking such a pragmatic approach to this research, the aim was to develop useful knowledge for practice for, as Greene and Hall (2010), stated “the pragmatist attends to content, practicality and instrumentality – not to philosophy – in service to this overall commitment to problem solutions” (p. 138).

Mixed methods use the epistemological approach of pragmatism and thus concentrate on social action as the basis of knowing. This research used an exploratory mixed-methods design, thus addressing the need for an initial descriptive profile of the students included in the study, with the contribution of the views of students and teachers on the learning environment providing an additional perspective to complete the rich picture of the learning environment of the students.

3.2.1 Methodology

In line with the researcher’s pragmatic position, this research adopted a mixed methodology approach. This exploratory study is undertaken in a real-world
environment. In seeking to understand the learning experiences of a group of students in the current Queensland state high school system, it recognises that the information available will come from the participants with an understanding of the participants needed to support full interpretation of this data.

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) suggest that “the adoption of mixed methods is not to replace either of these approaches but rather to draw from the strengths and minimise the weaknesses of both in single research studies and across studies” (pp. 14-15). By utilising this combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches the shortcomings from using only one approach may be overcome, resulting in a better understanding of the issue (Greene, 2007). Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner’s (2007) definition of mixed methods explains how it “combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (p. 123). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010) affirmed this definition as one that covers all aspects of the research and may lead to a clearer understanding of the nature of mixed methods. The combined mixed-methods approach allowed for the integration of quantitative results and findings with the qualitative data.

In this study, by utilising the qualitative approach, it was also possible to gain richer understanding of some of the students by profiling a small group of them through their own descriptions of their situations. This interview process added to and gave a further appreciation of these students’ situations as well as adding to the interpretation of the initial material that had been collected.

A mixed-methods design does not occur simply by mixing two methods (i.e., qualitative and quantitative). Rather, it occurs when research outcomes would be more effective through the utilisation of more than one method, providing complementary perspectives (Locke, Silverman, & Spirduso, 2010). Holosko and Thyer (2011) described qualitative methods as “the systematic, first-hand observation of real-world phenomena” (p. 97) and quantitative as “research that systematically explores, describes or tests variables in numerical or statistical form” (p. 98); they proposed that the utilisation of both led to better outcomes and understandings. As suggested by Denscombe (2010), mixed methods “refers to a research strategy that crosses the
boundaries of conventional paradigms of research by deliberately combining methods drawn from different traditions with different underlying assumptions” (p. 137). In the case of this research, while the surveys provided extensive detail on the participants in the study, the interview and emailed survey processes provided depth and richness from those interviewees that enhanced the understanding of their initial details.

An initial survey approach was adopted as a screening tool to capture overall data for participants from each school and to identify the students recording their demographic, cultural and school experiences and the data collected at this level was, as in the interview data, seen as capturing the views of students at the time of the study. It accessed descriptive data from surveys and interviews and then interprets people’s meaning from both their responses and interviews.

This exploration, through simple surveys and interviews, asked people’s views and recognised that, in some cases, there can be issues with the information received. An exploratory approach was used to “explore or open up new areas of social inquiry” (Walter, 2010, p. 11) in the natural setting of schools. This was also utilised to “take a broad look at the phenomenon being investigated. The purpose was to “gather information to build a description of what is ‘going on’,” (Bouma, 2000, p. 91). In this instance, it is to inquire into the issue of students from bi/multilingual homes in public sector high schools in Queensland and gain an understanding of their cultural backgrounds and educational experiences. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) explained how, “exploratory research generates information about unknown aspects of a phenomenon” (p. 25) and by using an exploratory approach, the focus of exploring is on the research issues that are articulated in the research questions.

Quantitative methods were used first to explore, through surveys from staff and students, the characteristics of students from bi/multilingual homes. Further understanding of the views and experiences of both staff and students were then captured through a series of semistructured interviews though a sample of the initially surveyed participants. This combination of words and numbers highlighted particular findings and gave more insight into the results and complexities of an issue (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; O’Leary, 2014; Sammons, Davis, Day, & Gu, 2014).
3.3 Insider/outside perspective

As a researcher, one must reflect on one’s journey, as certain assumptions will be carried forward from that into the research methodology (O’Leary, 2014) and these assumptions may help to shape certain interpretations (Creswell, 2014b). It is also important to acknowledge being a part of the social world in which the research is being conducted (Berg, 2007; Bryman, 2012). Any researcher brings with them certain knowledge, biases, and values (Glesne, 1999); therefore, the ability to reflect on these matters should ensure that no undue influence is exerted on the research process.

Denzin and Lincoln (2013) suggested that reflexivity is the process and ability to reflect “critically on the self as researcher” (p. 254) and thus be able to experience the dual role of both researcher and learner. The position of the insider or outsider researcher has been the subject of much research with advantages and disadvantages mooted from both perspectives. Unluer (2012) suggested, “it is critical for social researchers to clarify their researchers’ roles especially for those utilising qualitative methodology to make their research credible” (p. 1). Bogdan and Biklen (1998) reminded researchers that, whether they are an insider or an outsider to the site, they must always remember that the main reason to be in the facilities is to collect information relevant to the research project and they must reflect on the appropriateness of their roles.

Smyth and Holian (2008) suggested that “what an insider ‘sees’ and ‘understands’ will be different from, but as valid as what an outsider understands” (p. 415). Further, they suggest, “research from within (insider research) that is done by members of the organisation under study is, and feels very different from, research that is conducted by and provided to organisations by outsiders” (p. 33). Because of my extensive community and school experience working with multicultural groups and classes, in planning my research it was important for me to reflect on my perspective and on my role within the school communities where I would be working— was I still an insider or now an outsider? Such a reflection would ensure that I managed my data collection and analysis processes effectively and my subsequent interpretations appropriately.

As a former Education Queensland state high school teacher and teacher-librarian, I acknowledge advantages from the point of view of an insider, as school
culture is understood and processes and jargon known (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002; Smyth & Holian, 2008). Most importantly, I was not seen by school staff as a person alien to the environment and was, therefore, able to act within the normal school processes and procedures (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002). Being a former insider gave me an understanding of this social phenomenon and this assisted when having discussions with the legitimate gatekeepers (Ruane, 2005; Seidman, 2013), such as school principals, who needed to allow access to the community first before parents/carers could be approached. This prior knowledge about school operations also helped to limit the time taken in these negotiations (Harding, 2013). The total collection process was conducted over 12 months and, if I had not been cognizant of matters of schools, it might have taken much longer to complete.

Staff in all participating school communities knew that I was a former teacher/teacher-librarian in Education Queensland and some took the opportunity to discuss the research and to ask advice about their multicultural cohorts. I was often included in staff room discussions about internal concerns and, at one school, was invited to attend a staff PD session. These events all lead to the researcher feeling total acceptance (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009) within all the school communities. Any research in school facilities will have the administration and staff questioning the benefits, so it was important to ensure that all understood what positive outcomes might arise from the research that might assist their school community. Explaining how the research would be conducted was also vital so that the schools’ administrators understood the purpose of using a mixed-methods approach and how this would be beneficial not only to the research but also to the schools.

However, I was not a true insider in any of the schools studied. I ceased employment with Education Queensland more than seven years before commencing this research, so this decreased the likelihood of being overly familiar with the settings and saw me positioned as an outsider in each facility – someone not involved in the day-to-day proceedings of each school. No effort was expended in trying to develop a rapport with teaching and administration staff although, in all instances, I was welcomed into staff rooms and administration facilities. There was no danger of my losing the research perspective and even though I worked from a particular staff room or area in the schools, there was no regular pattern to visits to any of the schools.
As an outsider, my first impressions, the “feel”, assisted my approach (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002) when working in each school. The wearing of a university shirt and identification helped to identify me as a person who was not part of the actual school community but as one who had been welcomed into it. Though having the understanding of an insider, I was an outsider in each facility and this helped to temper any potential bias or conflicts of interest that may have arisen. Merriam et al. (2001) suggested that,

drawing from contemporary perspectives on insider/outsider status, that in the course of a study, not only will the researcher experience moments of being both insider and outsider, but that these positions are relative to the cultural values and norms of both the researcher and the participants. (pp. 415-416)

I believe that I experienced both insider and outsider moments at each school and this conscious awareness has helped in progressing through the research and also in recognising the need to consider and acknowledge different perspectives in interpreting the data collected through the study.

3.4 Research context

This research was undertaken in 2015-2016 in state high schools in Queensland, Australia (Figure 3.1). The schools’ geographical settings covered a wide area in southeast Queensland (Figure 3.1). All schools approached lay within the area covered by the Southeast Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031. This includes the local government areas of the Brisbane City Council, Gold Coast City Council, Ipswich City Council, Lockyer Valley Regional Council, Logan City Council, Moreton Bay Regional Council, Noosa Shire Council, Redland City Council, Scenic Rim Council, Somerset Regional Council, Sunshine Coast Regional Council, and the Toowoomba Regional Council (part only) (see Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1. Map of Australia and Southeast Queensland regional area
(adapted from Outline map of Australia with State boundaries http://www.map.net.au/outline-map, and Queensland Government. Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, 2016b)

The research context was state high schools in Queensland, with participants including staff and students from these school communities. Before schools in
southeast Queensland were approached, approval was given by Education Queensland to proceed and this process is detailed in Ethics (Section 3.9). This research was conducted in real-world settings (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010; Yin, 2003) at these schools. As all state high schools operate under the same set of policies and procedures, this gives a level of consistency, with the school selection then giving variation across different school communities.

### 3.4.1 School communities

As a first step, selection was restricted to Education Queensland state high schools, thus ensuring all included schools operated under the same policies and guidelines. All specialist colleges and schools on each of the Education Queensland southeast regional lists with a known high EAL/D cohort were excluded because of their specialised entry and individual student assessment policies. The selection of potential school sites was then based on three criteria: (a) type of school, (b) school enrolment size, and (c) socio-educational advantage level for each school. To obtain a reasonable group of students within each site, and thus enhance the likelihood of identifying all students from bi/multilingual homes, schools with a junior secondary cohort between 300 and 500 students were identified.

The final criteria targeted variation in school SES. Scores on the My School website from the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) (ACARA, 2013) were used – these being the most recently available information. ICSEA measures the SES of schools so that students from like schools may be compared in the fields of literacy and numeracy. All schools are allocated an ICSEA value - these ranging from the extremely disadvantaged, with a score of 500, to scores of around 1,300 (very advantaged) with a median of 1,000 and a standard deviation of 100 (ACARA, 2011). From data available, the ICSEA scores for all Queensland schools (primary, secondary, state, private and independent) ranged from 570 to 1,200 in this year. While this is the total range for all schools in Queensland, the lowest state high school for this year recorded an ICSEA score of 643 and the highest 1,155. Table 3.1 provides the criteria-based selection used and rationale for each criterion.
Table 3.1 Criteria for School Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>Queensland state school sector</td>
<td>The selection of state schools means that all schools selected will be operating under the same policy and procedural guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Around 300-500 in junior secondary years</td>
<td>Working with a relatively large school size will increase the potential identification of a noteworthy group of unidentified students if they are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Ensure high, medium and low SES school communities included</td>
<td>A mix of SES will allow comparison across all spectrums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once schools that met the above criteria were identified, administrators were approached and invited to participate in the research and this led to the identification of five schools. Table 3.2 provides a summary of other key features of each participating school (note pseudonyms are used to refer to each school).

Table 3.2 Key Features of Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Approx. student number</th>
<th>Approx. staff number</th>
<th>ICSEA 2013</th>
<th>My School% ATSI/ % LBOTE</th>
<th>Other information**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>Fast-growing urban community; national partnership funding in hospitality, science, sports; 30% single-parent families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idstone</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>15/3</td>
<td>Rapidly expanding urban area edging rural. Excellence programs in sport and retail; high Vocational (Voc.) Education (Educ.) programs; 26% single-parent families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>Stable heart of urban community. Independent Public School; member Education Qld International; balance of academic and Voc. Educ. subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnor</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>Urban area of high infrastructure growth. Member Education Qld International; partnership agreements with local Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>3/18</td>
<td>Stable urban community. High performance programs with Queensland Academy of Sport; academic as well as Voc. Educ. programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICSEA – Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage; 1000 = average
ATSI – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders
LBOTE – Language Background Other Than English
The selection resulted in the inclusion of five well-established schools, each with at least 30 years of operation. The participating schools’ ICSEA scores ranged from 910 (disadvantaged) to 1,045 (advantaged, but not highly advantaged) where 1,000 is the median ICSEA value. From the Queensland information of ICSEA scores for 2013, only 13 state high schools recorded ratings of 1,045 (the score for Henley) or higher. Though the 910 (the score for Idstone) score may not appear to be on the lower end of the scale, for south-east Queensland it is low with only 22 state high schools recording lower scores and only 1 of those was within the research area, and this school choose not to participate. The other state high schools were all far north or rural and remote school communities with most being smaller communities. Thus, the range of ICSEA values for the schools in the study shows levels of variation in ICSEA ratings – the intent of the selection.

3.5 Participants

Staff and students from the five schools were invited to participate in this research. The sampling processes are detailed in the following sections.

3.5.1 Sampling staff

Once approval had been received from individual schools, the principal advised all staff (including all teaching staff, members of the administrative team and support staff) of the research either in their school newsletter or at a staff meeting. Information about the research, as well as times when the survey was to be administered, was widely publicised; the number of staff informed is detailed in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Potential Staff Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A marked interest in the research was evident when, from a total of 450 staff, 359 attended staff meetings on the days when the surveys were completed and 337 completed the survey providing a broad coverage of staff. Of these, 63 consented to be contacted further about participating in a semistructured interview with the researcher.
Following discussions with teachers, they requested if a list of questions could be supplied and they participated in emailed surveys.

### 3.5.2 Sampling students

Given the intent to provide a relative assessment of the proportion of students who were from bi/multilingual homes, it was essential to screen as many students as possible through the initial survey. At all schools, all students from Years 7, 8, and 9 were given the opportunity to participate by completing the survey. This was undertaken using the Opt-Out approach under Sections 2.3.5 to 2.3.8 of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) ethical guidelines (Australian Government, 2014), as shown in Appendix C1 and detailed in Section 3.9 Ethics. This meant that parents/caregivers were only required to contact the school if they did not wish their student to participate in the research. Families were notified about the research in the schools’ newsletters and on their websites. Opportunities were also posted for families to come and speak individually with the researcher if they required further information about the processes. Potential student participants, by gender and school communities, are detailed in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the potential participant cohort was relatively evenly spread between male and female students. There were fewer students in Year 8 as this had been the first cohort to trial preparatory year in Queensland state schools in 2007, and a smaller group commenced in that first year (Queensland Government, 2014b). Following data collection, respondents were then identified as fitting into one of the
three study groups – those from monolingual English-speaking homes (English only, or EO), those classified by their school as EAL/D students (EAL/D), and those students who were not classified as EAL/D but who identified as being from bi/multilingual homes (Undefined).

The final stage of the analysis was through semistructured interviews that were undertaken with students from the Undefined group. The selection of interview participants occurred in a four-step process. Firstly, each school list of students in the Undefined group was shown to school liaisons. On advice from the schools, 58 students were not invited to participate in this phase of the research. The schools did not want any special education students or any students who were habitual truants or had identified behaviour issues to be approached for interviews. Secondly, where there were two students from the one family in the research group, only one of these students was invited. Several students from each year level at each school were sought to further assist in understanding the linguistic and cultural diversity amongst these students. Once agreed and lists of possible student interviewees were completed, the researcher was then able to take the final step and approach the students, provide the appropriate approvals and information paperwork, and await their responses. Table 3.5 reports those approached, those who declined, and those who accepted to participate in the interviews at each school.

Table 3.5 Outcomes from Requests for Student Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes to interview request</th>
<th>No to interview request</th>
<th>No reply to interview request</th>
<th>Not offered interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idstone</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 191 students approached, 84 families declined the offer on behalf of their students and a further 39 had not returned the consent form by the scheduled time for the interviews. Families approved the remainder, 68 (27.3%), participating in the interviews. These students were drawn from all schools, from both genders and from the three year levels. Of these 68 students, 11 males and 11 females were from Year 7,
11 males and 15 females from Year 8, and nine males and 11 females from Year 9 – a total of 31 males and 37 females. Figure 3.2 provides a summary of the sampling of staff and student participants in all aspects of the research.

The high participation rate in the completion of both the staff and student surveys allowed the gathering of comprehensive data relating to their school and classroom experiences.

### 3.6 Data-collection instruments

Data were collected through the two stages identified above – initial surveys and then emailed surveys/interviews. This process included both staff and students at each school. To ensure the process fitted into school timetables, the proposed data-collection processes were discussed with each school principal to ensure an efficient and effective process in individual schools. A summary of the design is shown in Table 3.6.
Table 3.6 Summary of Research Design, Associated Links to Analysis and RQs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Links to analysis</th>
<th>Links to RQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Discussion with principals re processes and time frames</td>
<td>Ensuring quality and timely data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Staff (n=4) and student (n=16) surveys piloted at one school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative data collection</td>
<td>Staff surveys</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
<td>Information from schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative data collection</td>
<td>Interviews with students</td>
<td>Emailed surveys with staff</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Integrated analysis of all data</td>
<td></td>
<td>RQs 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected through staff and student surveys, as well as by semistructured interviews with students and emailed qualitative surveys from teachers. Additionally, further personal, academic, and NAPLAN information was supplied by each school. Staff surveys collected information about the professional, teaching, and school-based knowledge of those who participated while student surveys were utilised to obtain the initial data set regarding characteristics of students from bi/multilingual homes. The subsequent student interview process, with a subset of participants from the survey stage, was designed to provide in-depth explorations of the issues raised by comments from the initial survey. Staff emailed survey responses further enhanced information gathered in the initial staff surveys. The information received from each school included notification if the student was a special education student, if students had been classified as having EAL/D, individual academic and NAPLAN results, and absences and behaviour notifications for each student.

3.6.1 Surveys

The first step in data collection used surveys to collect key information from both staff and students. Important aspects in the design and administration of surveys are the achievement of rich information along with good completion rates (Greenlaw & Brown-Welty, 2009; Hayslett & Wildemuth, 2004; Shih & Fan, 2009). A single-sided hard-copy survey was used for both staff and students, as it was felt that this would be easy to complete and thus allow a good opportunity for completion (Blaikie,
2000) and ultimately a good response rate. For staff, the opportunity was provided to complete the survey before the commencement of a staff meeting. For students, time was provided in class, during a defined week, and teacher support was available if needed.

3.6.1.1 Staff survey

The staff survey (see Appendix A1) was designed to capture insights into the professional backgrounds of staff as well as an appreciation of their understanding of working in CALD classrooms and schools. Opportunities, through open-response options, to report information gained from their classroom experiences, their knowledge of the school’s cultural and linguistic diversity, and enrolment processes were also given. The information covered by the survey is summarised in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 Information Requested on Staff Survey

| Demographic details | * name, age grouping, gender |
|                     | * country of birth, years in Australia |
|                     | * languages spoken other than English |
| Professional details | * role in school |
|                     | * years teaching, years teaching in current school |
|                     | * main teaching areas |
|                     | * knowledge of school enrolment processes generally |
| Individual EAL/D knowledge | * knowledge of EAL/D students in own school/own classes |
|                     | * professional development about EAL/D or any higher education on EAL/D |
|                     | * strategies used when teaching EAL/D students |
|                     | * difficulties encountered in CALD classrooms |
|                     | * knowledge of enrolment processes for EAL/D students |

The staff survey firstly sought details about each staff member and their experiences, as shown in Table 3.7, and then their views on classroom experiences with students from CALD backgrounds. They were also asked to relate the process of identifying these students on enrolment at the school. Teachers’ general knowledge in this area of teaching in CALD classrooms was sought as was detail as to whether they had received any tertiary education or have attended PD in this area.

3.6.1.2 Student survey

The student survey (see Appendix B1) was designed to be accessible for all students and thus the language used was simple SAE, with no technical jargon. The survey sought responses that provided details on the students’ background as well as
cultural and linguistic information about each student and their parents, with the
details collected summarised in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8 Information Requested on Student Survey

| Student demographic details | * year level
|                           | * age, gender
|                           | * country of birth, years in Australia
|                           | * any other language besides English spoken in the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* English competencies (speak, read, write the language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* difficulties in English (with speaking, reading, writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* if student has other language, competencies (speak, read, write the language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* any additional English language support, if so where and how long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Queensland EAL/D category, if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ demographic details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* countries of birth, years in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* competency in speaking in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* competencies in other language (speak, read, write)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey provided an opportunity for the students to share some school and
classroom experiences and to self-assess their skills in SAE. It also encouraged them
to nominate any other home language and to assess their proficiencies in this other
language as shown in Table 3.8. Students reported on their parents’ cultural and
linguistic heritage as well as proficiency in speaking English and speaking, reading,
and writing other languages.

3.6.2 Interviews

Some of the teachers participated by completing qualitative emailed surveys.
These were designed to provide rich information about some school processes and
teaching strategies and experiences in CALD teaching environments. Sixty-three staff
initially agreed, in their survey consent forms, to being approached to participate in
interviews. Of these 21 participated in emailed surveys. Following the selection
process, 68 students from the Undefined group received parental/carer permission to
participate in interviews. The student interviews were designed to extend the initial
school and student profiling provided through the survey process and to hear more of
the student voices in relation to school and classroom experiences.
3.6.2.1 Staff qualitative emailed surveys

Staff interviews were initially to be scheduled to fit in with work commitments. Because of the day-to-day school life, time schedules, and staff illnesses, personal interviews with the researcher were difficult to schedule. Following discussions with staff, the process was changed to a qualitative self-response emailed survey, thus providing staff with the issues that were to have been covered in the interviews, and allowing them to respond to these at their own convenience. Given that the planned interviews were probing for information regarding school processes and teaching strategies, rather than views and experiences that might be drawn out through an interview, the emailed process was seen as an effective way to facilitate the collection of detailed information across a wide range of staff. The researcher’s ability to remain flexible and adapt (Creswell, 2013) the research tool showed a sensitivity to the needs of the staff participants and ensured that some would be able to participate in the emailed surveys.

Each participant was sent details of the areas of inquiry and asked to respond as able. The areas, arising from the research questions, sought more detailed information about responses on the survey. All responses were open ended and asked the staff member to relate what processes occurred in their particular school community. The areas of inquiry and the question focus of the emailed survey are summarised in Table 3.9.
As outlined in Table 3.9, the survey structure was designed with a view of ascertaining staff members’ general knowledge about social and institutional practices (Blaikie, 2000), particularly enrolments and support of EAL/D students at their particular school. Teachers’ views and knowledge about teaching EAL/D students in a multicultural classroom were also sought. Detailed information about any attendance at PD or teacher education in the area of CALD school environments was also requested.

### 3.6.2.2 Student interviews

Interviews with students were scheduled so as not to interfere with the daily school routine. The purpose of the interview was to gain a deeper understanding of students’ cultural and linguistic heritage as well as the students’ classroom and schooling experiences – their lived experience (Seidman, 2013). The interview protocol took into consideration that the participants were students undertaking the interview at their school during school time. Care was taken not to have long questions (Bryman, 2006) and to ensure that there was only one aspect to each question. The interview had four areas of inquiry and these, and the associated focus topics, that centred on family, school, and classroom life are summarised in Table 3.10.
Table 3.10 Student Interview Focus Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of inquiry</th>
<th>Focus topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Culture/language  | • cultural background, any challenges at school because of their background  
                        • other home language and its importance  
                        • competencies in other home language (speak, read, write)  
                        • advantages/disadvantages in having two languages  
                        • students from same culture at school, language used with them and why this choice |
| School subjects   | • favourite subject/teacher – why student likes teacher, why likes subject  
                        • what are some of the ways that teacher teaches this subject that helps student  
                        • English – narrative writing task – is this easy or hard to do and reasons for this  
                        • English/Maths/Science – like subjects or not and reasons for answers  
                        • best ways student learns – what would student tell the teacher to do to help them learn different subjects |
| Enrolment         | • enrolment process used when enrolled at high school  
                        • anything about another home language written on form or asked in interview or when dropped forms to office |
| Future            | • future job/career thoughts, family’s feelings about potential career and if they will support student in that choice |

The interviews all occurred in a relaxed setting that allowed the researcher to frame the interview more as a conversation with each student rather than as a formal interview. Using open-ended response options allowed the participants to give as much, or as little, detail as they wished and this also allowed for follow up by the researcher as needed. Students were given time to reflect and expand on their answers as was appropriate.

3.6.3 Pilot study

Mackey and Gass (2005) commented that we want to make sure that the results of our study are valid. That is, we want them to reflect what we believe they reflect and that they are meaningful in the sense that they have significance not only to the population that was tested, but, at least for most experimental research, to a broader, relevant population (p. 106).

Like Mackey and Gass, Silverman (2011) saw validity as expressing the truth found in research. This, Creswell (2014a) suggested, could be found in “sound evidence to demonstrate that the intended test interpretation matches the proposed purpose of the test” (p. 14) or “whether a measure accurately captures ‘reality’” (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 280). To ensure the validity of the data collected, a pilot study of the staff and
student was undertaken via surveys at Brightwell school during the final week of the school year in 2014, thus before the commencement of data collection.

To replicate the planned research procedures (Fink, 2006), selected staff (four) completed their surveys before a staff meeting while the students (16) completed theirs during a Year 9 Mathematics class. These students would not be participants in the research as they would be in Year 10 the following year. Of the four staff who completed the pilot survey, only one was at the school the following year when the surveys were completed and he did not participate. These small groups closely resembled the larger school cohort that was to be involved in the research (Ruane, 2005).

The resultant information from the completed pilot surveys appeared to be accurate and reliable (Creswell, 2014a; Fink, 2006). Reliability, as suggested by Creswell (2014a), “is a means of consistency” (p. 159) and the potential for this was affirmed in the feedback received from the pilot study participants. The use of these surveys therefore should allow for repeated administrations of the same and thereby produce a “degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observers on different occasions” (Silverman, 2011, p. 290), thus generating reliability about the survey tools utilised. Listening to and acting on comments from staff and student pilot study participants helped to build trust within the school communities and this would assist in capturing the truth from each of the research participants, thus helping to consolidate trustworthiness between the researcher and participants (O’Leary, 2014).

Following feedback from staff and students, the researcher made only minor changes to both forms based on this feedback (Creswell, 2009; Davies, 2007). Formatting on the students’ survey, such as additional tick boxes to save students needing to write the answers, were added. The addition of space for staff to write their email addresses was the only change suggested for the staff form – this inclusion allowed staff to be more easily contactable. This initial feedback suggested that the information sought in this research would be meaningful and on reflection have significance to the schools that were involved in the research (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The appropriate modifications were completed on both forms.
3.7 Data-collection procedures

The same overall process was used in all schools for the collection of staff and students’ surveys and the organisation of interviews. This included initial contact, approvals, and planning for each interview in line with agreed ethical processes. The general processes for data collection from staff and student surveys, student interviews, and staff emailed surveys are outlined in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11 Summary of the Data-collection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Quantitative data</th>
<th>Qualitative data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>- Staff (n=337)</td>
<td>- Staff (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students (n=2,484)</td>
<td>- Students classified as Undefined as being from bi/multilingual homes (n=68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>- Staff – staff meeting, completed surveys at the beginning of it.</td>
<td>- Staff – emailed surveys protocols developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collected by researcher/school liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students – process occurred over a designated week. Undertaken in class by</td>
<td>- Students - semistructured interview protocols developed for students classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom teacher using a prepared script. Returned to HOD and sealed in</td>
<td>as Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>envelopes. Collected by researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>- Staff – appropriate information and permission paperwork to staff</td>
<td>- Staff – appropriate permissions obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerations</td>
<td>- Students – appropriate information and permission paperwork to families/carers.</td>
<td>- Students – offers of interviews only to students from Undefined group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of the Opt Out system.</td>
<td>Abridged Information and Consent forms to parents/carers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After meeting with each school principal, a liaison person was nominated for each school. In three schools, the contact was a Head of a Department (HOD), in one a Guidance Officer (GO), and in the final school a Deputy Principal (DP). The liaison provided a link between the researcher and the school. They also provided access to the school in general, access to school information, an understanding of the school’s information technology processes, the setting up of staff meetings and any other meetings or appointments that were needed, as well as liaison between the researcher and school families and students. This was important for the school to ensure that their...
responsibilities were respected and it facilitated smooth linkages between the researcher and the school.

3.7.1 Staff surveys

The staff surveys were completed within a scheduled staff meeting. At the beginning of the meeting, the researcher briefed staff about the research. As stakeholders, staff showed interest as to the purpose of the research and the potential outcomes and benefits for their school communities. At all schools, the surveys were completed at the beginning of a staff meeting and, on completion, were placed in a box at the front of the room which was sealed on completion of the collection, thus maintaining the confidentiality of respondents. The collection of survey information from staff, outlined in Table 3.11, was completed before that of the students to ensure a separation between these processes.

3.7.2 Student surveys

With the assistance of each school liaison, appropriate contact was made with parents/carers (email, newsletters, or letters home) and times were determined for administering the surveys in line with agreed ethical approval processes. The liaison person from each school was asked if the information for parents/carers needed to be translated into other known home languages. In all instances, schools responded that they believed that this would not be necessary. While these communication processes were being run in individual schools, the researcher met with the relevant HOD administering the student survey and explained the process to be used during the collection week. Appropriate numbers of class sets, each containing a copy of the Process for Administering the Student Survey (Appendix B2) for teachers and the Student Surveys (Appendix B1) were prepared.

After collection of completed surveys, sorting and checking of each form was undertaken. Care was taken to double check the list of students who did not have parental consent to participate in the research. If any surveys had completed inadvertently, it was destroyed and thus deleted from the process. Information on the forms was checked and if any student’s information was unclear, they were added to the class list for a follow-up meeting with the researcher. Each school was revisited on several occasions to speak with students who had been away and to have them complete the survey, to seek clarification from others about some of the information
that had been written on the form, or to speak with those who had indicated that they were from bi/multilingual homes. The returned surveys were sorted alphabetically, by year level, in preparation for aligning with provided additional school information that was collected and collated alphabetically by year level.

3.7.3 Staff interview by emailed survey

Staff had consented to participating in a semistructured interview when giving approvals at the time they completed the staff surveys. When these 63 staff were contacted most replied in the negative to proceed with the interview. The remaining 21, who agreed to proceed through an emailed survey (Appendix A5) as this was felt to be the most time efficient process for them, were reminded of the permissions they gave when completing the survey and were then emailed details of the questions. Staff were requested to provide typed responses to each question immediately after each question. When completed, the emailed surveys were returned to the researcher, one of which is shown as Appendix A6. As each completed document was received, it was printed out and an identification code (ID) applied to the staff member’s responses. An email reply was sent to each staff member, thanking them for their participation. Because no transcription was needed in these situations, no member checking (Stake, 2006) transaction was necessary.

3.7.4 Student interviews

Only students who were classified as Undefined (i.e., as being from bi/multilingual homes by their schools) were included in the interview process. Once consent was received, arrangements were made with each school for appropriate times and locations to undertake student interviews. The settings used were a range of quiet private places appropriate for the interview to take place (Braun & Clarke, 2013). These varied with each school but were, in all cases, a quiet private space such as the staff room or a designated office in the administration building. All interviews were limited to less than 30 minutes. All were held during school time with agreed time out of class for students. Students were told at the beginning of the interviews that the interviews were to be recorded (see Ethics Section 3.9). They were also shown the signed consent form that had been received from their parents/caregivers.

Recognising the importance of establishing a relationship with the students (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Bryman, 2006; Di Cicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Orcher,
2005) an initial process to put the students at ease was used. Each student was greeted in their other nominated home language with initial conversation around their home culture. This helped to make them feel at ease and showed that the researcher valued their culture (Seidman, 2013). The interview questions are attached as Appendix B3.

After the initial introduction, each student was reminded of what they had previously completed in their survey form. Each was given clear instructions (Bryman, 2006) as to what would be taking place in the interview and were told they could ask questions or stop the process at any time. The interviews followed the same structure, moving through the interview protocol with additional clarification occurring as appropriate. After the final question, all students were asked if they wished to make any further comments. After each student was thanked, they were then farewelled in their other nominated home language. One transcribed interview is attached as Appendix B4. All of this data collection complied with ethics requirements.

### 3.8 Data management and analysis

A formal structure and processes were developed to ensure efficient and rigorous data management and analysis. The processes used are summarised in Table 3.12 and detailed in the following sections. Given the exploratory objective of this research, the data analysis adopted a strong descriptive approach, both with the survey (quantitative) and interview (qualitative) data accessed. The focus of the analysis was on describing responses and drawing out patterns.
To maintain student confidentiality, each student record was identified with the following coding – gender (M/F), the pseudonymic name of the school (name in full), Year level (7, 8, 9) and an ID (ID 9999). Staff were identified in a similar fashion using a school name and an individual ID number. By following the outlined data management and analysis processes in all aspects of the data management, as shown in Table 3.12, staff and student data confidentiality were ensured. The following section details the processes used for both quantitative and qualitative data.

### 3.8.1 Quantitative data preparation and analysis

#### 3.8.1.1 Surveys and school information coding

Coding is a fundamental element of quantitative research where codes are seen as the assigning of a “symbolic meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 71). The coding of the survey information ensured privacy and confidentiality, which is of paramount importance as this de-identified schools and participants. Code books for staff and student responses were prepared with these aligned for efficiency.

Once data entry for students from a school had been completed, the surveys were sorted manually and students who selected EO were separated from the rest. From the information offered by each school, it was then possible to sort the remaining surveys into two groups – those classified EAL/D students and others who...
reported that they were from bi/multilingual homes (Undefined). The surveys from Undefined students, were further examined for clarification regarding languages spoken at home. Once satisfied that the information was correct, to the best of each student’s ability, any changes in information were completed. The surveys were sorted numerically by school as some of these students would be considered for the next phase of this research, the semistructured interviews.

In addition to the information collected through the surveys, schools made available student data including whether students were classified as EAL/D students and also school academic and NAPLAN results. Schools also indicated the students who were supported by their special education units. School information and student surveys were matched through unique ID codes. The student cover sheet had the individual student’s name on it; however, once the ID code was added the cover sheet was removed. This coding and the removal of all cover sheets de-identified all students in future analysis.

Similar processes to those used for the students were used for coding and de-identifying staff. Staff who had consented to being considered for interviews later were removed from the numerically sorted staff surveys so that they could be considered for next phase of the research.

3.8.1.2 Data cleaning

Aday and Cornelius (2006) defined data cleaning as “the process for detecting and correcting errors during the computerisation of survey data” (p. 348). The handling of missing data adhered to all safeguards (George & Mallery, 2001; Hall, 2008; O’Leary, 2014) outlined in Section 3.9 Ethics. Staff and students who chose not to participate were initially coded as non-participants. Creswell (2008) suggested that it was appropriate to eliminate participants who did not complete the whole data set. Given the substantial number of participants, this elimination was undertaken. Thus, the 22 staff who attended the staff meeting but did not complete the survey, along with 140 non-participant students, were removed from their respective databases. Both the staff and the student databases, which had been compiled on an Excel spreadsheet, were uploaded to SPSS v24 and then checked to ensure that all data fell within the variable range (Creswell, 2009). All variables were also checked to ensure all were entered as numeric values for use in analysis. The rechecking of school and participant
information ensured that all were coded appropriately, thus ensuring the de-
identification of both the settings and all participants. Data cleaning ensured that the
two databases for the quantitative material were sound before beginning data analysis
(Gray, 2009).

3.8.1.3 Data analysis

Data analysis was undertaken using SPSS v24. The use of the descriptive
statistics element in this program allowed analysis through cross-tabulations and
frequencies and this allowed comparison checking. Once the staff and student data
files were ready for analysis, data relevant to each aspect of the research were
analysed. Initially, the frequencies component was used to establish the base
information about students in each school. The use of frequencies also ensured that all
participants were counted as the reporting would produce any that were missing. Once
this was established, cross-tabulations were utilised to enhance this information and
help to gain a deep understanding of the characteristics of the students in this research.
Where more information was need about a particular situation, additional variables
were added and data entered as required. From this information, it was then possible to
create appropriate tables and graphs.

No inferential statistics were undertaken. Firstly, this study takes a whole
population focus with a very large proportion (94.7%) participating from the five
schools. Additionally, the group of interest, the Unidentified students, represented a
much smaller but very diverse group, culturally and linguistically and their skill levels
with the data used based on self-reporting – whether through the surveys or
interviews. It was felt that to understand this group, the researcher needed to stay very
close to the data to capture the meanings of the responses, given that much of the
variation seen will be due to personal differences rather than cultural backgrounds. For
example, while students were asked to describe their own capacity in English on a
rating scale from “Very Well” to Not Very Well”, it is recognised that there will be
differences in such assessments across respondents with different students placing
different meanings on the terms, particularly VW and W. Thus, in the associated
analysis, discussion is primarily of Good (aggregated from VW and W), Average and
NVW, these being more realistic separations, thus recognising that some students
might either place or not place themselves in the VW category.
3.8.2 Qualitative data collection, preparation and analysis

Creswell (2014a) stated that there are several steps involved in collecting, preparing and analysing qualitative data and these include “preparing and organizing the data, exploring and coding the data base, describing findings and exploring themes” (p. 260). The following (Figure 3.3) shows the steps used in the preparation and analysis of qualitative data in this study.

![Diagram of data collection process]

**Figure 3.3.** Process for collection, preparation, analysis of qualitative information (adapted from Creswell, 2014a)

### 3.8.2.1 Data collection and preparation

All student interviews were recorded. Once a session was completed with students, the researcher transcribed each interview from that session. A verbatim approach was used, one “that is without grammatical or other ‘tidying up’” (Silverman, 2011, p. 366) thus capturing the words spoken but without using any of the detail required for a full conversational analysis. Following the initial transcription, the text was reread to check details. The emailed survey responses received from staff had been typed by them individually onto a Word document therefore no transcription of checking was required.

The information was typed on to an Excel spreadsheet, which had been headed with the relevant interview questions and columns had been inserted for coded student
identification. After the completion of an individual transcription, the researcher printed out the information and then listened to the recorded interview again to check that it had been transposed correctly. Any errors or omissions were rectified.

3.8.2.2 Data analysis

Extensive data were collected through student interviews and staff emailed surveys. A thematic approach was used for the analysis of each set of data. This analysis followed the guidelines from Creswell (2014a) with the steps undertaken are outlined in Figure 3.3 above and detailed below.

Hand analysis

A hand analysis, described by Creswell (2014a) as one which “means that the researchers read the data, mark it by hand and divide it in to parts” (p.263) was then undertaken. By using this manual method of analysis, the researcher was able to stay close to the material. Being able to manually-handle the material, rather than trying to “see” the information on a computer monitor was affirmed by Saldana (2016) when he stated that

There is something to be said for a large area of desk or table space with each code written on its own index card or “sticky note”, or multiple pages or strips of paper, spread out and arranged into appropriate clusters to see the smaller pieces of the larger puzzle – a literal, “old school” perspective not always possible on a computer’s monitor screen. (p. 30)

The first step in this analysis of rereading the material several times, from both groups, gave the researcher a deeper knowledge and understanding of the information gathered. As a part of this process, the researcher was able to highlight certain parts of the information and to write various comments in the margins of the printed-out material as each was reviewed. This meant that as well as identifying key point in relation to the identified codes, key statements were identified for use in the final reporting.

Coding

The next step was to code all responses. Saldana (2016) described how, “a code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a
portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 4). As recognised by Saldana and also Creswell (2014a), this coding process may be iterative – the case in this study. By utilising a coding process, Creswell (2014a) suggested that this would “develop a more general picture of the data – descriptions and themes” (p. 261).

Saldana further suggested that “your choice of coding method(s) and even a provisional list of codes should be determined beforehand (deductive) to harmonize with your study’s conceptual framework, paradigm or research goals. But emergent, data-driven (inductive) coding are also legitimate” (p. 75). This research worked from predetermined themes linked to key aspects of the Research Questions and thus reflected in the interview protocol with sub themes then identified through the coding process. The themes for the staff data were education and professional development, school enrolments, and teaching in CALD classes. Student data themes were related to their cultural heritage, schooling, educational experiences, enrolment at high school, English language support and their learning styles and strategies used to help them at school. This approach gave a systematic process for the linkage of responses to the themes. As suggested by Auerback and Silverstein, (2003), a copy of the themes was clearly visible throughout the coding process. Although initial themes had been predetermined for coding, it was also important to remain flexible and add additional themes if any unexpected ones surfaced.

Hand coding using hard copies of transcripts was undertaken. While progressing through interview transcripts, colour coding for each general theme area was applied where appropriate to each of the printed-out copies. From this initial round of coding, responses from staff and students were then sorted in to the above thematic areas and were further coded into sub themes. Saldana (2016) referred to a sub code as a “second-order tag assigned after a primary code to detail or enrich the entry, depending on the volume of data you have or specificity you may need for categorization and data analysis” (p. 91). Four sub themes were developed to help gain a deeper appreciation of the information supplied by staff particularly in relation to CALD school environments and classes. These were preservice teacher education, ongoing school PD and teaching strategies used in CALD classes as well as difficulties faced in such classes. From the student responses, 12 sub themes were coloured coded to highlight some aspects of their responses. These sub themes were centred on the use of their other language at school and any impact on learning and
their school subjects and their teachers. The other sub themes focussed on how they learn in their classes and assistance from teachers that helped with their learning and how they felt they learn best. This descriptive coding and organising of the information into each of the themes and sub themes allowed the collected information to be prepared for reporting.

3.9 Ethics

The initial design of the student survey required a full cohort response to allow identification of the group of previously Undefined students from bi/multilingual homes. To achieve this, the Opt-Out approach under Sections 2.3.5 to 2.3.8 of the National Health and Medical Research Guidelines (Australian Government, 2014) (Appendix C1) introduced March 2014, was used. This approval meant that permissions were not required from all parents/carers for students to participate in the survey; rather, parents had the opportunity to respond if they did not wish their child to participate. Involvement in this research carried no more than “low risk” under Sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 of these guidelines and all other aspects of Section 2.3.6 were addressed in the ethics application.

Ethics approval was first obtained from Griffith University Human Research Ethics with the Approval Reference No: EDN/21/14/HREC (Appendix C2) and then through Head Office, Education Queensland Ref No 550/27/1509 (Appendix C3). When approached, each school was given a copy of Education Queensland’s principal’s letter (Appendix C4), the Education Queensland Approval letter (Appendix C3), Griffith University’s Ethics Approval (Appendix C4), and a project summary letter about the research (Appendix C5). Once approval was forthcoming from a school, a letter of approval to conduct the research (Appendix C6) was signed off by the principal affirming that decision and acknowledging that the research involved both staff and students.

Before conducting the research, informed consent was needed from all participants (Berg, 2007; Bogden & Bilken, 1998; Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2009; Hall, 2008). Potential participants (and parents/caregivers in the case of students) were given appropriate documentation. This outlined the study and the aims of the research as well as the process to be used and any risks that it may or may not incur (Fontana & Frey, 2000; Johnson & Christensen, 2004). It also included a statement that
confidentiality would be maintained at all times thus allowing “participants to retain ownership of their voices and exert their independence in making decisions” (Creswell, 2009, p.90). Agreement was then reached with parents/caregivers for the children’s involvement in this research. Under Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund, n.d), one is encouraged to respect the views of the child and to acknowledge that they can have their views and express their opinions, and this occurred in this research.

The staff survey (Appendix A1) had an Identification and Consent Form (Appendix A2) attached as the cover sheet and all staff were given an Information Sheet (Appendix A3) to keep which contained all the information about the research. Completed staff surveys were placed in a secured box and collected by the researcher. After an individual identification code had been written on the survey and onto the consent form, the latter was removed and filed away from the survey to keep the individual surveys anonymous.

Similar processes were employed for student surveys (Appendix B1). For this initial phase of the research, all parents/carers received an Information Sheet (Appendix B5) which set out all the relevant information about the research, and a Consent through Opt Out Form (Appendix B6). An Identification Sheet was attached to the front of each student survey (Appendix B1). Returned surveys were placed in boxes and each was secured for the researcher to collect. An individual identification code was written on all surveys and onto the identification form. The latter was removed and filed away from the surveys to keep the individual surveys anonymous. When it was necessary to link school information to individual students, the filed identification forms were checked and matched and the code written on the school material for linking with the surveys. Confidentiality was maintained at all times.

Completed staff emailed survey documents were emailed to the researcher by individual staff from each school. These documents were printed out, matched to the staff member’s survey and coded. The emailed forms were copied and stored on a flash drive that was secured in a locked university filing cabinet. All staff online survey emails were then deleted from the university’s email system. Individual consent was required from parents for the students selected to participate in the
semistructured interviews and an abridged Information Sheet (Appendix B7) and a Consent Form (Appendix B8) were mailed or emailed to these families and, in some instances, were also given to the students. All staff and student surveys, all interview transcripts, copies of Word interview transcripts on a flash drive, and interview recordings were secured in a locked filing cabinet within a secured office space at the university to which only the researcher and her supervisors had access.

3.10 Summary

Having set out the research questions and design, identified the settings and participants, and completed the data-collection instruments, it was then possible to enable the data-collection processes in each school. Processes were enacted to allow for the management of all information and the subsequent analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. All of these processes complied with all ethical requirements. Once all the information was collected and analysed, processing the results, which would assist in answering the research questions, was undertaken. These results are examined in the next two chapters.
Chapter 4: Results – Students in the classroom

4.1 Introduction

This exploratory study examines the learning environment and experiences of students from bi/multilingual homes in Queensland state high schools. The research is focused through four research questions. Questions leading this study firstly focus on the students and their classroom-based experiences and then a broader perspective on the school and pedagogical environment. This chapter reports on the findings from RQ 1 and 2.

RQ 1  What are the characteristics of students, in Queensland state high schools, who are from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 2  What school and classroom experiences, relevant to learning, are reported by students who are undefined by their school communities as being from bi/multilingual homes?

It firstly introduces the school communities and then profiles the students from information received from their completed surveys. Further, several students self-selected to participate in semistructured interviews; through these interviews, they shared some of their school and classroom learning experiences.

4.2 School communities

This section introduces the respondents and their school communities, noting variations in school size and level of socio-educational advantage. Five state high school communities, Brightwell, Idstone, Aston, Chinnor, and Henley, with geographical locations across southeast Queensland, participated in this research. Table 4.1 profiles each participating school from the information provided by My School (ACARA, 2017).
This shows that the included school communities cover a range of socio-educational advantage, from those with relatively low ICSEA levels (Idstone) to higher ICSEA levels (Chinnor). The schools also range in size, from small (Henley) to mid (Brightwell), to larger (Aston) schools, all of which identified as having a cultural mix of students as shown by the ATSI and LBOTE information in Table 4.1. The following section profiles the cohorts of student participants at these schools, with details of the staff presented in Chapter 5.

4.3 Students

The first step in this research (addressing RQ 1) was to determine the characteristics of students, in the Queensland state school sector, who were from bi/multilingual homes. Ultimately, 2,484 students from Years 7, 8, and 9 participated in the study – 94.7% of the total population. The distribution of these students by school, gender, and year level are presented in Table 4.2.

The high student participation rate of 94.7% was spread evenly across the five school communities. Similar proportions of male and female participants were seen with a slightly higher proportion of males 1,332 (53.6%) to females 1,152 (46.4%). Student participation occurred evenly across all schools and all three year levels within each school. From Year 7 there were 923 participants, 918 from Year 9, and 643 from Year 8. The lower number for Year 8 occurred because it was the first group, across
Queensland, to undertake formal preparatory schooling some years prior and was thus a smaller intake.

Table 4.2 Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idstone</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. 88 males and 52 females did not participate either because of lack of consent from parents (n= 48) or absence (n= 92) resulting in 94.7% of students completing surveys.*

Profiles of the students in each group were developed from the survey information provided including birthplaces for students and families, languages spoken at home, students’ ratings of their language competencies and any additional English language support in their schools. Additionally, information received from each school included the number of absences and any behaviour issues for each student, academic results in English, Mathematics, and Science, and NAPLAN results for each year level.

4.3.1 Language grouping

This initial student information gave some insight into the cultural and linguistic diversity within the individual school communities. Figure 4.1 profiles the composition of each school population showing the proportion of students classified as EO, EAL/D, or Undefined.
Chapter 4: Results – Students in the classroom

Figure 4.1 shows that of the students surveyed, 1,974 (79.5%) indicated that only English (EO) was spoken in their homes. Another 261 (10.5%) were classified by their schools as EAL/D students. The remaining 249 (10.0%) also recorded they were from bi/multilingual homes – thus were labelled for this study as Undefined. Students at Aston were predominantly EO – 518 (86.2%) – with a further 61 (10.1%) of the cohort being in the Undefined group. The percentage of students classified by their individual schools as having EAL/D ranged from 22 (3.7%) at Aston to 45 (18.7%) at Henley, in the junior secondary classes at these schools. Brightwell classified 52 (13.5%) of its students as EAL/D, yet a further 65 (16.9%) were Undefined.

### 4.3.2 Education Queensland potential EAL/D students by cultural groups

Under Education Queensland guidelines, alignment with different cultural heritage groups is used in making a definition of EAL/D. The alignment of students within these cultural heritage groups is presented in Table 4.3, showing the main cultural heritage backgrounds nominated by the students included in the study.
Table 4.3 Student Alignment with Education Queensland EAL/D Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Queensland category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/Temporary visa holder</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of previous migrants – language other than English at home</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born students educated overseas in language besides English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of deaf parents using AUSLAN at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students nominated a range of categories with which they identified. While these findings reflect the cultural diversity of the students, they do not necessarily define the linguistic diversity or capabilities of individual students. Students who identified with the Maori/Pacific Islander cultures numbered 220 (8.9% of cohort) with a further 128 (5.2%) identifying as a child of a previous migrant and living in a home where another language is spoken.

4.3.3 Regions of birth

Students nominated the countries where they were born and these 52 countries of birth were grouped into regions – Australia, New Zealand (NZ) and Pasifika, Asia, Africa, and other regions. This information, presented by percentage of each group by regions of birth, is shown in Figure 4.2.
The majority of students (84.9%), were born in Australia, with another 6.8% born in New Zealand and Pasifika nations. Within the EAL/D group, 27.2% were born in Asian countries with another 13.8% born in New Zealand and Pasifika nations. A further 13.0% of the EAL/D students were born in Africa; however, 36.8% of the EAL/D group were born in Australia. For those students in the Undefined group, the majority (58.2%) were born in Australia and a further 30.9% were born in New Zealand or Pasifika nations. With most of the students (84.9%) in this study being born in Australia, an understanding of how long they had lived in here was then required to establish their years in the education system in this country.

### 4.3.4 Years in Australia

All students reported the number of years they had lived in Australia by marking “All of Life” or the appropriate number of years. Results for the three groups, presented in Figure 4.3, provide details of the time students had resided in Australia.

As Figure 4.3 illustrates, the majority (84.3%) of the students had lived their whole lives in Australia with only a small percentage (5.5%) living here for fewer than five years. Students from the EO group reported that 94.2% of them had lived in Australia all of their lives, as had 36.8% of the EAL/D group and 56.2% of the Undefined group. Those from the EO group who had not resided in Australia all of their lives came primarily from the UK and the USA with a few also from European and African countries. A further 1.6% of the EO group, 10.3% of the EAL/D group, and 10.8% of the Undefined group had lived here for more than 10 years. Most
students had spent the majority of their lives in Australia and in an Australian education system.

4.3.5 English language competencies

Students’ self-assessed their English language competencies. These are summarised in Table 4.4 profiling the three groups – EO, EAL/D, and Undefined.

Table 4.4 Students’ Self-assessed English Language Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-assessed components</th>
<th>Student group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>VW/W combined</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>NVW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. VW=Very Well; W=Well; Av=Average; NVW=Not Very Well*

To aid discussion, the categories of VW and W were also aggregated, thus providing three comparative categories reflecting competencies of above average (i.e., VW/W), average, and poor (i.e., NVW). The responses show that the majority of the students assessed their English language skills as above average in all areas – speaking 93.4%, reading 86.8%, and writing 84.0%. Additionally, the results showed that these students believed that they were far more proficient in speaking than they were in reading, with writing indicated as their least proficient skill.

Looking at the aggregated VW and W rating scores for EO and EAL/D groups respectively, it can be seen that a higher proportion of EO students reported at this level than did the EAL/D students in speaking (94.7% and 81.9%), to reading (87.5% and 80.8%), and in writing (84.4% and 78.1%). The Undefined group reported 93.2% at the VW/W levels in speaking but a lower 86.8% in reading and 86.7% in writing. Of note, when the self-assessed skill levels within the three groups are compared, EO
had the highest level of speaking and reading, but the Undefined group reported the highest for writing and the smallest range (93.2% to 86.7%) over the three skills.

While this may suggest that the Undefined group have superior skills, it also may be that the three groups are rating their competence against different levels of personal expectations – with the EO students setting a higher personal standard. The high rating of oral proficiency that the students have attributed in their English language assessments may also be noted here.

### 4.3.6 Other home languages besides English

Students nominated any other languages besides English that were spoken in their homes and the 52 languages and dialects identified were then collated into six language regions. Twenty-five students reported that they were from multilingual homes. None of the students said that they spoke the second other home language, so all were treated in this study as being from bilingual homes.

The number of homes arranged by these language group regions of Maori, Pasifika, Asian, European, African, and other areas are summarised in Figure 4.4.

![Figure 4.4. Regions of other languages besides English spoken in students' homes.](image)

As illustrated in Figure 4.4, within the EAL/D group, 90 (34.4% of this group) reported Asian languages spoken in their homes while 64 (24.5%) reported Maori/Pasifika languages. A further 58 (22.2%) students in this group shared African languages in their homes. In contrast, from the Undefined group, the Maori/Pasifika
and European languages spoken in the homes were the least identified. Of these, 123 (49.4%) were students from Maori/Pasifika home and 59 (23.7%) were from European heritage. From the Maori/Pasifika families, 79 (64.2%) of the 123 reported the use of the Maori language, making it by far the largest cultural group in the Undefined students.

In recognition that a student’s ability to speak, read, and write their other home language may influence their learning, students were asked to self-assess their speaking, reading, and writing competencies in their other home language (see Figure 4.5).

![Figure 4.5. Students' skills in (a) speaking, (b) reading, (c) writing other language.](image-url)
These data suggest that the students from the EAL/D group were more reliant on their home languages. More reported that they spoke, read, and wrote their other home language in the VW and W categories than did students in the Undefined group. In contrast, there are more students in the Undefined group who reported that they did “Not at all” speak, read, or write their other home language. Within the EAL/D group, several (n=20, 7.7%) reported that they did not speak this other home language at all, 65 (24.9%) did not read it and 87 (33.3%) did not write it. Students in this group, however, reported higher numbers at the VW and W levels for those who spoke, read or wrote this other home language. These groups were broken down further into regional language groups, as shown in Table 4.5, where VW/W have been aggregated, as has NVW/No, to show the upper and lower levels of the competencies.

Table 4.5 Students’ Self-assessed Other Home Language Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language region</th>
<th>EAL/D</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Undefined</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>VW/W</td>
<td>NVW/No</td>
<td>% of regional</td>
<td>VW/W</td>
<td>NVW/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>language group</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori/Pasifika</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori/Pasifika</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: VW=Very Well; W=Well; Av=Average; NVW=Not Very Well; No=Not at all

From the information in Table 4.5, it appears that students across all language regions in the EAL/D group speak, read, or write their other home languages at a much higher level than those in the Undefined group. Proficiency levels in speaking...
were higher for both groups than were their proficiencies in reading or writing their other home language.

To gauge usage of the other home language, students nominated the amount of time this other language was spoken in their homes. This time is shown in Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.6. Percentage usage of other language in homes.

From the combined EAL/D and Undefined groups, only 46 (9.0%) reported that this nominated language was spoken 90% or 100% of the time at home. Many, 175 (34.3%), predominantly from the Undefined group, indicated that it was spoken for only 10% of the time. To compare home language usage, the time it was spoken in the homes was summarised as more or less than 50%. Table 4.6 presents this information by language region groups.

Table 4.6 Percentage of Time Other Language Spoken in Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Language region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>&lt;50%</th>
<th>&gt;50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAL/D n=261</td>
<td>Maori/Pasifika</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined n=249</td>
<td>Maori/Pasifika</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This shows that in 153 (58.6%) of the EAL/D group homes, students’ other home language was spoken for more than 50% of home time; in contrast, only 35 (14.1%) of the students in the Undefined group stated that this other language was spoken for more than 50% of home time. From the combined groups, 322 (63.1%) of students reported that their other language was spoken in their homes for less than 50% of the time. From the EAL/D students’ group, this occurred in 108 (41.4%) of their homes, while 214 students (85.9%) from the Undefined group reported that their other language was only spoken about 10% of the time at home. Of those in the Undefined group, across all language region groups, the majority spoke this other language for less than 50% of home time. In the Maori/Pasifika group, 63 are classified as EALD and a further 123 as Undefined and in 137 (73.6%) of these homes, their other home languages are spoken for less than 50% of the time.

All but 66 (12.9%) of these students from bi/multilingual homes (EALD, n=20, Undefined n=46) speak their other home languages with varying degrees of self-assessed proficiencies. It would appear that students from the EAL/D group utilise and are more proficient with these other home languages than those students in the Undefined group.

4.3.7 Absences and behaviour notifications

Another aspect of the students’ context that was taken into consideration was their recorded absences and behaviour notifications. Access was given to data showing the number of days that students had been absent during 2015. As well, the number of times students had been documented on One School for behaviour issues was also made available. Absences are reported in Table 4.7, while behaviour notifications are presented in Figure 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days absent 2015 (% of responses)</th>
<th>EAL/D n=261</th>
<th>Undefined n=249</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;10</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;30</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this, it may be seen that the information across the two groups is similar, although slightly more students are seen with fewer than five days absence in the EAL/D group than in the Undefined group (39.4% and 24.3% respectively). A higher
proportion of students in the latter group had 20+ days absent. These reported absences were then further broken down into the language region groups by the EAL/D and Undefined groups and presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Student Absences by Language Region Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># days absent</th>
<th>&lt;5</th>
<th>5&lt;10</th>
<th>10&lt;20</th>
<th>20&lt;30</th>
<th>30+</th>
<th>EAL/D</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>5&lt;10</th>
<th>10&lt;20</th>
<th>20&lt;30</th>
<th>30+</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>5&lt;10</th>
<th>10&lt;20</th>
<th>20&lt;30</th>
<th>30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori/Pasifika Asian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4.8, the students with an Asian heritage, in both groups, showed the lowest level of absences with 52.2% from the EAL/D group and 31.0% from the Undefined group having fewer than five days absence during 2015. Students from the Maori and Pasifika groups had the highest absentee rates of more than 20 days in both groups (EALD 38.1%, Undefined 32.5%). While these data are suggestive of different cultural patterns, information was not available as to whether the students had taken extended leave (e.g., gone back to home countries), had been sick, or were on suspension from school.

In Queensland, all behaviour issues that fall within the school reporting guidelines are recorded on the One School database. Schools have guidelines as to what may be documented, but the actual types of instances recorded are confidential. The number of behaviour notifications for 2015 are shown in Figure 4.7 for students across the three groups.
These results in Figure 4.7 show a relatively low level of behaviour notification within all three groups. In the EO group, 83.9% of students had fewer than five incidents written up and only 8.4% recorded more than 10 reports. The Undefined group had 87.5% of the group with fewer than five incidents and 6.0% with more than 10 notifications, slightly less than those in the EAL/D group which recorded 83.5% with fewer than five incidents but 9.7% with more than 10 incidents.

Both the EAL/D and the Undefined groups were divided further into regional language groups. This allowed for comparison by groups and by the EAL/D and Undefined students within them. Respective behaviour notifications for 2015 are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 Student Behaviour Notifications by Language Region Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># behaviour notifications</th>
<th>EAL/D</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>% of language region group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori/Pasifika Asian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74.6 11.1 9.5 3.2 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96.7 1.1 1.1 0.0 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.3 3.8 0.0 3.8 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77.6 10.3 10.3 0.0 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62.5 12.5 4.2 4.2 16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the EAL/D group, the majority (n=226, 83.5%) of the students recorded fewer than five reported behaviour notifications, but a slightly higher percentage...
(n=219, 87.5%) in the Undefined group reported this low notification. The majority of students, from both the EAL/D and the Undefined groups, and across all language regions, had a low number of behaviour notifications on school records.

4.3.8 Academic and NAPLAN results

All schools record academic and NAPLAN results for every student on the One School database. Students undertake formal academic assessment each half semester and these are in all subject areas across all year levels. Annually, all Australian students in Years 7 and 9 undergo the NAPLAN tests which assess students’ outcomes for reading, writing, spelling, grammar, and numeracy. Though NAPLAN results are primarily used to compare information about like schools, they also record individual student results from literacy and numeracy tests.

4.3.8.1 Academic and NAPLAN results

The academic results for Semester 1 2015 (see Appendix D1) show student results for English, Mathematics and Science. There are some variations in performance between the English and the Mathematics/Science groups of results with students appearing to achieve higher results in the latter groups. When the EAL/D and Undefined groups’ academic results were explored further, the performances in these groups were similar to those of the total cohort.

NAPLAN results for 2015, in the areas of literacy and numeracy for the whole cohort of students, were accessed. Results for the three year levels for the EAL/D and Undefined groups, showing the proportion of each cohort that scored below national minimum standards (BNMS), are presented in Table 4.10. More detailed results are attached as Appendix D2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Student group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of assessed components by student group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>BNMS</td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>BNMS</td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>BNMS</td>
<td>EAL/D</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: BNMS=Below National Minimum Standards*
From these results, the writing and grammar assessments appear to be areas of particular weakness. In the EAL/D group in all three year levels, many are reported at the BNMS level: Year 7 – 15.7%, Year 8 – 14.8%, and Year 9 – 36.9% for writing. These results are also reflected in the Undefined group of students who appear, in Years 8 and 9, to be achieving only slightly better than the EAL/D students with their writing capabilities. In all year levels, a high percentage appears to have struggled with the writing and grammar tasks. The numeracy outcomes for all year levels reflect a far more positive picture than that of literacy, with under 10% in both groups, across all three year levels, being reported at BNMS. This suggests that across all year levels, students from both of these groups performed better in the numeracy test for NAPLAN than they did for the writing and grammar tests.

4.3.8.2 Year 9 academic and NAPLAN results 2015

Within the Year 9 cohort, 111 students were classified as EAL/D and an additional 96 were from the Undefined group. The Year 9 results were examined further in relation to English (Semester 1 Year 9, May/June 2015) (Table 4.11) with academic results being reported from A (highest) to D/E (failure), and N/R as nothing reported. NAPLAN Literacy (May 2015) scores are reported in Table 4.12. These two sets of results pertain to a similar point in time for these students. NAPLAN scales range from 10 (the highest) to 5, with 5 being BNMS and 6 being assessed at NMS.

Table 4.11 English Academic Results Year 9 Undefined Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed component</th>
<th>Language group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A/B combined</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D/E combined</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School English</td>
<td>EAL/D n=111</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined n=96</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English academic results for both groups are very similar. The major difference appears in failures (i.e. a D or an E) and the proportion where no result was recorded. When these two areas are combined, 18.9% of the EAL/D group and 21.9% of the Undefined group either did not pass or did not complete enough assessments to be graded.
The writing component of the NAPLAN literacy test, as shown in Table 4.12, shows that 36.9% of EAL/D students and 22.9% of the Undefined group scored at BNMS – a level that suggests that students will have difficulty progressing satisfactorily at school. When those who did not undertake NAPLAN are added to each group, 51.3% of the EAL/D group and 37.5% of the Undefined group may be deemed at risk of completing any writing task. Of interest are the 40.5% of the EAL/D group and 38.5% of the Undefined group who are receiving a C in subject English yet the equivalent NAPLAN data for writing show 18.9% and 21.9% respectively for these groups.

Mathematics results (Semester 1 Year 9, May/June 2015) and NAPLAN Numeracy (May 2015) results are recorded in the same manner as English and Literacy. These results are shown in Tables 4.13 and 4.14.

Students from the EAL/D group appear to be performing better than those in the Undefined group. In both groups, however, there is a high percentage of students receiving the passing mark (C). More students from the Undefined group than from the EAL/D group did not have any recorded results.
As shown in Table 4.14, when the scores of 10 and 9 are aggregated, more students from the EAL/D group than in the Undefined group are performing at these highest levels. Also of note is the low number of students who are rated at BNMS for this subject. Over 10% of students in both groups (EAL/D 10.8%, Undefined 17.7%) did not participate in this testing.

In summary, some of the characteristics of students have been reported in the above sections. Students from across the school communities came with a range of cultural and linguistic heritages that make for rich school environments. From exploring the students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, it has been established that 10.5% of the students were known as coming from EAL/D backgrounds. Another 10% comprised the Undefined group whose linguistic and cultural heritage had not been documented by their schools. In some instances, comparisons have been drawn between the data from the EAL/D and Undefined groups. A further examination into the educational experiences of some of the students from the Undefined group follows.

### 4.4 Student interviews from the Undefined group

Of the 249 students in the Undefined group, 68 students participated in the semistructured interviews. This process provided information to address RQ 2 that explored the school and classroom experiences, relevant to learning, as reported by students who are undefined by their school communities as being from bi/multilingual homes.

#### 4.4.1 Characteristics of interviewed students from the Undefined group

The following section profiles the characteristics of this group against the broader Undefined group from which they are drawn. It presents a summary of the 68 interviewed students’ regions of birth, years in Australia, and their English and other language competencies. It further explores the students’ use of their other home language and some of their educational experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of assessment</th>
<th>Language group</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6 NMS</th>
<th>5 BNMS</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>EAL/D n= 111</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined n=96</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students’ gender, their birthplaces recorded by regions of birth, and how long they had lived in Australia are reported in Table 4.15, per school.

Table 4.15 Demographics for Interviewed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of life</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviewed group had a gender balance of 37 female and 31 male participants. The students came from across all year levels (Year 7 = 22, Year 8 = 26, Year 9 = 20). The majority (n=35, 51.5%) of the students were born in Australia, and many (n=33, 48.5%) had lived here their whole lives. Several students (n=19, 27.9%) were born in New Zealand and the Pasifika nations. The participating interview group was a mix of long-term Australian residents, with less than a quarter of the students having lived in Australia for under five years. The information in Table 4.15 is shown by school community to confirm that the participants are from across all schools.

Students self-assessed their speaking, reading, and writing competencies in English. These assessments, as shown in Table 4.16, are for all in the Undefined group and then those from this group who were interviewed.
Table 4.16 Self-assessed English Language Competencies of all Undefined and Interviewed Undefined Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-assessed competencies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>NVW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>All Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>All Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>All Undefined</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. VW=Very Well; W=Well; Av=Average; NVW=Not Very Well*

The speaking and reading information from both groups is comparable though, in the writing component, fewer of those interviewed rated in these high categories than did in the whole group. These data suggest that those interviewed appear to have a slightly higher perception of their English language skills than the total group with fewer of the really weak students included.

The interviewed students also reported a range of other home languages. These were collated by school communities and are shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17 Other Home Languages – Interviewed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language regions</th>
<th>Brightwell n=19</th>
<th>Idstone n=16</th>
<th>Aston n=11</th>
<th>Chinnor n=10</th>
<th>Henley n=12</th>
<th>Total n=68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika nations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students from Maori/Pasifika language backgrounds were the main group (n=28, 41.2%) interviewed. The spread of linguistic backgrounds of the students interviewed included 21 (30.9%) from Asian language backgrounds, 12 (17.6%) from European heritage, and 6 (8.8%) from African region groups. The students also self-assessed their competencies in their other home language and these results are presented in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18 Other Home Language Competencies – Interviewed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>VW/W combined</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>NVW</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NVW/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VW=Very Well; W=Well; Av=Average; NVW=Not Very Well; No=Does not speak other language at all

More students reported that they speak their other home language rather than read or write it. When the VW and W levels were aggregated, 22.1% said they spoke this other home language at these higher levels, 23.6% said they read at these higher levels, and 16.2% reported that their writing skills were of this high standard.

Academic and NAPLAN results from the interviewed students largely reflected the whole Undefined group. Academically, results were spread from A (highest) to D (failure) grades in all year levels with seven students in English, six in Mathematics and four in Science failing the subjects. For the NAPLAN writing test, three (13.6%) of the interviewed students from the Year 7 (n=22) were BNMS, for Year 8 (n=26), four (15.4%) were at BNMS and for Year 9 (n=20), three (15%) of the students were at the BNMS. In contrast, only one student from Year 8 and one from Year 9 were BNMS in the numeracy test.

This section has provided a brief profile of the students from the Undefined group who were interviewed. It has profiled their nationalities, linguistic heritages, competencies in English and their other home languages, and academic and NAPLAN performances. This reflects a diverse group, culturally and linguistically, whose cultural and school experiences are explored further in the following section to gain a deeper understanding of what they perceive their educational needs are.

4.4.2 Students’ cultural and school experiences

The interviews focused on the students’ experiences in their current schools, including their feelings about being from another culture in that environment. Students were asked about some of their cultural and educational experiences and in talking about their learning experiences, shared their feelings about their favourite teachers and school subjects. They also related if they felt that their education at their school
was preparing them for their future life goals. Figure 4.8 provides a summary of the areas in which students expressed their views.

As seen in Figure 4.8, students were asked for more detail about the importance of their other home language to them as well as if they spoke in this language at school with students from the same linguistic background. Further, they shared if they felt their other home language helped or hindered their school outcomes. Their educational experiences, aspects of school that they liked such as their favourite teacher and favourite subject, and then their academic progress in subject English, Mathematics, and Science are related. Details about these subjects, the students’ hopes for their futures, as well as individual quotes, are presented in the following sections.

4.4.2.1 School environment

“I like this school. Everyone tries to look after everyone else,” said a Year 7 female student from Henley (ID 1697) – a very positive comment about her school environment. Her comments reflect those of most of the students (n=66) who stated that they had no concerns or issues about fitting into their school environments. This could perhaps be seen as a positive step in their learning at their schools as they believed their current learning environment presented no hindrances. As one student
indicated, “I chose to come here and am happy here” (F, Brightwell, Yr. 9, ID 2) and another student from Henley commented, “no, I like this school and they are good here. Some parts are rough but mostly everyone is OK” (F, Yr. 7, ID 1684). Students attributed no negative comments to teachers or other school staff.

However, some negatives were expressed about interpersonal issues, perhaps reflective of the cultural diversity of schools. Twenty-eight of the students were from either Maori (n=15) or Pasifika (n=13) cultural heritages. Two, from Pasifika cultures, gave negative comments about other students at their schools. In one instance, concern was expressed that “some of the kids are mean and pick on other kids. I am OK. It is the little kids from the same culture and the big kids pick on them” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 354). The other student said,

all of my friends are mixed race and we don’t have any problems now; we have been called black and been teased a fair bit. These kids have been reported and school did something. Something happened there. It has all stopped. (F, Aston, Yr. 8, ID 1255)

While the comments about their school environments were generally very positive, particularly when reflecting on the overall school environment, notably, several students did raise some interpersonal issues, with some of these appearing to reflect difference amongst different cultural groups.

4.4.2.2 Other home language beside English

The use of their other home language at school was then explored to see if that posed any difficulties for these students. Six students spoke their other home languages at school – two spoke only their home language, and the other four spoke English and their other language with other students. These languages were Maori, Tongan, and Tuvaluan (Pacific nation). Reasons for utilising their home languages at school varied from, “we speak English and sometimes we speak Tuvaluan when others are around” (F, Idstone, Yr. 8, ID 1355) to “we speak both languages. Tongan so that the other kids don’t understand” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 8, ID 1921), and finally,

we speak Tongan. It is about embracing our culture and being proud of it so we use it whenever we can. We speak it when we are together. Most of the kids are better at Tongan than they are at English. (M, Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 312)
One male Chinnor student (Yr. 8, ID 2233), when commenting on speaking his home language at school, said, “we do not speak Afrikaans as it could be seen to be rude”. Students from different cultures expressed different perspectives. While only six (8.8%) students from this group used their other language at school, the importance of their cultural language was emphasised.

Following the discussion on their other home language at school, students were asked to consider if they felt that having two languages was an advantage and why they felt this way. Of the 58 students from the interviewed group who spoke their other language, 36 (62.1%) responded that it was important for them to be able to speak in their home language with their families and extended families. Their responses included, “yes, it is to help me keep my culture [Maori]; also my parents expect me to use my language and so do my grandparents” (F, Brightwell, Yr. 8, ID 155) and, “yes, it is a part of me, my culture [Asian] and I will always speak this language. It is important to my family, to me and I will use it” (F, Brightwell, Yr. 9, ID 2).

The importance placed on respecting the elders in their communities was also raised with the following response, “it is for my mum and the Samoan elders and my culture. It shows respect” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 9, ID 8) and, “yes, it is good to be able to maintain my culture [Maori] and to speak with my elders” (M, Idstone, Yr. 8, ID 632). Respect for their heritage and culture was related in two responses. One said, “so like it is about where I come from and my culture [Pasifika] and being proud of it and having respect” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 312). “Since I have been here, it has become even more important to keep speaking in this language [Asian] and hold on to and respect that part of my culture” responded a female student from Chinnor (Yr. 9, ID 2045).

None of the students made any comments about the fact that being bilingual might be an advantage to them at school or in their further education or career options. Though questioned about using their other home language at school, the general observations were that English is what is spoken at school, suggesting a recognition of wanting to conform. Yet students had repeatedly emphasised the importance of their cultural and linguistic heritage to them individually and also to their family. Thus, clearly, they were able to make conscious choices in language use.
“Mixing up” the two languages

Given the frequent use of two languages by the students, the issue of whether these might be mixed up or confused was worthy of consideration. Fifty-eight students indicated that they spoke their other home language. These students were asked if they felt that having more than one language created any learning problems for them or if it assisted with their learning; some responses are recounted below.

Nineteen (32.7%) students indicated that they had no concerns with having two languages and they did not confuse them because they only used English at school. A further 20 (34.5%) said they do not mix up the words from the two languages because they are quite different. One student commented that he “sometimes get mixed up and put Maori words in English and the other way around. It slows me down and I have to think it through more but I am glad I have two languages” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 255). A similar comment was made by a Year 8 Maori student from Aston, commenting, “sometimes well maybe I do get a little confused. The words are not similar but most of the time, well, no I’m OK, I think just sometimes maybe they get confused” (F, Aston, Yr. 8, ID 1215). Similarly, a Year 9 student from Henley (F, ID 1879) said she mixes up her two languages, English and Greek, and “sometimes the sentence structures get mixed but it is a good thing to have two languages and it is an important part of who I am”. However, this “mixing up” can lead to confusion in learning, as expressed by a Tongan-speaking student from Brightwell:

Sometimes having the two languages confuses me – the words. I speak alright in English and Tongan, but my writing in English is not very good. Maybe my other language confuses me. I have to work hard at English because at times I do not understand. I go from Tongan to English at school, in class. (M, Yr. 7, ID 312)

Alternatively, several students indicated that they saw benefits in having a bilingual background; for example, a student who had been learning her Asian home language since she was a child, related that,

yes, I think it is good as it makes me think and work things out. We mainly speak my other language at home and I practise it a lot but English is what I use at school. They are also very different types of writing and reading and speaking is very, very different. (F, Henley, Yr. 7, ID 1684)
The importance of the students’ cultural heritage to them is seen in the above comments about their other language usage. They related that it was important to embrace their first culture and that included their linguistic heritage. From their comments, it would appear that generally they had given little thought to the fact that having two languages may affect their learning in English in some way. Further, they revealed that being proud of their culture, and speaking that other home language, meant that they not only respected their family but also the elders from that culture. For many, their lives are a mix of two cultures and two languages and they are positioned somewhere in the middle. For some of these students there is the real potential that having these two languages may affect their learning, although they may not always recognise this effect.

4.4.3 Educational experiences

Students were also eager to share about what happened in each of their classes and none more so than sharing about their favourite teacher, their favourite school subjects, and their work in subjects English, Mathematics, and Science. While these were school aspects of interest to the students, they also potentially provided insights into their learning experiences.

4.4.3.1 Students’ favourite teachers

For most students, their teachers have an impact on their learning in particular subjects and, when asked, the participants were all eager to share about their favourite teacher. Further, they shared what that teacher did in class that helped them not only like the subject but also learn the content and do the tasks required.

For 16 students (23.5%), their favourite teachers brought fun and humour into the classroom which meant that each lesson was always interesting. Another nine (13.2%) shared about the class being calm and relaxing, as typified by a Henley student (M, Yr. 7, ID 1707) who said of his teacher, “she is easy and relaxing and doesn’t put pressure on. She doesn’t get angry and just has a relaxing classroom”. A more personal view of a Year 9 male student (Henley, ID 1753) was, “I think she has a good understanding of me and knows what I can do and knows when I need some help”. A female student (Yr. 9, ID 4) from Brightwell liked that her teacher, “is laid back and easy to get along with and you feel safe saying and asking her anything”. Further, a Year 7 male student (ID 488) from Idstone said, “my teacher explains things
to me and to each person and then he makes sure that I understand. He helps me understand stuff”.

As could be expected when talking about their favourite teachers, the students’ comments were extremely positive. If the student were to share with school staff about another home language, it would probably be with this teacher, their favourite. When students were asked if it was important to them that their favourite teacher knew they had another language in their homes, 49 (84.5%) of the 58 who spoke their other home language did not think it mattered at all if teachers knew or not. Some of the students commented that they did not believe there would be any advantage to their teachers knowing they had another language at home. Many (n=34, 50.0%) of the students said that they thought that their favourite teacher did not know that there was another language besides English spoken in their homes as they had not told them. A Year 7 male student (ID 312) from Brightwell stated,

I had him in Year 6 also. I think he knows I am Tongan, maybe an Islander, but probably doesn’t know how much I speak Tongan at home and how important it is to me. Don’t know if he knows anything about my culture.

This student’s family speaks Tongan about 80% of home time yet the teacher was unaware of this and the influence this may be having on the student’s learning. When asked about sharing her other language with her favourite teacher, a Year 9 female student (ID 948) at Aston said, “no they don’t know. No one has ever asked me.” This student’s family speaks Samoan about 40% of the time at home.

A male student, who had replied that his teacher did not know that he spoke another language, offered a further comment about the importance of fitting in with the majority of students when he said,

No, I don’t think he would know. He has never asked me and I have never said anything. I don’t think it is that important. I think he may know there may be another language but my accent is not strong [Afrikaans]. Not having an accent helps you fit in – I feel like I am part of the whole school group, I really don’t stand out and I am also white not dark skinned coloured. (Yr. 8, Chinnor, ID 2636)
Students liked their favourite teachers for a variety of reasons but mainly for creating interesting classes and helping the student on an individual basis. It did not appear to be of importance to these students at all if their teachers knew about their cultural or linguistic backgrounds even though, to them individually, their home languages and cultures are very important.

4.4.3.2 Students’ school subjects

For some students, their favourite teacher was not the one who taught their favourite subject. Students were also keen to talk about subjects they liked and even to share some of the difficulties they have experienced within that subject area, whether it be simply difficult content or even perhaps first language interference. When commenting generally about their school subjects, again the responses were very positive with the only negative comments relating to some teachers’ teaching styles. Some of the students’ interview responses about their favourite school subjects and general comments about the key learning areas of English, Mathematics and Science are reported below.

English - favourite subject

For many students, English proves difficult but one Year 7 male student at Aston, who was failing this subject, said, “English is my favourite subject because of the stuff we do. I am doing research on Al Capone. It is all OK. My teacher helps me and we can choose interesting stuff for our assignments” (ID 1550). In total, nine students nominated English as their favourite subject, with their results spread from A to E, suggesting it is not a choice based upon performance. All the students related that they enjoyed learning in English classes; “I am learning new things and better ways to write. Sometimes getting started with my writing is hard but it is by far my favourite subject as it is interesting,” commented one students from Idstone (M, Yr. 7, ID 921).

The only comment of concern came from a Year 7 female student at Henley (ID 1705) who had arrived from the Philippines 3 years ago and speaks Tagalog 90% of the time at home. She is performing well in her school work, receiving As and Bs in English, Mathematics and Science. Her initial education was in English in the Philippines before commencing her schooling in Australia in Year 5. She said she speaks Tagalog but cannot read or write it. She commented,
I really love English and it is a great class to be in. My teacher thinks I have comprehension problems because I don’t get stuff straight away sometimes. Maybe it justs takes me a little longer to get it sorted in my head. My teacher is nice though and I like the stuff we do. I like being there and learning. My teacher is understanding so like when I need to catch up she understands.

This student likes being in her English class and likes what she is learning; however, she finds it hard to understand why her teacher would think she has comprehension issues particularly when her results appear to show otherwise. Perhaps her teacher had adopted a deficit model towards this student and is treating her as an EAL/D student. The student herself nominated that she, at times, needs extra processing time and this may be because she is bilingual. She is in the Undefined group, has received no additional English language support and her bilingual status appears to be unknown to this teacher.

Those who preferred English did so because they found the content interesting. A student of European background was failing all subjects. In his home, French is spoken about 30% of the time. He also found that at times his “languages do get confused and this doesn’t help my writing; but I work things out in English”. Though this student is failing English, the teacher appears to have encouraged him to participate and enjoy the subject but is unaware of his bilingual ability. Whether achieving high or low grades in this subject, the students related that they have teachers whom they perceive to be helpful and are trying to make their classes interesting. These strategies appear to be of benefit to these students.

**English - general comments**

The students were asked to expand further on their subject areas because for many ELLs, the writing tasks associated with high school subjects present increasing challenges. They were asked to share what they found relatively easy and what they found a challenge in the varying aspects of the subject.

Completing a writing task in subject English was reported by most (n=61) as being easy as long as the directions given by the teacher were followed – that is, the teacher had given appropriate scaffolding for the task. When asked what was difficult with the task, however, 16 of these students stated that writing was difficult for them. The following are examples of two Pasifika heritage students – one who works hard
and does not improve, and one who simply finds this subject difficult and identified that she needed more assistance.

I didn’t pass English last term. I work really hard on my English but still can’t pass. I am not too good because I am slow and I don’t get things first up. Sometimes I find English hard because in writing I don’t get any ideas. I have to go over things lots. (F, Aston, Yr. 9, ID 948)

I find writing just hard. I don’t know what to write. I am not very good at writing. Getting ideas is hard and then knowing what to do is really hard. In primary school, it was much easier and this year has been particularly hard. I need more help with my writing. (F, Chinnor, Yr. 9 ID 2153)

Both of the above Year 9 students are Australian born and have lived here all of their lives and undertaken their schooling in Queensland. Both are experiencing difficulties with their subjects with the former failing English, Mathematics and Science and the latter receiving Cs in all. They both reported that their other home languages are spoken about 40% of the time and also commented about the difficulty they have in coming up with ideas to start a writing task in subject English.

Some concerns, expressed by the following two female students from Chinnor, were perhaps more relevant to their home language influencing their writing in subject English at school. These concerns come from students from two different cultural backgrounds, Asian and European, with home languages spoken only 20% and 10% of the time, respectively. Both students received a C in English and were achieving much higher grades in Mathematics and Science.

I have to work hard in English even though I have learnt it since I was little. I have only been here from Sri Lanka for a year but I learnt English in my home country. I am getting better. Getting started is sometimes hard. Many things are different in English and I have to know the way to go about it properly. (Yr. 9, ID 2045)

Writing is hard. I either leave out letters or add letters. Sometimes I use Spanish words. I can read stuff; I do not have any problems reading, just the writing. With the long words, I have to work out which is correct – I have to read over it a few times and work out what is correct. Sometimes I go to the Spanish and that helps me too. (Yr. 7, ID 2536)
In subject English, it would appear from the above comments that writing presents a major challenge for some of these students. Some suggested they have difficulties starting a task, others that they have to revert to their other language to help them with word choices. Still others noted that they needed additional assistance with some of the tasks. Though trying her best, one student found that her English results were not improving from a pass yet she was receiving the highest grades in her other subjects. None of these students have received additional English language support throughout their schooling.

**Mathematics – favourite subject**

Nineteen students (27.9% of interviewed group) nominated Mathematics as their favourite subject and across the year levels and the various cultures, reasons for liking the subject varied. “I enjoy Maths because there is always only one solution. There are no problems and if I have a concern I ask the teacher and he helps me, he comes over and explains stuff,” said a female Year 7 student (ID 1684) at Henley. Another student of Asian heritage said he, “I like Maths because it is easy to understand. It is Ok, I have no real difficulties and if I do the teacher comes over and is just patient with me and explains” (Idstone, Yr. 9, ID 772).

One of the main concerns expressed by some students related to the introduction of new mathematics concepts. One Pasifika student said, “I really like tables. Probably the hardest thing at the moment is shapes” (M, Brightwell, Yr. 8, ID 192). Another from that school (F, Yr. 8, ID 330) said, “I like Maths because it is interesting and I learn numbers which is a good opportunity and may be good for a job. I just don’t get how formula work”. Regardless of their academic mark, Mathematics remained the favourite subject for some. A male student of Pasifika heritage shared his reasons for liking Mathematics:

Maths is my favourite and I can do it. I know my tables and can do multiplication. I can do this, so I like it. When you forget stuff like all those formula things that annoys me cause I can do Maths. The teacher makes stuff interesting. When I can’t figure it out, I ask my friends. (Brightwell, Yr. 8, ID 284)

For some, the logical processes of the subject and a very helpful teacher made it enjoyable, as expressed by a female student at Brightwell when she said,
Maths because it is very logical for me. Learning the different techniques and the different ways of doing things can be difficult. When I get confused, I just ask my teacher and she takes time and explains it to me and makes sure I understand it. She is really cool and makes the class fun. (Yr. 9, ID 2)

Students who nominated Mathematics as their favourite subject liked the subject but also appreciated that their teachers were understanding and took the time to help them with any concerns that they experienced in class. One of the above students noted that learning Mathematics may help him with a future career choice. All of these students were passing this subject but for all, their English grade was one level lower. Both of the Asian background students had achieved As in Mathematics and Bs in Science and English, far better results than the Pasifika students, both of whom achieved pass marks in their subjects.

**Mathematics – general comments**

When questioned further about Mathematics, most students indicated that they liked the subject and were progressing satisfactorily. Those who had stated that this was also their favourite subject listed no concerns or difficulties with it. Some students, however, expressed difficulties with the way that their teachers taught, as was the case for a Year 7 Asian student at Aston who reported that “I don’t like it because our teacher does not explain it a lot. Just, here is the exercise, take it down and do. I don’t ask for help as she will just say go back to the book” (F, ID 1483). Another found that the teacher talked too quickly and “everyone thinks he talks fast and no one gets it when he explains things. He mucks up the words and they run into one another and we don’t get it” (F, Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 330). A Year 8 Pasifika student at Aston said she loved Maths “but I do not understand it. My teacher does not explain it or go over it for us. It is just on the board or in the textbook” (F, ID 1255).

Other students simply found this subject difficult, with one Asian background student relating that she is “struggling. I used to do OK in Maths. Now my new teacher leaves all the important stuff till the end – I need it from the beginning” (Chinnor, Yr. 9, ID 2031). A Year 7 Maori student from Aston liked direct responses from his teacher and found it difficult in this subject when “sometimes the teacher doesn’t answer my question. I find that hard as we are learning new stuff and I need to
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know what he is teaching us. I don’t ask him anymore because it just confuses me” (M, ID 1556).

Mathematics classes presented a different set of challenges for some students. The Mathematics results for the students mentioned above were higher, in all but one instance, than the students’ English marks. Some students noted difficulties with some of the teaching strategies used and others simply found the classes challenging and interesting, as they liked to learn new things.

**Science – favourite subject**

Two of the eight students who said Science was their favourite subject received an A mark, with two receiving Bs, three Cs, and one having no result recorded, indicating that the choice was not necessarily due to high performance. The students commented that they did interesting things in these lessons, in particular experiments, and all found them fascinating regardless of the results they were achieving. A student from Chinnor who is receiving As in Science commented,

> I really like Science and I am good at it. One day I hope to become a marine biologist so this fascinates me. I like the way my teacher teaches. It works for me. He doesn’t waste time. We do really interesting stuff. The teacher is there to answer all your questions and explains stuff. (F, Yr. 9, ID 1996)

This student had a clear interest in this subject area as she is already focussing on potential career options in the field. She likes the teacher and the teaching strategies that are employed to make the lessons meaningful. The student says the teacher is supportive and has created a learning environment where she engages with her work and enjoys learning in her Science classes. Another student from Chinnor (M, Yr. 8, ID 2302) commented about Science and said,

> my favourite subject is Science because I have a passion for it and think it is interesting. I am learning new things all the time. My favourite bit is doing the experiments. The maths part is challenging, but I can always ask my teacher. I try to work stuff out in my head but most times I ask the teacher and he always helps and explains it to me.

Though not an A student, this student found the strategies used by the teacher in this class engaged him and he nominated the subject as his favourite. This student is
achieving better results (C) in this subject, his favourite, than in both English and Mathematics (Ds). He has found that this teacher is always available to help him and takes time to explain content to him, especially that part which he finds the most challenging – mathematics. These two students are doing the best they are able in their favourite subject. For one it is a career option, for the other simply a favourite subject at this point but one where a teacher is helping him rise to the subject challenges.

Science – general comments

In Science, one student said that she liked the subject; however, “it seems to be getting harder and at times I just don’t know what to do really in writing up the theory in Science that is really difficult” (Henley, Yr. 9, ID 1879). This student has been receiving Cs in all three subjects since she has been in high school. Another, of European background, found difficulties with understanding the more challenging information being conveyed and said,

Tests I find challenging because of the writing and sometimes I forget things. I sometimes get things mixed up. I do need help with the writing. I just like learning things and most well, they are interesting. I find new stuff hard, really hard. I need it explained a bit better until I get it. (F, Aston, Yr. 8, ID 1234)

Students who commented all appeared to like this subject and some were considering career options in related areas. Though it was mentioned that the areas they studied were challenging, students also saw the rewards from such challenges in class. Again, comments were made in relation to some of the difficulties some of these students were experiencing with writing tasks.

Other subjects

Health and Physical Education (HPE) and the Arts were the other main subject areas designated as favourites by the students. Of the 10 students who said HPE was their favourite, only one student nominated a career in rugby league as his future plans. All 10 made some comment about the writing requirements of the subject and the challenges it presented to them. One student (M, Henley, Yr. 7, ID 1707) who received As in Maths, English, and Science, said “I probably like HPE because we get to go outside and be active. I like to play and exercise. Tests are the hardest, the
theory. The writing bits”. A male student from Brightwell (Year 9, ID 10), who was born and raised in Australia, shared that his favourite time at school is,


gym. It gives me more positive thinking. I like being out of the classroom being outside in the open. My teacher makes me feel energetic and makes things interesting. I find the written stuff the hardest. I am not confident in English.

These feelings of getting outside and being active were also reflected by another five students of Maori or Pacific Islander backgrounds who nominated HPE as their favourite subject.

Those students (n=10) who nominated the Arts as their favourite subjects all alluded to being allowed to be creative and using their imaginations. Favourite subjects of Language Other Than English (LOTE) (n=4), the Humanities (n=2), Home Economics (n=4), or Manual Arts (n=3) were nominated by students who had a particular interest in them. In all instances, the students recounted how they found these particular subjects interesting and that it was the way their teachers taught them that made them that way.

A common theme running through the students’ comments about their favourite subjects has been the role that the teacher plays in each. Favourite subjects varied with gender, year level and potential career choices. In some instances, the favourite teacher taught the favourite subject. The students’ reasons for nominating their favourite teacher or favourite subject varied. For many, the favourite teacher took an interest in the student individually and assisted them; also, the teaching strategies employed by the teacher appeared to assist some students’ learning. Some students liked a subject as they saw it had potential as a career choice. Others simply liked it and the challenges it presented to them or they found the subject easy to undertake. In the key learning areas, some students were having difficulty with the teaching strategies and styles used by some of their teachers – some that appear not to be compatible with the learning styles of the student. Of interest was the fact that many of these students highlighted writing difficulties across a range of subjects, not just in their English subject.
4.4.4 Preparing for the future

Most of the students felt that their schooling, in their present school environment, was positive and would help them to secure future study or employment. All but two students responded positively about their schooling preparing them for their potential career options. One Maori student (M, Idstone, Yr. 8, ID 892) simply responded “maybe” and the other, of European background (M, Chinnor, Yr. 8, ID 2302), said, “I don’t know. I am finding it hard here at the moment. I only came this year”. Most responded with a “yes” (n=29) or “I hope so” (n=15), with the others affirming that their school was a good place to be and was preparing them for their future career options.

University (n=29), TAFE college (n=25), apprenticeships (n=10), or yet undecided (n=4) were the range of options that these students were currently considering for their future. Of those seeking a future goal of attending university to pursue careers in fields such as medicine, law, veterinary science, marine biology, teaching, nursing, architecture, engineering, and forensic science, 13 were of Asian heritage and nine were from the Maori/Pasifika backgrounds. Fifteen students of Maori/Pasifika heritage nominated TAFE as their current option to pursue careers in trades, hospitality, childcare, or hairdressing.

Comments from the students about their educational experiences in their school communities were mainly positive, indicating that the schools were preparing them for their future careers. Many said they had discussed their career aspirations with family and most believed that their family would support their career choice in whatever they chose to do in the future. None of the students commented about being bilingual and how that may help them in their future career choices.

4.5 Summary

This chapter explored some of the characteristics of students in junior secondary classes in Queensland state high schools who were from bi-multilingual homes. Further, it related cultural and educational experiences of some of these students. The results show that while 20.5% of students are from bi-multilingual homes, only 10.5% are classified as EAL/D and the remaining 10.0% are Undefined. The remaining students were from EO backgrounds. The profiling of the students into the above groups confirmed that all school cohorts were multicultural.
The majority of the students, in all groups, were Australian born (84.9%) and most (84.3%) had lived here all of their lives. New Zealand and Pasifika nations were reported by another 6.8% of the students as their birthplaces. In relation to English language competencies, most of the students showed positive self-reporting on their skills in speaking, reading, and writing; writing, however, was seen as their least proficient across all three groups.

Students nominated 52 other languages that were spoken in their homes, with Maori/Pasifika, Asian, European, and African languages being the dominant groups recorded. From the EAL/D students, the main language region reported was Asia and these students were more reliant on their other home language, with most speaking it at the “Very Well/Well” levels. In contrast, in the Undefined group where the largest group language region was Maori/Pasifika, the majority only spoke their language at the “Average/Not Very Well” ratings. From the Undefined group (n=249), 49.4% came from the combined Maori Pasifika groups, 23.7% from European, and 18.1% from Asian language regional backgrounds. Many of the students in the Undefined group present with good oral English skills and may be managing well in their schooling, while others may be facing some challenges.

The students who were interviewed came from across all schools with students of Maori/Pasifika, Asian, or European backgrounds being the main groups. From the interviews, students shared about the importance of their culture and their other home language. Some students shared about how the maintenance of their home language was important to them, to their families, and to their elders and their various reasons for using their other language at school. “Mixing up” of the two languages was related also. None of the students commented about the benefits to them of having another language either at school or in their future career choices.

Most students were eager to share what they liked at school such as their favourite subject or their favourite teacher. Students provided positive reports of their school experiences. They felt that the school environments in which they were gaining an education were facilitating their learning. When talking about the three key learning areas of English, Mathematics, and Science, some educational concerns were highlighted. Across all subjects, difficulties faced by students in the area of writing were the most prominent issues raised, with some noting that this difficulty had increased as they had progressed into the next year level at school. Some students
raised concerns about teachers’ methods of instruction and how the use of these
startegies did not help them with their learning in that particular class.

Many had a clear idea of what they would like to achieve in the future. Some
explained how the subjects they were undertaking now were already preparing them
for a career in their chosen fields. They believed that their schools were giving them a
good basis for their future aspirations and that their families would support them in
their choices.

The following chapter relates the characteristics of the staff respondents. It
then explores some school processes and staff teaching strategies used with students
from diverse backgrounds as well as difficulties faced in CALD classes. Students also
share some of their learning experiences in this chapter.
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5.1 Introduction

Extending from the exploration of students’ views regarding their learning experiences, this chapter takes a broader focus on the school environment drawn from the views of the teachers and the students, in responding to the final two RQs.

RQ 3 What perceptions of school processes are reported by staff and undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

RQ 4 What pedagogical practices do teachers and students identify that may result in addressing the educational learning needs of undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

Following a profile of those surveyed and interviewed, teacher responses to the school process of accommodating appropriate PD in the area of teaching CALD learners are explored. Further comments by staff made in relation to preservice teacher education are also related. Another focus, the enrolment processes that position the bilingual student in the school environment, is also reported from both student and staff perspectives. Identified EAL/D students may have access to additional English language support and students’ comments are reported about this process. Teaching strategies utilised by staff in CALD classrooms are then examined as are any difficulties they have experienced in such classes. Students further report some of the ways that they perceived that they learnt in their various schooling contexts.

5.2 Characteristics of respondents

The perspectives reported in this chapter were drawn from representatives of the school communities including administrators, teachers, and support personnel as well as students. From the staff group, 337 completed the surveys with 21 of this group selected to participate in the qualitative emailed survey process. The whole staff group are profiled in the following.

Across the 337 staff, a wide range of teaching experiences were reported, ranging from beginning teachers to many (n=84, 24.9%) who had over 20 years’ experience. More interestingly, the profiled teachers showed limited ethnic diversity in their backgrounds. The majority (n=281, 83.4%) were born in Australia with 276 (81.9%) of them having lived here all of their lives and only eight (2.4%) having lived
here for fewer than 5 years. A small number (n=44, 13.1%) reported that they spoke another language besides English, of which nearly half (n=21, 47.7%), were European languages, predominantly German (n=10), which is one of the LOTE subjects taken in schools.

Through the initial surveys, staff (n=337) reported demographic and teaching details and, as well, reflected on their teaching and school experiences. They also reported briefly if they had taught in diverse school communities and some of the strategies they had used in these CALD classrooms. The qualitative emailed surveys with staff (n=21) sought more in-depth information about school processes and teaching strategies used in CALD classes. A detailed overview of staff backgrounds, teaching experience, and teaching areas for the whole staff group is included as Appendix A4.

Sixty-eight students participated in semistructured interviews – slightly more than one-quarter (27.3%) of the Undefined group (see Chapter 4.4.1 for a profile of this group).

5.3 School processes

RQ 3 What perceptions of school processes are reported by staff and undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

Within schools, processes are defined to help with the effective and efficient running of the school community that will ultimately produce positive outcomes for those working and learning within that community. Thus, this section looks at issues that directly relate to the learning experiences of students. These processes are school organized PD, school enrolment procedures, and additional English language support for ELLs.

Staff, in the emailed surveys, commented further on two areas in relation to processes. One important issue was the preparation and capacity of teachers to support student learning. Respondents raised issues with this initial preservice education and then with ongoing development of teachers for their role in teaching in the CALD school environment. This also provided information of the current capacity of teachers to offer support to these CALD students. The second element raised related to school enrolment procedures used as students first enter the high school community. Staff
related their knowledge of these procedures and students related the process they experienced when enrolling at high school. The third process related to the availability of additional English language support to ELLs and whether or not the students had been able to access any additional English language support. These three processes are examined in more detail in the following sections.

5.3.1 Staff preservice education and professional development

Staff responses from completed surveys and qualitative emailed surveys are explored in relation to their preservice education and ongoing PD for teaching in diverse classes. Figure 5.1 gives a summary of staff views in relation to staff PD and preservice training.
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**Figure 5.1.** Staff views – professional development and preservice education.

The responses from staff, as shown in Figure 5.1, expanded on the importance of having appropriate ongoing PD in relation to CALD students. Staff shared what they thought would be appropriate content for these sessions and the importance of making it school specific. From this discussion came thoughts on current preservice education and acknowledgment that there were very limited courses designed to teach preservice teachers about working in multicultural environments. Staff responses
about their PD sessions about students from CALD backgrounds follow. These are followed by further comments by staff about preservice teacher education preparing new teachers for the CALD teaching environment. One teacher from Chinnor encapsulated his view of the current situation in Queensland state high schools when he said,

Queensland continues to become more culturally and linguistically diverse. This has slowly happened in this state over the past years, now action is needed to support school communities responsible for the education of all children. There is a need for appropriate university training and continuing professional development and this in itself just creates more issues. (ID 342)

His comments suggest that this is not a new issue and that now is the time for appropriate preservice education and ongoing PD, for all teachers, in relation to teaching in CALD environments. The appropriate education of staff, whether at preservice level or through ongoing PD in schools, is of importance not only to staff but also to school families who desire the best for their children and seek the best education they can for them.

5.3.1.1 Professional development

School PD is funded from individual school budgets. In many schools, the funding for this, and other school-initiated priorities, is limited, which may constrain staff attending appropriate sessions. Of the 337 staff participants, only 35 (10.4%) reported that they had undertaken any PD about teaching in a multicultural environment or specifically about understanding the CALD student. Staff commented on the need for appropriate PD to support them in the growing CALD school environments and some suggested topics that would be of benefit to their school staff. Staff also commented that the PD should be school specific while some concerns about teacher literacy skills were raised.

Need for professional development

There was consistent recognition of the need for appropriate, ongoing PD sessions in the area relating to teaching students from CALD backgrounds. Examples from some of the staff follow. A special education teacher said, “the teacher’s role continues to grow in complexity. Appropriate PD is needed to enhance skills in this
changing cultural environment” (F, Chinnor, ID 293) while another thought PD was “needed to help create a greater awareness of the diversity in classes” (M, Brightwell, ID 32). A third suggested that there is a need for PD and said, “each year the number of these kids increases so we need a whole school approach to understanding these students’ needs” (F, Idstone, ID73).

Staff saw the need for ongoing PD through the increasing diversity that was occurring in their individual schools. They also commented on the urgency of having appropriate PD occurring in their school facilities now and for this to be ongoing.

**Topics for professional development**

When staff were asked what specific areas they thought would enhance their teaching in multicultural schools, many could offer no suggestions. Some suggested that knowing about the cultures and appropriate teaching strategies would be of assistance, as exampled by the following.

Yes! We have a reasonably large percentage of EAL/D students. It would be nice to have some background about their cultures, how they learn, what sort of schooling systems they have been exposed to, how to present basic information without being insulting, etc. So, ultimately, some useful small strategies that can be used without having to prepare complete lessons to cater for 1 or 2 students. Even being advised to write instructions on the board is a small but very useful strategy that is doable for any busy teacher. (F, Idstone, English, ID 71)

A common suggestion was “specific strategies for teaching EAL/D students. We need to know how to do stuff, like the teaching strategies” (F, Brightwell, Humanities, ID 33). An English teacher at Henley also suggested some appropriate teaching strategies by offering, “yes, we have multicultural students so any strategies would be good particularly doable ones that can be implemented quite easily” (ID 356). To enhance their knowledge about teaching strategies, a Chinnor teacher went further and observed specific education was needed and suggested,

we need cross-cultural training as well as strategies to assist teachers to help their EAL/D students in the mainstream classroom. Teachers also need to do professional reading and work with their EAL/D specialists if they have any at their school. (F, English, ID 343)
Education, appropriate to the composition of the school community, was suggested as a guide as to what was needed and this was suggested by one of the deputy principals at Idstone who said,

PD should be offered in schools that reflect the “how to do” in multicultural classrooms. It needs to be school based and tailor-made. This will still not be completely effective because you need to consider the cultural biases and understandings of your teacher base which cannot be done based purely on quant data. Continue to up-skill staff in their subject area in teaching practices and tested strategies that can be adapted for the multicultural classroom. (ID 113)

Similar to the comments offered by the deputy principal from Idstone, the following raised similar concerns:

This is the tricky one. A generalised overview of the sorts of challenges that exist in diverse classrooms could be useful but after that, it would be best to target specifics depending on the teacher and classroom – no one size can fit all when catering to specific needs. And as far as dealing with difference, well, you can only do so much if individuals are bigoted to any degree. (F, Aston, ID 347)

Two other staff members put forward their thoughts in relation to PD and the need for staff new to a school, and support staff, to receive appropriate PD. A male science teacher at Idstone said, “while all teachers should have appropriate PD, new teachers to a school with multicultural diversity should be offered specific courses” (ID 43). A teacher aide at Idstone felt that “appropriate training should also be provided to those in classroom and support roles who are not teachers” (F, Idstone, Aide, ID 124).

Comments by a Mathematics teacher at Idstone (F, ID 49) sum up what the teachers had identified as needed for their ongoing PD when she said, “what is changing is the awareness of this. We need to address it through appropriate PD and other education. We need information appropriate to our school. Just how do we do this and do it now”.

5.3.1.2 Preservice teacher education

Though not a school process, education about and understanding of CALD students needed to start with preservice teachers during their preservice courses,
according to most of the teachers. From the total staff (n=337) who completed surveys, only 16 (4.7%) had completed either undergraduate or postgraduate study about teaching students from diverse backgrounds. In the schools to which these teachers were attached, 20.5% of the students were from bi/multilingual homes.

**Preservice teacher education relevant for teaching CALD students**

Teachers acknowledged that appropriate ongoing PD relevant to CALD learners would be of benefit to them in current classes now; however, most commented that this should start when a student enters university to commence their preservice courses to become a high school teacher. Most of the comments from teachers about preservice teacher education related to the need for an understanding of the relevant cultural diversity within their establishments because this country and these communities are now multicultural. Additional understanding was needed, they suggested, because of the changing composition of the modern classroom as “now we are a multicultural nation and promote equality for everyone and that includes in schools so teachers need to have an understanding of this diversity” (F, Idstone, ID 133). The speed at which this change has occurred in classrooms was acknowledged by a female teacher at Chinnor (ID 343) when she said, “yes, there is cultural and linguistic diversity evident in all classrooms and this change has happened quite dramatically in the past 10-15 years”. Further,

we are now a very multicultural community and teachers need the appropriate knowledge and strategies from the start because of this change which is becoming more and more evident and occurring more rapidly. I guess there are also the kids we do not know about as well – those who speak another language at home. (M, Chinnor, ID 303)

A teacher from Aston, with over 30 years’ teaching experience, expressed her disbelief about the current lack of preservice education for teaching staff in relation to teaching students from CALD backgrounds. “It is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace that there isn’t better prep for teachers, they need to understand this diversity, they need to know it now, as you never know what you are going to walk in to” (ID 347). The comments made by this teacher were followed by her saying that she was thankful she had undertaken a voluntary diversity course at university and felt strongly that there was very limited education available in this area. Staff acknowledged and were clearly
aware of some of the cultural changes within their classes and most related a sense of urgency that teacher education needed to deal with this now rather than later when this diversity becomes more apparent:

The changes that we are seeing in our classes in relation to cultural diversity are happening rapidly. There is not just one cultural group any more but numerous ones all with different cultural and social beliefs and values. Our teachers need to be trained appropriately for the diversity in the classrooms now. (F, Idstone, English HOD, ID 117)

Further, it was noted by a female English teacher from Chinnor that staff at universities are trained in many areas but not in aspects of teaching in CALD classrooms. She stated,

There are more and more EAL/D learners in schools. There are lots of different cultures in Australian schools. This is now a reality and we need training in how to teach multicultural students. We get training on teaching Indigenous and SEP [Special Education Programs] students; we must also get training for multicultural students. (F, ID 338)

Many suggested that teaching strategies and how these could be implemented in the classroom should be a priority subject in preservice education. A female English teacher at Idstone (ID 71) saw “value in it being included in teacher training as it would help to prepare new teachers for such diversity – perhaps a semester about understanding different cultures and some teaching strategies”. Another English teacher (F, Chinnor, ID 313) commented that, “teachers are already catering to incredible diversity; it is incredibly difficult to add EAL/D to the mix without proper training. This should include the how to do – relevant material not just all the theory”. Another shared her thoughts about university education content when she said,

they need to be taught now in their training. It is imperative that teachers are aware of students’ diverse cultural backgrounds and how this impacts on students’ learning and the rest of the class. This understanding is important. It should also encourage sensitivity around cultural issues. (F, Brightwell, Humanities, ID 33)

Other staff felt that preservice teachers needed exposure to CALD environments during their courses because, as a deputy principal from Henley (F, ID 355) noted,
graduating teachers may have a permanent placement to a school where there are CALD students. Another from that school also shared this idea when he said,

> Obviously, our classes are becoming more diverse; without enough training or recognition of the scope and speed of this change, teachers will continue to struggle in diverse classrooms. Start it from the beginning. Many trainee teachers have never been in culturally diverse schools. Train them and put them into these schools on their pracs. (HPE, ID 359)

Of concern to two staff from Idstone were the English language skills of some current teachers. They felt these needed to be enhanced in preservice teacher courses before staff could effectively model and teach English language skills to ELLs.

> Many Qld teachers do not know/understand their own language to an appropriate level. Train teachers better; require them to know and use the English language properly themselves so they can teach all students. I think teacher-training needs more strategies for and practise with diverse learners. (F, DP, ID 113)

> Many students are living in households where language education is lacking. Unfortunately, so are too many of our teachers who need more rigorous English language training and skills to present the language across all subject areas. Yes – all teachers should be trained to teach all students – EALD students, gifted students, SWD [students with disabilities], Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students etc. (F, HOD Spec Ed, ID 116)

As the preceding discussion illustrates, staff related that they do not feel this is occurring in either setting. The school process of allocating appropriate ongoing PD to develop staff understanding of the multicultural environment within their school communities appears not to be a prioritised area of support for staff in all schools.

### 5.3.2 Enrolment processes

The process of enrolment, a school’s first interaction with students and families, was an issue raised with both staff and students. The move into secondary school can be daunting for some students and this may be more of a concern for families from language backgrounds other than English. For some, there may be unfamiliarity with the enrolment processes in Queensland schools. The following section reports on staff and students’ perceptions and knowledge of the enrolment process.
processes of their individual schools. Staff related their understanding of the processes used at their schools and this included their knowledge of how students actually are enrolled and who undertakes that process. Students were asked to reflect on the process they experienced when they enrolled at high school.

### 5.3.2.1 Staff enrolment knowledge

All staff (n=337), when completing the survey, responded to a question about how students were enrolled at their schools. It is clear from the following discussion that many staff are aware that while the enrolment process should effectively identify student needs this does not always happen, with reasons including the processes undertaken, the appropriate education of those involved and also, in some cases, a reluctance by parents to label their children as different.

Only 32 (9.5\%) of the respondents had some understanding of how enrolments were undertaken and what, if any, variations were made for EAL/D students during enrolment. When questioned further about this in the emailed surveys, 17 of the 21 believed that members of their administration team, including guidance officers, were responsible for all enrolments to their school community. They also knew that there was an additional process for students who present as being from CALD backgrounds but most were unsure what it entailed. Some detailed responses from staff about enrolments processes are reported in the following.

When commenting generally about student enrolments, one of the principals (Henley, ID 352) acknowledged that there are students with language backgrounds besides English that the school did not know about. She said,

> there is no doubt that there is a “hidden” component of undisclosed EAL/D students and families who think that hiding this at enrolments helps students integrate in to the school community. It is very hard to convince them otherwise and there is very little we can do to have them tell us. I don’t think they realise it would be helpful for us to know this information particularly now that we have an EAL/D trained staff member.

All staff were asked if they knew whether enrolment personnel at their school received additional education to enrol children from diverse backgrounds. When commenting on this, the above-cited principal from Henley continued that there was
nothing formal because at the level of Deputy Principal and Guidance Officer who do these interviews, this is well understood. Interpreter and support people are welcome if that is necessary. The school will also organise a phone interpreter if needed.

At three of the schools, staff knew that those who were involved with these EAL/D enrolments had received some PD in working with those from CALD backgrounds but were not able to expand on what this involved. At Chinnor, one of the English teachers reported that some concerns about some of the information on the enrolment form had been raised with their administration team.

There is a problem with enrolments. It has been picked up here. The families want to say English only, so they do and ignore the small space for them and their children to put in their other language. The parents see this and some may assume it means language at school in many instances, so they just tick the English only box. It is not a well-designed form – perhaps the families genuinely think it is language at school. We follow them up when we know and talk with them about it and sort it out. (F, Chinnor, ID 343)

Staff commented on the general process of enrolment and the schools’ procedures for ELLs. A Health and Physical Education (HPE) teacher from Henley said, “some students, or perhaps their parents, are reluctant to be identified as they do not want to be seen as different from the other kids in the school, so they say that they only speak English” (F, ID 221). Further, another HPE teacher commented on her survey that,

our Islander students need assistance. They come through NZ and their enrolments here are constantly overlooked. It is an area that needs to be picked up as we are getting more and more of these students and a lot of them do need some assistance particularly with their writing. The boys soon realise that not all of them are going to be NRL stars. (F, Idstone, ID 74)

An English teacher at Idstone suggested that the diversity within high school classes is problematic and that this should be examined from the administration perspective. She was unsure if those responsible for enrolments had appropriate knowledge to deal with the diverse cultures enrolling at her school. Further, she wrote,
many language diverse students (at my school) seem to miss any “diagnosis” on enrolment; however, there is a reasonably OK process for verifying students with disabilities. Quite often these second language students are categorised as having a problem (don’t know what the problem is) and are put into a lower class. I guess this is not really an enrolment issue – well, perhaps it is, it should be done right then – sometimes this may be alright as these classes often have a teacher-aide (untrained) who can mostly assist them. This really doesn’t address the problem though, does it? (F, ID 71)

Perhaps that comment sums up the teachers’ responses – they are aware there is a process mainly done by others and believe that processes in administration will attend to correctly identifying students and their various needs, including those who have another home language besides English and need strategic English language support. Another suggestion, put forward by one of the deputy principals at Brightwell, went further: she proposed that one way to identify and enrol students correctly, and then support those who needed it, was through diagnostic testing at enrolment to determine literacy levels – in reading, writing and speaking. This would be for all students, not just for these ELLs, as some families don’t identify. This would be beneficial for all staff and students alike and although time consuming and possibly expensive to start, students would benefit by being correctly assessed early. (ID 31)

From staff comments, it is clear that there are limitations in the enrolment processes and there appears to be a lack of knowledge about these processes by many staff at each school. As noted by one teacher, it would appear that some parents are reluctant to identify their children as coming from CALD backgrounds. This, combined with the apparent lack of appropriate education for those responsible for enrolments, either generally or for those dealing with families from CALD backgrounds, makes it difficult for enrolment staff to correctly identify and then refer the student for support as appropriate.

5.3.2.2 Student enrolment experiences

For many of the interviewed students, the completion of Education Queensland enrolment forms (see Appendix B9) occurred at home and there were only two
instances where the student was not present when this occurred. Key issues associated
with enrolment through student experiences are summarised in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Enrolment Comments – Interviewed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=68</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Other comments by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Interviewed, handed in enrolment forms at the end of the interview</td>
<td>22 Not asked if another language was spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Family said nothing about another language at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Family mentioned other home language; no further conversation about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Collected forms from high school office, filled in and dropped back to the school office</td>
<td>5 Not asked if another language was spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 Just took forms in to office and no conversation with office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>High school information night–collected and filled in forms, dropped back to the school office</td>
<td>5 Not asked if another language was spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Don’t know why parents didn’t put it in form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High school staff came to primary school and gave out enrolment forms; filled in at home, dropped at the school office</td>
<td>5 Form not checked, not asked about any other language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students did not see enrolment form so did not know what happened to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family went to the high school office, filled in forms at school and handed back in when completed</td>
<td>1 Nothing asked about anything</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once completed, enrolment forms were delivered to the school office by either
the student or the parent. Forms that were completed at interviews with appropriate
school personnel were handed to that staff member. From the information in Table 5.1,
it may be seen that over half of the students (n=37) simply handed in their forms at the
school office. A further 29 students attended an interview at their school with their
parents and someone from the school’s enrolment team. The experiences of students
with regard to these processes are discussed in more detail below.

**Students who were involved in an enrolment interview**

Twenty-nine students and their families underwent enrolment interviews with a
member of the administration team from their school. From those interviewed, 14
were of Asian heritage and five were from Maori/Pasifika backgrounds. While their
experiences varied, in only three instances were there any conversations about the
family having another home language besides English. A female student (Yr. 8, ID 1738) from Henley, whose family speaks Egyptian about 80% of the time at home, said,

We had an interview and I wanted to come here as my friends were coming here. We filled in some forms and had an interview with the deputy. She knew we were Egyptian as we told her but nothing further was said about speaking this language at home or about putting it on the form.

Several other students and their families had similar experiences. “Mum mentioned that we had another language at home but nothing further was said about it,” was the comment made by a male student from Idstone (Yr. 9, ID 772) whose mother speaks Tagalog (Asian) and they share this language about 10% of their time at home. He could offer no further reason as to why this was not discussed or why the family did not put this information on the enrolment form. The third student, a female from Aston (Yr. 8, ID 1215, Maori), said, “we filled in the forms and had an interview with a deputy. We said yes to another language in the form and mentioned it to the deputy. Nothing more was said about it”. In this student’s home, the Maori language is spoken about 50% of the time.

A female student (Yr. 9, ID 2031) from Chinnor related how, “we got the enrolment form, came for an interview, filled the form out with the deputy. All we talked about was me and what I liked to do. There was no mention of another language.” This family speaks Creole (African) about 90% of home time. No discussion occurred about another home language with her or with the other three students cited above. This lack of conversation may have disadvantaged these students’ learning as they may have been denied strategic support for their English language learning.

**Enrolment forms handed in at school office by family/student**

Thirty-seven students, or their families, handed in their completed enrolment forms to their respective school administration offices. Of these students, 23 were from Maori/Pasifika backgrounds and eight stated that their other language was spoken more than 50% of their home time, with one saying it was spoken 80% of the time. Five of these eight students have been in Australia for fewer than 5 years,
including the student whose other language is spoken for 80% of their home time. Of
the six students from Asian backgrounds, the other home language was spoken in two
homes more than 50% of the time. This raises the question as to why these students
were not asked further about their enrolment forms nor was the issue of another home
language raised. In fact, just the simple acknowledgment of receipt was the only
conversation that occurred.

Other students explained the enrolment processes that they experienced. For
one student, her sister picked up the enrolment forms which were “filled in at home
and dropped at the school office. We didn’t tell anyone about our other language. I am
not sure why we didn’t because we speak it a lot at home” (Aston, Yr. 9, ID 948). This
student’s family speak Samoan for 40% of home time. Her school results, English C,
and Maths and Science D, suggest she is having some difficulty with her academic
progress. Further, when commenting about her use of Samoan and English she said
that she did mix them up and that the two languages do confuse her at times. This
student has lived in Australia all of her life but there was no conversation on
enrolment about another language besides English in the home.

Two students, from different cultural backgrounds, expressed similar
experiences at their schools. A Year 7 student of Nepalese heritage said that he
received the forms at primary school and then, “we filled them in at home and then
just dropped them in at the school office. Nothing was said about anything. They just
said thanks. No one asked about speaking another language” (Aston, ID 1550). This
student’s family speaks their heritage language approximately 40% of their home time.
Similarly, a female student at Brightwell, whose family speak Hindi about 50% of the
time, added “the lady at the office was nice but there was nothing said about my
language at all” (Yr. 9, ID 2).

Of the 68 students interviewed, none indicated that they had been asked any
questions about another home language besides English. Some 39 families dropped the
completed forms at the school office but they indicated that no questions were asked
of them about another home language; senior administration staff interviewed the
other 29 and though some parents indicated that they had another home language no
further discussion was raised on this topic. Thus, across the schools, an apparent lack
of conversations between families and staff members about any other home language was noted.

### 5.3.3 English language support

For some students, being classified as EAL/D may provide them with access to some additional English language support within their schools above that available to other students. Of the total 510 students where English was not the only language spoken in the home (261 EAL/D and 249 Undefined), 115 (22.7%) reported receiving some additional English language support. Table 5.2 summarises the different types and levels of support received by students from these two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of English language support</th>
<th>Migrant centre</th>
<th>ESL primary school</th>
<th>ESL high school</th>
<th>Parent-funded tuition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAL/D n=261</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined n=249</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined interviewed n=68</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary school settings were the locations where many students (n=77) from this group received English language support and the majority receiving it here were newly arrived migrants or refugees, as shown in Table 5.2. Of the students in the EAL/D group, 101 (38.7%) received some form of additional English language support – this included that provided by schools or by family-funded private tuition. In comparison, only 14 (5.6%) of the students in the Undefined group reported having received any additional assistance with their English language needs. This was predominantly while in primary school (n=5, 2%) or through parent-funded tuition (n=6, 2.4%). For example, two such students from the Undefined group, who received ESL English language support in primary school, commented in the following. A female Pasifika student from Idstone said,

we came here when I was in Year 6 and I received extra ESL English help in Year 6. I am getting better at English and I haven’t had any extra help this year, just my English teacher tries to help me a lot. (Yr. 7, ID 513)
I have been here nearly all my life and I speak Hindi. In primary school, I got ESL help with my English up till Year 4. I got a B last term in English and I have to continue to work very hard to improve. My teacher helps me. (F, Brightwell, ID 2)

Both of these students commented that they had received some assistance in primary school and that the assistance they receive now, for English language support, is only from their classroom teacher. Both of these families speak their other home languages for more than 50% of home time.

Some parents were able to pay for additional private English lessons for their children, as exampled by two students, one from Maori and the other from Vietnamese linguistic backgrounds. A Year 8 student from Idstone has been in Australia for 7 years and the family speaks Maori about 10% of their home time. He said that, “I passed English. I’m not very good at it. My teacher tries to help me but lots of kids need help. Mum paid for an English teacher person to help me. I didn’t like it too much” (M, ID 892). The other found that the assistance of an English language tutor had helped her improve her English marks. “I got Bs in all my subjects. My parents pay for a tutor to help me with my English. I am now doing OK. My English teacher at school is very good and she helps me when she can” (F, Aston, Yr. 7, ID 1483).

This Year 7 student from Aston now appears to be doing well in her school subjects after her parents paid for additional English language support. The student from Idstone, who also received some English language support, also seemed to have benefitted. It would appear that receiving this additional English language support has benefitted these two students as well as those indicated above who received ESL English language support in primary school. The strategic support received has had positive benefits for these students.

5.4 Pedagogical practices

RQ 4 What pedagogical practices do teachers and students identify that may result in addressing the educational learning needs of undefined students from bi/multilingual homes?

Each teacher develops his or her own teaching styles and strategies used in the classroom. Students also develop their own learning styles and respond in different ways to the strategies that are used in their various classes. Staff and students shared their knowledge about schooling in multicultural environments. Some teaching
strategies as well as some difficulties teachers have experienced in CALD classes are reported here, as are students’ learning styles.

5.4.1 Teaching strategies

In both the staff surveys and the emailed surveys, teachers related strategies they have used in diverse classrooms, as summarised in Figure 5.2. They shared what strategies they felt had succeeded for culturally diverse students and if these were appropriate for all students. Further, they shared any difficulties they had experienced in these classes and specifically any English language difficulties with students they knew had another home language besides English.
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Figure 5.2. Teachers’ views on teaching CALD classes.

Staff shared a range of strategies that they had utilised in their classrooms with CALD students. One teacher said, “the cultural make-up of the school is constantly changing – this makes it challenging to cater for all students by using appropriate strategies and knowing the right strategies to use for EAL/D students” (Aston, F, Business, ID 179). Staff suggested teaching strategies in both the surveys and from the emailed surveys. A selection of suggested teaching strategies follows.

5.4.1.1 Explicit instruction, visual prompts

Good teaching practice, one teacher suggested, can be achieved by “explicit instruction for reading skills – to explicitly teach students reading behaviours; explicit vocab instruction – word of the day, and explicit instruction in writing – to build writing capacity” (F, Idstone, ID 90). This teacher has English as her third language.
Another English teacher from Idstone suggested “explicit instructions on the board and on handouts – each with step by step instructions to help with understanding usually works” (F, ID 133). Fifteen of the staff mentioned “explicit teaching” on the emailed surveys and another 47, from the 172 staff, commented in this section on the survey.

Just under a quarter (n=41, 23.8%) of staff commented in this section on the survey and several from the emailed surveys also identified visual cues or aides as a primary strategy in a CALD classroom. Visual cues were utilised, whether it was by trying to cater to different learning styles or by using videos where “clear goals for such use were defined and students were aware why they were using that resource” (F, Idstone, Science, ID 81). An English teacher, who also teaches social sciences, said that she likes “to use images to explain different processes. I find I do this most in SOSE [study of society and environment] classes, but not really in English classes. I draw (very) basic images on the board for this” (Chinnor, ID 338). Another (F, Henley, English, ID 356) simply related that she uses visual prompts to help the students understand different concepts and difficult parts of the work.

Some of the teaching staff had found that these strategies of explicit instruction and the use of visual cues had worked in their CALD classes.

5.4.1.2 Checking for prior knowledge, checking for understanding

Checking on students’ prior knowledge and checking for understanding were also strategies used by several teachers. A Science teacher (F, Chinnor, ID 337) noted the importance of checking for prior knowledge and the role it plays in her teaching plan.

My aim is to help all students make connections between what they know and my subject material. Establishing their prior knowledge is very important in any subject and even more so for students with another language besides English. I want to improve engagement by providing ways all students can experience success.

Others shared how they checked that the students understood the content that had been taught. A female English teacher (ID 71) at Idstone said she knew that students understood when she saw “some nod, write something down or underline it”. Another (Idstone, English, ID 133) believed she knew her approaches worked “when I
check for understanding and the students’ responses indicated [to her] that they understood the explained content”. A teacher from Chinnor revealed she knows her teaching strategies work with her students when they “recount content/information, use subject specific vocabulary, ask questions, discuss work/assignment requirements with peers, able to work independently for some/part of an assignment/activity, help other students” (English, ID 343).

Some students identified that they wanted their teachers to check they understood content before moving on to the next phase of the work and in the above, some teachers related the importance of this strategy. They also indicated the importance of checking students’ prior knowledge about any content, for all students. As indicated, this is vitally important for students from CALD background who may have limited prior knowledge in some subject areas.

5.4.1.3 Other teaching strategies

Others (surveys n=19, emailed surveys n=2) suggested the importance of breaking the material down into manageable amounts and then taking the time to explain and re-explain if needed. “A range of strategies is used daily. I scaffold their work which helps them engage with the curriculum” (F, Idstone, Humanities, ID 116) was part of this teacher’s daily routine with her classes. Other strategies suggested including grammar and reading exercises, group work, more work on the board, practical demonstrations, larger fonts used on handouts, lots of white space on the handout page, and peer mentoring.

One Chinnor teacher’s summary of her strategies incorporated many of those indicated individually by other teachers when she said,

One idea at a time. Simplify. Put learning/content into context. Give students time to think/plan/complete tasks. Go over foundation/background knowledge. Recast/paraphrase information/knowledge in as many ways as possible. Give students opportunities to interact/participate in learning/activities and ask questions. Focus on developing oracy – reading/writing skills will follow. Assume students will learn – but don’t assume they know/understand content, context or background information. Check often for understanding. Be encouraging. (F, English, ID 343)
Staff suggested that the teaching strategies they used in their classrooms were of benefit to all students regardless of their cultural or linguistic backgrounds and this was reinforced by the principal at Henley (ID 352) when she said, “in my experience, the strategies for EAL/D students are great for all students”. The importance of remaining “flexible and open to change – ready to adapt practice to meet learners’ needs and learning styles” (F, Chinnor, English ID 343) was suggested as an important element for all teachers to bear in mind about all students. “Strategies used are dependent on the student – each student is different” and, as suggested by a Maths teacher (F, Chinnor, ID 339), “good ESL practice helps all students”.

Not all staff offered suggestions of the teaching strategies they have used in CALD classes. More detailed responses from those who completed the emailed survey suggested that explicit instructions, use of visual cues, checking for prior knowledge and for a student’s understanding, and being able to be flexible with the strategies used in a classroom, though these may be targeted at CALD students, were teaching strategies which benefitted all students.

5.4.2 Difficulties faced in teaching in CALD classrooms

Through both the surveys and emailed surveys, staff related any difficulties they had encountered with CALD students while teaching in diverse classrooms. They raised their own lack of knowledge about some cultures, some behaviour concerns mainly with male students, and the lack of English language skills by some ELLs. Some of their responses are related in the following section.

5.4.2.1 Cultural difficulties

Two areas of concern raised by staff in emailed surveys were students’ racist comments and sexism. A male, manual arts teacher at Henley (ID 230) was concerned about the “students’ racist jokes and bullying” that he witnessed from all students. Further, a female teacher from Chinnor (English, ID 338) said,

> racism is a major difficulty. Some kids are just ignorant and they soon figure out I do not like racism at all so it tends not to last long. They are quite terrible how they talk and act to one another at times. It does lead to good discussion about the topic however.

The other concern related to some male students’ attitudes to female teachers. In some cultures, male students will not listen to female teachers, as the Science HOD at
Henley (F, ID 357) shared, “sexism from older ethnic boys towards myself and other students is quite apparent”. Other teachers also commented on this when they said, “male students do not respond to female teachers” (F, Chinnor, Special Education, ID 316); further, “Muslim boys show a lack of respect for female teachers” (M, Brightwell, Horticulture, ID 21) and there is a “lack of respect for female teachers from some male students” (F, Henley, Home Economics, ID 237). Another teacher from Henley simply said, “some boys are disrespectful to teachers, particularly female ones” (F, Science, ID 224).

One staff member from Chinnor mentioned the importance of creating a learning environment that was suitable for students’ learning. She suggested that it is necessary to create “a quiet, hassle-free environment where students feel safe and learning can occur” (F, English, ID 343). She further suggested that there are “tricky areas of student interaction – religion, politics, customs, attitudes” and all staff need to be able to recognise these potential areas of difficulty. Further, she said from her discussions with students that they preferred “actually having a quiet environment”. No other staff member commented on the importance of the quiet learning environment.

Some of the difficulties expressed in the interviews highlight a lack of understanding of the various cultures within the classrooms and the problems between different cultural groups within them. These challenges and “not being clear about the detail/customs can mean you are unintentionally causing an issue” within the class (F, Idstone, Science, ID 81). This lack of knowledge leads to teachers not “being able to accommodate all students; not having an understanding of the culture and what is the best teaching strategy to use for them” (F, Idstone, English, ID 133). Further, “cultural diversity in classes presents challenges socially and emotionally for all students. The teacher’s role has become very complex,” according to a special education teacher at Chinnor (F, ID 295). A home economics teacher (ID 38) at Idstone wrote, “this school is very multicultural and should be recognised as such and receive more support and trained staff. Not knowing how to teach these students is frustrating for both teachers and students and often results in behaviour issues”.

5.4.2.2 English language concerns

Many of the staff believed that the classroom difficulties they had experienced were not limited to their subject area but that the key learning areas, such as subject
English, experienced more difficulties. A deputy principal (F, ID 355) at Henley noted that these difficulties are “in all subject areas because most Queensland schools use a model of integration rather than withdrawal”. In Queensland, ELLs who are in mainstream schools are integrated into normal classes rather than having specialist classes that could be designed for them. A female teacher from Idstone, (English, ID 71), suggested that the causes of some of the English language challenges might have caused by one or several reasons. These included “a lack of ability, lower reading level, poor spelling/grammar, lack of engagement, fear of failure, fear of being wrong, behaviour issues to cover up any inabilities, students at different stage/level of abilities, not trying, non-submission of work”.

Concerns raised by teachers about the students’ English language knowledge and use included the areas of lack of prior knowledge, vocabulary awareness, lack of vocabulary for technical terms, and a general lack of written communication skills. Another issue was “the different levels of language” (F, Henley, English, ID 356) within the class and this created difficulties. ELLs’ English language abilities ranged from “students not being aware of local/western culture and history thus impacting on comprehension when studying texts particularly in subject English” (F, Brightwell, HOD Humanities, ID 33) to the students’ inability to comprehend simple words that native English speakers take for granted. Also of concern were, “the English words with very different meanings depending on context. Spelling has many exceptions to the rule. Plurals are difficult for some students that don’t have these in their native tongue. Tense is a particularly difficult concept to grasp” (F, Chinnor, Science, ID 337).

The principal at Henley (F, ID 352) expressed the concerns of many teachers when she said,

teachers find the range to cater for overwhelming – EAL/D, learning difficulties, ASD [Autism Spectrum Disorder], and the like – and tailoring resources and tasks to an individual is very time-consuming. Specialist teachers who can do some of this and provide advice to teachers are essential.

Though acknowledging that it would add to the complexity of teaching in such a diverse class, the head of the Humanities department (M, ID 303) at Chinnor said, “I value EAL/D students as they often have worldly perspectives on issues discussed in
class and as such need clear identification and support”. Further to this comment, a deputy principal (ID 355) at Henley suggested,

we need a consistent definition of and funded support for EAL/D students. We also need clear identification and acknowledgement of students who have another language and do not fit into this category. Many of these students need as much if not more support than the known EAL/D students and much of this is based around their English language knowledge and use.

If this identification was clear, she felt, some of these expressed concerns would be alleviated earlier in an ELL’s education and this would “go a long way to helping these students and staff”.

The range of English language skills within any class varies but this is extended when students from non-English speaking backgrounds are added in to the mix. Awareness of and ability to highlight these concerns is the first step in offering solutions to them. The concerns about student behaviours are focussed on particular cultures and religions and here both the teachers and students are showing a lack of cultural knowledge and understanding when working within an English-speaking environment.

5.4.3 Students’ reported learning strategies

Each student, within each classroom, uses different learning strategies to accommodate their learning. When asked what helped them to learn in class, the students in this study all responded positively as they were being asked to express something about themselves and their style of learning. Figure 5.3 is a summary of students’ views in relation to how they learn in different contexts.
Students were given the opportunity to reflect on how they best learnt and what worked for them in the classroom. During the interview, they were asked some questions about how they undertook school tasks and learnt their subject material; their main responses are summarised in Figure 5.3. Across all contexts, the students sought for the material to be broken down and repeated as often as necessary, and then for the teacher to check for understanding before moving on to the next section of work. One area raised only in the question when students could tell the teacher about how they would like them to teach them, was that they preferred a quiet working environment. What they sought was good teaching practices; students’ comments are explored further about these and other ways of learning in the following sections.

5.4.3.1 Break down the content

When sharing about their learning strategies, 43 of the 68 students interviewed stated that they preferred the subject content to be broken down in to small units,
explained, repeated as often as needed for understanding, and then for the teacher to check that the content is understood before moving forward. Twenty-one students reported the “break down the content” method as a strategy used in their favourite teacher’s class and 17 said that their teachers also used this in their favourite subject lessons. Nine reported its use when preparing to write a narrative and 31 said that they would ask teachers to break down the content and work with it a small piece at a time. In all, 43 (64.7%) of the total students interviewed commented in a positive manner about how breaking down the subject content helped them learn, as evidenced from the comments from two students of Pasifika heritage.

I like to have the things broken down into little bits, explained and gone over and over. Sometimes I don’t get it first up, sometimes it needs more explaining and more breaking down until I finally get it. I like things explained to me in little chunks. (F, Brightwell, Yr. 8, ID 238)

I need you to take time and explain things slowly; go step-by-step and break it down and break it down even more if I don’t get it the first time. I need you to go over and over it and break it down to the basics until I’ve got it. (F, Aston, Yr. 9, ID 948)

As seen by these two examples, the students not only needed the content broken in to small parts, but they also needed it broken down as many times as required until they believed they understood the base content on which to build their knowledge.

5.4.3.2 Repetition of content

Some students emphasised their need to have the subject content repeated as many times as necessary by their teachers to ensure their understanding. Many students (n=34) commented on this as a way of learning, as something that occurred in class when they are writing a narrative for assessment, than at any other time. Of the total group interviewed, 36 mentioned this as a method that helped them to learn the subject content. One female student from Aston said, “I like things broken down and to have them explained a few times so I can get it in my head” (F, Aston, Yr. 7, ID 1442). Two others expressed their opinions and what they believed worked for them when the classroom material was repeated several times. Two other Pasifika students echoed similar comments, with one Brightwell student saying that he needed the teacher to “go over it and over it again until you know that I understand. Do not continue until I do. That may be slow but I need it like that” (Yr. 7, ID 312).
The comments from a female student from Aston, of African heritage, reflected her need to have time to understand the content and this she was able to do when the teacher goes “slowly and explain things to me, go over and over the stuff many times. Repeat things for a couple of lessons and build up to the main point. Give me time to take it in each time you repeat it” (Yr. 8, ID 1215). Another African heritage student (M, Chinnor, Yr. 8, ID 2233) found the technical material difficult and asked that this was not undertaken at the beginning of a lesson, but rather that the teachers went over content three or four times as it allowed him time to think about the harder material. These thoughts were echoed by another student from the same school, when she shared,

say things simply first, not technical stuff. Then teach the meaning and then build up to technical stuff. Going over stuff helps me – three or more times – first time I sort of get it and it takes a couple more times for me to get it. Say it lots and build up to the technical stuff. (Yr. 9, ID 2031)

Like the comments expressed by the students who asked for the content to be broken down, those who liked it repeated several times were suggesting that not only did they need more time for processing, they also needed time to understand the content – understanding that they saw would be gained by repetition.

5.4.3.3 Check students for understanding

Thirty-two of the interviewed students wanted the teacher to take time and make sure they knew the material being taught before moving on to the next section of the lesson; that is, they wanted their teachers to check their understanding of the content being taught. Comments by two students from Idstone reflect those made by others about this desire to have personal checking by the teacher.

I need to have things explained and to be given time to make sure it gets into my brain. I wish teachers would check that I actually knew stuff before they start something new. I don’t always get it. I need more time sometimes. They need to make sure I understand as there is no sense moving to new stuff if I haven’t got the old stuff, that just frustrates me and I give up. (M, Yr. 9, ID 772)

Don’t be in a hurry. I need time and a quiet space. Make sure I know what I am doing. Sometimes I don’t and I don’t ask questions because that makes me feel stupid. So
teachers need to take the time to check with me that I do know what it all means. (F, Yr. 7, ID 513)

For some interviewed students, all of these classroom processes mentioned have a role to play in their learning. “I need teachers to take time, explain things slowly, go over it lots, go step by step and break each bit down. I could tell them when I have got it and we could move on” (F, Aston, Yr. 9, ID 948) was a comment that summed up good teaching practice. This was recognised by this student as the way forward for her in her learning. One student’s apparent frustration surfaced when he explained that he wanted teachers to “make sure I understand it [content] before you go on to the next thing that is important. What is the point of moving on if I don’t know the basic stuff, that is not good and doesn’t help me” (M, Idstone, Yr. 7, ID 488).

Checking for understanding was seen as important by the students, as they indicated that if they did not understand the content, it leads to frustration and they fall further behind in the subject. What the students have indicated again as strategies that help with their learning are simply good teaching strategies.

5.4.3.4 Quiet learning environment

During the interviews, students related how they would suggest ways for a teacher to teach them during a lesson – what they believed would help them to learn. Nearly half (n=33) of them stated that they needed a quiet space and they offered various reasons for this requirement. This group was comprised of 11 males and 22 females spread across the three year levels. They represented all of the main language regions – 13 Maori/Pasifika, eight Asian, eight European, two African, and two from the other language regions. Most reported that they spoke (n=31), read (n=30), or wrote (n=28) English at the VW/W levels. In contrast, many reported that they did not speak (n=20), read (n=21), or write (n=20) their other home language very well at all. Their academic results in English ranged from A (4), B (14), C (11), and D (4) across the year levels, with Mathematics very similar: A (4), B (10), C (18), and D (1).

Comments from these students, from across all five schools, about their preference for a quiet learning environment are explored in the following.
Noisy classrooms

Thirteen of these students specifically shared opinions about the noisy classrooms at their schools and in five instances they wanted the teacher to control the noise so they could progress with their work. This was demonstrated by comments such as, “I am not too good in a noisy classroom as it distracts me. I need the teacher to tell the other kids to shut up so I can concentrate and do my work,” said a Year 8 student from Idstone (F, ID 652). “I need to concentrate, so I need it quiet. Too many of our classes are very noisy and the teacher just lets that happen. I need quiet” (M, Yr. 8, Brightwell, ID 222). One told how she needed “a quiet classroom to help me focus. Too many of our classes are noisy and the teacher doesn’t bother. I am glad when I get home to my quiet house to work” (Chinnor, Yr. 9, ID 2031). Of the remaining 10 students who commented about their noisy classrooms, five were from Maori/Pasifika backgrounds, four from Asian, and one from another language background (Welsh).

Quiet environment allows focus and concentration

For some (n=12), the ability to concentrate was the main reason they preferred a quiet learning environment. Being able to focus on the task was seen as easier when the class was quiet, as reported when the student from Henley suggested it allowed her to “focus on my work. We have told Mrs …. that we like it quiet as it is best and helps us to work stuff out. Sometimes then I could take a bit longer and that would be OK” (Yr. 8, ID 1738). Being able to concentrate was essential for one Aston student who suggested she need a quiet space where “I can think, mainly quiet where I can concentrate. Some of my classes, the noise is too much. I don’t know why the teacher doesn’t stop it so we can all work” (F, Yr. 9, ID 1017). Quiet to these two students allows them to concentrate and focus on the tasks at hand.

Quiet environment allows thinking time, sorting time, hearing properly

Eight students reported that they needed time to think about what they were learning in class and then time to sort through that material in their heads. One of these students, a Year 8 Pasifika heritage male from Brightwell (ID 192), simply said, “I don’t like it noisy and I need time to think about things”. This student had only been in Australia for 3 years and his family speaks Tongan for 50% of their home time. When commenting about subject English he said, “I think in Tongan. I guess I should be
thinking in English because they are different”. This perhaps explains why he needs
time to think – he needs the time to process from his Tongan home language into
English and he needs a quiet space to accommodate that.

Another male student from Brightwell (Yr. 7, ID 284) also indicated that he
liked it “when the class is quiet so I can hear properly and then have time to think
about it”. From comments by this student, when talking about his school subjects, he
said that he had some difficulties in understanding some teachers because too many
students talked in the class and he could not hear teachers properly. This student’s
family speaks Samoan for 10% of their home time and though he does not read or
write this other language, he rated himself as average in speaking it. His academic
results were Cs in English and Maths and a D in Science; he has received all his
schooling in Queensland. This could be another instance of the student working in the
home language in class and needing time to process back in to English. Of the
remaining six students, from Pasifika or Asian heritage, all suggested that they needed
time “to think” or to “work things out”. Even though all of these families only spoke
their other home languages for 10% of the time, this still appears to be an issue.

By having a quiet environment, these students felt that they could learn better
as they could stay focused on their classroom content and not be distracted. While
other students were less explicit regarding their need for quiet, some mentioned being
able to concentrate or focus on their work in a quiet environment. Most simply
reported that they needed a quiet environment because, without it, they were unable to
do the work required of them in the classroom situations. The teachers referred to
perhaps did not see that, for some of these students, a quiet working and learning
environment is important for their continuing progress with their school achievements
because it allows them to concentrate on the language of the classroom. For some of
these students they would be utilising their other home language as well, and this quiet
environment would not only assist them in processing their work but would also help
to improve their English language skills.

5.4.3.5 Other learning strategies

Other strategies that students indicated in the interviews that are assisting them
to learn included taking notes (n=19), the use of visual prompts (n=15), and question
and answer time (n=9) in which the students asked questions and the teacher took time
to answer. From the students who mentioned note taking, the common theme was that they found that not only did it help them remember the content, but it also allowed them to go back to the notes and reflect on the content. Comments from two female students show this point, with one Year 9 student saying, “I like to see things on the board and then I can copy it. I like to take notes and I can go back and look at them again” (Brightwell, ID 721), and the other, “I love taking notes as this helps me to learn. Handouts I never really read. The more I can take notes the more that gets in my brain. I can also then go back and re-read them” (Henley, Yr. 7, ID 1697).

Some students indicated that they preferred visual prompts to help with their learning and, as one Year 9 student from Brightwell said, “I like to learn visually and have things drawn out for me – use the board, I think I need to be shown things” (F, ID 4). Another liked “demonstrations and pictures. I like being able to copy things and see how that works” (F, Brightwell, Yr. 9, ID 23) while another wanted classes made “fun. Show me some videos that are about what we are doing. I also like hands on stuff, I learn that way too” (M, Idstone, Yr. 8, ID 631).

Nine students preferred being able to ask questions of teachers and for the teacher to take time in explaining the answer. As a Year 8 student from Idstone said, “give me time to think about the work and then let me ask questions. I also like to take notes and then ask more questions. Asking questions works for me” (F, ID 1355). Another also liked asking questions and he said, “I would ask you [teacher] questions and then you would take the time to explain it to me. Then if I wasn’t sure I would ask you more questions or you could ask me some more questions back” (Brightwell, Yr. 7, ID 354).

Student generally responded in a positive manner when asked about what strategies they use in their learning environments. Besides some being frustrated that some teachers do not limit the noise in their classrooms, two other Year 7 students expressed their frustration at their teachers’ method of teaching. One asked that the teacher, “answer my questions don’t just say go back to the board and write the same stuff when I don’t know the beginning stuff” (M, Brightwell, ID 375). The other said, “I need you to explain it to me well and to answer all my questions, so I understand, not just tell me to go back to the book” (F, Aston, ID 1515).
These students offered a range of suggestions of things that would assist them with their learning and their responses also indicated the range of learning styles and strategies used by the students. Each learner’s needs were different. Each was able to articulate what they believed worked for them. Each took the opportunity to share, to have their voices heard about what helps with their learning and what additional practices could be utilised to help them further achieve in their learning environments – practices that their teachers were, in the main, unaware of.

5.5 Summary

This chapter further explored key school processes which may impact on student learning. It then recounted some of the teaching and learning strategies recognised as positive by staff and students respectively. Findings from teachers and students indicated a number of issues that would affect achieving the most positive support for multilingual students, these ranging from the processes that allowed the school to understand the cultural diversity within the school, the availability of and access to specialised support for students, and the overall preparation of teachers for working in CALD classrooms.

From the perspective of the staff, concern was expressed that there is now an urgent need for school-focussed PD in this area of teaching in CALD classrooms. Only a small number (n=35) of all staff surveyed indicated that they had undertaken any PD relevant to CALD classes. There was recognition of this diversity across staff from all schools and the acknowledgment that they were not appropriately trained nor did they understand the appropriate strategies to teach in such classes. Many also suggested that preservice teacher education needed to include subjects about teaching strategies for EAL/D students and an understanding of this diversity, as their initial preservice teacher courses had not prepared them for this changing cultural and linguistic diversity within classrooms.

Both staff and students also shared perspectives on enrolment processes. Many staff had little understanding of the general enrolment processes, though most knew that administrative staff undertook these. None of the interviewed students (n=68) had the issue of another home language raised with them, although all had another home language. This was the case in both the interview situations and when the student’s
enrolment form was dropped at the school office. Some of these students have their other home language spoken for more than 50% of this time.

Another school process discussed with students was the supply of additional English language support with such support being available to EAL/D students after an assessment process. However, where students have not been identified and assessed as EAL/D, no additional English language support is offered. In only three instances, from 510 students from bi/multilingual homes, was some additional English language support offered in these high schools. Parents, in some instances, facilitated private English tutorial lessons for their children.

Staff teaching and student learning strategies showed some similarity in methods that assisted a student’s learning. Both staff and students saw the need to break the material down and repeat the work as often as needed; both also raised checking for understanding. One preference raised by some students (n=33) was the need for a quiet learning environment to help them focus and concentrate and process the work being undertaken in the class. Only one teacher, in staff comments, raised this important consideration. The three school processes of staff PD, school enrolments, and English language support appear not to be benefitting all students and, for some, they may have the detrimental effect of negatively affecting the learning of some students.
Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Introduction

From this study, a number of key findings have emerged, with the first aspect being a clear identification of students, in the schools in this study, including bilingual students who are not so classified (n=249, 10.0%). The school and classroom experiences, particularly of unknown bilingual students, provide insights into these students’ cultural and linguistic experiences in their learning communities, an insight that Bronfenbrenner (1989) claimed important when trying to gain an understanding of the students. Additionally, the views of both students and teachers regarding the classroom environment and pedagogical practices offer new insights into not only staff preparedness to teach such students and the difficulties they have in doing so but also the learning styles of, and strategies used by, these students from bi/multilingual homes.

From the exploration of students in five schools, that were representative a range of ICSEA scores, it is clear that in all of these schools, there is quite a high proportion of students who are clearly bilingual but who, nevertheless, have neither been formally identified nor assessed for their English language competencies. Because they are not identified they are not eligible to receive any additional English language support, whether this be broader across-group support or more intensive, targeted support. Interestingly, this group was seen to be similar to the identified bilingual students’ group, which also had very diverse academic levels and varied support needs, from marked academic weaknesses needing targeted support to those where specific EAL/D programs would have the potential to improve their levels of academic achievement.

Teacher perspectives were gained about their preparation for teaching in CALD classes and their schools’ enrolment processes and, as well, information about important teaching strategies emerged. The exploration of the experiences of these Undefined students supported further important understandings about their educational needs and other high school experiences. Students provided details about their first experience with their schools through the enrolment processes, then provided insights in to aspects of their learning environments, insights that can further inform school and teacher practice. These findings, and their contribution to the literature, are discussed.
below in detail in relation to the school processes, teaching environments and school and classroom experiences of the students.

6.2 School processes

Understanding school environments, including the school processes that operate within them, can provide insights into each individual student (Bronfenbrenner, 1989) and their learning. The first aspect considered is the processes that support the preparation of teachers – their initial preservice courses and also subsequent PD undertaken by teachers within the school regarding effective teaching in CALD school environments. Enrolment processes are then discussed, both from the staff and students’ perspectives. Another school process raised through this research is the allocation of additional English language support for ELLs.

6.2.1 Professional development and preservice education

Reflections from teachers on their preparation, through both preservice education and ongoing school organized PD, provided a valuable insight into areas that they believe would have enhanced their preparation to teach in CALD environments. Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002) and Schmid (2001) found that the majority of ELLs in the USA were being taught by staff with no specialised education to cater for the changing CALD student body. Similarly, in this study, the low percentage of appropriately trained teachers (4.7% in preservice and 10.5% in PD) was surprising. This current study also affirms the research of Brown (2007), Kumaravadivelu (2008), Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011), and Xu and Drame (2007) whose studies all found that many teachers had no PD or qualifications to teach students from CALD backgrounds.

A further issue in this Australian research regarding the cultural background of teachers again aligns with past research such as that of Verdugo and Flores (2006), who had previously found a high percentage of teachers in the USA were monolingual English speakers. These researchers also noted that most of the staff had limited understanding of the students’ cultural backgrounds or their cultures, something which Bronfenbrenner (1989) suggested was of value when an understanding of each child was imperative to assist in achieving their learning outcomes. In this study, several staff in the emailed surveys suggested that they needed a better understanding of the predominant cultures within their respective schools. Similar to the findings of Luster
(2011), most of the teachers in this study were only trained for the mainstream classroom and had little knowledge about the cultures of the students within the broader school environment. Miller’s (2015) research found that in Australian universities there was a lack of appropriate preservice education available to prepare future teachers for the CALD classroom – this was also highlighted from evidence in this research where only 4.7% of teachers had received some education in these areas during their preservice studies.

Teachers also acknowledged that not only did they not have the specialised knowledge needed for these classes but they also did not understand the challenges these students faced, not only in English but also with the language needed in their content areas, confirming findings of previous work by Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011). As suggested by Bronfenbrenner (1989), an understanding of the influences on children’s lives is important so that they can assist them with their learning and, for many of these students, their cultural and linguistic heritages, and the role they play in their lives, are unknown by their teachers. Hélot and Ó Laoire (2011) found in their research that teachers did not understand the complexities of teaching a CALD class and this issue was acknowledged by most teachers in this study. Reeves (2006) showed that over half of the teachers in her research were open to receiving more PD and this, too, is reflected in responses from staff in the present study who saw that this was necessary now in both preservice education and ongoing PD.

Research by Amaro-Jimenez (2012), Gay (2010), Griner and Stewart (2012), and Reeves (2006) all highlighted the need for teachers to become culturally responsive when working in a CALD environment. Teacher responses, in this study, indicated that most could see the need to become aware of the changing cultural and linguistic diversity within schools. Further, they acknowledged that this would require them to undertake further courses that would help them become culturally responsive teachers. The majority of teachers suggested that this education should start in preservice, at university.

Many teachers in this study suggested, as had Flynn (2015) in discussing preservice education in England, that there should be some definite curriculum subjects about understanding the ELL. Similar to what Villegas and Lucas (2007) had previously reported, many teachers in this study thought it essential to include subjects
in preservice courses that enabled staff to gain an understanding of these diverse learners. Suggestions included areas such as cultural and religious differences of the various cultures, how these CALD students learn English, the types of errors they would be making in their English writing, and a range of teaching strategies applicable to various cultural groups. One teacher suggested the value of cross-cultural understanding, an approach also raised by Moloney and Saltmarsh (2016) in their research when they assessed an Australian university’s preparation of preservice teachers for teaching in a CALD school community. Responses from staff in relation to topics for PD were similar. They reported that the preservice education should give them the basics required to work in CALD environments and then the ongoing school PD should enhance that preparation, building on the topics that were started in preservice (Premier & Miller, 2010). Some placed emphasis on the PD being specific to the cultural and linguistic composition of their individual school communities. For the majority of teaching staff, the emphasis was on the “how to do” – How do I teach well in a culturally and linguistically diverse school community?

Thus, consistent with other literature about becoming culturally responsive teachers (Au, 2013; Coleman, 2010; Flores et al., 2015), this study found several situations where, in discussing the teaching environment, staff recognised their limited cultural awareness and its associated constraints on teaching in a CALD classroom. They also identified limitations in their preparation and indicated a need for greater preparation for this situation and the need for further ongoing, appropriate PD within their schools to address such a need.

6.2.2 Enrolment processes – teacher and student perspectives

The first point of entry to school is at enrolment – a point at which the school can identify student needs, including whether a student is from a CALD background. This process has indicated some constraints in being able to implement this identification. While the reasons for this constraint may relate to parents not explicitly identifying their children’s cultural and linguistic heritage, there may also be assumptions by school administrations that all families will declare their cultural and linguistic heritages on the enrolment form.

Ten percent of the students in this study were not documented as ELLs and their linguistic heritage was not recognised. This finding is similar to that indicated by
Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002) as to what had occurred to many ELLs in the USA. This may have occurred because the families lacked knowledge about, or were unfamiliar with, the education system, as Mills (2008) and Monkman et al. (2005) had reported from their earlier research; as a result, many in this study simply dropped the enrolment forms at the school with no communication about the form occurring with the office staff.

On, or prior to, enrolment, all prospective students and families receive school enrolment packages that should contain all the necessary information to enrol at high school. For many in this research, this does not appear to have happened as they have not completed the enrolment form correctly; nor for some have they completed the section in relation to their other home language. This situation appears to be similar to what Olsen (2010) reported in her Californian research when she suggested that many of the families in her study were not receiving all the information that they required to appropriately enrol their CALD children at school.

Several Pasifika students commented that they believed their parents did not fill in the section about another home language on the enrolment form. van Leent and Exley (2013) found a similar issue in their research in a Queensland school with a large Pasifika cohort. Perhaps some of the parents/carers had poor or no understanding of English and may not have understood what support may have been available to their children if they had identified another home language. Crosnoe (2010) found such a situation in his research. As reported by Mills’ (2008), some ELL families found the school process alienating. Did this occur for some of the families in this study? Perhaps the parents did not consider their children as true bilinguals, as they the parents were, so therefore did not report the children as having another home language. Weiss et al. (2009) had reported that some school processes created barriers between staff and families. Was this happening with the school enrolment process for some families because they were unfamiliar with the school processes?

Further, given that the largest cultural group of the interviewed students was Maori/Pasifika, the largely oral communication focus of their cultures may also be a factor to consider. The Queensland Education enrolment form (see Appendix B9) is nine pages in length, including instructions, and some of the printing very small and the content dense. Perhaps the unexplained requirements, as suggested by Crosnoe...
may have presented as quite intimidating to a people who would prefer to have the material explained to them. This may partly explain why so many of this group simply handed their enrolment forms to the school office and also why so few chose to request enrolment interviews.

This leaves the issue of why students, in many cases obviously from CALD backgrounds, and in some instances treated as bilingual students in classes, had not been formally acknowledged in some way by their school as such. The question remains, however, as to why there were no questions asked by school office staff or the interviewing personnel, from each school, as to whether or not there was another home language besides English. A lack of understanding in relation to how to be culturally responsive when interviewing those from CALD backgrounds may be one of the reasons why enrolment staff had no conversations with any of the 68 interviewed students and their families concerning another home language besides English.

Research by Spinelli (2008) showed that if students are not correctly identified on enrolment, they cannot be allocated the appropriate strategic support for their individual needs and, in fact, may be placed in mainstream or special education classes. Some students were not able to participate in the interview process for a variety of reasons including that they were special education students, habitual truants, or presented with behaviour issues. These behaviours, from students in the Undefined group, may in some instances have been caused because of the student’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Some teachers may have misinterpreted the student’s challenging behaviours (Au, 2013) incorrectly because of a lack of knowledge about the student’s heritage language.

**6.2.3 Additional English language support**

Students confirmed as having EAL/D are further assessed and may be allocated additional English language support (Queensland Government, 2013) if funding if available. For new arrivals, this support may occur in a migrant centre or be intensive at a special ESL school. According to Kim and Garcia (2014), most English language support courses are designed for new arrivals to an English-speaking country, not for longer-term English language learners, and the scenario in Queensland is similar. This may partly explain the low rate of additional support for ELLs reported
by the students in these state high schools, with only six (2 in the EAL/D group and 4 in Undefined) receiving limited additional English language assistance. For those in the Undefined group, six families chose to support their children with privately funded English language tuition, with five of these families being from an Asian heritage. This supports findings from Crosnoe’s (2010) research, when he reported that Asian families will find ways to resource their children’s education.

Even though some of the CALD families may not understand school processes, all want what is best for their children and that includes a good education, as previously discussed by Reay (2009) and Vera et al. (2012). Access to and understanding of school processes would be more open to CALD families if the processes were implemented in a culturally sensitive way by appropriately trained administration and support staff.

This section focused on the environment and preparedness that students are greeted with when they commence high school. One issue is that most teachers are not trained to cater for individual students’ particular cultural or linguistic needs. This is in opposition to Bronfenbrenner’s framework which suggested that an understanding of all influences of a student’s life is important. Further, school enrolment processes are not identifying all students with particular needs, especially those from CALD backgrounds and as a consequence, some students are then not being supported by a learning environment appropriate for these needs. Interestingly, these patterns were evident across all 5 schools, suggesting that regardless of the schools’ ICSEA rating, these issues were occurring.

6.3 Teaching environments – staff

This section provides a focus on the teaching environments and some difficulties that happen within classrooms. It looks at strategies used by the teaching staff in CALD classrooms and any difficulties they had encountered with known EAL/D students.

6.3.1 Teaching strategies

Most teachers are trained for and have developed teaching strategies that are appropriate for the mainstream group of students (Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002; Harper & de Jong, 2004; Verdugo & Flores, 2007) – those who are monolingual
English speakers. For many teachers in this study, they shared a range of strategies that they used generally in all their classes as they believed these benefitted all students – an interesting reflection, considering that there possibly would have been students from bi/multilingual homes in their classes who were unknown to them.

Several of the teaching staff who had received PD in relation to working with students from CALD backgrounds stated that that they used explicit teaching methods in their classes, not dissimilar to what Brown (2007), Harper and de Jong (2004), and Verdugo and Flores (2007) had described. They found that, by taking the time, repeating and explaining information in a more succinct manner and then giving students more practice at different tasks, the outcomes for all students were then more positive.

Staff praised some of these EAL/D students for what they brought to the classroom environment with their range of world experiences and knowledge, as had been foreshadowed by Flores et al. (2015). These teachers valued this diversity in their class, as was recommended by Kumaravadivelu (2008), and they, the teachers, had been able to refine and expand their teaching strategies to cope with the different ways that some of these students learnt. Checking for prior knowledge and then checking for understanding were two strategies that staff found helped them to gain not just a better understanding of the learners but also of the language that they were using in the classroom. This allowed the teachers to see if the students understood the meaning of the content, a strategy strongly recommended by Olsen (2010) when teaching ELLs.

Others found that it was of benefit to incorporate more English language teaching into their lessons, regardless of the subject area, a finding that Luster (2011) had earlier recommended. Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron’s (2011) research found that most secondary teachers saw themselves as content teachers only, not teachers of the English language, and this was more so the case with Mathematics and Science teachers. In this study, of the 86 staff who nominated Mathematics or Science as their main teaching areas, none made comments about incorporating more English language teaching in to their lessons.

No staff specifically suggested that different strategies should be used for different cultural groups although several said that, in their experience, all would benefit from a range of teaching strategies. Their comments differ from those found in
research by Fletcher et al. (2008) with Pasifika people when they found that, for some particular groups, different strategies needed to be employed to accommodate not simply the learning styles of the students but also their cultural mores. Across the five study schools, all have a notable percentage of students from Maori/Pasifika backgrounds. Perhaps this is a reflection of the teachers’ lack of cultural and linguistic understanding - an aspect that Bronfenbrenner (1989) considered essential in gaining an understanding of the student; or, perhaps it is a reflection of the deficit model, as described in research by Brown and Eisterhold (2004), Brown (2007), and Villegas and Lucas (2007), that some teachers hold about ELLs.

6.3.2 Difficulties experienced teaching in CALD classes

One of the difficulties experienced by some of these teachers, with some of the known EAL/D students in the classrooms, was the students’ lack of basic English skills. This aligns with the research by Chamberlain (2005) who found that students who did not understand the language of the classroom had difficulty in succeeding in their academic studies. These teachers also found that many of the students were missing the basic understandings and language skills of the English language, as found by Harper and de Jong (2004) in their study in which they encouraged teachers to ensure that this foundation material was taught and appropriate feedback was given in areas such as English language structures.

Cultural awareness was mentioned, by some staff, along with their lack of understanding about the different cultures and this reinforced the findings of Au (2013) and Harper and de Jong (2004) that for teachers to be culturally responsive, they had to understand the students’ ethnic background and then adapt their teaching to help the student with their learning. The teachers in this study acknowledged that they needed to expand their pedagogical practices to include those that are suitable for CALD classes of students, as suggested by Fletcher et al. (2009).

6.4 School and classroom experiences – students

When looking at the characteristics of students from bi/multilingual homes, some of the key factors that were found centred on the diversity of the students surveyed. One in five of all the students surveyed were from bi/multilingual homes and, of these, half were not documented and thus were invisible to their schools as coming from this linguistic environment, similar to what Menken et al. (2012) had
found in their research about LTELls in the USA. As with the EAL/D students, these Undefined students also had diverse needs and there clearly are different requirements for support to achieve their full potential. These range from broad, strategic support strategies for all bi/multilingual students to intensive support for a small number of students. A first step in developing any support strategy must be an awareness of the different target groups and their specific needs. Thus, the first questions, in line with the Melbourne Declaration (MCEECDYA, 2008), are who are these students and are they achieving their level of personal excellence, or are they just performing at a level that is considered reasonable and thus does not identify them all as needing remedial support?

**EAL/D and Undefined groups’ similarities**

The student voices have shown, through data from surveys and interviews, that the two groups – classified EAL/Ds and Undefined students – are similar. Because of a lack of operational knowledge about students in the Undefined group, similar types of pedagogical interventions offered to the EAL/D students were not offered to those in the Undefined group: These students are unacknowledged and therefore under-researched. As shown in the following paragraph, their circumstances are the same; the difference is only in their treatment.

Of the 2,484 students surveyed, 10.5% (n=261) were classified by their schools as EAL/D and a further 10.0% (n=249) as Undefined – also coming from bilingual homes. For both groups, the majority of the students were born in Australia and had lived in this country most of their lives. Within both groups of students, most (between 80% and 93%) assessed their English language skills (speaking, reading, and writing English) at the Very Well/Well levels with few (under 3.8%) assessing their skills at Not Very Well. The linguistic heritage of each group was similar – Asian, European, or Maori/Pasifika languages. More EAL/D students spoke their additional language more often at home than did the Undefined students. Results in subject English are similar for both groups, with the major difference being in the combined no results/fail categories (18.9% of the EAL/D group and 21.9% of the Undefined group). Across the NAPLAN results available there was a high proportion of students (36.9% of EAL/D students and 22.9% of the Undefined) recording below national minimum standards in the writing component. Mathematics results, in academic reporting and through
NAPLAN, showed that the EAL/D group was performing at a higher level than students in the Undefined group. These characteristics of students, who are all from bilingual homes, reflect the similarities between the members of the two groups.

**Undefined students**

Most of the students in the Undefined group were born in English-speaking countries – Australia 58.2% and New Zealand 30.9% – and were the children of migrants to Australia; however, the first language of their parents was still the main home language. Over half of this Undefined group had spent their whole life in Australia, and had undertaken all of their schooling in an English-speaking environment. These students come from across all five schools in this study. As seen in the previous chapter, students’ comments about their school environments were generally very positive, with only a couple of instances raised in relation to some interpersonal issues, which may have reflected differences amongst different cultures and their positive attitudes reflecting their wanting to be part of the normal school group. The following discusses the students’ linguistic and cultural diversity, their other language use at school, and classroom outcomes and support.

Of particular interest is the fact that the cultural heritage of students in this Undefined group was primarily Maori/Pasifika, European, and Asian, with nearly half coming from the first group. As reported by Samu (2006), many Maori/Pasifika peoples move to Australia to seek a better life for their families and this may partly account for the high number in this group. In contrast, in the EAL/D group, students from Asian backgrounds were the most identified, followed by Maori/Pasifika students and then African students. In this study, many of the families of the largest group in the Undefined, Maori/Pasifika, have chosen not to identity their cultural or linguistic heritage to their schools, possibly unaware of potential advantages that may be given to their students if they had done so.

**6.4.1 Other home language**

Almost all of the students interviewed spoke their other home language and this was also found with those identified as EAL/D students. A small group (n=6) spoke their home language at school and here the students voiced the importance of their culture to them, including using their other language with other students from the
same culture. These students had imposed boundaries by domain on their other home language use, as suggested by Brown and Eisterhold (2004), where they used their home language at home or with extended family and community, and English at school. The students also saw this other language as part of what Au (2006) and Jandt (2013) called identity, a vital part of their role in their cultural heritage. In contrast to those who used their other home language at school, one Afrikaans speaking student suggested it could be seen to be rude to speak their other language at school but gave no further explanation as to why this would be so. Another, of the same language heritage, said it was not important to speak his other language at school; rather, it was better simply to fit in with the whole school group, as Miller (2000) had found from some students’ comments in her Australian research. Perhaps the majority of the students reflect this view in choosing not to speak their other home language at school.

The majority of the students interviewed had not told their teachers of their other home languages as they believed there was no advantage in their teachers knowing, unlike Bronfenbrenner (1989) who suggested that knowing about the influence on a child, in this instance their linguistic heritage, was important when learning about the child. From the group, 13 (19.1%) answered that their teachers definitely knew of their other home language. This finding is of interest when assessed next to the finding of Flores et al. (2015) who found that students wanted their teachers to know about all aspects of their cultural heritage, including language, and above all wanted their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds to be valued. This may partly be explained, in this study, by the fact that families did not identify their children’s cultural and linguistic heritage on enrolment and the children may have been led to believe that it was not important to do so.

6.4.2 Learning styles and strategies used by students in the Undefined group

The learning styles of children that are developed from childhood within their family are enhanced as they grow older (Oxford, 2003) and are influenced by individuals’ cultures and backgrounds, as shown by de Vita (2001). The students in this study utilised a variety of learning styles, global, analytical, auditory and visual (Oxford, 2003), and these were enhanced by learning strategies (metacognitive, affective, and cognitive) which they utilised in the classroom. Many of the students identified that they used a mix of different learning styles and strategies.
From those students interviewed, most wanted their teachers to break the material down into small parts (analytical style) and then give concise step-by-step instructions (auditory style) which could be repeated (cognitive strategy) as many times as was necessary for understanding by the student. These processes were identified by these students as ones that helped them with their learning. Some teachers, as noted earlier in Section 6.3.1, used explicit teaching strategies, ones that the students also indicated would assist them with their learning. All learning styles identified by Oxford (2003) were utilised by these students, as were a mixture of other strategies. A knowledge of these students’ ways of learning adds to the complexity of the classroom for the teachers as they strive to facilitate each student’s learning. The importance of teachers having this knowledge about students’ learning styles is highlighted as the majority of the students in the Undefined group stated that the only additional English language support they received in high school was from their classroom teacher, as has been previously found by Carrasquillo and Rodríguez (2002).

Some students raised the issue of “mixing up” their two languages, particularly when they were writing. Though they were proud of their home language and chose when to use it, at times it appeared as though negative transfer, as referred to by Lado (1959) and O’Malley and Chamot (1990), may be occurring from their home language to English. Students identified being able to speak well in both languages but indicated that they sometimes used the other language in class to help them understand the content. From some, at times, they transferred the patterns of their home language to English and confusion occurred resulting in poor results, mainly in writing, as revealed by the NAPLAN results from the students. For some students who said they utilised both languages in their learning, a positive transfer, as described by Cummins (2005), occurred and it enhanced their academic outcomes. This cognitive learning strategy does affect different students in differing ways and this was the case for many of the students in this study; however, this impact seemed to be negative.

One surprising finding from the students about what they felt was one way to help them learn related to the classroom environment. The students, 33 of the 68 interviewed, specifically requested a quiet classroom as they found, as Olivo’s (2003) research had, that the silence allowed them to focus and concentrate on the task at hand, including the language of the classroom, as well as allowing them thinking and
processing time when in class. Most commented about their noisy classrooms and how it was distracting for them. Others commented that a quiet space allowed them to concentrate, as suggested by students in McCallum et al.’s (2000) research, and for some they used this time to process their work between their two languages. This aspect would appear to offer one practical strategy that schools could easily adopt in some form to support appropriate students.

6.4.3 Classroom outcomes

For many ELLs, as suggested by Slama’s (2012) research, acquiring the academic or more formal English required in schools can take between 4-8 years, even if the child is born in an English-speaking country. This is one possibly one of the reasons why so many of the students, from both the EAL/D and Undefined groups, performed at BNMS in their NAPLAN writing tests and a high percentage reported at a pass grade in their English subject. Perhaps they are still acquiring formal academic English, something that is not being acknowledged or known by their classroom teachers.

Within this study, there were a lot of similarities in the cultural and linguistic heritages and the educational performances between the students in the EAL/D and Undefined groups. Self-assessed English language skills reported by these students are diverse, reflecting not only their personal capabilities but also their backgrounds and the home language influence. This diversity is similar to that seen in students identified as having EAL/D. The students’ positive self-assessing of their English language competencies is not a reflection, for many, of their academic achievements. The students’ reporting reflected the work of Menken et al. (2012) whose research found that ELLs self-assessed as having high oral competencies in both English and their home language but also found that English literacy was of concern for them, all of which is replicated in this study. Butler and Lee (2010) had found that if students are regularly self-assessing their own work they became competent, suggesting that first-time assessment may not be a true indication of competency level.

Studies by Freeman et al. (2002) and Olsen (2010) found that many students were orally competent but lacked in their other skills, particularly writing. Some teachers in this study had observed and commented on this; in their self-assessments, students also reflected how they could speak English well but many noted that writing
in English presented other challenges, a finding noted by Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron (2011) in their research in relation to the range of academic results across ELLs. Some of the interviewed students, however, stated that they were finding the English language demands increasing, and therefore more difficult, as they progressed into higher year levels, again affirming Schleppegrell and O’Hallaron’s research.

From the Undefined group, the main language background of the students was Maori/Pasifika and many from this group reported that they were struggling with the writing component in their subject areas. For some, they were not able to equate SAE with their other home language, similarly to what has been reported by Fletcher et al. (2009) and Samu (2006) in relation to Pasifika students’ difficulties in writing in English. Many of the students from these language backgrounds had lower academic results than students in the mainstream classes and this result replicates those of Bishop et al. (2009) when they had previously reported in relation to ELLs.

6.4.4 Classroom supports

For many ELLs, there are limited opportunities to improve their English language skills in high school, as was shown in another study by Kim and Garcia (2014), where they had not been identified as ELLs nor assessed as needing any form of additional English language support. Some of these students had possibly learned what Olsen (2010) had called passivity and invisibility, as they were achieving pass grades in their school subjects, came to school regularly, and had no record of behaviour issues, so they were able to remain invisible. As a result, their academic needs were not identified, nor did they receive any additional support. For some of these students, achieving better results in subjects occurred where they liked their teachers or they simply had an interest in the subject. For some, they engaged in the classes because of the strategies used by the teacher or their learning styles were suited to a particular subject and the way it was being taught.

Students in the Undefined group may not feel that they are being inspired or challenged in relation to their learning experiences and, for some, they may still be seen in a deficit model approach, as described by Brown (2007), by those whose role it is to facilitate their learning. In fact, most students would gain from a small amount of support that was more purposefully and intentionally implemented, such as that utilised in the RTI process for ELLs as presented by Brown and Doolittle (2008),
Hamayan et al. (2013), and Orosco and Klingner (2010). Utilising a process such as RTI for ELLs, though encouraged, comes with a warning from Xu and Drame (2007) who found that unless all staff are appropriately trained for cultural awareness, the use of this model will not succeed.

Some of these Undefined students will remain, as Luster (2011) suggested, forgotten, because in the classroom they are performing adequately (passing grade in the subject) and do not present as needing remedial support, a scenario presented in the results of this research. Menken et al. (2012) from their research explained how, until now, these LTELLs have been invisible in the classroom and invisible in research. The students in the Undefined group in this study are not unlike those described by Luster (2011) and Menken et al. (2012) as they perhaps are invisible in class because they appear to be orally proficient in the English language and are working to what is perceived to be their capacity. Because those in the Undefined group have not been assessed as needing additional English language support, they potentially will not be given all the opportunities they should to achieve to their full potential.

6.4.5 Profiles of three students from the Undefined group

To gain a deeper and more focussed understanding of student experiences across the extensive data collected in this study, three students from the Undefined group were selected and are profiled below. One student was selected from each of the major linguistic groups represented – Maori/Pasifika, European, and Asian – a selection criterion being an identified high level of use of their other home language. Their following profiles draw on the full information available through Chapters 4 and 5.

The first profile presented, in Box 6.1, is for Eli who was in Year 7 when interviewed. He was born in New Zealand of Tongan parents and had only been in Australia for 2 years. He had not undertaken any English language assessment on his arrival nor had he received any additional English language support in his 2 years in Australian schools.
Box 6.1 Profile of Eli, a New Zealand born student in the Undefined group.

Eli – ID 312 – Year 7

Eli’s parents and his siblings came to Australia because his parents “thought we might have a better life here”. Eli is extremely proud of his culture and all it offers him. He sees Tongan as his first language, which he reported is spoken about 80% of the time in his home. He is involved in all the cultural aspects of his heritage and learns traditional dances and singing by watching his father, brothers and elders.

“Our mum wants us to show respect to our elders and to speak in Tongan to them. This is important. It is about where I come from and my culture and being proud of it.” He has received no additional English language support since starting school in Australia. About the Tongan language, he says, “sometimes it confuses me, the words. I speak alright in English and Tongan; my writing in English is not good and I am bad in writing in Tongan too. Maybe my other language confuses me”

Self-assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tongan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>VW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>NVW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School academic results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Maths</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 7 Sem 2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 7 Sem 1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 6 Sem 2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 6 Sem 1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eli’s parents filled in an enrolment form for the school; he did not know why they didn’t say they spoke Tongan. His favourite subject is rugby as “it is physical and I like running” but he likes Maths and Science. Maths is a favourite because he finds it interesting. He finds his Maths teacher is helpful because he breaks things down for him and makes sure he understands; he also had that teacher in Year 6. “I think he knows I Tongan,” said Eli but he did not think he knew “how much I speak Tongan and how important it is to me”.

English is a challenge, particularly in writing “I think it is the way I write it down and it may not make sense. I think in English but I might get mixed up.” Further, he said, “I make punctuation errors and I can’t spell and my grammar could be better”. When asked about his self-assessment in English, “I am OK at English, sort of. I got a C minus last term but failed before that. I have to keep working on it. I speak it OK. Maybe the others are a bit high – I am OK”. “English” he wrote “is just writing and pretty boring” but he sees it now as his main language as he uses it at school and with friends. Eli finds that some of his teachers go too fast for him to “get it”. He would like the “teacher to slow down and make sure I know what is happening”. He also prefers it if the teacher repeats the information several times and then makes sure that he does understand the content before moving on. He understands that this probably will never happen but “that may be slow but I need it like that – that way I have got it and can move on”.

Eli would like to teach, “a helper in some way – it would make my family proud”.

Eli appears to be performing relatively poorly in his school subjects even though he is motivated and works diligently, particularly in trying to improve his English language skills. He says he speaks very well in English but his reading and writing in English is not as proficient. He acknowledges that he confuses his two languages and his self-reporting has overemphasised his English language skills. Personal communication between the researcher and the Year 7 coordinator of Eli’s school indicated that he has been identified as a future school leader.
The second profile, presented in Box 6.2, is for Anna, a Year 9 student of Greek heritage. Through an Australian by birth, Anna keeps alive her first culture by attending Greek school and participating in all that her family culture has to offer. Like Eli, she has received no additional English language support during her schooling.

Box 6.2 Profile of Anna, an Australian born student in the Undefined group.

**Anna – ID 1879 – Year 9**

Born in Australia, of a Greek migrant father and an Australian Greek-heritage mother, Anna has lived here all of her life. She is proud of her cultural and linguistic heritage and attends Greek school at the weekend to maintain her heritage language. Anna has spoken both Greek and English for as long as she can remember with Greek being the language of the home when she was born. English and Greek are spoken about 50% each in the home. She enjoys the special Greek celebration days with her family and everyone in her homes “speaks Greek and we are all good at it. It is part of who I am”. Anna said that occasionally her two languages “get mixed up. Sometimes, the sentence structures get mixed up but it is good having 2 languages … it is an important part of who I am”.

**Self-assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>VW W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>VW W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>VW W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School academic results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Maths Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 9 Sem 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 9 Sem 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 8 Sem 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. 8 Sem 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family attended an enrolment interview and no questions were asked about an additional home language. Anna enjoys schooling, loves cooking and learning about nutrition but sometimes “finds the writing of theory difficult”. Science, she noted, “was becoming harder with the writing”. Anna finds that all her teachers try to help her and only struggles in Maths when the teacher “talks too quickly and doesn’t explain things properly”. She likes to have a “the unit explained to me first so I can get the big picture in my head”. She also likes to take lots of notes.

English assessments are challenging and Anna starts them early and tries to work on them at home and do a draft for the teacher to see. “I usually do heaps but my marks still stay the same. I don’t know what else I can do. I know I have to keep working at it”. Her favourite teacher is her English teacher because she can, “just make things great and if you ask her a dumb question she helps you out; she is very kind”. She said that she worked best “if there was only me it would be quiet and I can concentrate and that is a good thing for me”. When asked about her self-assessment, she replied, “I think I am OK at English but maybe not the VW I put in the survey for writing and reading’.

Anna has hopes of working in “hospitality or childcare. My teachers say I would be a good teacher as I like to take charge and do things. My parents will help me and support me”.

Anna’s family speaks Greek at home when her father is present and English the rest of the time. Like Eli, she is not doing very well at school and her frustration about the lack of improvement in her academic results is evident as she feels she has expended everything known to her to improve her results. Anna’s teachers have a higher assessment of her ability when commenting that she should be a teacher, whereas Anna herself says she will work in childcare or hospitality.
The third profile, presented in Box 6.3, is for Rasa, a Year 7 student who was born in Japan of a Japanese mother and Korean father. Rasa lives in a multilingual home where Japanese is spoken 80% of the time and Korean about 10%. Rasa came to Australia as a 4-year-old so has undertaken all her schooling in Australian schools.

Box 6.3 Profile of Rasa, a Japanese born student in the Undefined group.

Rasa – ID 1684 – Year 7

Japanese is the main language spoken in the home, about 80% of the time, and Korean and English are also spoken. Rasa and her mum were born in Japan, dad in Korea. Rasa reported that she cannot speak Korean. Rasa enjoys Japanese and finds it beneficial when she visits her mother’s family in Japan. They have been in Australia for 9 years and she “can enjoy the Australia way of life”.

Rasa said she “likes this school and they are all good here. Some parts of the school are rough, but mostly everyone is OK”. The family attended an enrolment interview and no questions were asked about an additional home language. She likes her school and says, “she fits in well and makes friends as my English is very good and I am just one of the group”. Rasa enjoys schooling especially Maths where she is said she was “getting As. I like it is logical and there can only be one answer”. She enjoys English “I am doing alright I got a B last semester”. Further she said that she enjoys writing and that her English teacher “explains things slowly and makes sure I understand. That is what I like”. She also explained how she “likes to build up to the whole topics. I like to add things on after I am sure that I know something. I like the teacher to check that I do know and understand stuff”.

Rasa does not find that having additional languages to English confuses her with her work. She said that “they do not confuse me because I have been learning since I was little.” When asked about her self-assessment of English, she replied, “I think I am OK at English and there is nothing that is difficult, I usually get a B”. Rasa hopes “to teach Maths or maybe be a Japanese teacher. Maybe a Maths teacher first as I really like it”. She finds all her teachers supportive as are her parents.

Rasa presents as an above-average achieving student in all of her subjects. At school she sees herself as one of her class group. Rasa sees her attainment of a B in English as usual for her though she is achieving higher in her other subjects of Mathematics and Science. She appears to have no difficulty in having another home language because, as she said, she has had both from birth and they are very different.

6.4.6 Learnings from the student profiles

Are the above student profiles presenting pictures of these students that allow their teachers to justify that each one of these students is performing to their capacity?
Are any of the staff probing deeper to determine if these profiled students are in fact working to their full capacity and achieving to their full potential?

From the profiles of these three students, different needs identified in the preceding sections are clear and the consideration of specific student situations helps to answer this question for individual students and thus supports a greater appreciation of the overall issue. The three profiled students have had exposure to English all of their lives, and Anna and Rasa have undertaken all of their schooling in Queensland state schools. All see themselves as Australian and nominated English as the language they speak at school and with friends. However, this is not the main language spoken at home, and there was no indication that their respective school communities were aware of their actual bilingual status. One issue then is whether parents want their children to be identified as bi/multilingual or whether they feel it is more important for them to fit in as part of the mainstream group.

For some families the enrolment process may be new or even confusing and even if interviewed on enrolment, as were Anna and Rasa, or if the enrolment form was simply dropped to the school office, as for Eli, no conversations were entered into with these families about whether they had another home language or not. Some bi/multilingual families choose not to complete the section on the enrolment form about another home language, as occurred with these families, and this may have occurred through a lack of understanding about what was required (van Leent & Exley, 2013). Not identifying the needs of individual students on enrolment may results in their unique needs (Queensland Government, 2012) not being supported, as has occurred with these profiled students.

Villegas and Lucas (2007) encouraged teachers to see the students from diverse backgrounds as competent learners and Bronfenbrenner (1989) noted the importance of understanding all the influences of a child’s development. Are students’ educational achievements, even at a pass level, being perceived as that student being a competent learner? Are Eli and Anna perceived as such, or are they not seen as such because of their cultural heritage? Anna, of migrant Greek heritage, and her family speak Greek 50% of home time; Eli, of Pasifika background, speaks Tongan 80% of the time at home. When this is considered alongside their different ethnic and socio-educational
backgrounds, there could be an impact, as Waldfogel (2012) suggested, on their learning that has stopped them reaching their full potential.

Menken et al. (2012) suggested that bilingual students needed to be competent in reading and writing in both languages to achieve well at school. In line with their findings, given his English and Tongan self-assessments of his language skills (Very Well to Well in all), Eli’s academic results are not improving. Further, his assessments of his English language skills do not match those of his academic results (Cs), and this aligns with the findings of Miller et al. (2012). Eli’s cultural and linguistic heritage presents a challenge for him when equating the Tongan language with SAE, similar to findings reported by Fletcher et al. (2009) about Pasifika students’ language impact on their academic results. Samu (2006) reported that many Pasifika families move to Australia for the betterment of their families, as did Eli’s family 2 years ago. Clearly, Eli should have had his English language skills assessed, on enrolment, when he arrived from New Zealand. If this had occurred he also may have been able to access strategically offered support to assist him in improving his SAE and his overall school performance. As the academic demands in reading and writing increase, his lesser ability in SAE may cause him to become what Freeman et al. (2002) and Menken et al. (2012) call an LTELL.

While clearly schools suffer resourcing constraints, impacting their capacity to offer individualised language support to large numbers of students, an understanding of the full situation of both the EAL/D and Undefined groups would suggest that significantly increased resourcing may not be needed. Many of the students in the Undefined group (and potentially also the EAL/D group) appear to need minimal additional English language support, but they would benefit from the wider use of more effective and appropriate CALD teaching. Other students from both groups could potentially improve in their schooling outcomes by the addition of evidence-based additional support such as RTI for ELLs (Brown & Doolittle, 2008; Hamayan et al. 2013; Orosco & Klingner, 2010) which was outlined in Section 2.4.1.3, support that could be offered after initial needs assessments of all students.

These three students provide a good example of how the three-tiered support approach of RTI for ELLs could work effectively. Rasa rated her English reading and writing as Very Well but reading in Japanese as Not Very Well and writing as
Average. Unlike Menken et al.’s (2012) findings, Rasa is performing well and this may be, as Waldfogel (2012) noted, because of family influences in relation to her ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Rasa’s comments in relation to how well she fitted in at school and being seen as one of the group align with Miller’s (2000) research in multicultural schools. Rasa may believe that she has achieved her highest marks but minimal additional support, through the first general tier of support from RTI for ELLs, may result in her attaining her full potential.

The next level of support on the RTI for ELLs may have helped Anna to improve her English literacy skills. Anna self-rated all her English and Greek language skills at Very Well levels; her academic marks, however, for four academic semesters are all Cs and have not improved. RTI is but one form of support that may have been able to focus on Anna’s individual English language literacy needs and support her in also acquiring a better understanding of her content knowledge as well as English. This additional support, if available to the student on initial enrolment assessment, may only be required for a short time and would assist the student to achieve her personal, academic excellence. Eli could have also benefitted from this intervention if it had occurred on his arrival from New Zealand. His support could have continued into the second tier and, if needed, as with Anna, possibly into the third tier until their SAE skills had reached an appropriate level for their schooling that allowed them to work competently in their various subject areas. Because the level of support is tiered, only about 5% of students from CALD backgrounds would need the intensive third tier of support.

From these students’ profiles, it can be seen that there is a need for early and correct identification of students from bi/multilingual homes, and for their English language needs to be correctly assessed and supported as appropriate if they are to achieved the aspirational goals as detailed by all levels of governments (MCEECDYA, 1999; Queensland Government, 2012).

6.5 Summary

One in five students, in this study, is from a bi/multilingual home and they are from across all 5 schools which have ICSEA ratings from low to high. Of concern is the fact that none of these schools seem to be aware of the full extent of the diversity within their individual school communities. All had previously identified that there
were classified EAL/D students in their schools. It may be that, because students in the Undefined group have not been identified as being from bi/multilingual homes, their schooling outcomes may be limited, resulting in schools being constrained in achieving the best possible outcomes for all students.

The majority of students seek to achieve to their capacity and the value in this is well recognised, not just to the student and school community but also to maximise each student’s future potential and ultimate contribution to society. Many of these students from bi/multilingual homes have common issues and a range of needs that could be supported through a range of strategically offered supports for the various levels of need. Achieving the best outcomes for all students will occur in an environment where the broad needs of all students are recognised and all teachers are well prepared to apply appropriate teaching approaches.

With all the other pressures in today’s classrooms, students from bi/multilingual homes can be easily forgotten; however, with the increasing linguistic and cultural diversity in schools, as Carrasquillo and Rodriguez (2002) stress, it is imperative that time is taken to properly identify these students. Hakuta’s (2011) acknowledgement that this will take time, money, and effort is of relevance to administrators. For governments’ aspirational goals to be achieved for all students, there is a need to identify these students, properly assess their English language needs, and then allocate strategic support. The growing “forgotten population of non-proficient English students” in America, as revealed by Luster (2011, p. 71), may easily occur in Queensland if the research reported here is an indication of the growing cultural and linguistic diversity within the state school sector.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This exploratory research makes an important contribution to existing knowledge in understanding the learning experiences and associated needs of students from bi/multilingual homes. Through a deeper understanding of the cultural and linguistic diversity of school cohorts, three key areas have emerged that support greater understanding of student learning situations, thus then supporting students from bi/multilingual homes to address learning needs. These areas focus around school preparedness and processes to identify students from CALD backgrounds, teacher preparation and capacity to teach in multicultural classrooms, and in the adoption of appropriate strategies to facilitate the learning of CALD students. This section firstly summarises the key findings from this study. In the following an acknowledgement of the limitations of the study, and the implications of the findings from the perspectives of policy, in the field of Education, and also for future research, are then discussed.

Firstly, school environments will best facilitate students’ learning when they are led by administrators with an appreciation of the key issues, including those relating to an understanding of the students and the influences around them (Bronfenbrenner, 1989) as well connecting with families from CALD backgrounds. A first step that such preparedness should deliver is a complete awareness of the student cohort, thus the identification of children from bi/multilingual homes. With culturally responsive preparation of school processes for enrolment and strategically apportioned English language support for those from CALD backgrounds, more students from these backgrounds will have the opportunity to reach their academic potential.

Another school process is the provision of ongoing PD of staff in areas related to working/teaching in a CALD environment. All staff should be given opportunities to enhance their skills to build capacity to work or teach in multicultural environments. While outside the responsibility of the schools, preservice teacher preparation needs to prepare teachers to teach students from CALD backgrounds. Such initial preservice education should equip potential teachers with the appropriate tools that allow them to adopt appropriate strategies to enhance student learning for those from diverse backgrounds. Finally, through the voices of staff and students, valuable pedagogical practices have been highlighted. These relate to the teaching strategies used by
teachers within the CALD classroom as well as the learning styles and strategies used by students from diverse backgrounds to assist them with their learning.

7.2 Limitations

While the results of this research can to some degree be generalised to the broader high school student experiences, there remain limitations that need to be recognised. These firstly come from the actual conduct of the research that was undertaken in the real-world environment of five high schools and their school communities. Further, the nature of the research and the data collected place constraints on the level to which these findings can be generalised. It is acknowledged that the study has been undertaken in Queensland schools but this may be extrapolated more broadly given that the findings clearly align with international research in this area.

7.2.1 Design constraints

When undertaking research in a real-world environment, time is of an essence and the interactions between the researched and the researcher need to be considered. Undertaking the research in schools clearly took some focus from the staff and students and efficiency in these interactions was a high priority and also was a factor in the research design. Once access was gained to each participating school, however, time was again constrained because of school holidays, examination periods, sport and special activities, and the availability of the participants at the times required, thus the setting limited what could be done and when and where this could happen. All participating schools, however, were generous in the access the researcher was given to each school, the teachers, students, and relevant school records.

7.2.2 Staff and student surveys

It is important to acknowledge that most of the data come from self-reporting by both staff and students; thus, this relies firstly on a common understanding of each issue. For example, do all respondents take the same meaning of speaking, reading, or writing English “Very Well”? And, further, are their cultural or personal constraints regarding how each person decides to report on themselves the same? Two strategies were used to help address this. Firstly, aggregation of the self-reporting of language skills levels of “Very Well” and “Well” meant such self-assessments were measured
against three categories reflecting good, average, or poor, and so likely to be more consistent. Secondly, the descriptive focus kept the researcher very close to the data and the multiple aspects of personal profiles, assisting in the interpretations of students’ perceptions.

7.2.3 Staff emailed surveys and student interviews

Many staff indicated approval to participate in semistructured interviews but a variety of circumstances reduced the original number of those who had consented to a third of the original group; all wanted the format changed because of difficulty in organising suitable times for the interviews. At their request, staff interviews were reorganised as emailed surveys that were completed against a set of explicit questions. This reduction in participants and the changed approach considerably reduced the depth of information that may have been gathered from the interviews but, nevertheless, 21 teachers were interviewed and a diversity of opinions was accessed for these as well as in addition to the detail from the teacher surveys.

Student interviews (n=68) were only with students from the Undefined group; perhaps having known EAL/D students interviewed would have led to rich comparative data. School administrations nominated 58 students from the Undefined group (23.3% of group) who were not to be approached for an interview. All of these students had completed the surveys but schools did not want any Special Education students or any students who were habitual truants or had identified behaviour issues to be approached for interviews. Some of these students would probably have been those who truly fitted the pattern of the LTELL, or even those potentially incorrectly assessed as Special Education students when the issue may well have been second-language interference. Perhaps some of these students were also from the group of students who were performing at a lower level academically and had lower English language skills; their inclusion may have added additional richness to the understanding of these issues.

7.3 Implications of this research

This exploratory research has provided a detailed view of the environment and experiences of 2,484 students in 5 Queensland state high schools, schools communities representing a range of ICSEA ratings. To encourage each student to strive to their potential, it is important that when students enter schools, all processes
are enacted that will correctly identify any student needing any form of assistance, with particular emphasis being placed on identifying those from CALD backgrounds. These processes include having staff, in all areas of the school, who are properly trained to work with students from CALD backgrounds, enrolment processes that identify these students at this time, and then strategic support enacted as appropriate for each student as soon as practicable. Further, as Menken et al. (2012) suggested, those who design school policies need to be aware that working to improve the language learning of ELLs takes time and their policies should reflect this. The findings from this study, while derived from five schools, nevertheless provide valuable implications for policy, the field of Education, and future research. These findings are discussed below.

### 7.3.1 Implications for policy

This study raises a number of issues that are relevant in consideration of policy direction relating to EAL/D students. Two particular areas are highlighted below. Firstly, the broad area of support for students is discussed and this is followed by comments about the need for teachers to be prepared for their role in CALD classrooms. An overarching issue is the recognition that while there are many strategies and supports that can be provided to EAL/D students, in many cases such provision can be cost effective through undertaking appropriate sessions relating to school processes. Clearly, in the situation seen in this study, additional specialist support would add a prohibitive cost to schools but it may not be needed in most cases.

It has been suggested that there is a need for educators and administrators to look at their policies and practices, many of which are traditionally based on the culture of the mainstream group (Au, 2006; Nieto, 2010), and acknowledge and action concerns about the changing cultural and linguistic makeup of school populations (Gearon, Miller, & Kostogriz, 2009). Gaining an understanding of what these CALD students bring to the school community, something that has not often been undertaken in the past (Xu & Drame, 2007), would also contribute to the school environment. By facilitating greater inclusion, administrators may then be able to utilise this new diversity within their schools to build on school processes and create culturally and linguistically responsive learning environments (Au, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) that will benefit all students.
One critical aspect that emerges from this research is the limited preparedness of many of the teachers – something acknowledged by many of them. Preservice education programs and other courses need to reflect the changing demographics of local communities and the schools within them to which these teachers are appointed. Units relating to teaching in multicultural classes should be included for preservice university courses and regular PD in this area in schools is important to continue to upskill all staff and increase teacher capacity in this area.

7.3.2 Implications for the field of Education

From this research, it is clear that there are implications on student learning arising from schools’ lack of awareness of the cultural and linguistic heritages of many in their student bodies. In fact, the number of students who stated they were from bilingual homes, (10.5% EAL/D and 10.0% Undefined) was far greater than imagined. Interestingly, one factor behind this lack of awareness comes from information provided or not provided from the home. Better engagement between schools and families, including an enhanced understanding of the school processes, would thus ensure schools are better informed and parents are more able to support their child appropriately from enrolment through to completion of this phase of their education.

For some parents or carers, there may be a feeling of alienation, as they do not understand the school system or their English language skills may inhibit their understanding of school processes. As individual schools are able to determine what is culturally responsive and appropriate for their community, the inclusion of support from some of the leaders of the various cultural groups would continue to build on this engagement. The involvement of families from CALD backgrounds, within their school communities, would help break down any perceived barriers between school and home. It would also give the families an opportunity to provide relevant feedback on any issues or concerns about their child’s education.

Family engagement with schools would be further enhanced by a review of the “labelling” system used in education for students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Engagement with families – the microsystem level which Bronfenbrenner’s (1989) bioecological model of development claims is the most influential on a child – could lead to their identifying their children as coming from CALD backgrounds and appropriate academic support could then be offered. This
engagement, which occurs at Bronfenbrenner’s mesosystem level of development, may lead to parents acknowledging that identifying to a school community that their child has another home language could in fact result in positive action from the school and appropriate supports being offered to enhance the child’s schooling outcomes.

This engagement must take in to consideration Bronfenbrenner’s (1989) macrosystem level that acknowledges the importance of being aware of the values and customs in which a child is being raised. These principles may influence some of the decisions that CALD parents make for their child’s education and, included in this, may be the reason that they do not identify another home language. A review of the current EAL/D categorisation must take this into consideration and, to do this effectively, the reviewers need to be culturally responsive. Such a review could lead to more students being identified as having this background and appropriate strategic support could then be offered.

Many CALD students have strong, informal oral skills in both of their languages but for some, academic literacy and writing skills, the skills needed for successful outcomes in school, are lacking. Teachers then need an understanding of the implication of students’ CALD backgrounds and cannot assume prior literacy or knowledge in any subject area and should, therefore, teach English language skills consistently across all subject areas (Menken et al., 2012). The facilitating of learning for all students is primarily the responsibility of the classroom teacher, the majority of whom, as reflected in this study, may be monolingual English-speaking Australians.

This research will contribute to the field of education in several major ways. It has uncovered processes that may likely be in many schools, where a group of students from bi/multilingual homes have not been identified as such yet have similar characteristics to those classified as EAL/D students. The data reflect that the issue of EAL/D students may be bigger than recognised through current processes. Without this new information, good management of resources and school processes cannot happen so the information is critical for the implementation of effective strategies to assist schools in supporting all students.

Another contribution highlighted is the need for appropriate preservice teacher education to prepare university students to teach in a multicultural environment. Administrators need to be informed about this so that they may act appropriately to
prepare teachers to meet the future demands of the ever-changing classroom composition. Teachers in this study also suggested that there was an urgent need for appropriate professional learning and development experiences appropriate to these changing school environments. Adding to this need for new knowledge is the need for training and understanding of the suggestion of the quiet learning environment. There is limited research in this area which was raised by students from CALD backgrounds, so it is a new pedagogical practice of which teachers need to be made aware.

7.4 Future research

The issues covered in this exploratory research are broad. Two foci for future research have been identified. Firstly, underlying this research is an assumption that appropriate support can bring these students to their true potential, rather than just to adequate outcomes. The second aspect is the effect that pedagogical practices utilised by appropriately qualified teachers will also have in bringing this change in outcomes. Both these aspects could be investigated through longitudinal studies.

Thus, what has been clear in undertaking this research is that while it is generally acknowledged that students may not be achieving to their full potential in the absence of best pedagogical practice, and that teachers with such pedagogical skills will make a difference, there is limited explicit evidence of what such difference would be. Quantitative research, that extends the evidence base of learning outcomes, appears an essential next step.

7.5 Summary

This exploratory research has confirmed the cultural and linguistic diversity amongst junior secondary students in Queensland state high schools – some 20.5% of students in this study came from bi/multilingual homes. Of these students, 10.5% are classified by their schools as EAL/D; the other 10.0% are also from bilingual homes but are Undefined. The students from the former group are recognised, supported, and researched; those in the latter group are unrecognised, unsupported, and unresearched. However, an important finding from this research was that the students in these two groups had strong similarities.

This research has raised many questions, with implications for policy and in the field of education, in particular about preservice teacher education and PD for
teachers, school enrolment practices, identification of students from bi/multilingual homes, and the design of strategic support that comes when students from CALD backgrounds are identified and assessed as needing such support.

Limitations have been identified in school processes that impact on the identification of students from bi/multilingual homes. In working with such students it is clear that there are pedagogical practices, such as a quiet learning environment, that they, as students, recognise would help their learning but that are not always utilised within the classroom. From this study it is clear that, while the teacher has a pivotal role in facilitating learning for all students within their classes, many teachers acknowledge that they are not well prepared to do this role as effectively as they would like, especially in classes that are culturally and linguistically diverse.

Finally, what future potential and contribution to our society from these students has been and will continue to be foregone until students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are properly identified and supported to learn in culturally responsive school environments?
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Appendices

Appendix A Staff

A1. Staff Survey

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

State High School 2015 - staff survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. The purpose of this research has been outlined in the Information Sheet which you have received. The survey will take very little time for you to complete. We may need to do minimal follow up if clarification of any information is needed. Please complete the survey in privacy - not in consultation with other staff.

All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. A research code on each page will be added by the researcher and this will de-identify you, thus allowing your information to be treated with anonymity. This page will be removed from the survey once the code is added to the other pages.

This research will culminate in a thesis for a PhD. Further articles in journals may also be published. The researcher will be available to discuss any of the findings at a designated staff meeting at your school.

FAMILY NAME

OTHER NAME

Name: ................................................................. PLEASE PRINT

Male [ ] Female [ ] Age Group (Years): Under 30 [ ] 30-40 [ ] 41-50 [ ] 51-60 [ ] 61+ [ ]

Lyn Gilmour PhD candidate
Email: l.gilmour@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 041 89 85 113

Dr Helen Klieve Supervisor
Email: h.klieve@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3925

Dr Minglin Li Supervisor
Email: minglin.l@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3471

Research Code: .......................
A2. Staff Identification and Consent Form

Dear staff

If you choose to be a participant in this study, you are asked to complete a survey, which may be followed by a semi-structured interview about your thoughts on cultural and linguistic diversity at your school. Your participation is entirely voluntary and privacy will be respected. Permission has already been received from Education Queensland and the school’s principal to undertake this research at this state high school.

Several staff members will be asked to participate in semi-structured interviews and their responses will be identified only by a coded number. The researcher will code the responses so that they remain anonymous. Please read the Information Sheet carefully.

Please note the following declaration:
By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the Information Sheet and the above information and in particular, I understand that:

• my participation and involvement in this research is voluntary;
• there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation;
• I am free to withdraw at any time without comment or penalty;
• any questions I have will be answered to my satisfaction and any additional questions can be directed to the research team;
• responses will be coded and remain anonymous and my privacy respected;
• responses will be used in the research project and in any resulting publications;
• I can contact the manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 07 3735 4375 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this project.

Please put X in relevant box(es). Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I wish to participate in the survey [ ]</th>
<th>I wish to participate in the semi-structured interview [ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do NOT wish to participate in the survey [ ]</td>
<td>I do NOT wish to participate in the semi-structured interview [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: (PLEASE PRINT) ........................................................................................................

Signature .................................................................................................................. Date ......./...../2015

Staff email address: (PLEASE PRINT) ...........................................................................

This will only be used if you completed the survey (for follow up) or said yes for interviews - making interview appointment times.
Lyn Gilmore l.gilmore@griffith.edu.au
A3. Staff Information sheet

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

Who are we? We are Lyn Gilmour (PhD candidate) and Helen Klieve and Minglin Li (researchers and Lyn’s research supervisors) from the School of Education and Professional Studies at Griffith University. Our contact details are below.

Why is this research being undertaken? The aim of this research is to better understand the situations and needs of students who have English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D). To do this we want to explore how these students are most effectively identified and then assisted with their studies.

What we are asking? Staff and administrators will receive a survey. This could be undertaken in a staff meeting and will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Once completed and sorted, some staff will be asked to participate further through semi-structured interviews which will take 15-20 minutes. Staff whose classes will be involved in completing the survey will have approximately 20 minutes of their class time lost to do this and also 15-20 minutes in their department staff meeting taken by an explanation of the process to be used to collect the data.

All Junior Secondary students (Years 7-9) will be asked to participate in doing a survey. The survey will be administered in class time (approximately 10-15 minutes) and any follow up for clarification or completion by students who were absent will be undertaken by the researcher.

Following this, some of the newly detected students, who have a language other than English in their homes, will be invited to participate in interviews to discuss how they find their schooling. This will take approximately 15 minutes of each student’s time.

The expected benefits of the research. The scope of students who had not previously been identified as having a language other than English in their homes will be known and schools will then be able to adopt better identification procedures as well as plan to support these students with their learning. Staff will be able to get to know their clients better! Recommendations will be forthcoming in relation to classroom strategies and best practices for teaching EAL/D students as defined by current research literature. These strategies could be incorporated in to an ongoing school professional development plan for all staff.

Communication. Communication, in relation to the research, will initially be to staff through the staff notices (in general terms) and then at a staff meeting they will be addressed by the researcher. After staff are informed, notices will appear in the school newsletter, and be communicated in all forms of information disseminating that is used by the school to relay information, to their parent body. All parents will be contacted and invited to attend an information session about the research; those who are known to have EAL/D will be contacted by support personnel and an interpreter arranged if needed.
Risks to you.
There are minimal risks to you. It will involve some time (as outlined above) from staff to complete the survey and then a little more time from those invited to participate in the interviews.

Confidentiality and voluntary participation. All survey will be coded and no identifying information will be left on the survey except this code. The master code sheet will be stored securely at Griffith University and only the researchers will have access to it. All audio recording (interviews) will also be coded and stored securely. On completion of the research, the key code list will be shredded. The participation of students and teachers alike is purely voluntary. We would like as many as possible to participate so that we are able to obtain the best possible outcomes for all.

Ethical conduct of the research. Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, you are free to contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 4375 or by email research-ethics@griffith.edu.au

Feedback. We will be able to provide summary material of the findings to the school administration and also to staff in a staff meeting. The research will culminate in a thesis for the purpose of a PhD. Further articles in journals may also be published.

Privacy Statement. The conduct of this research involves the collection and use of personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to any other person without your consent. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. Your anonymity will be safeguarded at all times. Further information may be obtained from http://www.griffith.edu.au/privacy-plan or by phoning 3735 4375.

Contact details
Lyn Gilmour
lgilmour@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 041 89 85 113

Dr Helen Kliese
h.kliese@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 5925

Dr Manglid Li
mli@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3471
# A4. Staff data

## All participating staff information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Birth</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand/Pacific Islands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Australia</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of life</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak language other than English</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language region</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mars/Pacific Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Staff Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development in TESOL/CALD</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University study TESOL/Applied Linguistics</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teaching staff only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years teaching</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main teaching area</th>
<th>Brightwell</th>
<th>Idstone</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Chinnor</th>
<th>Henley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Study of Society</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Other Than English (LOTE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics/Manual Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Horticulture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A5. Staff emailed survey questions

Name: 
School: 

Q1 Can you tell me your interpretation of the acronym EAL/D as used in SHSs?

Q2 Let’s start with the general enrollment processes in your school. How are new enrollments done at your school and by whom?

Q3 Is there any variation for EAL/D students and, if so what, is it?

Q4 To your knowledge, do those doing the enrolments have any specialist training to understand and deal with those from diverse backgrounds?

Q5 What is your understanding of how EAL/D students are assessed under Education Queensland guidelines?

Q6 After they are assessed as EALD students what sort of supports are put in place for them and for you in the classroom?

Q7 How do you know that you have students from non-English speaking backgrounds in your classes?

Q8 What sort of cultural and/or linguistic advice do you received from Administration about these students?

Q9 What support is there in your school for all students with a home language other than English to improve their English language learning?

Q10 I would like you to think, generally, about the different teaching and learning strategies that you use in your classroom every day. Please tell me about them and why you use them.

Q11 Do these strategies work with known EAL/D students not just the English only speaking students? Yes/No; why, how do you know?

Q12 How do you change your teaching strategies for EAL/D students? Why?

Q13 What are some of the major difficulties that you have faced in classrooms that had a mix of cultures?

Q14 Is this just your subject area of …… or do you think this is in all subject areas – why?

Q15 What are some of the main English language challenges that you face in your multicultural classroom?

Q16 What sort of modifications, if any, do you do for your known EAL/D students?

Q17 Let’s look at the parents of EAL/D students now - have you ever had occasion to meet and have conversations with any of these parents, if not why not?

Q18 Do you know if any of the parents of your students do not speak English? How?
Q19  What involvement by the EA/LD parents do you see in your school? Why do you think this is so?

Q20  What, if any supports, are there to help orientate EAL/D parents?

Q21  How do you think parents could help with their child’s learning generally?

Q22  What do you think their role should be in their children’s English language learning success?

Q23  From what I have observed, it would appear that the population spreads across the socio economic spectrum. Where do you think your EAL/D students sit on this spectrum?

Q24  What makes you think that?

Q25  Do you think the parents of your students, in general, prepare and support your students’ learning in appropriate ways – how/ evidence of this?

Q26  What about the parents of students from another language background – do you think they are preparing the students for life here at school and then after school?

Q27  Have you ever attended any training/workshops on English as an Additional Language or Dialect or on Second Language Acquisition strategies in classroom – at school, anywhere? What and where?

Q28  What sort of units do you think should be included in pre-service teacher training about teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms? Why?

Q29  PD is important for ongoing teacher education. What sort of PD do you think should be offered in schools that reflects the ‘how to do’ in multicultural classrooms?

Q30  What are some ways that staff at this school could be better supported to assist with the teaching and learning of EAL/D students in their ever changing culturally and linguistic diverse classrooms?

Q31  Do you know if you have any staff here who are trained as EAL/D teachers?

Q32  What are some ways that you believe should be used to better support EAL/D students?

Q33  How could this be done/prioritised?

Q34  How is cultural diversity expressed/valued across your school community?

Any other comments/ questions

Thank you for taking time to reflect and answer these questions.
A6. Staff completed emailed survey

Staff emailed survey responses:
(F, Idstena, ID 71, English teacher)

Q 1 Can you tell me your interpretation of the acronym EAL/D as used in SSHS?
Response: It refers to English as an Additional Language or Dialect and is used to classify students so they can get more English help.

Q 2 Let’s start with enrolment generally of students in your school. How are new enrolments done and by whom?
Response: Enrolments are usually carried out by the deputies and the principal, sometimes HOSES and HODs will do them. I think that paperwork (enrolment packages) is available for people to take home and complete, then bring in to the interview appointment. There are some enrolment evenings — not sure if actual enrolment happens or if it is an information gathering session with parents taking home info.

Q 3 Is there any variation for known EALD students and if so what is it?
Response: Not certain. Possibly the HOSES may be involved in the process.

Q 4 To your knowledge, do these enrolment officers have any specialist training to understand and deal with those from diverse backgrounds?
Response: Not sure (I would hope so!)

Q 5 What is your understanding of how EALD students are assessed under EQ guidelines?
Response: Not exactly sure now, but I believe that previously, English language testing was carried out by Central EQ staff and the level of assistance would be determined by how long the child had been in the country rather than based on need. – seems very unfair because even if a child has been in the country for several years, it doesn’t guarantee that they will be exposed to good English, as some parents can’t speak it all. I know that many students enrol at Milpore for intensive English language tuition before graduating to Yeronga or Sunnybank.

Q 6 After they are assessed as EALD students what sorts of supports are put in place for them and for you in the classroom?
Response: Many EALD students (at this school) seem to miss diagnosis (?) however, there is a reasonably OK process for verifying students with disabilities. Quite often EALD students are categorised as having a problem and are put into a lower class. This is sometimes alright as these classes often have a teacher aide who can assist EALD students as well. This doesn’t really address the problem though.

Q 7 How do you know that you have students from non-English speaking backgrounds in your classes?
Response: Without looking at individual student records, the only way to guess that there is a student from non-English speaking background is by appearance which isn’t always accurate. At this school, it is a good guess that the Islander and African students come from non-English speaking backgrounds. This doesn’t always mean that their English is poor, however. Many of the Indigenous students may also speak their language at home.

Q 8 What sort of cultural and/or linguistic advice have you received from Admin about these students?
Response: Minimal! In fact I really can’t recall any specific info about EALD students. Although Admin does suggest contacting …….. for Indigenous student issues and …….. for Islander student issues.

Q 9 What general support is there in this school for all students, with a home language other than English, to improve their English language learning?
Response: No specific program to my knowledge. However, the school is currently developing and working on a whole school literacy program that focusses on reading. Very slow progress at the moment.
Q 10  I would like you to think, generally, about the different teaching and learning strategies that you use in your classroom every day. Please tell me about them and why you use them.

I use a variety of strategies that I have picked up while working at a previous school with a high ESL population. When reading texts, I always encourage students to follow along with the words. I will sometimes quickly provide a definition for certain words in the text that are perhaps unknown and may get students to underline it. I will sometimes provide a synonym or antonym to help clarify meaning of some words. Occasionally I will focus on a problem word (too, two, to) or punctuation, or grammar feature in a piece of text. When reading, I try to clearly articulate and enunciate the words and if I see students trying to say the word I will repeat some of them and get them to say the words too. Sometimes after reading a word I might ask if anyone knows what it means. If I am not 100% sure, I will ask a student to double check the dictionary. We all then write the meaning. Sometimes I will write the word on the board for spelling and break it up into known parts (prefixes, suffixes, roots, etc.). When writing on the board I will often sound out my words to get my spelling right, even standing back and looking at it and asking if that looks right. These are very basic incidental teaching and learning strategies that I find to be useful as they can sometimes help to fill in any missing gaps. Are they successful? Not sure, but I hope it does contribute!

Q 11  Do these strategies work with known student from non-English speaking backgrounds: not just the English only speaking students? Yes: how do you know

Yes, strategies work with all students - how high and EALD. How do I know? - because I often see some students nod, or write something down, or underline it. This tells me that something has happened with the text and their understanding.

Q 12  How do you change your teaching strategies for EALD students? Why?

Speak more clearly, explain any idioms, write instructions on board, show students rather than just tell them. Sometimes it is not their understanding of the words, but their ability to quickly process the amount of information (I think!)

Q 13  What are some of the major difficulties that you have faced in classrooms that had a mix of known cultures? Occasionally there are some hostilities between different cultural groups, but I am lucky that it has been minimal and controllable. Not sure what they were about - possibly just about the differences??

Q 14  Is this just your subject area of English or do you think this is in all subject areas - why?

I think that all subject areas have the potential to be inclusive and supportive, it often depends upon the student themselves and whether they have chosen the subject. Core subject often see greater problems.

Q 15  What are some of the main English language challenges that you face in your multicultural classroom?

Lack of ability, lower reading levels, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation, lack of engagement, fear of failure, fear of being wrong, behaviour issues to cover up any inadequacies, students at different ages/levels of ability, not trying, non-submission of work, etc.

Q 16  What sort of modifications, if any, do you do for known EALD students?

I just what I have mentioned above. I don’t have many (any?) students this year.

Q 17  Let’s look at the parents of EALD students – have you ever had occasion to meet and have conversations with any of these parents – if not why not?

At a previous school, Phoning home was difficult as parents didn’t understand what I was saying. At P/T interviews, sometimes the student would assist and translate for parents.
Q14  Do you know if any of the parents of your students do not speak English?
No.

Q19  What involvement, by the EALD parents, do you see in your school? Why do you think this is so?
There is some parent involvement at this school, but not much. I don’t know about EALD parent involvement.

Q20  What, if any, support are there to help orientate EALD parents?
We have the Indigenous and Islander Liaison Officers who are willing to help out.

Q21  How do you think parents could help with their child’s learning generally?
Read to children, encourage reading, talk to children about news and happenings in the community, encourage homework, value school, support school and rules, perhaps show that they are interested in learning themselves.

Q22  What do you think their role should be in their children’s English language learning success?
Ideally it should be a strong foundation! Informal education through the family should provide a solid foundation for a child, so that when they attend formal education they have a good grounding in English language and basic cognitive skills as well as social skills, some emotional control, some moral direction, etc. Language development begins at a very early age, so parents should be talking and reading to their children as soon as they are born.

Q23  From what I have observed, it would appear that the population spreads across the Socio Economic spectrum. Where do you think your EALD students sit on this spectrum?
At this school (and my previous school) I would say that many EALD students are at the lower end of the spectrum.

Q24  What makes you think that?
More affluent parents/children tend to organise tutors or extra assistance to assist with English language acquisition. These seems to be a greater correlation between higher socio economic status and the valuing of education (broad generalisation)

Q25  Do you think the parents of your students, in general, prepare and support your students’ learning in appropriate ways – how evidence of this?
Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Some parents positively encourage learning and achievement, while others overtly reject/ opposse schooling. Some parents react to poor performance with violence rather than support. I would like to see more parents valuing education and assisting with language acquisition etc. Parental support or lack of support is evident when phoning home about an issue, or at the P.T interviews.

Q26  What about the parents of students from another language background – do you think they are preparing the students for life here at school and then after school?
Sometimes I think they try harder because they know the importance of a good education. Sometimes they have come from another country where they had better jobs themselves and know they want better for their children.

Q27  Have you ever attended any training workshops on English as an Additional Language or A DIet or on Second Language Acquisition strategies in classroom – school anywhere? What and where?
Many years ago at Yeronga SHS, offered by ROSES/HOD . . . . . . Possibly where I picked up some of what I do in the classroom.
What sort of units do you think should be included in pre-service teacher training about teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms? Why?
Yes! I can definitely say the value in it as it would help prepare new teachers to deal with such diversity. Perhaps a semester unit? Perhaps an elective? Perhaps as part of a diversity or differentiation unit?
No! Because even though there is value in knowing how to teach EALD students, not every teacher will be at a school with such students.

PD is important for ongoing teacher education. What sort of PD do you think should be offered in schools that reflect the ‘how to do’ in multicultural classrooms?
Yes! We have a reasonably large percentage of Islander and Indigenous students. It would be nice to have some background about their culture, how they learn, what sort of schooling systems they have been exposed to, how to present basic information without being insulting, etc. So, ultimately, some useful small strategies that can be used without having to prepare complete lessons to cater for 1 or 2 students. Even being advised to write instructions on the board is a small but very useful strategy that is doable for any busy teacher.

What are some ways that staff at this school can be better supported to assist with the teaching and learning of EALD students in their every changing culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms?
Having access to an “expert”, being shown quick but useful strategies at staff meetings, having informative PD sessions on SFDs, maybe have case meetings with all teachers of certain students to discuss consistency. I think that most importantly, we as staff need to know WHO the EALD students are, whether they have access to teacher aide assistance, how much assistance they require, what are their specific issues… etc.

Do you know if you have any staff here who are trained as EALD teachers?
No.

What are some ways that you believe should be used to better support EALD students?
Better communication between staff, so that we know who they are, what assistance is needed and how to specifically help them. A detailed data base of students with details. Data base of resources that are age, subject and level appropriate. Tutoring programs? Teacher aide assistance in the classroom?

How could this be done prioritised?
Not certain, but obviously funding is needed, or schools need to hire a teacher to take on the role of coordinating these students?

How is cultural diversity expressed across your school community?
We have Indigenous and Poly school captains. We celebrate these cultures with dance and song at assembly. These students are often involved in programs so they can grow and develop and become a valued member of the school.

Any other comments/questions:
Thanks for your hard work – I hope you are making some positive progress with students and information you are receiving.

Thank you for taking the time to reflect and answer these questions. It is appreciated.
Lyn Gilmour
Appendix B Students

B1. Student survey and identification sheet

Research Code:..........................

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

.............................. High School 2015 - Student Survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research by completing the attached survey.

Your family/carer(s) have read the Information Sheet and have agreed to your participation. It is important that you listen to the instructions that will be given for the completion of this form. Please complete it as accurately as you are able in relation to you and your family members.

Please use black or blue pen and print your responses. In other cases, simply place an X in the appropriate box.

All information recorded here will be treated in the strictest of confidence and your anonymity will be maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY NAME</th>
<th>OTHER NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: .................................................................</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year level: ............ Male [ ] Female [ ] Age: 11[ ] 12[ ] 13[ ] 14[ ] 15 [ ] 16 [ ]

Sibling(s) at THIS high school only (given name/Yr) – siblings are your brothers and sisters
1. ................................................................. Yr: ............
2. ................................................................. Yr: ............

Lyn Gilmour  PhD Candidate
Email: l.gilmour@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 041 89 85 113

Dr Helen Klieve  Supervisor
Email: h.klieve@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3925

Dr Minglin Li  Supervisor
Email: minglin.li@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3471

Code: ......................... Research

Please put an X in the appropriate boxes and print other responses.

Year level: ............ Male [ ] Female [ ] Age: 11[ ] 12[ ] 13[ ] 14[ ] 15[ ] 16[ ]
Country of birth? (siblings at THIS high school only)
Australia - x in box [ ] If not Australia, please specify where:
YOU: [ ] .................................................................
Mother: [ ] .............................................................
Father: [ ] ..............................................................
Sibling 1 [ ] ............................................................
Sibling 2 [ ] ............................................................

How many years in Australia?
All of life - x in box [ ] If not all of life, approximately how many years:
YOU: [ ] .................................................................
Mother: [ ] .............................................................
Father: [ ] ..............................................................
Sibling 1 [ ] ............................................................
Sibling 2 [ ] ............................................................

Please specify response
Do you think you speak English... [vw w av wv]
Do you think you write English ... [vw w av wv]
Do you think you read English ... [vw w av wv]

What difficulties do you have with speaking English, if any?
............................................................................................................................

What difficulties do you have when writing in English, if any?
............................................................................................................................

What difficulties do you have when reading in English, if any?
............................................................................................................................

What language/dialect, other than English, is spoken in your home?
None [ ] Other - please print language or dialect
............................................................................................................................

Speaking this language other than English
- if yes, please circle how well.

Do you? [No/Yes] [vw w av wv]
Does mother? [No/Yes] [vw w av wv]
Does father? [No/Yes] [vw w av wv]
Does sibling 1? [No/Yes] [vw w av wv]
Does sibling 2? [No/Yes] [vw w av wv]

Research Code: _______________________

Appendices
At home, what percentage of time is spent speaking this language? Colour in appropriate block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing this other language</th>
<th>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does mother?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does father?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 1?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 2?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading this other language</th>
<th>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does mother?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does father?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 1?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 2?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is English spoken in your home? No/Yes - if yes, please circle how well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does mother?</th>
<th>No/Yes</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does father?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 1?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does sibling 2?</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At home, what percentage of time is spent speaking English? Colour in appropriate block.

| 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 |

✓ Category(ies) relevant to you

- Aboriginal
- Pacific Islander
- Refugee
- Child of previous migrants - language other than English spoken at home
- Other (please specify)

Have you received any English language support? Yes [ ] No [ ] If yes, where?
Migrant Centre [ ] ESL Primary school [ ] Private lessons [ ] Other

What were your school results last semester for:
English .................................. Maths ............................... Science ..........................

Thank you for completing this survey.
B2. Process for administering the student survey

Process for completion of student survey

Further to our discussion in staff and departmental meetings, this information sheet will support you in gathering the data. The data will be collected during the nominated week and, when completed, all forms and class roll to be placed inside the envelope which they were in when you received them. Seal it and then give it to the HOD. All completed envelopes will then be returned to the researcher by close of school of the nominated week. The initial data collection should be completed within a week. If students are not present on Day 1 of collection, then revisit in next lesson etc. If student is not present during all lessons of the week, note on roll next to students name the reason that no form was completed e.g. sick. Thank you for helping us to gain a greater understanding of your students.

Remember - students whose names have been crossed off your roll are not to be given the survey - their families/careers have declined to participate in this research. As discussed previously, students can also 'opt out' on the day, if they wish.

FOR THE CLASSROOM - it is important that instructions given to the students are the same throughout the year levels. Please follow these guidelines.

1. 'Today we are going to take a few minutes to complete a short survey. Your responses will help to identify how we may be able to improve students' English language skills here at school so it is important that you pay close attention and follow my instructions'. Give out forms.

2. 'Take a moment to have a quick read through the form. Are there any words you do not understand' - please clarify if there are!

3. 'It is important that you do not go ahead of me so - listen closely and let's start filling in this form. Our responses will either be with an X in a box, a circle around some letters or, when we are asked to answer a question, we will PRINT our replies. Use only blue or black pen.'

4. 'On the first page, please print our school name and then your family name first and then your given name and then put our year level, ........., and then an X in the gender box. If you have any siblings at THIS school, please print in their first name and year level. Look up when you are ready to continue. 'Siblings' means brothers or sisters only and they have to be at THIS school.'

5. 'On the next page please re-enter your Year level and gender and then put an X in your age box. Country of birth is next. Either put an X in Australia or print where you were born for yourself, your parents and any brothers or sisters at THIS school. Then write in the number of years you have been in Australia, for you, your parents and siblings'.

6. 'The next questions require you to place a circle around how well YOU think you speak, write and read English. You also then have an opportunity to write down things you have difficulty with'.

Please read out the questions about difficulties and then give examples of responses which they can make - e.g. in writing spelling, grammar, subject/verb agreement, sentence structure.
Encourage every student to think of at least one thing they struggle with - you may even wish to give a personal example!

7. 'Last question on this page - and it is about if another language/dialect other than English is spoken in your home (explain - additional to main language of a country, a dialect is a regional language spoken by people from a particular area in a country) - please print that on the next line; if you speak more than one please print them all. If you have none but English, place an X in the 'none' box.

8. 'How many of you put an X in the NONE box - please raise your hands. I would like you now to put your pens down and listen quietly so that the students who have another language can complete some more questions. This will only take a few minutes and then we will all complete the form together.'

STUDENTS WHO HAVE ANOTHER LANGUAGE/DIALECT IN THEIR HOME

9. Continue in the same way in relation to the language questions - all responses, for speaking, writing and reading this other language require student to circle only one response for self, parents and any siblings at this school.

Question about % of time speaking other language - give them time to think about their response and then have them colour in appropriate block.

ALL STUDENTS

10. The question about speaking English at home - again read to students and ask them to assess how well parents and siblings speak English. Circle response. Colour in % of time spent speaking English at home – majority will be 100%.

11. The categories in the box relate to those which Education Queensland deem to be EAL/D students and who may, after qualification, receive some support. It is possible that a student may tick 2 categories (e.g. aboriginal and child of previous migrants) - that is fine. EAL/Ds should, however, be able to tick at least one box.

Australian/English speaking students will not need to enter anything in this box unless they are Indigenous.

12. English language support. 2 x boxes to complete.

13. Finally, some academic results to end on a happy note – this relates to results from last results available!

When completed, please collect and put in envelope. Please try to have all of your students complete the survey within the nominated week. Many thanks - this is of value for trying to find ways to firstly identify these students from homes where several languages are spoken - not just English. Hopefully then, staff can be informed and, where appropriate, here at your school they will be supported.

If you have any questions about this procedure please see me at school or email me at l.gilmour@griffith.edu.au.

Many thanks,

Lyn Gilmour
B3. Student interview questions

Hello (in student’s other home language)

Thank you for coming so promptly for your interview. Your family has given permission for me to talk to you further about the information you put in the questionnaire that you did in your class (show questionnaire). I am going to talk about that and also ask you some more questions about your culture, about school and how you enrolled here. We will just work through the questions I have here; remember you can stop me anytime you want to ask questions or just to say you have had enough. Do you understand?

I am also going to record the session (show recorder) and that will help me when I get back to the University to remember everything we shared.

Q1: In the survey, you stated that you are from a ................... background. Please tell me about things in your culture that you think are very special?

Q2: Do you have to speak or read ................... to be able to participate in any of these? If so, can you tell me when?

Q3: When do you speak, write and read ...................? How good are you at it?

Q4: Who speaks ................... at home? How good are they?

Q5: How many other students are there in your school from your cultural background?

Q6: Which language do you speak the most with them - English or ......? Why?

Q7: How important is it for you to speak this other language with them? Why?

Q8: In the survey, you said that you were born here/........... been here for all of your life or .... years. Do you see English as your first language or is ................ your main language?

Q9: In the survey, you said that ...................... is spoken about ........% of time in your home and the rest is in English. Would that be about right?

Q10: On the survey form, you said that you speak, read and write English at ...................... levels. Tell me about how you are doing in subject English.

Q11: What is your favourite subject at school and what do you like most about it?

Q12: What is the hardest thing about this subject?

Q13: Can you explain that to me a little more and tell me what you do when you can’t understand or do the task?

Q14: Can you explain the best thing that the teacher of your favourite subject does that really helps you learn?

Q15: What is one thing that you do not like about the way the teacher teaches this subject?
Q16: What sort of difficulties do you have in understanding what you teacher says in class?
Q17: Does your teacher always understand you when you ask questions in class? Do you have to repeat them or explain them again? If so, why?
Q18: What sort of difficulties do you have listening to the teachers in you various classes at school - i.e. can you clearly understand their English?
Q19: Let’s imagine that you have been given a take home writing task in English. You have a task sheet and a criteria sheet. Your teacher has gone through them both with you in class. You have had 3 lessons on how to do the task. How would you go about completing it so you can hand it in on time?
Q20: What sorts of things do you find easy in doing this sort of task?
Q21: What sorts of things do you find hard when doing this sort of task?
Q22: What do you do when you need help to do the task when it is hard?
Q23: I would like you to think about your favourite teacher here at school. Can you tell me what it is that makes this teacher special to you? What does this teacher do in your lessons?
Q24: How does this help you to learn and possibly get better grades?
Q25: Does your favourite teacher know that another language besides English is spoken in your home? If so, how do you know this and is it important that they know?
Q26: Let’s pretend that I am going to be your teacher this term. You are going to be the only student in my class. I want you to think about some things that work for you in class – what helps you to learn and improve your English and also the content of your subjects. How would you like me to teach you – things that help you learn and hopefully get better marks?
Q27: Maths and Science, let’s talk about them now – how are you going with these subjects and what do you think is easy or hard about them? Why?
Q28: As a student from another cultural background what, if any, challenges have you had to face at school because of that – can you explain what you had to do and how it was sorted out?
Q29: You told me that you have ............... as another home language and that you speak it (or don’t) here at school and at home. Is speaking the ........ language important to you? ...Why? ... Do you think it helps you at school to have two languages? How?
Q30: Let’s talk a little about when you leave school. What do you think you will do as a future job?

Q31: Do you think your schooling here will help you reach that goal? How?

Q32: What will your family think of you being a ..........? Will they be able to support you to reach this goal?

Q33: Is that important also to others in your culture? Why?

Q34: I would like you to try to remember when you enrolled here at this high school. Can you explain to me how your enrolment happened - did you come here, did someone came to your primary school, did you come to an interview - just what happened with you and your parents so you could come to school here....

Do you know if your family filled in the bit in the enrolment form about you speaking another language besides English at home? If not, why do you think they did not fill it in?

Is there anything further you would like to add or ask?

Thank you for your time and for sharing things about you with me.

Please thank your teacher for me - now straight back to class.

Goodbye (in student’s other home language)
B4. Student transcript of interview

Male, Chinnor, Year 8, 14 years, ID 2636

Q1 In the survey you stated that you are from a South African background. Please tell me about the things in your culture that you think are very special?

Q2 Do you have to speak or read Afrikaans to be able to participate in any of these? If so, can you tell me about it?
Student: I speak it. I don’t think it matters you can see what is happening when they do festivals and that sort of thing.

Q3 When do you read, write and speak the language and how good are you at it?
Student: Speak very well, read average

Q4 Who speaks the language at home and how good are they?
Student: We all do and my parents are very good. We speak it a fair but at home.

Q5 Are there any other students from your culture in this school and if so how many?
Student: Yes, there are. There are some in my year and in my class

Q6 Do you speak English or Afrikaans with them and why that choice?
Student: Only if asked to speak Afrikaans I really don’t use it at school.

Q7 Is it important to you to speak this language? Why?
Student: Not really it is more for my parents now - I have always learnt English and that is what I use also.

Q8 You said you were born in South Africa and that you have lived here 3 years. Do you see English as your main language or is Afrikaans your main language?
Student: Yes, born in Sth Africa. We have been here several years now. English is spoken but we speak a fair bit of time in Afrikaans.

Q9 You said that at home you speak Afrikaans about 40% of the time would - that be right?
Student: 40% yep.

Q10 You rated yourself in English as speaking, reading and writing it very well. Your English results show you received a B last term.
Student: I do not have any problems with English. I am doing alright.

Q11 What is your favorite subject at school and what do you like about it?
Student: I have only been in this school for 6 months and I was at a private one before that. I like Science. We are doing Physics and I like this.

Q12 What do you find the hardest thing in this subject - what and why?
Student: Nothing really. I like it and the teacher and it makes you really think

Q13 What do you do when you can’t understand or do a task, how does the teacher help you?
Student: Probably ask teacher or one of my friends to explain it. Also my dad is pretty good. The teacher doesn’t tell us the answer, he challenges us to explore and work things out. We do it step by step; we also write a lot down.
Q 14  What is one thing that you do not like about the way this teacher teaches you?
Student: There is nothing really.

Q 15  Do you have any difficulties understanding what your teacher says in class?
Student: Not at all.

Q 16  Do your teachers always understand you when you ask questions in class?
Student: There are no worries there, I don’t really have an accent.

Q 17  Do you have any difficulties listening to your teachers in class - can you clearly understand their English?
Student: No.

Q 18  Subject English – you have been given a narrative assessment – how do you go about doing it?
Student: I would go and do some research; I read a lot so would do a plan and then do a draft.

Q 19  What is easy for you with that sort of a task?
Student: I don’t have any worries at this stage as long as I follow what we have been told.

Q 20  What do you find difficult when writing for subject English?
Student: Not too much, I am pretty ok in it.

Q 21  What sorts of things help you when you find a writing task hard - what do you do?
Student: Need some examples so can analyse how to do it - need some visuals, they always help.

Q 22  Favourite classroom teacher - 1-2 things in the way they teach that helps with your learning
Student: He is not one of the teachers who have to get through the work. He is available, open to questions whether simple or hard and all are treated with respect. He connects with us. He keeps us on track and focused. We know his structure for each lesson.

Q 23  How does this help you?
Student: I like this, it works for me what he does in class and this helps me to keep working hard.

Q 24  Do you think this teacher knows that another language is spoken in your home? Is it important to you that they know? Why?
Student: No, I don’t think he would know. He has never asked me and I have never said anything. I don’t think it is that important. I think he may know there may be another language but my accent is not strong [Afrikaans]. Not having an accent helps you fit in - I feel like I am part of the whole school group. I don’t really stand out and I am also white not dark skinned coloured.

Q 25  If you could tell your teacher how you would like them to teach what would be some of the things that would help and some that wouldn’t?
Student: Breaking down new ideas, taking time to explain that is important; I like a quiet environment, also like to take things slow and little bits building to big one.

Q 26  Maths and Science - what is good in these subjects and what is not?
Student: I am doing OK and really like Science - some of the new concepts are difficult.

Q 27  As a student from another cultural background, do you face any challenges here because of that?

Student: Not really, no one really knows I am from South Africa. I have told some and they seem surprised when I tell them.

Q 28  *Filing cabinets for each language - confused, help?*
Student: Sometimes I probably do think in Afrikaans because we speak it a fair amount. I am not sure if it helps me or not.

Q 29  *Do you think your schooling here will prepare you for your future job?*
Student: I am sure it will and they will make sure I select the correct subjects to give me the options. I am much happier here than in my previous school.

Q 30  *What sort of job/career do you hope to have?*
Student: I am not sure. I am in to designing, perhaps architecture. I would like to have some space first and then go to Uni.

Q 31  *What will your family think of that - is that important to you?*
Student: My mum and dad would be very supportive. My dad said to look at something that would have a reasonable pay and we talked about architecture.

Q 32  *Is that important also to others in your culture? Why?*
Student: I would not have had the opportunity to do this in SA - things have really changed. So something like this here is really fantastic.

Q 33  *When you enrolled at this school how did the process run?*
Student: I came across from .......... We got the enrolment package, filled it out and then an interview with DP. No one asked us anything about another language.

Q 34  *Any other comment*  
Because I am a white South African people think I only speak English. I think people forget how badly off the whites are over there. We are so happy to be out and in this country.
Parent/carer/student information sheet

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

Dear parents/care givers

We are education researchers at Griffith University and this letter is to tell you about a project which is designed to help develop our understanding of and support for students for whom English is not their main language.

In many high schools there are students who, while not being identified as having English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D), may have limited English with English not always being spoken at home. These students often speak good English and many have been enrolled as English speaking only by their parents to ensure that they are perceived as part of the main student body; their lack of recognition as students from a home where a language other than English is spoken, means that teachers and the school are not able to give them all the English language support available and this may limit their educational outcomes.

We are undertaking research in several state high schools to gain a better understanding of this issue and to also look at strategies that can be used to better support all students. The first step will be to ask Junior Secondary students to do a survey just to let us know about their English language background. From this information, we would then like to invite a small number of students to participate in interviews where we will talk to them about their experiences at school.

The research will keep personal details about each student and their family confidential. They will not be identified. Our purpose is simply trying to better understand the needs of all students in our schools. You and your child do not have to participate, this is your choice. If your child does start to participate, they can opt in or opt out at any time during the process, with no criticism of them.

So that you can find out more about this project, we are holding an information session at your school on ........................................ in the Administration Building. You are invited to come along and hear how this research will be conducted and what part students will play in the process. There will be plenty of time for any questions you may have about this research. If you have specific questions please feel free to email us about these (contact details below).

Ethics and Research team Contact details

Approval has been received from Griffith University’s Ethics Branch (Phone 3735 4375), Education Queensland’s Research Branch (Phone 3237 1281) and the school’s principal to proceed with this research which will be conducted to the highest ethical standards as outlined by National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2014.

Lyn Gilmour  Dr Helen Kliwe  Dr Minglin Li
l.gilmour@griffith.edu.au  h.kliwe@griffith.edu.au  minglin.li@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 041 89 85 113  Phone: 07 3735 5925  Phone: 07 3735 3471
B6. Consent through Opt Out form for surveys

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

The aim of this research has been outlined in the Information Sheet.

All Junior Secondary students will be asked to participate in a survey which asks them questions about their cultural and linguistic diversity. They will be asked to complete a survey about home languages and which members of their family speak a language other than English. If they also speak another language they will be asked how well they speak, read and write it. Information about any English language support they had received in the past will also be sought.

As outlined, the student’s participation is entirely voluntary. Permission has already been received from Education Queensland and the school’s principal to undertake this research at your school. All responses from survey and from the interviews will be coded by the researcher and will be anonymous and confidential.

If you **DO NOT** want your child to participate in this research, it is important that you indicate this below and also sign on the line. Once you have completed this, please return it to the school’s administration, or by emailing or mailing it to the address indicated at the bottom of this letter. If I do not hear from you before the close off date of ……………………., your child will be included in this research.

I **DO NOT** wish for my child, ................................................................., in Year ........ to participate in this research.  

Please print

Signature ............................................. ...............................................

Print Name .......................................................... Date ........../....../2015

Relationship to child:  Parent [ ] Carer/Guardian [ ] Brother [ ] Sister [ ] Other family member [ ]

Other (please specify) [ ] ...............................................................  

Lyn Gilmour
HDR - EPS Griffith University,
M19, 5-46, Mt Gravatt Campus,
Meesines Ridge Road, Mt Gravatt 4122
lgilmour@griffith.edu.au
B7. Abridged Information sheet for interviews

Abridged information sheet for student interviews

Valuing language diversity in state high schools in Queensland

Dear parents/care givers

This is an abridged version of the Information sheet which you received when this research was commenced in the school earlier in the year. It will refresh your memory about the survey that your child and other Junior secondary students completed.

This project is designed to help develop our understanding of and support for who have more than just English spoken in their homes. In many high schools there are students who, while not being identified as having English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D), may have limited English with English not always being spoken at home. These students often speak good English and many have been enrolled as English speaking only by their parents to ensure that they are perceived as part of the main student body; their lack of recognition as students who have EAL/D means that teachers and the school are not able to give them all the English language support available and this may limit their educational outcomes.

From the information received in the surveys, we are now inviting a small number of students to participate in interviews where we will talk to them about their experiences at school and we would like your student to be involved.

The research will keep personal details about each student and their family confidential. They will not be identified. Our purpose is simply trying to better understand the needs of all students in our schools. You and your child do not have to participate, this is your choice. If your child does start to participate, they can opt in or opt out at any time during the process, with no criticism of them.

If you have specific questions please feel free to email us about these (contact details below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics and Research team Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval has been received from Griffith University’s Ethics Branch (Phone 3735 4375), Education Queensland’s Research Branch (Phone 3237 1281) and the school’s principal to proceed with this research which will be conducted to the highest ethical standards as outlined by National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyn Gilmore</th>
<th>Dr Helen Klieve</th>
<th>Dr Minglin Li</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:l.gilmore@griffith.edu.au">l.gilmore@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:h.klieve@griffith.edu.au">h.klieve@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:minglin.li@griffith.edu.au">minglin.li@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 041 89 83 113</td>
<td>Phone: 07 3735 3925</td>
<td>Phone: 07 3735 3471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B8. Consent form for interviews

Written consent to interview student

Unlike the surveys where you did not have to return the form, this time you do have to return the signed form so that your student may be interviewed.

Please complete the information in the box below and return it to:

[Box for information]

email or send to Lyn Gilmour at Griffith University

as soon as possible.

I approve of my child .......................................................... in Year ........... participating in this interview

Please print

Signature ................................................................. Date ......./....../2015

Print Name ................................................................. Relationship to child: Parent [ ] Carer/Guardian [ ] Brother [ ] Sister [ ] Other family member [ ]

Other (please specify) [ ]

I do not wish for my child .......................................................... in Year ......... to participate in this interview

Please print

Lyn Gilmour – l.gilmour@griffith.edu.au

or mail to Lyn at

HDR – EPS, M10-5.46,
Griffith University,
Mt Gravatt Campus,
Messines Ridge Road
Mt Gravatt 4122.
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B9. Education Queensland Student Enrolment Form

Application for student enrolment form

INSTRUCTIONS
Please refer to the Application to Enroll in a Queensland State School registration sheet at the end of this form when completing this application.
Failure to fill in all sections of this form may result in a delay in processing your application. Information on minor sections may result in the school not being able to provide the important Federal, State and local Government funding arrangements. The information on this form is subject to change without notice.

PRIVACY STATEMENT
The Department of Education and Training (DET) is collecting the information on this form for the purposes outlined in the Education (General Provisions) Act 2005 (EGPA) and, in particular, as follows:

· assessing whether the application for enrolment should be approved
· requiring students to provide information required by the school
· gathering and maintaining accurate student information
· providing professional education, training and support services to students
· communicating with students and parents.

This collection is authorised by section 115 and 116 of the EGPA. DET will disclose personal information from this form to the Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority when opening student accounts. In compliance with Part 3 of the Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014 (QAQA), personal information from this form may be disclosed to Centrallink in compliance with sections 193 and 195 of the Social Security (Administration) Act 1999 (Cth). Personal information and contact details of students of non-school education, occupation group and main language other than English are not disclosed to Centrallink. Where the information is shared with Centrallink, the information is disclosed to Centrallink in compliance with the EGPA and QAQA.

ENTITLEMENT TO ENROLMENT

Under the EGPA 2005, an applicant for enrolment at a state school must be enrolled if they are entitled to enrolment. While not exhaustive, the following matters may affect an applicant's entitlement to enrolment at a state school:

· failure to adequately complete the enrolment form
· if the school has an enrolment management plan or an enrolment eligibility plan (enrolment is subject to eligibility under the plan)
· if the applicant is a prospective student, the applicant can only apply for enrolment at a state school and will be subject to a satisfactory criminal history check, or as a student to a program of distance education. All prospective mature age students must have a remaining allocation of state education
· the applicant is not of current age for enrolment (relates to Preparatory Year and Years 1 to 10)
· the applicant has been excluded or suspended from enrolment or is subject to suspension from a state school at the time of the application
· the school is a special school and the applicant does not meet the criteria for enrolment in a special school
· the school principal reasonably believes that the applicant presents an unacceptable risk to the safety or well-being of the student community
· the proposed enrolment requires approval as part of a flexible arrangement under s.105 of the DGPA, 2005, and the arrangement has not yet been approved
· the proposed enrolment is not an Australian resident or citizen or the child of an Australian permanent resident or citizen (visa restrictions may apply), fees must be charged in cases where legislation requires that the applicant must obtain approval from the Chief Executive via Education Queensland International (EQI) to enrol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Code Class</th>
<th>EDI ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student name</td>
<td>student visa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PROSPECTIVE STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal family name</th>
<th>(as per birth certificate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal given name</td>
<td>(as per birth certificate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred family name</th>
<th>Preferred given names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Copy of birth certificate available to show school site | Yes | No |

| For prospective mature age students, proof of identity supplied and dated | Yes | No |

Enrollment may be approved without seeing staff sighting the prospective student’s birth certificate. An alternative to birth certificate will be considered where it is not possible to obtain a birth certificate, e.g., a prospective student born in another country without a birth registration system. A passport or visa document will suffice. This does not include failure to register a birth or reluctance to order a birth certificate.

For international students approved for enrollment by EQ, a passport or visa will be acceptable.

### APPLICATION DETAILS

| Use the prospective student for a Queensland state school? | Yes | No |

If yes, provide name of school and approximate date of enrolment:

What year level is the prospective student seeking to enrol in? Please provide the appropriate year level:

Proposed start date Please provide the proposed starting date for the prospective student at this school:

| Does the prospective student have a sibling attending this school, or another Queensland state school? | Yes | No |

If yes, provide name of sibling, year level, date of birth, and school:

Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PROSPECTIVE STUDENT ADDRESS DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal place of residence address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing address (if it is the same as principal place of residence, write ‘AS ABOVE’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FAMILY DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents/Grandparents</th>
<th>Parent/Grandparent 1</th>
<th>Parent/Grandparent 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mr</th>
<th>Mrs</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>Dr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership to prospective student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Is the parent/grandparent an emergency contact? | Yes | No |

Uncontrolled copy. Refer to the Department of Education and Training Policy and Procedure Register at [http://www.det.qld.gov.au](http://www.det.qld.gov.au) to ensure you have the most current version of this document.
### FAMILY DETAILS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Carer</th>
<th>Parent/Carer 1</th>
<th>Parent/Carer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Phone contact number</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Phone contact number</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Phone contact number</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What is the occupation group of the parent/carer?

- [ ] Please select the parental occupation group from the list provided at the end of this form. If parent/carer 1 is not currently in paid work but has had a job in the last 12 months or has relied in the last 12 months, please use the last occupation. If parent/carer 1 has not been in paid work in the last 12 months, enter ‘1’.

- [ ] Please select the parental occupation group from the list provided at the end of this form. If parent/carer 2 is not currently in paid work but has had a job in the last 12 months or has relied in the last 12 months, please use the last occupation. If parent/carer 2 has not been in paid work in the last 12 months, enter ‘2’.

#### Country of birth

| Country of birth | | |

#### Country of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does parent/carer 1 or parent/carer 2 speak a language other than English at home? (If yes, specify which one that is spoken most often)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Interpreter?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/carer 1 is an Australian citizen?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/carer 2 is a permanent resident of Australia?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Address line 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb/town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mailing address (if it is the same as principal place of residence, write ‘AS ABOVE’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address line 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb/town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parent/carer school education

| Year 8 or equivalent or below | | |
| Year 10 or equivalent | | |
| Year 11 or equivalent | | |
| Year 12 or equivalent | | |

#### Parent/carer non-school education

| Certificate I to V (including trade certificate) | | |
| Advanced Diploma/Diplomas | | |
| Bachelor degree or above | | |
| No non-school qualification | | |

Uncontrolled copy. Refer to the Department of Education and Training Policy and Procedure Register at [site details here] to ensure you have the most current version of this document.
### PROSPECTIVE STUDENT ORIGIN DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Queensland/interstate/oversea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin type</td>
<td>Daycare centre or kindergarten/Prep/Dominant/secondary/VE/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous school/other location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously employed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDIGENOUS STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the prospective student of Aboriginal or Torres Strait islander origin?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Torres Strait islander</th>
<th>Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### RELIGION – RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Do you want the prospective student to participate in religious instruction?  
- Yes  - No

If 'Yes', please nominate the religion:

### COUNTRY OF BIRTH

- In which country was the prospective student born?  
- Other (please specify country):
- Date of arrival in Australia: / / 

Is the prospective student an Australian citizen?  
- Yes | No

### PROSPECTIVE STUDENT LANGUAGE DETAILS

- Does the prospective student speak a language other than English at home?  
  - No, English only  
  - Yes, other – please specify: 

### EVIDENCE OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT’S IMMIGRATION STATUS  
(to be completed if this person is NOT an Australian citizen)

- Permanent resident:  
  - Complete passport and visa details section below
- Student visa holder:  
  - Date of arrival in Australia: / / 
  - Date enrolment approved to: / / 
  - Visa reference number: 
- Temporary visa holder:  
  - Complete passport and visa details section below
- Other, please specify:  
  - Temporary visa holders must obtain an ‘Approval to enrol in a State school’ from EQI

Passport and visa details to be cancelled for a prospective student who is NOT an Australian citizen.

**Note:** A permanent resident will have a passport with a permanent resident visa issued words ‘Permanent’ permitted to remain in Australia indefinitely. For prospective students arriving in Australia as refugee or humanitarian entrants, either PVO 68 Immigration issued land or ‘Document to travel to Australia’ with ‘stay indefinitely’ recorded must be sighted by the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passport number</th>
<th>Passport expiry date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visa number</td>
<td>Visa expiry date (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncontrolled copy. Refer to the Department of Education and Training Policy and Procedure Register at [link](https://www.det.gov.au) to ensure you have the most current version of this document.

Page 4 of 9
### Emergency Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergency Contact</th>
<th>Emergency Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (e.g., suit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st phone contact number*</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd phone contact number*</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd phone contact number*</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
<td>Work/home/mobile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prospective Student Medical Information (including allergies)*

**Privacy Statement**

The Department of Education and Training (DET) is collecting this medical information in order to address the medical needs of students during school hours as well as during school excursions, school camps, sports and other school activities. DET will not use this information to make a decision about a prospective student’s eligibility for enrolment. The information will only be used by authorised employees of the department and DET will only record, use and disclose the medical information in accordance with the confidentiality provisions at Section 418 of the Education (General Provisions) Act 2008.

It is essential that the school is advised of the prospective student's first day of attendance if the prospective student has any medical conditions. The school administration staff must also be informed of any new medical conditions or a change to medical conditions as soon as they are known. Should the prospective student need to take medications during school hours, an Individual Health Plan, including Emergency Health Plan if relevant, or Authority for Administration Medication Form will need to be completed each year and retained at the office.

#### No known medical conditions

- Medical condition (including allergies/sensitivities), symptoms and management (please refer to the list of Medical Condition Categories provided)
- Medical condition (including allergies/sensitivities), symptoms and management (please refer to the list of Medical Condition Categories provided)
- Medical condition (including allergies/sensitivities), symptoms and management (please refer to the list of Medical Condition Categories provided)

**Does the prospective student require any medical aids or devices (such as glasses, contact lenses, prosthetics or orthotics)? This is for the purpose of informing planning for school activities such as sport and school excursions.**

- No
- Yes, please specify

**Name of prospective student’s medical practitioner (optional)**

**Contact number of medical practitioner**

I authorize school staff to contact the prospective student's medical practitioner for the purposes of seeking advice in cases where an immediate but non-acute medical response is required (for instance, when the prospective student may be an emergency or sporting event). Please only provide the medical practitioner details if they have been provided.

**Medicare card number (optional)**

**Position Number**

**Family name (if listed in name of prospective student)**

**Private health insurance company name (if covered) (optional)**

**Private health insurance membership number (where applicable) (if company name is not provided)**

---

Uncontrolled copy. Refer to the Department of Education and Training Policy and Procedure Register at [http://www.det.qld.edu.au](http://www.det.qld.edu.au) to ensure you have the most current version of this document.
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COURT ORDERS*

Out of Home Care Arrangements*

Under the Child Protection Act 1999, when a Child Protection Order is approved by the Children’s Court, the child is placed in out-of-home care (OOHC). Out-of-home care includes short or long term placement with an approved relative or foster care; in a supported independent living arrangement; or in residential care.

Is the prospective student identified as residing in out-of-home care? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, what are the dates of the court order? Please provide a copy of the court order and/or the Authority to Care.

Commencement date

End date

Contact details of the Child Safety Officer (if known)

Name

Phone number

Family Court Orders*

Are there any current orders made pursuant to the Family Law Act 1975 concerning the welfare, safety or parenting arrangements of the prospective student? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, what are the dates of the court order? Please provide a copy of the court order.

Commencement date

End date

Other Court Orders*

Are there any other current court orders, such as a domestic violence order, concerning the welfare, safety or parenting arrangements of the prospective student? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, what are the dates of the court order? Please provide a copy of the court order.

Commencement date

End date

TRAVEL DETAILS

Mode of transport to school

[ ] Walk [ ] Car [ ] Bus [ ] Bicycle [ ] Train [ ] Other

APPLICATION TO ENROL*

I hereby apply to enrol my child or myself at _______.

I understand that supplying false or incorrect information on this form may lead to the reversal of a decision to approve enrolment. I believe that the information I have supplied on this form is true and correct in every particular, to the best of my knowledge.

Parent/Parent 2

Prospective student

Signature

Date

[ ] Yes [ ] No
### Parental occupation groups for use with parent/carer details

**Group 1**: Senior management in large business organisation, government administration and defence, and qualified professionals

- Senior executive/manager/department head in industry, commerce, media or other large organisation.
- Public service manager (section head or above), regional director, health/education/police/fire services administrator
- Other administrator (school principal, faculty head/assistant, library/museum/gallery director, research facility director)
- Defence Forces commissioned officer
- Professionals generally have degrees or higher qualifications and experience in applying this knowledge to design, develop or operate complex systems; plan, develop and advise on problems; teach others.
- Health, education, law, social welfare, engineering, science, computing professional
- Business [management consultant, business analyst, accountant, auditor, policy analyst, actuary, valuer]
- Airline transport [aircraft’s captain/equipment pilot, flight officer, flying instructor, air traffic controller]

**Group 2**: Other business managers, arts/media/sportspeople and associate professionals

- Owner/manager of farm, construction, import/export, wholesale, manufacturing, transport, real estate business
- Specialist manager (finance/engineering/production/personnel/industrial relations/sales marketing)
- Financial services manager [bank branch manager, finance/investment/insurance broker, credit/loan officer]
- Retail/sales/services manager [shop, petrol station, restaurant, pub, hotel/motel, cinema, theatre, agency]
- Arts/entertainment [musician, actor, dancer, painter, potter, sculptor, journalist, author, media presenter, photographer, designer, illustrator, proofreader, sportsperson, coach, trainer, sports official]
- Associate professionals generally have diplomas/technical qualifications and support managers and professionals
- Health, education, law, social welfare, engineering, science, computing technician/associate professional
- Business/management [recruitment/employment, industrial relations, training officer, marketing/Advertising specialist, market research analyst, technical sales representative, retail buyer, office/Project manager]
- Defence Forces senior Non-Commissioned Officer

**Group 3**: Tradespeople, clerks and skilled office, sales and service staff

- Tradespeople generally have completed a four year trade certificate, usually by apprenticeship. All tradespeople are included in this group.
- Clerks (bookkeeper, bank/office clerk, statistical/technical clerk, accounting/clerk/audit clerk, payroll clerk, accounting clerk, billing clerk, stores/inventory clerk, purchasing/stock clerk, freight/transport/shipping clerk, bond clerk, customs agent, customer services clerk, admissions clerk)
- Skilled office, sales and service staff:
  - Office [secretary, personal assistant, desktop publishing operator, switchboard operator]
  - Sales [company sales representative, auctioneer, insurance agent/assessor/loss adjuster, market researcher]
  - Service [aged/disabled/infants’/childcare worker, trolley/basket tester, parking inspector, postal worker, courier, travel agent, tour guide, flight attendant, fitness instructor, casino dealer/supervisor]

**Group 4**: Machine operators, hospitality staff, assistants, labourers and related workers

- Drivers, mobile plant, production/processing/machinery and other machinery operators
- Hospitality staff [hotel service supervisor, receptionist, waiter, bar attendant, kitchen hand, porter, housekeeper]
- Office assistants, sales assistants and other assistants:
  - Office [clerk, word processing data entry/business machine operator, receptionist, office assistant]
  - Sales [sales assistant, motor vehicle/charter/parts salesperson, checkout operator, cashier, bus/taxi driver, ticket seller, service station attendant, car rental desk staff, telephone sales, telemarketer, shelf stacker]
  - Assistant (trades assistant, schoolteacher aide, dental assistant, veterinary nurse, nursing assistant, museum/gallery attendant, usher, home helper, salon assistant, animal attendant]
- Labourers and related workers
  - Defence Forces ranks below senior NCO not included above
- Agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fishing, mining worker [farm overseer, shepherd, woolclipper, farmhand, horse trainer, nurseryman, greengrocer, gardener, tree surgeon, forestry/logging worker, miner, seafarer/fishing hand]
- Other workers [labourer, factory hand, stonemason, guard, cleaner, canalside worker, laundry worker, trolley collector, car park attendant, crossing supervisor]

**Group 5**: Have not been in paid work in the last 12 months
### State Schools Standardised Medical Condition Category List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired brain injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergies/Intolerances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/fung/breathing - Oxygen required (continuously/periodically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/fung/breathing - Suctioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/fung/breathing - Tracheostomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial feeding - Gastrostomy device (tube or button)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial feeding - Nasogastric tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial feeding - Jejunostomy tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial feeding - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma - student self-administers medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-deficit Hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder and bowel - Urinary retention, incontinence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder and bowel - Fecal soiling, constipation, incontinence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder and bowel - Catheterisation (continuous, clean intermittent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder and bowel - Stoma site, urostomy, Microfil, MACE, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder and bowel - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood disorders - Haemophilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood disorders - Thalassaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood disorders - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer/leukemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeliac disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cystic Fibrosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes - type one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes - type two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear/nose/throat disorders - Otitis Media (middle ear infection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear/nose/throat disorders - Hearing loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear/nose/throat disorders - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy/Seizure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyelid disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrine disorder - Adrenal hypoplasia, pituitary, thyroid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart/cardiac conditions - Heart valve disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart/cardiac conditions - Heart congenital malformations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart/cardiac conditions - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health - Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health - Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health - Oppositional defiant disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle/bone/musculoskeletal disorder - spasticity (Hemi Palsy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle/bone/musculoskeletal disorder - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Disorders - eczema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Disorders - psoriasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowing/dysphagia - requiring modified foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowing/dysphagia - requiring artificial feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer &amp; positioning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel motion sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application to enrol in a Queensland State School

This sheet contains information on how to complete the Application for Student Enrolment Form (SEF-1 Version 7).

Entitlement to enrolment

Under the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006 (Qld) a state school must enrol an applicant if they are entitled to enrolment. While not exhaustive, a list of matters which may affect an applicant’s entitlement to enrolment are included on the front cover of the enrolment form.

Questions which must be answered

The Application for Student Enrolment Form contains a number of questions marked with an (*) which must be answered. These include – Prospective student demographic details, Prospective student address details, Family details, Religion – Religious Instruction, Country of Birth, Emergency contact details, Prospective student medical information, Court orders and the Application to enrol. These questions and consent are considered necessary to ensure the school can undertake its administrative and care responsibilities.

Sections of the form not marked (*) are optional. However, failure to complete these sections may result in the school not being eligible for important Federal and State Government funding.

Parent’s occupation and education

All parents across Australia, no matter which school their child attends, are being asked to provide information about family background (answering this question is optional). The main purpose of collecting this information is to promote an education system which is fair for all Australian students regardless of their background.

Sighting of birth certificate

Schools are required to sight a prospective student’s birth certificate. An alternative to a birth certificate will be considered where it is not possible to obtain a birth certificate (e.g. person born in a country without a birth registration system – passport or visa documents will suffice). Prospective mature age students who provide appropriate photographic proof of identity do not need to present a birth certificate.

Court Orders

Any court orders concerning the prospective student’s welfare, safety or parenting arrangements should be provided to the school, and the school should also be provided with any new or updated orders.

Name on enrolment form

A prospective student should be enrolled under their legal name as per their birth certificate. There is provision to also record a preferred family and/or given name. The preferred name will be used on internal school documents such as class rolls. The legal name will appear on semester reports unless there is a specific request to use the preferred name only. This request can come from parents/carers or the student (if the student is independent/mature age).

Evidence of Prospective Student’s Immigration Status

This section is required to be completed when a prospective student is not an Australian citizen and information is required to be recorded about their passport and visa.

Medical information and emergency contacts

A prospective student’s medical condition, symptoms, management and medication(s) must be documented. Medical conditions may include (but are not limited to) seizures/epilepsy, fainting, diabetes, asthma, heart problems, anaphylaxis and allergies (such as food or insect stings). Parents must indicate if they are an emergency contact. Three additional emergency contacts are also required.

Religion – Religious Instruction

Applicants are asked if they would like the prospective student to participate in religious instruction. From Year 1, the prospective student may participate in religious instruction if it is available.

If you tick ‘No’ or if the nominated religion is not represented within the school’s religious instruction program, the prospective student will receive another instruction in a separate location during the period arranged for religious instruction. Parents/carers may change these arrangements at any time by notifying the principal in writing.

Office use

This section is to be completed by the school and will assist in documenting specific details in relation to enrolment, including confirmation of the sighting of documentary evidence such as a prospective student’s birth certificate, passport or visa and prospective student’s mature age status.
Appendix C Ethics

C1. National Health and Medical Research Council Guidelines

Chapter 2.3: Qualifying or waiving conditions for consent

Introduction
Consent to participate in research must be voluntary and based on sufficient information and adequate understanding of both the proposed research and the implications of participation in it. "Limited disclosure" to participants of the aims and/or methods of research may sometimes be justifiable. This is because in some human research (for example, in the study of behaviour), the aims of the research cannot be achieved if those aims and/or the research method are fully disclosed to participants.

Research involving limited disclosure covers a spectrum, from simply not fully disclosing or describing the aims or methods of observational research in public contexts, all the way to actively concealing information and planning deception of participants. Examples along the spectrum include: observation in public spaces of everyday behaviour; covert observation, for example of the hand-washing behaviour of hospital employees; undisclosed role-playing by a researcher to investigate participants' responses; telling participants the aim of the research is one thing when it is in fact quite different.

Depending upon the circumstances of an individual project it may be justifiable to employ an opt-out approach or a waiver of the requirement for consent, rather than seeking explicit consent. A single research project may involve discrete elements or participant groups where different recruitment approaches can be used. For example, a project may involve some elements or participant groups where explicit consent must be sought and other elements where an opt-out approach may be considered or where a waiver of the consent requirement may be applied.

The opt-out approach is a method used in the recruitment of participants into research where information is provided to the potential participant regarding the research and their involvement and where their participation is presumed unless they take action to decline to participate.

While an opt-out approach makes it possible for people to make an informed choice about their participation, this choice can only be made if participants receive and read the information provided, and they understand that they are able to act on this information in order to decline to participate.

Importantly, the opt-out approach is unlikely to constitute consent when applying Commonwealth privacy legislation to the handling of sensitive information, including health information. Therefore, where it is impracticable to obtain an individual’s explicit consent to the use of their information and the purpose of the research cannot be served by using non-identifiable information, researchers must comply with the Guidelines under Section 95 of the Privacy Act 1988 (s95 guidelines) or the Guidelines approved under Section 95A of the Privacy Act 1988 (s95A guidelines) (as applicable) to ensure that their handling of personal information does not breach the Privacy Act 1988. Where researchers need approval to use an opt-out approach for research to which the s95 or s95A guidelines apply, only an HREC may grant this approval. Other review bodies may approve an opt-out approach for other research.

The Australian Privacy Principles Guidelines contain further information about consent and the handling of personal information.

When neither explicit consent nor an opt-out approach are appropriate, the requirement for consent may sometimes be justifiably waived. When an HREC or, where appropriate, another review body grants a waiver of consent for research conducted prospectively or retrospectively, research
participants will characteristic not know that they, or perhaps their tissue or data, are involved in
the research.

Guidelines

Limited disclosure

2.3.1 Where limited disclosure does not involve active concealment or planned deception, ethical
review bodies may approve research provided researchers can demonstrate that:

a. there are no suitable alternatives involving fuller disclosure by which the aims of the research
   can be achieved
b. the potential benefits of the research are sufficient to justify both the limited disclosure to
   participants and any risk to the community’s trust in research and researchers
c. the research involves no more than low risk to participants (see paragraph 2.1.6, page 18), and
   the limited disclosure is unlikely to affect participants adversely
d. the precise extent of the limited disclosure is defined

e. whenever possible and appropriate, after their participation has ended, participants will be:
   i. provided with information about the aims of the research and an explanation of why
      the omission or alteration was necessary
   ii. offered the opportunity to withdraw any data or tissue provided by them.

2.3.2 Where limited disclosure involves active concealment or explicit deception, and the research
does not aim to expose illegal activity, researchers should in addition demonstrate that:

a. participants will not be exposed to an increased risk of harm as a result of the concealment or
deception
b. a full explanation, both of the real aims and/or methods of the research, and also of why the
   concealment or deception was necessary, will subsequently be made available to participants
c. there is no known or likely reason for thinking that participants would not have consented if
   they had been fully aware of what the research involved.

2.3.3 Where research involving limited disclosure aims to expose illegal activity (see paragraph
4.6.1, page 67), the adverse effects on those whose illegal activity is exposed must be justified by the
value of the exposure.

2.3.4 Only a Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) can review and approve research that:

a. involves active concealment or planned deception
   or
b. aims to expose illegal activity.

Opt-out approach

2.3.5 An opt-out approach to participant recruitment to research may be appropriate when it is
feasible to contact some or all of the participants, but where the project is of such scale and
significance that using explicit consent is neither practical nor feasible.

2.3.6 Before approving the use of an opt-out approach for research, an HREC or, where appropriate,
another review body must be satisfied that:

a. involvement in the research carries no more than low risk (see paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7,
   page 18) to participants
b. the public interest in the proposed activity substantially outweighs the public interest in the
   protection of privacy
c. the research activity is likely to be compromised if the participation rate is not near complete,
   and the requirement for explicit consent would compromise the necessary level of
   participation
d. reasonable attempts are made to provide all prospective participants with appropriate plain
   language information explaining the nature of the information to be collected, the purpose of
   collecting it, and the procedure to decline participation or withdraw from the research

e. a reasonable time period is allowed between the provision of information to prospective
   participants and the use of their data so that an opportunity for them to decline to participate is
   provided before the research begins
f. a mechanism is provided for prospective participants to obtain further information and decline to participate.
g. the data collected will be managed and maintained in accordance with relevant security standards.
h. there is a governance process in place that delineates specific responsibility for the project and for the appropriate management of the data.
i. the opt-out approach is not prohibited by State, federal, or international law.

2.3.7 For guidance on the use of an opt-out approach in activities other than research, such as quality assurance and evaluation, refer to Ethical Considerations in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Activities, 2014.

2.3.8 When considering the provision of information to prospective participants and the mechanism by which individuals can decline participation, the ethical review body should consider the sensitivity and the risks, the potential participant pool, the context in which the research and opt-out approach will occur, and whether withdrawal from participation is feasible once identifiers have been removed from data.

Waiver

2.3.9 Only an HREC may grant waiver of consent for research using personal information in medical research, or personal health information. Other review bodies may grant waiver of consent for other research.

2.3.10 Before deciding to waive the requirement for consent (other than in the case of research aiming to expose illegal activity), an HREC or other review body must be satisfied that:
   a. involvement in the research carries no more than low risk (see paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7, page 18) to participants.
   b. the benefits from the research justify any risks of harm associated with not seeking consent.
   c. it is impracticable to obtain consent (for example, due to the quantity, age or accessibility of records).
   d. there is no known or likely reason for thinking that participants would not have consented if they had been asked.
   e. there is sufficient protection of their privacy.
   f. there is an adequate plan to protect the confidentiality of data.
   g. in case the results have significance for the participants' welfare there is, where practicable, a plan for making information arising from the research available to them (for example, via a disease-specific website or regional news media).
   h. the possibility of commercial exploitation of derivatives of the data or tissue will not deprive the participants of any financial benefits to which they would be entitled.
   i. the waiver is not prohibited by State, federal, or international law.

2.3.11 Before deciding to waive the requirement for consent in the case of research aiming to expose illegal activity, an HREC must be satisfied that:
   a. the value of exposing the illegal activity justifies the adverse effects on the people exposed (see paragraph 4.6.1, page 67).
   b. there is sufficient protection of their privacy.
   c. there is sufficient protection of the confidentiality of data.
   d. the waiver is not otherwise prohibited by State, federal, or international law.

2.3.12 Given the importance of maintaining public confidence in the research process, it is the responsibility of each institution to make publicly accessible (for example in annual reports) summary descriptions of all its research projects for which consent has been waived under paragraphs 2.3.10 and 2.3.11. Waiver decisions under paragraph 2.3.11 should not be made publicly accessible until the research has been completed.
To Whom it May Concern

Human Research Ethics Approval

“To ascertain the scope of undetected students who have English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D) in state high schools in Queensland”
(Ref: EDN/21/14/HREC)

I am pleased to advise that this research has approval to commence from the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee, a committee established and operating in accordance with the standards and principles of the Australian National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) and Griffith University policy.

The decision to approve is dated 9 July 2014 and covers the period 9 July 2014 to 20 February 2016.

For any queries regarding this ethical approval please contact the Committee Secretary on 3735 4375 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Rick Williams
Secretary to the Griffith University
Human Research Ethics Committee and
Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity
Office for Research
Griffith University
Nathan Qld 4111 Australia

14 November 2014
Appendices

C3. Education Queensland Ethics Approval letter

20 November 2014

Ms Lyn Gilmour
Griffith University
Mount Gravatt Campus
Messines Ridge Road
MOUNT GRAVATT QLD 4122

Dear Lyn

Thank you for your application seeking approval to conduct research titled Unidentified students in state high schools in Queensland who have English as another language or dialect in Queensland State schools. I wish to advise that your application to invite research participants to be involved in your study has been approved. This letter gives you approval to approach potential research participants only.

You may approach principals of the schools nominated in your application and invite them to participate in your research project. In the first instance, please provide principals of these schools with the attached letter which provides important information to help inform their decision about whether they wish to participate in this study. Your approval is conditional upon provision of this letter to each of the school principals you have nominated (you may need to photocopy the attached letter to provide sufficient copies for all principals).

As detailed in the Department’s research guidelines the following applies to the study:

- You need to obtain consent from the relevant principals before your research project can commence.
- Principals have the right to decline participation if they consider that the research will cause undue disruption to educational programs in their schools.
- Principals have the right to monitor any research activities conducted in their facilities and can withdraw their support at any time.

This approval has been granted on the basis of the information you have provided in your research proposal and is subject to the conditions detailed below.

- Perusal of and adherence to the Department’s standard Terms and Conditions of Approval to Conduct Research in Departmental sites is required as outlined in the document at http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/research/terms_conditions.pdf
- Any changes required by your institution’s ethics committee must be submitted to the Department of Education, Training and Employment for consideration before you proceed.
- Any variations to the research proposal as originally submitted, including changes to data collection, additional research undertaken with the data, or publication based on the data beyond what is normally associated with academic studies, should be submitted to the ‘research officer’ via email. Significant variations will require the submission of a new application.
- Papers and articles intended for publication that are based on data collected from Queensland State schools and/or Departmental sites should be provided to the Department for comment before release.

Queensland Government

Department of Education, Training and Employment

30 Mary Street, Brisbane 1000
PO Box 11033 Uly/Eden
Queensland 4092 Australia
Website www.deet.qld.gov.au
ABN 76 337 611 647
- Under no circumstances should any publications disclose the names of individuals or schools.

- You are required to contact the Department if you are contacted by the media about research activities conducted on Departmental sites or if you intend to issue a media release about the study.

- At the conclusion of your study you are required to provide this Office and principals of participating schools with a summary of your research results and any associated published papers or materials in hard copy. You are also requested to submit the documents in electronic format, or provide a link to an online location if possible, to research.stratpol@dete.qld.gov.au. Failure to provide a report on your research will preclude you from undertaking any future research in Queensland State schools.

Please note that this letter constitutes approval to invite principals and teachers to participate in the research project as outlined in your research application. This approval does not constitute ethics approval or support for the general and commercial use of an intervention or curriculum program, software program or other enterprise that you may be evaluating as part of your research.

Research Services values your input into the research application process and is seeking your responses through the enclosed short feedback form. It is hoped that this feedback will enable Research Services to effectively assess whether its processes are efficiently streamlined, transparent and mutually beneficial to all stakeholders.

Should you require further information on the research application process, please feel free to contact Tanya Murray, Senior Research Officer, Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations on (07) 3034 5945. Please quote the file number 550/27/1509 in future correspondence.

I wish your study every success.

Yours sincerely

Dr John Dungan
Director
Research Services
Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations

Trim ref: 14/391526

Attachment: Principals letter
20 November 2014

School Principal(s)
Queensland State School(s)

Dear Colleague,

Ms Lyn Gilmour of Griffith University has the Department’s approval to approach your school inviting participation in Undetected students in state high schools in Queensland who have English as another language or dialect. The acceptance of the invitation to participate is entirely voluntary and at your discretion.

This letter provides you with information about the Department’s terms and conditions for research conducted on state school sites to inform your decision as to whether or not your school will participate in this research. The Department supports the conduct of quality research in State schools and values the potential contribution of good research in informing educational policy and professional practice. Participation in research, however, may impact on the daily operations of schools, and it is therefore imperative that discretion is used when deciding whether to agree to research involving your school.

As a minimum, the researcher should provide you with the following documentation to inform your decision regarding school research participation:

- an information statement which describes the research, identifies who will be involved (e.g. students, teachers, parents/caregivers) and explains what will be required of these participants
- the informed consent form for you to sign to indicate your agreement that school staff, students and/or parents/caregivers can be invited to participate in the research
- a copy of the approval to approach letter from central office or regional office (where applicable)
- a copy of the final ethical clearance from their institution’s Human Research Ethics Committee
- full copies of any data collection instruments such as surveys, questionnaires, and interview schedules to be used in the study
- a copy of all current Blue Cards and/or exemption notices from Blue Card Services at www.bluecard.qld.gov.au for any researcher(s) seeking access to children on school sites.

Most importantly, participation in any research is voluntary, and you have the right to decline your school’s participation in a research project, even if approval to approach your school has been granted at central office or regional level. It is also recommended that you monitor any research activities conducted in your school and you may, if you wish, withdraw your support for the research study at any time without penalty.
At the conclusion of research involving your school, the researchers are required to provide you and participants with a written report summarising the main findings of the study.

Should you require further information on the research application process, please feel free to contact Tanya Murray, Senior Research Officer, Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations on (07) 3034 5945. Please quote the file number 550/27/1509 in future correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Dr John Dungan
Director
Research Services
Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations
Principal's project summary letter

Topic: Undetected students who have English as Another Language or Dialect in state high schools in Queensland.

Abstract: Ciao, talofa lava, kia ora, malo e lelei, ni hao, swasdi, zdravo, konnichiwa. All these words mean the same thing, hello, and for many students in Australian schools today they represent their home language whether it be Oceanic, Asian or European. Mobile world-wide workforces, immigrants seeking new and better lifestyles and refugees are increasingly moving to English speaking nations. Families that came to Australia as migrants, twenty to forty years ago, are now established and into their first or second generation of children where one parent is from a language background other than English and, this language is the language of the home. These students move through the different levels of education systems and many receive little, if any, support with their English language usage because they are undetected as having English as another language or dialect (EAL/D) at home. An exploratory mixed methods study, conducted in some Queensland state high schools, aims to provide a greater understanding of the issues encountered by English language learners and to document the strategies through which these students may be best supported. This study will firstly establish the scope of undetected students, in some Queensland state high schools, who have English as another language or dialect (EAL/D) at home. Potential educational implications for these students will be examined, as well as strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in supporting their learning. Strategies which facilitate the support of early identification of these students and their on-going support will also be discussed.

Supervisors: Dr Helen Kliese
Email: h.kliese@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 5925

Dr Minglin Li
Email: minglin.li@griffith.edu.au
Phone: 07 3735 3471

Griffith University Ethics Approval: EDN/21/14/HREC July 2014
Education Queensland Research Approval: 530/27/1509 dated 20 November 2014
C6. Approval letter from principals to conduct research

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This is to advise that Lyn Gilmour, PhD candidate from Griffith University, has been given approval to conduct research to ascertain the scope of undetected students in state high schools in Queensland who have English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D) at home.

The school’s administration has been shown the relevant Ethics approval from Griffith University (EDN/21/14/HREC) and the letter of approval from Education Queensland. The letter to Principals from Education Queensland has also been received.

School

Principal

Please print name

Principal signature

Date: ......./........./2015
Appendix D School results

D1. Academic Results for Semester 1 2015

Academic Results Semester 1 2015 - year levels, groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>English % of group</th>
<th>Mathematics % of group</th>
<th>Science % of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Yr 7</td>
<td>EAL/D n=89</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und* n=89</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>English % of group</th>
<th>Mathematics % of group</th>
<th>Science % of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Yr 8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL/D n=81</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und* n=64</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>English % of group</th>
<th>Mathematics % of group</th>
<th>Science % of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Yr 9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL/D n=111</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und* n=96</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: A = highest grade; D or E = not passing subject; * Und = Undefined
As this was the time of data collection, all students should have had a result in all subjects.
N/R = nothing recorded - for students from Special Education classes or those who had not completed sufficient assessment pieces to be graded.
**D2. NAPLAN Results for 2015**

**NAPLAN results for Years 7, 8 and 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 7 2015</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN 2015</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BNMS</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 NMS</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year 8 2014 (Year 7) NAPLAN results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8 2015</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN 2014 Yr 7</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BNMS</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 NMS</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year 9 2015 NAPLAN results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 9 2015</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN 2015</td>
<td>% of group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BNMS</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 NMS</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>