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1 Rationale for the report

This research was commissioned by the Ministry of Education as part of its initiatives aimed at reviewing ESOL\(^1\) provision, in order to contribute to the effective provision of ESOL services in the future. The research investigates the way in which schools make use of the targeted funding (the funding is part of these initiatives and has been operative since 1998).

ESOL support is provided for NESB (non-English speaking background) students. The term NESB students, includes, but is not restricted to funded students. Other more proficient students, not deemed to require such funding, who come from non-English speaking backgrounds are also referred to as NESB students. NESB students may or may not be New Zealand born\(^2\). For the purposes of the present study we generally restrict our use to Ministry of Education terms as above when we refer to students in New Zealand schools. To refer to students who are private fee paying students of international origin, we use the term, International Fee Paying students (IFP).

Students eligible for funding are those in their first four or five (in the case of refugee students) years in a New Zealand school, and whose performance on language based mainstream curriculum tasks is not close to the performance of the national cohort. In the case of non-refugee students, their total entitlement to funded support is twelve terms (3 years); for refugee students it is twenty terms (5 years). This funding is paid to schools by the Ministry of Education on the basis of twice yearly reports of the students’ performance on assessment tasks, and on the basis of the submission of relevant background information on the students such as date commenced at the school, date of birth etc.

1.1 Research questions

The research questions for the current study were set by the Ministry of Education. They are as follows:

\(^1\) English for Speakers of Other Languages.

\(^2\) Programmes in other countries have different labels as do the students. “The term English as a Second Language (ESL) – used in Canada, North America and Australia – carries the same meaning as English as an Additional Language (EAL), which is the term now used in official documentation in England and Wales. In Australia and North America, reference is also made to learners with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)” (Rea-Dickens, 2000, p.115). See the glossary at the end of this report.
1. What is identified in the literature, or documented elsewhere, as good practice for teaching and learning in the compulsory school sector for NESB students, particularly new immigrants? What is identified as good ESOL practice, as differentiated from good literacy practice in teaching and learning in literacy? What are the implications for policy and practice? (see Section 2)

2. How do schools identify the needs of an individual NESB student? Which diagnostic practices in the ESOL guidelines do they use? What else do they use? Which of the diagnostic practices from the ESOL guidelines are easy to administer, and which if any are difficult to administer and why? Who carries out the assessment? (see sections 5.1-5.3)

3. How do schools identify the programme or support required by the NESB students? What determines what is offered? What is offered? (see sections 5.3 –5.5)

4. Are schools providing programmes and support for NESB students based on what has been established in the existing research as good practice? To what extent does it relate to that which is identified as good ESOL practice (as distinct from good literacy practice)? To what extent does it relate to that which is identified as good literacy practice? (see sections 5.6 & 5.7)

5. How are schools spending their ESOL funding? Apart from ESOL funding, how else do schools fund programmes/support for NESB students? (see sections 5.10 & 5.11)

6. How is student progress in ESOL programmes tracked? What is their progress measured against? (see sections 5.1 & 5.2)

7. How effective are the ESOL programmes / support the school provides for these students? What are the critical factors that make the programme/support effective? (see sections 5.8 & 5.14)

8. What TESOL qualifications and experience do those working with NESB students (running programmes that are additional to normal classroom programmes) have? (see section 5.8)

9. Are there any (English) language needs NESB students have that schools have identified that are not being met by the programmes/support currently being provided by the school? If so, what are these language needs? (see section 5.12)

The first of these research questions is addressed in the literature review in section 2. The others, not necessarily in identical form or organisation, are addressed through observations of the data in section 5. However,
preceding discussion of good practice, it is necessary first to examine contextual factors and achievement data relating to NESB students. The contextual factors include demographic trends, information about student populations, ethnicity and regional distribution of NESB students, and decile ranking of schools. The wider contextual factor of the language communities and speakers in New Zealand is also included.

1.2 Demographic trends

In the past decade, New Zealand has seen rapid population growth and change through migration. This is likely to continue. The effects of migration and of growth within the existing population are likely to be felt in New Zealand schools in the near future. Wilkinson (1998) reports that in 1990, nearly 10% of each age group of children in New Zealand schools had English as their second language. Data from the 2001 census shows that 15% of children under the age of 15 years speak more than one language.

Department of Statistics predictions suggest that the NESB school population is likely to increase significantly. The population of children under 15 of Pacific Peoples is projected to rise as a percentage of the total under-15 population from 10% in 1996 to 22% in 2051, with a net total migration gain of about 1000 per year. The Asian population of children under 15 is projected to rise to 11% in 2016. (Department of Statistics, Census Snapshot 13, 2002). New Zealand is not alone in this trend. Predictions in the USA are that by 2050, 40% of the school population will be children from non-English speaking backgrounds (Lindholm-Leary, 2000).

As at May 2002 there were 23,260 NZ resident NESB funded students in schools (retrieved from the Ministry of Education ESOL database, June 2, 2002). This was approximately 3.2% of all students in New Zealand schools. May 2002 figures show that 18,309 of these NESB funded students were in primary or intermediate schools, and 4,951 NESB funded students were in secondary schools. This is a percentage distribution of 78.7% and 21.3% respectively.

In addition to this, numbers of students coming to New Zealand as International Fee Paying students (IFPs) continue to increase. Between July 2001 and March 2002 there was a 30% increase in IFPs in New Zealand schools (from 10,801 to 14,026). Nearly all of these students are NESB students. Schools are faced with the challenge of responding to this rapid pace of change.
1.3 Student populations

NESB students represent a diverse group of students in terms of their language backgrounds, and cultures. Students also vary in terms of the size of their communities, the newness of their communities, and their links to existing communities in New Zealand. Although we use the terms ESOL and NESB, we also need to recognize finer distinctions that account for some of these variables. Corson (1999) makes a distinction between new and established minorities, describing immigrant students as new minorities. Linguistic minorities who are not recent immigrants are established minorities. The Ministry of Education identifies the former as migrants, and the latter as New Zealand born students. The Ministry also identifies the status of Refugee.

The following table summarises data relating to the origins of funded NESB students (as at May 2002). Pasifika funded students make up 45.7% of all NESB funded students. In terms of ethnicity and countries of origin, the next largest group of NESB funded students are from various Asian backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of funded NESB students</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>(and %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Pasifika</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Other</td>
<td>8,509</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ born Pasifika</td>
<td>6,733</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ born Other</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,260</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESOL database, Ministry of Education, May 2002

1.3.1 New Zealand born students

Included in the targetted funding are students who are born in New Zealand. Over one third (38%, n=8849) of all funded NESB students are New Zealand born, while the remainder (62%) are New Zealand residents born overseas. In the OECD (2001) PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) those students who are born in New Zealand but whose parents were born outside of New Zealand are described as ‘first generation’ students, and data is collected on their performance.
Most of the New Zealand born funded NESB students are found in primary schools as funding does not extend beyond four years of New Zealand schooling. The largest group of New Zealand born students in New Zealand are from the Pacific Nations (predominantly Samoa). Pasifika\(^3\) New Zealand born students number 6,733 (29% of all funded students, and 76% of New Zealand born funded students). There is an increasing number of other minority groups who are becoming established through settlement and birth of new family members in New Zealand. These include Vietnamese, Kampuchean and Chinese and Indian ethnic groups (the latter from various countries). When these groups become a significant size in the community, they become established minorities (Corson, 1999, p.172).

1.3.2 Migrant students

Students who were born outside of New Zealand and whose parents were born outside of New Zealand are migrant students. In total, 14,411 (62%) funded NESB students were born outside New Zealand. Seventeen percent of all funded students (3,900) are Pasifika students born out of New Zealand.

1.3.3 Students who are refugees, both from literate and pre-literate backgrounds

Less than ten percent of NESB funded students are refugees. Some of the refugee students have had little or no education and have not learned to read or write in their first language (L1)\(^4\). In 2002, refugees accounted for 8.6% of the population of funded NESB students.

1.3.4 International foreign fee paying students

International foreign fee paying students and their families may be visitors, or may be awaiting confirmation of residency status. Many of them attend New Zealand schools with the intention of proceeding to tertiary study in New Zealand, or in other English medium countries. As at March 2002, IFP students (14,206) made up approximately 1.9% of all students in New Zealand schools. 8,037 attend Auckland schools and 6,169 attend schools in all other regions.

---

\(^3\) Students of Pacific ethnicity including Samoan, Tongan, Cook Is Maori, Fijian, Niuean, and Tokelauan students.

\(^4\) See the Glossary in section 8 for this and other acronyms.
1.4 Ethnicity and region

When NESB students attend schools, the contexts they find themselves in may vary greatly. Some will find many other NESB students at school with them, and some will find very few. Some will be at schools with many students of their own first language and cultural background, and some will be in very linguistically diverse school settings. As mentioned above, over one third of all funded NESB students are New Zealand born (mostly Pasifika). Second, are the similarly sized groups of Samoan born students (8.2%), South Korean born students (7.7%), and Chinese students (7.3%). Smaller but still significantly sized populations are students from India (3.1%), Fiji (2.9%), and Tonga (2.8%). A diverse range of students from over one hundred different ethnic and language backgrounds account for the remaining 30% (see Lists of Countries, Ethnicity, and Languages, Part B, ESOL Resourcing Information, Ministry of Education, 2000).

School students in the Auckland region account for 31% of all New Zealand school students. Funded NESB students are predominantly in the Auckland area in even greater proportions (75% of funded NESB students), as indicated in the following table. 10.1% of all funded NESB students are in the Wellington region, and 5.4% are in the Canterbury region. Other regions have smaller numbers of funded NESB students, and in all regions most of them are in the main centres.

Table 2: Funded NESB Students by school type and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Primary/Intermediate</th>
<th>Secondary/Area Intermediate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>13,834</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>17,364  (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>5,896   (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regions</td>
<td>18,309 (79)</td>
<td>4,951 (21)</td>
<td>23,260  (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESOL database, Ministry of Education, May 2002

Students of Pacific and Asian ethnicity (whether NESB students or not) are all most highly represented in the Auckland region. In Auckland there are numbers of schools where the students are predominantly Pasifika (of varying lengths of residence here and fluency in English), and some
schools where Asian NESB students are in the region of 25% of the school population. This is detailed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: All students by ethnicity and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number (and %) of students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Māori  Asian* Pacific Other IFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>113,577 (50) 32,943 (14) 28,703 (13) 42,018 (18) 4,912 (2) 5,876 (3)</td>
<td>228,029 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other regions</td>
<td>348,734 (69) 116,647 (23) 14,950 (3) 16,384 (3) 4,255 (1) 4,925 (1)</td>
<td>505,895 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regions</td>
<td>462,311 (63) 149,590 (20) 43,653 (6) 58,402 (8) 9,167 (1) 10,801 (2)</td>
<td>733,924 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: School Statistics, Ministry of Education website (based on school rolls at 1 July 2001)

Note 1: Terms marked with an * are the headings on the Ministry’s website, and include NZ born and migrant students. Not all of these students are NESB students

Note 2: [ ] contain figures from March 2002

Similarly IFP students, whose numbers are increasing at a rapid pace (compare figures in Table 3 as at July 2001, and figures in square brackets as at March 2002) are disproportionately in Auckland schools in terms of the total school population.

Table 4 below presents data derived from verification reports entered for funding for period two of 2002. Numbers of students differ slightly from those in Tables 1 and 2, which are based on period one data for 2002. In addition, the four-way categorisation of students (as All Asian, Pasifika (Migrant), Refugee, Pasifika (NZ born)) excludes a number of funded NESB students e.g. migrant students from regions other than Asia and the Pacific. Another limitation of the data is that students may be counted in two categories e.g. the small numbers of students who are counted both under All Asian and Refugee. While recognising the
limitations of the data, its value is in providing a breakdown of funded NESB students based on ethnicity and region at different school levels.

Large numbers of younger Asian and New Zealand born Pasifika students attract funding in Auckland schools. Smaller (though still sizable) numbers of secondary students are found in Auckland high schools. In other regions it is likewise the younger funded students who are more numerous than the older students.

Table 4: Funded NESB students by ethnicity, region and school level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Asian</td>
<td>Pasifika (Migrant)</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Pasifika (NZ born)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland:</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>5,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/Area</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other regions:</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/Area</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regions</td>
<td>11,802</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>6,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESOL database, Ministry of Education, as at period 2, 2002 allocation

These data also point to the important difference in the composition of school populations in Auckland as opposed to other regions. This concentration of NESB students in the Auckland region means a reduced proportion of speakers of English as a first language in the schools. Consequently there is a different learning environment for NESB learners in Auckland than they encounter in other parts of the country.
1.5 Decile ranking of schools

Funded NESB and international fee paying students are not equally spread across schools of all deciles[^5]. The former are most likely to be in low decile schools[^6], whereas IFP students are most likely to be in high decile schools (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>NESB Refugee</th>
<th>NESB Refugee</th>
<th>non-</th>
<th>Total NESB</th>
<th>IFP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>21,224</td>
<td>23,226</td>
<td>14,026</td>
<td>37,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NESB numbers as at May 2002; IFP numbers as at March 2002

Funded Pasifika students, either born in Pacific countries or born in New Zealand, are predominantly in low decile schools. By contrast, the Asian NESB funded students are predominantly in high decile schools, as are the predominantly Asian International fee paying students. Most of the

[^5]: A school’s decile indicates the extent to which the school draws its students from low socio-economic communities. Decile 1 schools have the highest proportion of these students. In allocating deciles the catchment area of the school is determined, and socio-economic factors of families with school-age children within this area are looked at. This information is combined with school ethnicity data (the proportion of Māori and Pasifika students).

[^6]: Low decile incorporates deciles 1-3, while high decile incorporates deciles 8-10.
refugee NESB students are in low to mid decile schools (see ESOL database).

The same pattern exists for all students when broken down by ethnicity. In low decile schools, students from European ethnic background make up 30% of the school population, students of Pacific ethnic background 21%, and those of Asian ethnic background 4%. By contrast, in high decile schools, the respective figures are European ethnic background 80%, Pacific 2%, and Asian 8%.

These different distributions mean that the language and learning context is very different for different NESB students. In some schools, immigrant NESB students will find themselves part of a significant and highly organised ESOL operation designed to cater for them as well as IFP students.

In secondary schools, where IFP students are mostly enrolled, the total number of IFP students is larger than the total of funded NESB students. The presence of IFP students therefore has a strong effect on the learning context and the ESOL programmes offered in many secondary schools.

In some schools, NESB students may be few in number and the ESOL help may be largely individual, and supported by inevitable interaction with predominantly Pākehā/European native speakers of English, and perhaps a buddy system with Pākehā students, or students who speak the same first language as the NESB English language learner.

### 1.6 Language communities and speakers in New Zealand

Although there have been calls for New Zealand to become less monolingual, European New Zealanders are still primarily monolingual. However, the composition of New Zealand’s population is changing, and with this change comes an increase in bilingualism. Table 6 below shows how ethnic groups have changed as a percentage of total NZ population between 1991 and 2001.

---

7 These percentages are derived from the Ministry of Education website, School Roll Cube, which provides data from school rolls, as at 1 July 2001, accessed July 26 2002.
Table 6: Proportions of ethnic groups in the New Zealand population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1991 Census</th>
<th>2001 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of NZ population</td>
<td>% of NZ population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified in more than one group</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census data 2001 (www.statistics.govt.nz, August 7, 2002) reports that 82.1% of the population speak only one language. Europeans are more likely to speak only one language than other ethnic groups (90.4% of New Zealanders of European ethnicity speak only one language).

English speakers therefore are not reducing monolingualism by learning other languages – it is immigrant speakers of other languages who do this when they come to New Zealand, either already bilingual or multilingual, or become so here by learning English. Bilingualism is also enlarged by New Zealand born bilinguals who maintain languages in various communities, as well as using English. Over 40% of both Asian and Pacific ethnic groups speak two languages (www.statistics.govt.nz, August 7, 2002).

As the non-European populations are increasing faster than the European population, the incidence of bilingualism will presumably continue to increase, although there is likely to be language loss in subsequent generations of migrant families.

Census data just released gives figures for bilingual children. There are 847,740 New Zealand children aged under 15 years, and 15% of them speak two or more languages. The following are the main languages spoken.

---

8 Māori is in a special category as the country’s first language, and as having New Zealand born bilinguals. A new report by Te Puni Kōkiri The Health of the Māori Language in 2001 shows that “For the first time in decades the speaking population has stabilised – not declined...”. (Retrieved from the www.tpk.govt.nz website, October 16, 2002).
### Table 7: Languages spoken by children 0-14 years in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>727,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>44,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>21,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>7,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>3,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As the non-European adult and child populations are both growing relative to the total population, the numbers of bilingual children are likely to continue to grow, particularly in areas where large numbers of ethnic groups other than Europeans live. Davis et al. (2001) did a pilot survey in 1999 on language use and maintenance in the Manukau region. Of the Pasifika languages, they found Samoan to be the most robust of the languages, followed by Tongan, Niuean, and Cook Islands Māori.

The above data set the language context for the present study of ESOL provision in New Zealand schools. The main observations are that:

- There is an increasingly diverse and multilingual population, especially among children
- There is a large number of NESB students in New Zealand schools, only a small proportion of whom are directly funded for extra ESOL provision at any point in time
- There are substantial and increasing numbers of International Fee Paying students, especially in secondary schools
- There is a disproportionate number of NESB students in the Auckland region
- Slightly less than half of the funded NESB students (46%) are of Pasifika background, and most of them are attending primary schools
• Slightly more than three quarters of funded NESB students (79%) are found in primary and intermediate schools

1.7 Achievement of NESB learners in New Zealand schools

Data are kept on educational achievement by ethnicity (e.g. NEMP, SEA\textsuperscript{9} – using the categories Pākehā, Māori, Pacific, Asian). Generally these show that Pacific, and sometimes Asian, students lag behind Pākehā. However, there is not a great deal of information related specifically to first language (L1) background and achievement in New Zealand schools.

Wylie, Thompson, and Lythe in their longitudinal study found gaps in achievement between students whose first language is not English and those whose first language is English.

In previous phases of the research, we found that some gaps grew over time between children whose first language was not English, and those whose first language was English, though the associations were diluted when family income was taken into account.

At age 10, the gaps are no longer there for most of the social skills and attitudes.... The gaps remain for Literacy, Mathematics, and Logical Problem-Solving, even after taking family income into account.

(Wylie et al, 2000, p.49)

The large scale international surveys which include New Zealand NESB students in their purview are important sources of information on student achievement. An IEA\textsuperscript{10} study in 1990-91 showed significant differences in New Zealand in reading achievement between students aged 9 with English as their first language (referred to as L1 in the study) and NESB students (referred to as L2 students in the study) (Wilkinson, 1998).

Similarly in 2000, the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) found large gaps in New Zealand (and the United States) for reading literacy between students (at age 15) who were minority language students (i.e. those who speak a language most of the time at home that is different from the language of assessment) and majority language students (OECD, 2001, pp.152-156). For New Zealand, where minority language students make up 9.6% of the students in the PISA sample, there was a difference of one whole proficiency level (there

\textsuperscript{9} National Education Monitoring Project, School Entry Assessment.

\textsuperscript{10} International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
being 5 levels of proficiency). By comparison, in Australia, where minority language students are 17% of the PISA sample, the difference between minority and majority language students was less than half a proficiency level.

The PISA study found that minority language students in New Zealand are more than twice as likely as majority language students to be in the bottom quarter of performance in reading literacy. Table 8 below gives ratios for a number of countries including New Zealand indicating the increased likelihood of students whose home language is different from the language of assessment being in the bottom quarter of the national reading literacy performance distribution. A ratio of 1 would indicate that students having a home language other than the language of assessment, would not be more likely than any other students to be in the bottom quarter of the national reading literacy performance distribution. A ratio of 2 indicates that students having a home language other than the language of assessment, are twice as likely to be in the bottom quarter of the national literacy distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, 2001

The data in the table above suggest that having a home language which is not the language of assessment appears to put a student in New Zealand or the United States at greater risk of low reading literacy performance in the PISA assessments than it does in Australia or Canada.

The PISA study also assessed mathematical and scientific literacy. Another international project, the 1998 TIMSS\(^\text{11}\) study of year 9 and year

\(^{11}\) TIMSS – Trends in Year 9 Students’ Mathematics and Science Achievement; Trends in Year 5 Students’ Mathematics and Science Achievement (www.minedu.govt.nz)
5 students, also looked at achievement in Mathematics and Science. In both studies New Zealand students generally performed better if they always or almost always spoke English at home. However, the TIMSS study of year 5 students found that in both Mathematics (p.17) and Science (p.32) there was a reduction between 1994 and 1998 in the size of the difference in achievement between those who rarely and those who usually spoke English at home.

In New Zealand, the PISA study also identified statistically significant differences in reading literacy performance between “Non-native” (Migrant and Refugee) and “First Generation” students (New Zealand born of immigrant or refugee parents), and “Native” New Zealand born students with at least one New Zealand born parent (see the Glossary for definitions of these OECD terms, and other terms). First Generation students, on average, in New Zealand perform at a similar level to Non-native students, whereas in Australia and Canada, First Generation students perform at a similar level to Native students.

No research has been done to investigate factors underlying these differences between New Zealand NESB students on the one hand, and their counterparts in Australia and Canada on the other. However, a number of factors outside the school system are known to differ. For many years, both Australia and Canada have had extensive language policies, and support for language learning throughout schools and the community, including ongoing funded programmes for adults. In addition there has been a large amount of research into second language learning and bilingual education, especially in Canada, and production of many teaching resources. All these activities, as well as community resources and support, very likely contribute to the differing results in those countries.

Chapter 8 of the PISA report (OECD, 2001) which is entitled “What makes a difference to PISA results”, concludes with the following:

PISA results suggest that there is no single factor that explains why some schools or some countries have better results than others. Successful performance is attributable to a constellation of factors, including school resources, school policy and practice, and classroom practice. It will require much further research and analysis to identify how these factors operate, interact with home background, and influence student performance.

A great many factors, including home and community, can be seen to differ between countries and between contexts of students, but we do not know precisely which factors are significant, or how student, school or community factors may be interacting to result in differences in achievement for NESB students.
2 Literature Review

This section provides a review of the literature guided by the following questions: What is identified as good practice for teaching and learning in the compulsory school sector for NESB students, particularly new immigrants? What is identified as good ESOL practice, as differentiated from good literacy practice in teaching and learning literacy?

Implications for policy and practice are addressed mainly in Section 5 in the context of the findings from the present study about practices in New Zealand schools.

In order to address ‘good practice’ the literature review concentrates on findings which are now well established by a considerable amount of research, and on conclusions which have a level of general agreement among major researchers in the field of second language learning. Recent books, especially collections of articles on topics by established researchers have been surveyed. The last 5 years of major journals have also been surveyed: *Applied Linguistics*, *TESOL Quarterly*, *Language and Education*, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Language Learning*, *Many Voices*, *Reading Research Quarterly*. New Zealand research, where available, is particularly important.

2.1 General aspects of effective provision

One notable study exploring the nature of provisions for NESB students has been conducted in New Zealand schools. This is a study (conducted in 1995 and published in 1997) by Kennedy and Dewar. It was “exploratory” in that it sought to describe the way in which a selected number of schools (14) provided programmes to cater for the needs of NESB students. “The main objective is to find out more about the implementation of ESOL programmes and support in schools, and how this is supported administratively and resource-wise” (Kennedy and Dewar, 1997, p.16). The methodology was by interview (54 individuals). These individuals included principals, deputy principals, ESOL coordinators, teachers, Board members and other support staff.

Features of effective provision identified by Kennedy and Dewar centre on five areas as outlined below:

1. **A policy of inclusiveness, achieved by:**
   - the school’s policy of inclusiveness and of meeting the needs of all students
• a commitment by the school and teachers to ensuring that NESB students and their families are welcomed to the school from the outset

• a commitment by all staff to learning about NESB students’ backgrounds and promoting cultural understanding among different groups in the school

• communicating with and involving the families of NESB students.

2. Support for first language maintenance, achieved by:

• helping students maintain or foster their first language

• employment of bi- and multi-lingual staff.

3. Support for teachers, achieved by:

• philosophical and administrative back-up and support (including professional development) for teachers of NESB students from the principal and other senior staff

• practical support for teachers, including increased staffing, an ESOL co-ordinator, and other appropriate and sufficient resources

• sufficient help being available from teacher support services, and other support agencies.

4. Quality of staff, achieved by:

• employing teachers who are committed to meeting the needs of NESB students, who have knowledge about language acquisition including for NESB students, and who are trained and experienced in working with NESB students.

5. A balanced programme, achieved by:

• fully integrating NESB students into the classroom as soon as possible, while maintaining targetted language support.

The above features at a general level could be considered to be good practice for all students, particularly the first and third features: a policy of inclusiveness, and support for teachers. The third feature - support for first language maintenance - relates exclusively to NESB students. The other two features: quality of staff and a balanced programme are realized in particular ways for NESB students which are not fully elaborated in Kennedy and Dewar. However they are discussed in detail in the following literature review, which seeks to identify the particular conditions for second language learning in a school setting.
First, the literature review deals with provisions at a government policy level, then moves on to differentiate good ESOL practice from good literacy practice. We approach this by exploring what the literature says about the conditions in which both the acquisition of literacy and the acquisition of a second or additional language occur.

### 2.2 Language policy in New Zealand

All NESB students, as currently funded, are bilingual (or multilingual) – either in the sense that their first language (L1) is developing along with English, or in the sense of a gradual replacement of the L1 by English, or an expansion of English while L1 development remains static. Good policies and programmes for NESB students depend on a full consideration of the language context of the students. However the bilingual aspect of their language context remains weakly theorized, and frequently ignored. In contrast to Australia and Canada, there is no formal language policy for New Zealand.\(^{12}\)

A language policy is helpful in specifying and formalising the roles and relationships of various languages. Decisions in the public or private sector can then be made with consistent reference to it. A language/s policy can guide developments in the school sector, in a way that is consistent with national policy.

At present in the New Zealand school sector we have the following: Te Reo Māori (as a language curriculum area, but also as a medium of instruction), English (with the same two aspects as Te Reo Māori), ESOL (in many forms, with no curriculum), community and foreign languages (some of which are spoken here by large numbers of NZ speakers), and Literacy. These diverse aspects of language use and learning are linked to some extent in a single page statement on Language and Languages on page 10 of the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework*.

*English in the National Curriculum*, in the section ‘English for All’ discusses English for Māori students, and for students from language backgrounds other than English (LBOTE). For the latter, the following observations and recommendations are made (p.15):

- (All) students should understand and respect the different cultures and languages which make up New Zealand society

---

• Students from LBOTE add valuable language resources to the classroom

• The first language and culture of each student should be incorporated in English programmes

• Students should initially use their first language and move between that language and English

• Students from LBOTE should work towards the same objectives as native speakers. They will approach the objectives differently

• They may at times be working at different levels from most of the class

• Time and a range of learning opportunities should be provided

• It is particularly important for these students to make connections with other areas of learning

• The use of different kinds of English for different purposes should be made explicit

• Teachers in all curriculum areas should recognize the role of language in learning

• Some new learners may need transition time in an intensive English language class. This transition is best managed, however, by planned immersion experiences in mainstream English classrooms.

2.2.1 Policies and practices related to bilingual provision

There is a strong research base to support the statements above from *English in the National Curriculum* recommending continued use of the first language alongside English as a second language. Corson (1990) discusses bilingual education and distinguishes conditions which promote language learning in different contexts in a number of countries. He concludes (p. 170) “that children from disadvantaged or oppressed minority groups generally profit from bilingual programmes in which their first language plays the major role, because this lays a language foundation which cannot otherwise be guaranteed”. It should be given maximum attention up to the stage of middle schooling. By secondary school, the main language of instruction and assessment tends to come to the fore for academic purposes, but it is still possible for maintenance and development of the first language to be assisted.
Cummins, who has been one of the major researchers in bilingual education in Canada and the United States, continues to develop approaches and tools for bilingual education, such as bilingual reading programmes and bilingual assessment (Cummins, 2001). There is now extensive experience of bilingual education in a number of countries, including Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori in New Zealand, which makes bilingual educational provision much easier than in the past.

However, although bilingual New Zealanders make up close to 20% of the population, there is a tendency for bilingualism to be associated with minority, marginal and outsider status. As Harris (1999, p.70) says of Britain:

...while there had been undoubted advances [in the two decades before 1997] from generally assimilationist to generally multicultural approaches in the education of pupils from ‘visible’ ethnic minorities, the underlying ideology remained one of positioning these pupils as permanent outsiders in the British nation state, and that consequently it had been difficult for British educators to develop equitable and effective approaches for language provision in multilingual and multi-ethnic settings. This difficulty was particularly marked in respect to the debate about what approach to language in schools additional targetted...funding should provide.

Similar difficulties exist in New Zealand. In spite of official support for maintaining and using first languages other than English (e.g. in the English curriculum statement above and in Ministry of Education publications related to NESB students, such as NESB Students: A Handbook for Schools, pp.18 & 19), this is largely expected to come from within the family. At school, the student is usually either fully ‘immersed’ in mainstream English medium education as recommended above in the English Curriculum Statement, or is partly withdrawn in order to better facilitate full immersion and mainstream participation.

However, Davis et al. (2001) found in their 1999 survey in Manukau of Māori and Pasifika languages that there is lively support in that region for Samoan, Tongan, Niuean and Cook Islands Māori (in that order of strength) at early childhood level. There was also a good spread of languages in immersion and bilingual classes in primary schools, but much less support at secondary level.

To be fully and thoughtfully incorporated as a widespread aspect of the New Zealand education system, bilingual approaches need to be based on research, and without a priori definitions of who is bilingual, and who might be expected to make use of or benefit from bilingual approaches, or how these might be arranged. Harris (1999, p.71) identifies four interrelated problems in Britain:
1. Inadequate approaches to and under-funding of the teaching of students with limited experience or proficiency in English

2. At best patchy funding of the teaching of minority languages, or long-term bilingual education programmes

3. Limited thinking about what funded provision might be needed for teaching subject-specific formal classroom English to ‘visible’ minority pupils whose English is rooted in local communities and who have varying proficiencies and affiliations to their family and community languages

4. Weak theorizing by British educators, linked with little empirical evidence, about what they might mean when they refer to bilingual, ethnic minority pupils and what kinds of curriculum approach might be needed, particularly in the area of language.

Taking account of the above difficulties, we outline below some preliminary thoughts on an approach to developing ‘bilingual-friendly’ policy and practices in New Zealand. Such an approach could include the following:

- Research into and careful consideration of target students for such a policy. It cannot automatically be assumed that target students are only or primarily new immigrants, or those with low levels of proficiency in English.

- A very broad conception of strategies which might be bilingual-friendly, including such things as educational credit for bilingual learning, and a reconsideration of the inseparability of English language goals and conceptual goals in curriculum areas.

- ‘Ownership’ of bilingualism by the education system, so that families and communities may be involved and supported, but not be left with the prime responsibility for bilingual development. For example in New South Wales, there is funded support for Community Language Schools, and free access to Government school premises is also provided (www.det.nsw.edu.au/eas/commlang/, August 23 2002). The NZ Curriculum Framework could include bilingual goals more explicitly under the Principles (the multicultural nature of New Zealand society), The Essential Learning Areas (Language and Languages), and the Essential Skills (Communication Skills). At the moment, the statement under Language and Languages that, “Students whose mother tongue is a Pacific Islands language or another community language will have the opportunity to develop and use their own language as an integral part of their schooling” promises an integral role for languages other than English which is
not actually the case to any great extent, but at the same time disallows these students full status as bilingual New Zealanders by referring to their 'mother tongue' as 'their own language' (implying that English is not also ‘their own language’). Furthermore, the following sentence, “The nature of mother tongue programmes will be decided by schools in response to local community needs and initiatives”, throws the burden of responsibility onto the community rather than requiring schools to take the lead in demonstrating that bilingual language development is highly valued in the curriculum and therefore instigated by the school.

- A flexible approach to timing, allowing for the possibility of students taking advantage of bilingual development opportunities to a greater or lesser extent at different points in their educational career.

- Coherent development of all language learning – Māori, the (English) Language curriculum, ESOL, second and foreign language learning, community language learning and use, bilingual learning, literacy initiatives, language in curriculum areas, special needs, etc., within a framework that explicitly recognizes and encompasses bilingual approaches.

- A bilingual-friendly policy which is not confined to the Language/s area of the curriculum, but includes language use in all curriculum areas.

- Support for schools to develop bilingual learning strategies, even if they have no bilingual staff.

- Integration of bilingual educational goals with bilingual-friendly policies and developments in public life.

- A “to the extent possible” principle in relation to the employment of bilingual teaching staff in schools (May, 2002b). This means that there would be an expectation that bilingual staff would be employed as much as possible in all schools with NESB students. However, if this proves impossible for any reason, the requirement is waived. This is a helpful concept which would encourage organisations (including schools) to consider to what extent they might be able to provide some bilingual support.

Given the research agreement on the importance of bilingual approaches to young NESB children’s first years of schooling, how to do this effectively is an important underlying theme in the subsequent discussion of developing literacy and English language proficiency.
2.3 Conditions for literacy acquisition

Literacy is often understood to refer to reading and writing. However, Edelsky (1996) points out that literacy is a superordinate category which includes every use of print as print, encompassing such things as numerals, diagrams, symbols and icons. ‘Literacy’, ‘reading’, and ‘writing’ are not interchangeable terms. In the New Zealand school context, the definition used of ‘literacy’ is wider than print material: “Literacy is the ability to use and understand those language forms required by society and valued by individuals and communities” (Ministry of Education, 2002a, p.1). Literacy is linked with numeracy in the Ministry’s current Literacy and Numeracy Strategy.

Although an important focus of the Strategy is on written language, it also includes a focus on learning with “language programmes based on the interrelationship of oral, visual and written language” and “teaching that takes account of students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds” (The Literacy and Numeracy Strategy, Ministry of Education Poster).

It is fully recognized in the Strategy that literacy learning begins in the home and that students come to school with varying schooling and literacy experiences. Several aspects of the Strategy (such as the Feed the Mind campaign, and the Home/School Partnership programme) have already begun to address this.

Families are not the only contexts in which children learn the practices associated with print. In New Zealand, opportunities for this type of learning occur in other important settings for the child such as early childhood education settings and significant institutions such as church, children’s clubs, and gatherings with other families (McNaughton, 1995, p.166).

A recognition of pre-school patterns and practices related to literacy, has led researchers to propose that greatest gains in literacy are to be made when the home and community ‘matches the school’ and vice versa. An extension of this hypothesis explains why children from some cultural groups are not well served by ‘mainstream’ schools. McNaughton (1995, p.166) explains the “match hypothesis”.

The argument has been that beliefs about schooling, patterns of language use, and forms of learning that have developed outside of school do not match those at school. The psychological processes entailed in this match are both personal (what sense the learner can or chooses to make of the new setting) and interpersonal (how easily shared goals develop within school activities).

For literacy development to be successful, the school genuinely needs to understand, work with and value the literacy experiences of its students. Students need to be exposed to language that is relevant to their own
interests and cultural background (Flores, Cousin and Díaz, 1998, pp.32-33). Flores, Cousin and Díaz (1998, pp.32-33) offer baseline assumptions from which to view all such children.

- Children are proficient language users and bring many experiences into the classroom.

- The parents of these children are interested in the achievement and success of their children in the school setting and can be partners in the educational experience of their children.

For bilingual children, there is debate about the way in which literacy is best acquired. Although there is strong research support for acquiring literacy first through the L1, this is dependent on quality teachers, quality materials and must be supported by genuine choice and commitment on the part of the families of the children (International Reading Association, 2001; McNaughton, personal communication). The low concentrations of L1 speakers may also militate against this in some contexts\textsuperscript{13}. However, Cummins (2001, p.126) reports on a study in Canada that showed that even under unfavourable conditions, grade one and two students taking home books in their first language to read with their parents, showed a significant improvement in a bilingual vocabulary knowledge test over the control group.

Cummins also discusses (p. 124) an English study where students who were having difficulties with reading took home books in English (their L2) to read to parents, many of whom spoke little English and were not literate in their L1 or L2. Nevertheless, the students made better progress in reading than comparison groups who had extra small-group instruction with a reading specialist.

Cummins surmises that the students taking home books would have had to explain the book to their parents in their L1, and that this cognitively demanding task led to the improvement in their reading. Another way of looking at this is that these students were encouraged to do the same as most students in New Zealand are routinely asked to do – namely read the book to their parents. Whether it is the oral interaction about the reading, or the supportive environment for the reading, that makes the difference is not clear. Studies have shown that different families respond very differently to shared reading, and yet the process seems to be helpful in all cases (e.g. New Zealand data in Tuafuti, 2000; and an English study, Williams and Gregory, 1999).

\textsuperscript{13} In England, concentration of L1 speakers has meant that language maintenance is seen as the responsibility of the language communities as speakers number too few in different schools (IRA, 2001), although in some areas schools do provide bilingual support (Turner & Francombe, 1995).
The children in the studies Cummins discusses were reading in their L2. Transitional bilingual programmes are another approach, in which the introduction of English is delayed. This is based on the thesis that there is a relationship between L1 reading proficiency, L2 language proficiency and L2 reading performance. Generally this is expressed in terms of a threshold level (see for instance, Cummins, 2000; Lee and Schallert, 1998). Learners need to acquire a certain level of proficiency in the L2 before there is a transfer from L1 reading proficiency to L2 reading performance\(^{14}\). Before that threshold level, it appears that the demands of processing an L2 with very low levels of L2 proficiency make it impossible for reading skills to transfer from the L1.

If there is no possibility for the development of L1 reading to take place, arguably schools need to provide first instruction in English literacy but in such a way as to embed focused and systematic instruction in a rich and meaningful language environment. Hudelson summarises the context in which literacy for NESB students is best developed as “learner-centred, language rich environments that are both linguistically stimulating and intellectually challenging” (1994, p.151). How this can be put into practice is documented in Phillips, McNaughton and McDonald (2000).

McNaughton (2002) referring primarily to New Zealand schools, proposes that the challenges for schools in literacy instruction are to:

- Create literacy settings which are harmonious and complementary for different communities
- Promote multiple developmental pathways and recognise multiple forms of literacy
- Create joint settings which provide opportunities for children to become expert at ‘reading’ and ‘writing’ both at school and in the home.

2.4 **Literacy and language learning**

For the acquisition of English as an additional language, we cannot assume that literacy conditions are the same as for children acquiring literacy in their first language. While we can assume that literacy considerations as outlined above are important for all children who are

---

\(^{14}\) The student’s L2 reading performance is what is observed on specific occasions and tasks. A level of proficiency in reading in the L1 or L2, is a more generalised notion derived from a variety of performances on different tasks and occasions.
not fully literate in their first language, we cannot assume that these considerations will encompass everything that is important for younger and older learners of English as an additional language. Figure 1 below outlines possible patterns in language and literacy proficiency amongst different groups of students and in so doing, isolates areas of priority. The four types of proficiency required are:

1. to develop literacies including how to read and write
2. to develop English language proficiency
3. to develop academic literacies including how to read and write in curriculum areas, and
4. to develop academic language proficiency including vocabulary, discourse, etc.

While we have separated these four aspects for the purposes of a discussion of pedagogical priorities and planning, in reality, much goes on, (and should go on, see May, 2002a) in schools where the development of literacies including how to read and write and the development of English language proficiency are combined, as are the development of academic literacies and academic language proficiency. However, for the purposes of analysis and more focused instruction, we propose the following model in Figure 1 which maps out possible patterns in language and literacy proficiency amongst different groups of students. This may help us, as May (2002a, p.5) advocates, to “recognise and maintain an explicit understanding of the plural, and context specific nature of the wide variety of language proficiencies and literacies with which we are dealing”. Clearly the following Figure represents the possible and likely, not absolute. To achieve the latter, proficiency data of a statistical nature on different groups of a large sample of students would need to be collated and analysed.

If we take ESB (English speaking background) students as the benchmark, we can compare how priorities for different groups of students may differ. In general, as can be seen in Figure 1 below, at early stages concerns include establishing literacy in English; and in later stages, establishing academic literacy and language become an important priority.

For New Zealand born NESB students most of whom do not have the advantage of continuing bilingual instruction in literacy, it is likely that it will take some time longer to establish both general and academic literacy. Initially also there may be the need to develop communicative competence in English, as represented by the column: Developing English language proficiency. In the Figure, the English speaking background (ESB) and the NZ born NESB students continue through
primary, intermediate and secondary school with different proficiencies becoming established at different stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developing literacies including how to read and write in English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developing English language proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developing academic literacies including how to read and write in curriculum areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developing academic proficiency including vocabulary, discourse etc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>Early primary establishing emergent emergent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later primary establishing establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate establishing establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary establishing establishing establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ born*</td>
<td>Early primary establishing may be emergent emergent emergent</td>
<td>may be emergent</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later primary may be established establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate may be established establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary established establishing establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant*</td>
<td>Early primary emergent emergent emergent emergent</td>
<td>emergent emergent</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later primary establishing emergent establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate establishing emergent establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary establishing emergent establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL Refugee*</td>
<td>Early primary emergent emergent emergent</td>
<td>emergent emergent</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
<td>establishing establishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later primary emergent emergent emergent</td>
<td>emergent emergent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate emergent emergent emergent</td>
<td>emergent emergent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1: Possible patterns in language and literacy proficiency amongst different groups of students

Note 1: The categories marked with an * refer to 3 groups of funded NESB students whose English language proficiency is below national cohort levels – those who are born in New Zealand, new migrants to New Zealand, and a sub group of Refugee students who are not literate in their first language.

Note 2: The blank squares indicate that we may expect this aspect of literacy to have been established by this time.

Note 3: The term ‘establishing’ is meant to suggest that development of this aspect of literacy is underway to some extent. However no distinction is made as to how far that development has proceeded.

Note 4: The term ‘emergent’ is meant to suggest that development of this aspect of literacy is as yet hardly underway.

The Migrant students and the Refugee students, with their different patterns of proficiencies and needs, are represented as snapshots at their time of arrival at each level of schooling. Thus the Migrant students who arrive in secondary schools have a different pattern from those who arrive at early primary level, and their pattern is more differentiated from the ESB and NZ born NESB students at secondary level.

For the funded NESB migrant students in intermediate and secondary schools, while there will still be the need to learn to read and write in English, they will already have acquired literacy skills and literacy practices particular to their cultural and social context in their first language. These students will probably be able to transfer much of their knowledge and skills related to literacy in their first language to English, and therefore we can think of this aspect of literacy as establishing.

For these students, literate in their first language, the challenge is primarily to learn enough academic vocabulary and language to access and function well in curriculum areas; and to learn this as fast as possible. As their English language proficiency increases, at least some L1 literacy skills will begin to transfer into their use of English. They may or may not have well developed academic literacy skills in their L1.

The large group of NESB funded children who enter a New Zealand school at age 5, or who come from non-literate backgrounds (NL Refugee), and who with little or no knowledge of English face a particular difficulty - without an established basis in first language literacy before school, they are faced with the dual task of learning those literacy practices deemed to be important in schools, and learning the English language. Instead of developing the ability to read and write from the
basis of their oral language proficiency as happens in L1 literacy, they have to base their learning of written language on a second language which they are only just beginning to learn. For them, the process lacks the easy connection between oracy and literacy that it ideally has for ESB learners, and for some New Zealand born students.

These students need to develop English language proficiency quickly. Otherwise the result of their reading instruction may be that their ability to decode letters into sounds will run ahead of their ability to comprehend text. The level of material they can read with comprehension will be below what would be intellectually challenging for them. It is difficult to create for them the conditions Hudelson recommends i.e. “learner-centred, language rich environments that are both linguistically stimulating and intellectually challenging” (1994, p.151).

Refugee children and their teachers face the particular and critical challenge of developing basic English language and literacy, and other academic skills and concepts, at an age when other students already have these quite well established. Most of their peers have moved on and are establishing academic language and literacy.

In all cases, the NESB students, whether they are New Zealand born, Migrant or Refugee, show very different areas of emergent or establishing needs from their L1 English speaking peers. And at all stages, there is an extra learning burden for NESB students. The burden is perhaps the greatest for Refugee children who come from non-literate backgrounds. However as stated above any of the other children are also disadvantaged if they cannot work from a sound basis in first language literacy also. Snow (2001, p. 600) points out that children learning to read in a language they do not speak are at high risk of poor outcomes. She lists a number of key research questions which are not yet fully answered, and says:

The TESOL field needs a concerted research effort to inform literacy instruction for such children – to determine when to start literacy instruction and how to adapt it to the L2 reader’s needs. L1 literates may enjoy positive transfer to English L2 literacy, but research is needed to enhance the likelihood of such transfer, to understand its limitations, and to pinpoint areas of likely interference.

The observations above are substantiated in Collier’s (1989) review of all research investigating the question: How long does it take to master a second language for schooling? The three most pertinent conclusions relating to the model presented above (Collier, 1989, p.256-257) are as follows:

1. Immigrants arriving at ages 8 to 12, with at least 2 years of L1 schooling in their home country, take 5 to 7 years to reach the level of average performance by native speakers on L2 standardized
tests in reading, social studies, and science when they are schooled exclusively in the second language after arrival in the host country. Their performance may reach national norms in as little as 2 years in mathematics and language arts.

2. Young arrivals with no schooling in their first language in either their home country or the host country may take even longer to reach the level of average performance by native speakers on L2 standardized tests: possibly as long as 7 to 10 years in reading, social studies, and science, or indeed, never.

3. Adolescent arrivals who have had no L2 exposure and who are not able to continue academic work in their first language while they are acquiring their second language do not have enough time left in high school to make up for the lost years of academic instruction.

Similarly, a study of nearly 300 12 year old English language learners in Toronto showed that even after 6 years of residence there were significant gaps in speaking, listening, reading and writing in comparison with L1 peers. Importantly, the findings revealed that teachers over-estimated the L2 students’ language proficiency. Teachers considered L2 students reached the L1 average for their age in speaking, listening and reading after 2 to 3 years, and after 5 to 6 years in writing (Cummins, 2001, p. 119).

Wylie et al. (2001) in the longitudinal study mentioned above in section 1.7 found that NESB learners who had entered New Zealand schools at age 5, were still, 5 years later at age 10, behind their L1 peers in literacy, mathematics and logical problem-solving. The study continues, so data will be available in later years on their subsequent progress.

These studies suggest that NESB students will need extra support in all aspects of academic literacy and English language proficiency for most of their school careers.

2.4.1 Complementary conditions for language and literacy provision

Current developments in Literacy teaching in New Zealand pay good attention to developing cultural knowledge and culturally informed teaching practices (e.g. Families Learning Together (Ministry of Education, 2002b, in 4 languages); the NESB module of the Literacy Leadership programme; Meeting of Minds (McNaughton, 2002); NESB Handbook for Schools; Kennedy and Dewar, 1997, etc).
However cultural knowledge and culturally informed teaching practices are not in themselves enough. Willis (2000) cites Abt-Perkins and Rosen’s (2000) five essential knowledge bases in the area of literacy for teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse children – self-knowledge, cultural knowledge, linguistic knowledge, culturally informed teaching knowledge, and knowledge of materials and methods for multicultural literacy education. Good practice for NESB literacy therefore needs to ensure that linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the materials and methods for multicultural literacy education are also available to teachers.

Some examples of linguistic knowledge which teachers may need to help students develop expertise with academic texts, include:

- use of verb forms and lexical items to signal out-of-chronological-order events in texts
- use of pronoun reference to hold texts together (cohesion)
- typical genre and text-type patterns
- implied subjects or objects in various verbs which may be expressed directly in the student’s L1, and
- the important range of textual meaning conveyed by modal verbs such as will, would, might, must etc.

These areas are but some of the knowledge needed to explore how writers make use of formal (linguistic) features to make meaning. In all cases the teacher’s knowledge should cover not only the features and their uses in English, but also the likely difficulties of particular features for students from different L1 backgrounds, plus an awareness of the developmental sequences of learners acquiring control of such items.

Examples of materials and methods for multicultural literacy education which are particularly relevant for NESB children are the following:

- a range of diagnostic tools and techniques to identify learners’ strengths, and areas of developing control in their current stage of language development. Without these tools and the ability to use them well, it is difficult to make realistic goals for NESB children’s progress in language proficiency or literacy, and thus difficult to focus on promoting achievement for them
- methods for accelerating students’ awareness of and facility with linguistic items important to textual comprehension
- methods to ensure that concepts and content are understood by NESB students, and that they work on cognitively challenging
comprehension tasks, even in the absence of full comprehension of the text at the linguistic level

- methods for linking language input and output to the students’ developing language proficiency.

These examples are given as an indication of the range of specialised knowledge and resources that teachers need to work well with language development and literacy. This kind of specialised knowledge, and the ability to work with it, is not acquired quickly, or in a single short course. For many teachers the kind of language knowledge appropriate for working with NESB students represents an unfamiliar challenge. It is also a considerable challenge for the education system to have enough appropriately skilled teachers in the right places.

Classroom teachers are able to extend their skills considerably into these specialised linguistic areas in order to bring the best support for NESB students into the regular classroom literacy programmes, which should be one important context for NESB students’ learning. There will still be a distinction between linguistically informed literacy teaching, and ESOL teaching which should attend very specifically to the whole range of language development and use across all curriculum areas, as discussed in the next section. However, closely co-ordinated links between ESOL teachers and classroom literacy teachers can maximise student learning opportunities.

It is not a case of one or the other. NESB students need good ESOL instruction and good literacy instruction. This is particularly the case in their first years of English learning.

### 2.5 Conditions for language learning

Languages are in a different position from other school curriculum areas in that they can be learned without any instruction. First languages are always learned this way, and in the world context probably most second languages are learned through untaught participation in a speech community, via the processes known as language “acquisition”. It has therefore been an issue in studies of second language learning and teaching to show that participation in language classes does accelerate language learning in comparison with only being immersed in the second language environment.

The NESB learners in New Zealand schools are in a second language environment for a large part of their time, and will certainly learn
English, especially as they have strong practical reasons for needing to do this. The questions are:

1. Will they learn faster if they have direct instruction in English?

2. What kind and amount of direct instruction is most effective?

3. Will learners achieve a higher ultimate standard with appropriate instruction?

4. Does this depend on individual factors, such as age, previous education and exposure to English, or their first language?

5. Does this depend on contextual factors, such as the other learners in the school, the school organization?

6. If there is no direct instruction, what qualities should the immersion experience have?

These questions are addressed in various ways in the following sections. Interestingly, Kennedy and Dewar (1997, p.40) found that those staff they interviewed in New Zealand schools primarily identified student characteristics as factors which influence NESB students’ ability to learn English. Leung (1999, p. 238) similarly found that teachers interviewed in England “seemed to attribute a great deal of English language development to home and family circumstances…” and “seemed to regard personality as an explanatory factor in children’s English language development”. Leung goes on to comment that these factors are not included in the National Curriculum, and that the relationship between home circumstances and English language development remains unexplained and unexplored.

Although second language learning research does identify some effects of individual characteristics in various circumstances, it has been found that all students who learn an L1 can also learn an L2. Individual factors are generally treated more in the nature of constraints which may require particular learning and teaching strategies, than factors which could be expected to determine whether or not learning takes place.

New Zealand schools in the SEMO project (which include many NESB students) were successful in improving student reading when they focussed on what changes they needed to make in their teaching (Timperley, Wiseman and Fung, 2002). Our discussion here follows the same focus, and primarily identifies factors relating to education systems, schools and teachers.

Lightbown (2000), in her summary of what international classroom-based research into second language acquisition has established over the last
15 years, deals with a number of conditions and constraints in second language learning.

2.5.1 Input and interaction

The first of these relates to exposure to rich and meaningful input and opportunities for interaction. Lightbown states that we now know:

- Learners are able to give each other SL input and opportunities for interaction; they do not necessarily produce more errors than when they are interacting with a teacher, they can provide each other with feedback on error, and they can benefit from increased opportunities to use language in a one-to-one setting.

- Reading and listening-based programmes providing large amounts of ‘comprehensible input’ do result in language learning, however, even more progress can be made with the addition of focused instruction.

Flores, Cousin and Diaz (1998, pp.32-33) favour regular classrooms to provide these conditions. Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000, p.24) add more specific information about the nature of the input learners should receive and the interaction opportunities they should have.

Examining how children acquire English in a variety of settings, Wong-Fillmore (1982; 1992) found that certain conditions must be met if children are to be successful. They must interact directly and frequently with people who know the language well enough to reveal how it works and how it can be used. During interactions with English learners, expert speakers not only provide access to the language at an appropriate level; they also provide ample clues as to what the units of analysis in the language are and how they can combine to communicate ideas, information, and intentions. Learners receive corrective feedback as they negotiate and clarify communicative intentions (Long, 1985; Pica, 1996).

2.5.2 Focussed instruction

Lightbown’s assessment that greater progress can be made with the addition of focused instruction is supported by other major studies. One meta-analysis of 49 studies of L2 learning indicated that “focused L2 instruction results in large target-oriented gains, and that explicit types of instruction are more effective than implicit types, and that Focus on
Form and Focus on Forms\textsuperscript{15} interventions result in equivalent and large effects” (Norris & Ortega 2000, p.417).

Findings of research in this area are critical to understanding why ‘whole language’ classrooms and programmes may not adequately meet the particular needs of second language learners. Lightbown’s own study showed that initially young students, whose ESL classes for three years were a half hour a day of listening and reading without teacher intervention, performed as well as those in a more traditionally “taught” programme. Three years further on, however, the students who had the guidance of a teacher and more opportunities for production of language performed better.

Wilkinson’s (1998) analysis of the New Zealand data from the 1990 IEA Reading Literacy Study similarly showed that in classrooms at year 5 where there was more teacher-led interaction, in the form of the teacher reading aloud (rather than silent reading) the NESB students’ results were better. Out of a large number of instructional variables, only reading aloud, and frequency of formal methods of comprehension assessment (such as written questions and exercises) were associated with a smaller home language gap. Other factors which Wilkinson tentatively identifies as lessening the gap are: non-composite classes, where the range of student differences is smaller and teachers are probably more able to give precise, direct support to scaffold individual students’ performance; and exposure to higher order literacy skills such as knowledge of genre, topic knowledge, inferencing.

\subsection*{2.5.3 Learner interlanguage}

Lightbown adds the following understandings of the way in which learners’ language develops:

- The learner creates a systematic interlanguage which is often characterized by the same systematic errors as produced by a child learning the same language as a first language, as well as others which appear to be based on the learner’s own native language

- There are predictable sequences in L2 acquisition such that certain structures have to be acquired before others can be integrated.

\textsuperscript{15} Focus on Form and Focus on Forms, refer to two slightly different approaches to paying attention to formal linguistic items in language teaching and learning.
2.5.4 Learning processes

With respect to learning processes and treatment of errors, she states:

- Knowing a language rule does not mean one will be able to use it in communicative interaction
- Isolated explicit error correction is usually ineffective in changing language behaviour
- Practice does not make perfect.

These findings from second language acquisition research set limits to what can be achieved by explicit instruction. Although they suggest that learners’ language is resistant to instructional change, it is not entirely so. Practice can lead to improvements in fluency, and in the use of formulaic chunks and collocational patterns which aid communication. A focus on forms and awareness of them, plus well thought out, meaning focused, and consistent feedback and correction can lead to progress in the use and correctness of those forms. Some features of a second language may not be noticed by learners at all unless their attention is drawn to them.

In drawing up goals for language learning, it is unwise to place a strong emphasis on correctness of use at specific points since this may run counter to learners’ second language acquisition processes.

2.5.5 Rate and outcomes of learning

The following are Lightbown’s generalisations related to the rate and outcomes of language learning.

- The learner’s task is enormous because language is enormously complex
- For most adult learners, acquisition stops before the learner has achieved native-like mastery of the target language
- One cannot achieve native-like (or near native-like) command of a second language in one hour a day
- A learner’s ability to understand language in a meaningful context exceeds his/her ability to comprehend decontextualised language and to produce language of comparable complexity and accuracy.
These generalisations from the research imply that NESB learners in schools need an environment which promotes language learning all day. They are not going to achieve native-like mastery of English if their useful learning is confined to their language classes.

While supportive contexts are helpful in that learners are enabled to understand important content (e.g. supported by visual materials etc), if attention is not paid to extending their abilities into decontextualised language and production, they will ultimately be at a disadvantage in their language abilities, and their ability to work with content under all circumstances.

Lightbown’s summary relates mainly to ‘core’ areas of linguistic analysis such as grammar and vocabulary. However Kasper (2001) adds a perspective on the task of acquiring pragmatic competence (see section 2.8 for other aspects of language competence). Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to use language in communicating particular attitudes or functional purposes. Kasper discusses research on the development of pragmatic competence in L2 learners which shows that it is possible for this also to result from classroom interactions, with teachers, other native speakers, or other learners, whether more or less proficient in the L2.

Learners are able to assist each other in the development of pragmatic competence, by “collective scaffolding” in collaborative activities, such as role play, (p.517). Teachers, even in teacher-initiated interactions, are able to assist by creating opportunities for student participation that lead students into a greater amount and quality of negotiated interaction over meaning, form and appropriateness.

In summary, good practice for second language learning, suggested by the research discussed above, is as follows:

- Learners should be given explicit and focused instruction on all aspects of language
- They should be given opportunities to use language in extended contexts, as well as comprehend language
- They need opportunities to interact on meaningful material, especially with a teacher
- They need very extensive language learning opportunities
- Goals should not focus on correctness at particular points, which cannot be guaranteed to be in line with a learner’s readiness
- Opportunities to engage with the same material need to be allowed for many times, therefore a linear approach to language
development or language teaching content is unlikely to be successful

- Goals for L2 learners should not be limited to performance in easier contexts, or on easier objectives.

### 2.6 The role of a syllabus or curriculum guidelines in the development of language and literacy

The previous three sections have given an indication of the scope of the task of the second language learner and teacher, and the conditions that have to be met for effective learning to occur. A discussion follows in section 2.10, presenting a view of what competencies and knowledge teachers of NESB students need to have. The list is comprehensive and extensive.

Language itself and the language learning process are complex, as are the interactions with other factors which at times impose significant developmental constraints. Not all of this knowledge can realistically be imparted to all teachers during pre-service education, or during professional development courses. For there to be a shared notion of outcomes for NESB students, there needs to be a common reference point for teachers and those assessing the language and literacy performance of NESB students.

At present there is no New Zealand reference point of this kind. The only possible reference points are the *New Zealand Curriculum* statements, and the NESB *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* (Ministry of Education, 1999b). However, both of these use the performance of students whose first language is English as their reference point. In *English in the National Curriculum* for example, the activities envisaged at Level 1 are suitable for students of approximately 5-8 years of age. A NESB student beginning to learn English in New Zealand at an older age, will not be well suited by working at Level 1. If the student works at an age-appropriate Level, on an adapted curriculum, there is no guidance available on how to adapt the curriculum at that Level to meet the needs of NESB learners of different English language proficiencies.

The *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* have a particular purpose which is to ascertain whether or not NESB students are close to the national cohort in their English language proficiency. The *Guidelines* include a wide range of assessment areas and tasks, with exemplars, but in all cases, the assessor’s job is to compare the NESB student with L1 English speaking peers. The *Guidelines* do not aim to provide guidance on possible or likely developmental paths for L2 learners of English.
It may be that this lack of a shared understanding and reference point for NESB students' progress in learning English is one factor accounting for the differential performance of New Zealand and Australian NESB students. A careful consideration of the interactions between different literacies (general and more academic), and strong curriculum development for ESL, can be seen in Australia. For example in Victoria, the English Curriculum is accompanied by The ESL Companion to the English Curriculum and Standards Framework (CSF)\(^\text{16}\).

It emphasizes that teachers need to teach these students English language skills systematically and explicitly until a point is reached where the outcomes of the English CSF are appropriate for them. No time frame is prescribed for this development, which is influenced by age, previous education, literacy, and the kinds of specialist ESL programmes students have been involved in.

To a large extent, the ESL Companion provides many of the materials and methods needed by teachers. It does this through the curriculum focus statements at each level of the English curriculum for several levels of ESOL proficiency, and through the detailed learning outcomes and indicators at each level. Similar English/ESL curriculum links are supported in other states – for example in New South Wales via links to the ESL scales.

Under the Australian National Literacy and Numeracy Plan student achievement data is reported nationally in relation to benchmarks, and by language background other than English. (See [www.dest.gov.au/schools/Literacy&Numeracy/benchmarks.htm](http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/Literacy&Numeracy/benchmarks.htm).)

It would be inappropriate to restrict NESB students to a special language learning curriculum which allowed no possibility of participating in the English curriculum with their peers. However, it is equally inappropriate to have no formal guidelines for the English language learning which NESB students are engaged in. The Victorian ESL Companion avoids both these problems by integrating ESL learning focusses and outcomes with the English curriculum.

Some form of syllabus, curriculum statement, or guidelines for NESB students’ English language learning would assist teachers in the large task they currently face in designing their own syllabus for each NESB student. Since this is currently done without formal Individual Learning Plans, it would also bring some clarity which would be helpful to schools and families.

2.7 Approaches and methods in the teaching of English as an additional language

Approaches in language teaching are defined by two things: beliefs about what is to be taught (e.g. grammar, reading skills, communicative language); and beliefs about how it is to be taught (e.g. explicit instruction, exposure, interaction) (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Methods are rather more procedural than theoretical, but nonetheless are influenced by teacher beliefs also. The following section discusses different ways in which language and language teaching of school age learners can be conceived in terms of approaches or methods.

Richards and Rodgers say (p. 20) that in order for an approach to lead to a method, it is necessary to develop a design for an instructional system. At this point, the designers consider the following:

- what the objectives of the method are – what it sets out to achieve
- how language content is selected and organised within the method
- the types of learning tasks and teaching activities the method advocates
- the roles of learners
- the roles of teachers
- the roles of instructional materials.

All methods of language teaching involve the use of the target language (p.20) so there are always overt or covert decisions concerning the selection of language items to be used (words, sentence patterns, tenses, constructions, functions, topics etc). The word “syllabus” usually refers primarily to the form of the linguistic content in a course or method.

In practice, most schools in New Zealand do not follow any of the methods discussed below in a pure form. Most of their “instructional systems” are eclectic in, for example, using elements of a communicative approach and an oral language approach. However, it is helpful to see what kinds of objectives are commonly associated with each method and approach, and how appropriate these may be to NESB learners in New Zealand schools.
2.7.1 Bilingual approaches

Bilingual language development is strongly supported in the research literature and in the Ministry of Education’s own recommendations (see section 2.2.1 above). In bilingual approaches the use of the students’ first language is encouraged because it is considered to facilitate language and conceptual development in general, thus leading to improved educational outcomes. Bilingual minority and immigrant students are generally thought of as being in transition to becoming primarily users of English, although this is not always desired by their parents.

Crandall’s (1997) review of research on approaches to language teaching for school-aged learners in second language contexts concludes that bilingual approaches are the most effective in supporting the primary language, and making a bridge to instruction in a second language. Crandall’s (1997, p.82) rankings from the most effective to the least effective approaches to teaching these students combine considerations of the type of bilingual arrangement, the degree of sheltered instruction and second language instruction. Sheltered Instruction is explained in detail below in this section. The nature of optimum second language instruction has been discussed above in section 2.5 and is also further developed below in this section.
The least effective approaches for NESB students are to be cut off from formal educational development in their L1 in order to give them maximum exposure to the L2. The more the instructional setting accommodates to the student, rather than vice versa, the better the outcomes are reported to be.

Two way bilingual education (also known as dual-language education, or DLE) is provided in a number of Canadian and United States schools. Two way bilingual education involves students from two different language backgrounds working together in the same class and developing both languages with content and literacy instruction in both languages. Some New Zealand schools are reported to have done this with Māori/English (Christian, 2001).

As well as Māori/English two way bilingual education, it is possible that there would be suitable contexts in New Zealand for Samoan/English, Tongan/English, Chinese/English two way bilingual education programmes, and perhaps other languages as well. In some cases these programmes could involve language maintenance with, for example, children of Chinese ethnicity who speak English as their L1, plus Pākehā L1 English speakers, plus Chinese speaking NESB students. Christian comments that in spite of the increasing numbers of these programmes in the United States there are gaps in the research base needed for guiding programme design and implementation.
2.7.2 Experience–based methods

Experience–based methods acknowledge the importance of early learning and literacy experiences that prepare students to deal with the tasks associated with school based learning. The assumption is that experiences provide an individual and a shared context for talk. The concepts which form part of the experiences are shared and new language can then be developed to refer to these shared concepts. Experiences, and the talk around them, provides the foundation for literacy and academic proficiency. For all students literacy, as in reading and writing, is based on a foundation of rich oral language experiences and knowledge.

Sheltered Instruction (see 2.7.8) generally makes some use of experience-based methods because it lays a strong emphasis on a shared visual or physical context as an aid to comprehension of language.

2.7.3 Oral language programmes

Oral language programmes acknowledge that oral language is a powerful tool for learning about the world, shaping a personal response to it and communicating with others. In an interactive social setting, oral language enables the communication and interaction to take place. Therefore these programmes often also have a strong experiential basis. Verhoeven cited in Koller et al., (2001, p.406) states that the single most influential factor in second language learners in schools learning to read was the amount of contact and oral interaction with native speaking peers.

Franken (1997, p73) isolates those functions of oral language that pertain to second language acquisition. The following claims relate to learning in general: talk operates as exploratory discourse, as a catalyst to change thinking, and as a means of promoting literate thinking (including a metalinguistic function).

However, for second language learners in a school context, talk also provides invaluable language practice, a context for the use of Graeco-Latin vocabulary (see also Corson, 1990), and a way in which learners come to see gaps in their knowledge through interaction with others, and consequently to trigger new linguistic knowledge.

A number of researchers stress the importance of oral language development and the creation of opportunities for NESB students to talk both with each other but most importantly with native speaking peers. Blair and Bourne in their review (1998) also noticed the careful attention given to oral language development in exemplary schools in England.

In classrooms where oral language programmes operate, teachers focus on vocabulary building, and tasks focus on retelling of experiences.
Both experience-based methods and oral language methods are associated just as much with first language literacy development as with second language learning. For this reason, they are common in the first years of schooling where L1 and L2 learners’ needs are less divergent and can be more easily included in the same activities.

However, oral language methods have also become more of a focus for older learners as a result partly of the communicative focus in second and foreign language learning, and partly as a result of the discovery that language learning does not reach acceptable levels without student output (e.g. Swain, 1995). Mostly this output has been investigated and incorporated into teaching methods in the form of negotiated oral interaction. Although the role of oral output is a major focus of research in second language learning, it does not appear to be commonly in use in New Zealand schools as a main method beyond the junior primary school.

2.7.4 Reading methods

Reading methods are wide ranging: some methods focus on comprehension, some on skills, some on vocabulary learning and grammatical analysis, and others on extensive reading. Reading methods consider reading to be the major source of input and strive to equip students with reading skills.

Possibly the most clearly articulated approach to reading in the second language literature is extensive reading (see for instance Day & Bamford, 1998). A well known piece of second language research is that by Elley and Mangubhai in Fiji. The project involved providing children with a rich diet of books, a ‘book flood’. Elley and Mangubhai (1981, p. 24-25) comment:

The impact of the books is clearly positive, and, as one would expect, most marked in those English skills which the pupils had been practising – general reading and listening comprehension. However, the effect did spread to related skills, as shown by the greater progress made in learning written English structures, and the ability to recite complex English sentences correctly.

They add the important observation that these results were obtained after eight months and in a culture in which reading for pleasure “is not a widely accepted custom” (Elley & Mangubhai, 1981, p. 3).

The extensive reading research correlates with the claims made by Lightbown (2000) regarding exposure to rich input. However Lightbown draws attention to the fact that a focus on form can promote faster learning. What does this mean in reading approaches? It needs to mean
that children are involved in an analysis of how form makes meaning, through textual analysis using cueing systems, and through comprehension work that encourages more than just literal interpretation of the text.

Lee and Schallert maintain that the implication for pedagogy is that learners need to read “to learn the language” with materials that allow them to concentrate on linguistic features. They name these materials, “language learner literature” (Lee and Schallert, 1998, p.737).

There is a danger though that reading for minority language children if it focussed on form in a narrow sense could lead to “skills and drills exercises” (McNaughton, personal communication).

In a broader context too, a focus on form perspective is often interpreted in a very narrow way. Edelsky critiques a ‘theory’ about literacy prevalent in both folk wisdom and professional knowledge.

This conception of literacy has at its center the idea that reading is a complex mechanical process consisting of separable skills (e.g. decoding, word attack, comprehending) internal to the reader and that teaching, testing or researching even one of these separable skills is part or sometimes the equivalent of teaching, testing or researching reading. Closely related is a belief in transfer - that practising separable skills of reading transfers to (because it is already a subset of) reading. (Edelsky, 1996, p.89)

While it is true that for teaching purposes teachers may want to break an activity into parts so that students understand what it is they need to be able to do, it is a mistake to think that the phenomenon of reading is made up of components which can be taken to bits and then put together again at will.

McNaughton (2002, p.42) explains the effects that such an approach can have on children. One effect is that,
Barton (1994, p.162) says that for those teaching reading, this emphasis, “leads to the notion of there being clear and discrete stages in learning with the separate skills learned in linear order, Underlying this, deep down, is the organizing idea of there being only one way of learning to read”.

The skills approach to reading tends to reify it as a ‘thing’ which can be learned. This obscures the fact that ‘reading’ is language itself in use in a particular way – visually rather than aurally. To read is to comprehend language visually, and in the context of education it has to become fully integrated for the student with other ways of using language. It has its own strategies, processes and outcomes – as well as those it shares with other ways of using language.

The prevalence of reading in groups for NESB students foregrounds ‘reading’ as a subject. Reading is done for its own sake so that children learn the skills. This explains the prevalence of basal readers used in junior school ESOL programmes. The basal readers themselves determine the programme for the children. The children are “on Rainbow Reading”.

The belief that reading is best taught through activities whose sole purpose is instructional or evaluative denies NESB learners the opportunity to experience how reading plays a meaningful role in the communication of ideas in general and specifically in curriculum areas.

In a school setting where facility with the written language is closely associated with educational outcomes, it is very important for NESB students to have appropriate reading programmes. Task-based approaches allow students to use and learn language and content from texts which are too difficult for their individual reading. With approaches such as this, students are able to use curriculum texts meaningfully at an age-appropriate level.

Van den Branden (2000) investigated reading comprehension in different text conditions in a recent study of 10 –12 year old second language learners of Dutch in Belgian schools. Students worked in one of four ways – individually on simplified texts, individually on unmodified texts, with oral negotiation with a peer on unmodified texts, and with oral negotiation with the rest of the class on unmodified texts. Negotiating the meaning of unmodified texts led to higher comprehension than working individually with a simplified text. Comprehension was higher if the negotiation was with the teacher or a peer of a different level of language proficiency, rather than a peer of the same level.

This is one of many studies that show the benefits of carefully planned negotiation and interaction for second language learners in all aspects of their language learning. This is particularly interesting in showing that students’ comprehension was better while working under planned
conditions on the same material as the rest of the class, rather than on material “at their own level”.

In the context of the Ministry of Education’s Literacy Initiative, it is important that very thorough consideration should be given to how NESB students’ work with reading relates to their language and conceptual development.

### 2.7.5 Skills based methods

Skills-based methods provide for the coverage of all skills and the integration of oral and written language. Communicative and task-based approaches (discussed below) usually have a definite focus on developing all four “skills” or modes of language use – reading, writing, speaking and listening. A skills based approach is often used in conjunction with a language based syllabus. There is a list of language items to be covered, plus a programme for developing the use of the language items in all modes of language use.

A skills based approach will give full weight to writing and listening, which unlike reading and speaking, are not the sole focus of any single approach.

This is a very common approach to designing second language programmes. Most New Zealand secondary schools use this approach (see section 5.5.3 below). It also underlies *English in the National Curriculum*, and is therefore an appropriate way to integrate ESOL provision with the *National Curriculum*.

### 2.7.6 Communicative methods

Communicative methods have as their premise the notion that language is primarily for communication, and that language learning should parallel real-life language use. Fluency, not accuracy, is the goal. A first language is learned through communicative interaction over real-life contexts, and a second language can (and should) be learned the same way. Communicative tasks provide a genuine purpose for using language and in the process of negotiation, learners refine their grammatical understandings (see Franken, 1997, pp.70-75, for a more detailed discussion).

The idea of communicative language teaching has been enormously influential, particularly in adult foreign language learning, over the last 20 years. To some extent, communicative tasks have spread into almost all language learning materials and programmes.
In the school context this approach has limited application for NESB students learning English because their language learning is directed towards academic tasks. Nevertheless, the extension into real-life uses of academic materials does provide a context for communicative methods. They have a particular strength in that they do not become formalistic but always keep in view the communicative functions of language, and how it is used between individuals and in groups to negotiate meaning and real-life outcomes and decisions.

Particular teaching techniques and resources are associated with communicative methods, which are not strongly in evidence in New Zealand schools.

**2.7.7 Task based approaches**

Task-based approaches also emphasise the importance of how language is used in learning a second language. What you have to do with language – the task – determines to a large extent the ability to work with that language. It is possible to set up tasks which enable language learners to use certain texts or aspects of language, whereas the same language approached through a different task might be beyond the learners’ capabilities.

Nunan (1993) sets out a framework for using task design systematically to assist language learning. This is an area of methodological knowledge which New Zealand teachers could greatly benefit from, since it provides the tools for a systematic variation of task to suit all learners whether NESB or not.

**2.7.8 Language across the curriculum methods**

Language across the curriculum methods recognise that academic language is different from general language and that students need to be helped to develop knowledge and use of vocabulary, grammar and text structures.

The major difficulty for mainstreamed NESB students, at secondary level in particular, is coping with curriculum content. The learning burden of both the language of the subject and the content itself for those students is not always fully appreciated by content teachers, who may define their role as having an exclusive focus on content. In the past, language in general and English language instruction were considered to be the domain of the English teacher.

However, these attitudes have increasingly changed since 1975 when *A Language for Life* (Department of Education and Science [DES]) was published in Britain after a major educational inquiry. It included a
chapter called “Language across the Curriculum” and following this, the idea that all content learning is mediated through language has become increasingly understood. Over the last 10 years in New Zealand, nearly all teachers have probably been exposed to some form of professional development or other input exploring the teaching and learning implications of the mediation through language of the content they teach.

Studies indicate that for most children it can take four to six years to acquire a second language to a level of proficiency adequate for dealing with ordinary classroom activities. (Collier, 1989; Corson, 1990, p.177). Recent studies suggest that this is a conservative estimate and that in fact it may be closer to seven to ten years (Wong-Fillmore and Snow, 2000, p. 22). At secondary level this has important implications for students’ ability to cope with academic study at a tertiary level (see Figure 1 in section 2.4 for an analysis of academic language proficiency in the context of language learning). Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000, p.23) cite Scarcella’s results of a United States survey that showed that 60% of freshmen who took a competence test of English failed it - “a third of them because of major problems with English language skills”. Some 90% of these ESL students were Asian Americans who had attended American schools for more than eight years, nearly always in English-only programmes.

There is no doubt that language learning must take place across the curriculum for NESB students to succeed as well as possible. There are two aspects to this. One is the time factor – language learning depends to a large extent on the amount of time spent on it. L1 users of English are acquiring new language daily through all curriculum work; NESB students need an equivalent opportunity, indeed they need more as they have a gap to close. This means that the communicative and task context in curriculum areas, which is geared primarily to L1 English speakers, must be broadened to match the language learning of NESB students.

The second factor is that NESB students must succeed in content areas. Many of them will lag behind in the English curriculum for many of their school years, but they should not be allowed to lag behind in other curriculum areas. Although language mediates all curriculum areas, it is possible for students under good teaching conditions to make normal progress in curriculum areas in spite of gaps in their language proficiency.

For example, Nystrand (cited in Abt-Perkins and Gomez, 1998, p. 11) suggests that teachers need to engage in the practice of “eliciting, sustaining, and extending student initiated contributions” in both written and spoken form so that students can articulate content through language in an academically appropriate way. More specifically, Corson (1990) recommends a focus on words and word parts derived from Greek and Latin which feature largely in academic text material. He also
(Corson, 1988) has developed at length approaches and techniques for oral language across the curriculum.

To maximise the language learning of NESB students, all curriculum area teachers need a good understanding of language and an excellent repertoire of teaching techniques and methods. Many such techniques needed for language development across the curriculum have been developed in the context of the approaches discussed in the three sections above. It is not possible for most curriculum area teachers to do as Nystrand suggests and elicit, sustain and extend student output without ongoing professional development in techniques for doing this.

2.7.9 Sheltered instruction

Closely related to language across the curriculum methods, is sheltered subject matter teaching. It is sometimes referred to as a type of programme or organisational arrangement rather an approach. It is most usually taught by mainstream teachers, who also have expertise in second language teaching. It has become an important approach recently in the United States.

Sheltered subject matter teaching refers to an adaptive teaching strategy to present content area material through a variety of recommended second language strategies to make the material meaningful and interesting to students ... Research has confirmed that students in sheltered subject matter classes acquire an impressive amount of second language and learn subject matter as well.  
(Carrasquillo and Rodriguez, 1996, p.73)

Genesee (1999, p.5) cites his own 1994 research as showing that language acquisition is enhanced by meaningful use of and interaction in the second language, and describes how sheltered instruction (SI) is designed to achieve this.

The English level used in sheltered classes is continually modulated or negotiated by the teacher and students, and content is made comprehensible through the use of modeling, demonstrations, graphic organizers, adapted texts and visual aides, among other techniques. SI recognizes that language processes (i.e. listening, speaking, reading, and writing) develop interdependently; thus SI lessons are organized around activities that integrate those skills.

He goes on to describe the necessary resources in terms of highly skilled teachers who have both a good knowledge of curriculum area content and methodologies, and of ESL methodology, second language acquisition processes, and cross-cultural awareness. He advocates that sheltered curricula for each curriculum area should be developed by each
school district. (In the New Zealand case, this would mean national sheltered curricula.) He also says that schools must have an abundance of resources for SI in order to provide hands-on materials, visuals, models, audiovisual resources, and supplementary reading materials.

Echeverria and Graves (1998) also describe the methodology of SI at length. They describe it as the major new advance in teaching, particularly for secondary level NESB students. They compare “Effective Instruction” and “Sheltered Instruction” (p.58). Effective instruction they define as the practices that are described as “good teaching” in research which correlates teacher behaviour and classroom processes with student achievement. Both approaches share the following characteristics:

- well planned lessons
- time-on-task
- use of student background knowledge and experience
- variety of delivery modes
- grade-level content
- checks for understanding
- use of higher-order thinking skills
- explicitly stated lesson objectives.

However, Sheltered Instruction is distinguished in particular by

- comprehensible input
- high levels of student interaction
- a student centred approach
- more hands-on tasks
- the selection of key concepts from the curriculum.

Some New Zealand secondary schools have developed special curriculum area classes for NESB students, with bilingual staff, or staff who have expertise in second language teaching as well as in the curriculum area. These teachers tend to use a number of the features associated above with Sheltered Instruction.
2.7.10 Approaches to developing lexis

The methods of language teaching discussed above focus primarily on methodology and language use, rather than the language system itself. It is possible to follow those methods in such a way that there is no explicit attention paid to language items, such as words or structures, apart from their communicative use. However, mostly these methods also incorporate some attention to the teaching and learning of vocabulary.

It is also possible to follow a lexical approach to second language teaching which concentrates on developing learners’ proficiency with lexis, or words and word combinations. A primarily lexical method assumes that words and lexical phrases are the basis of language rather than grammar – “language consists of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar” (Moudraia, 2001, p.1). Ellis (2002, p.31) in his discussion of the place of grammar instruction in second language learning maintains that the early stages of language acquisition are lexical rather than grammatical. His view is that early learning should be focused on lexis, and that grammatical instruction comes after learners are “able to engage in message-focussed tasks, albeit with language that is grammatically inaccurate”.

The discussion below concerns the development of lexical knowledge in second language learning. The findings discussed relate to issues that are relevant to New Zealand classrooms. It is assumed that, because of the nature of classroom learning, there will be some direct focus on vocabulary for all students, but no particular method of second language teaching is pre-supposed.

For native speakers of a language the number of words known is positively correlated with reading comprehension, and with content knowledge, which in turn is correlated with writing performance.

There is evidence that the same holds true for L2 learners. The growth of vocabulary is perhaps the single most important aspect of L2 learning. Lexical errors impede communication more than grammatical errors, and are more harshly judged by native speaking listeners (Ellis, 1994).

Most vocabulary is picked up incidentally through natural language acquisition processes. McNaughton (2002, p.132) reports some estimates that L1 speakers may pick up 6 new words per school day – at least half of which are independent of any effort by the school. He also cites (p.171) a study which suggests that under natural reading conditions children will learn for themselves the meaning of about 15 out of every 100 unknown words they encounter. Elley (1989) has shown that it is possible to increase this rate markedly to around 40 out of every 100 by teacher definitions and explanations in stories read out aloud.
There are a number of aspects to learning a word. Schmitt (2000, p.5) quotes Nation’s list of types of word knowledge to illustrate the richness and complexity of what has to be learned in the course of learning a word fully: the meaning(s) of a word, the written form, the spoken form of the word, the grammatical behaviour of the word, the collocations and the associations of the word, the register of the word and the frequency of the word. L1 English speaking children who “know” a word on entry to school, “know” everything except the written form of the word. They begin to learn to match the written form to the spoken form they already know.

However, their knowledge of the other aspects is likely to be quite restricted. They may know only one of many meanings of a word such as “skin”. Their own repertoire of grammar and register is limited compared with older children or adults, and they typically know few collocations or associations of words. The process of language development widens and enriches their understanding of “known” words as well as adding new words to their lexicon.

The process for L2 learners is quite different. Typically, they do not begin as L1 speakers do with a large oral vocabulary, which for several years after starting school remains ahead of their reading vocabulary and their written vocabulary. L2 learners in schools start to learn to read and write words as soon as they start learning English in school. Schmitt (2000, p.118) reports that in a study he conducted with older learners, they very quickly learned to spell the word plus a core meaning. Over time, they gradually extended their knowledge and added other types of knowledge of the word.

Recent research suggests that it is not so much the means of vocabulary learning (i.e. rote learning versus incidental learning or acquisition) that determines how many words are actually learned, but the degree of processing or involvement with the word during the language learning task. Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) analysed a number of studies of vocabulary acquisition through incidental learning and concluded that what made for an effective task from the point of view of vocabulary learning was the involvement load of the student with the word in the course of the task. Thus if successful completion of the task required the understanding or use of the word (need), and if students had to search out the meaning of the word (rather than have it provided for them) (search), and if they had to consider and evaluate whether or how the meaning they had found was appropriate (evaluate), they were more likely to retain the meaning of the word.

The more effective tasks involved selecting meaning from several options, looking meaning(s) up in dictionaries, doing vocabulary exercises, using words in original sentences and composition writing, negotiating meaning and input or output through interaction. In the less effective tasks, the meanings were given, students read without looking up or investigating words, there was no negotiation, or no need for output.
Laufer and Hulstijn point out that there is need for further research to test this analysis directly, and also to establish the relative weightings of the three factors – need, search, and evaluation. It appears possible that the factor search may be less important than the other two.

Summarising the issues for understanding vocabulary learning Laufer and Hulstijn (2001, p.22) say:

A crucial question in understanding vocabulary learning is whether retention depends on what one does with the word rather than how often one meets it. In pedagogy, the question is whether task type is just as important, more so, or less so than the number of tasks in which a new word appears. Put differently, we would like to find out whether the quality of exposure to new vocabulary during ‘incidental’ encounters can compensate for the relatively limited amount of exposure which is characteristic of learning a second language.

Working with university students, Boers (2000) found that if teaching develops an understanding of the metaphors underlying certain expressions, this facilitates the learners’ retention of the items. The types of metaphor he refers to are very common in English and an important aspect of lexical/content knowledge as students move towards and into secondary school. One example he gives is the cluster of “up” words used to describe economic change – increase, rise, grow/growth, raise, put up, push up, soar, surge, peak, mount, creep up.

The effective L2 tasks discussed above are similar in their type and level of involvement with words and meaning in context, to those activities described by McNaughton (2002, p.83) as being effective with at-risk Māori and Pacific Islands students in the early years of schooling in low decile New Zealand schools. They are therefore particularly important as approaches to word learning that are suitable for all children in a school.

Given that L1 speakers come to school able to use orally 1000 or more different words as a basis for learning to read and write, and that they are adding to them daily at the above rates, NESB children face a huge vocabulary learning task when they start to learn English.

NESB students ideally need to learn new words at the same rate as L1 speakers, as well as learning all the words that the L1 cohort already know. Depending on the time they begin to learn English, this backlog will be between at least 1000 and 5000+ words. Some words are easier to learn than others. A certain number of words will be learned from the first exposure (5-14%) (Schmitt 2000, p.137). Others will take from five to 16+ repetitions before they are permanently learned, and continued meetings with words over a period of time are necessary to ensure that they do achieve this status. Usually, some attention, or involvement on the part of the learner will be necessary to cement the learning of the word. It is not impossible for NESB students to achieve the required
levels of vocabulary learning, but it is most unlikely to happen without a consciously planned programme.

Large numbers of words can be learned through memorization and repetition – at least 100 or more in a week. Although this type of learning needs to be extended so that students “know” the words more fully, it gives a basis for that expansion of knowledge. L2 learners respond to high teacher expectations as do other students. Teachers should be conscious of the need to encourage students to achieve the maximum of which they are capable, and also conscious of the wide range of possible learning strategies. (Schmitt, 2000, p.34; McLaughlin, 1990, p.173; Lewis et al, 1998)

If L2 learners have not had an equivalent age-level prior education to L1 students, they may lack many concepts developed through education. This is the case for some refugee students, and generally involves specifically teaching the unmet content as well as the words associated with it. This is a slower process for students than matching new English words with already known concepts, and L1 words.

The principles of best practice in vocabulary learning which apply to both L1 and L2 learners and their teachers are:

- pay a great deal of attention to word learning
- focus on meaning and use in context – both receptive and productive use
- do this through activities which increase involvement of the students with word meaning and use.

Principles specific to L2 learners are:

- follow a specific programme designed so that NESB students can learn more words per day than L1 students in order to catch up
- target particular words – based on researched word lists for educational contexts
- use whatever strategies are acceptable to and effective for the learners, including repetition, memorization of lists, and words shown by pictures, and translation.

In the last twenty years there has been attention paid to the importance of lexical units longer than the word. Pawley and Syder (1983, p.208) observe that “[m]emorised clauses and clause-sequences form a high proportion of the fluent stretches of speech heard in everyday
conversation” (Examples of these are: Is everything OK? I knew you wouldn’t believe me.) These and other ‘formulaic sequences’ e.g. the current economic climate, And another thing... (Wray, 2000) pose particular difficulties for teaching. They are very common and make up a large proportion of language – particularly spoken language. But they are neither entirely fixed, nor entirely free to vary, and the learner must come to recognize these limits, and respond appropriately to the contexts and frequency of these items. Teachers need to be aware of the existence and special status of these word groups in order to guide learners’ attention to their characteristics.

As well as a systematic approach to what words and phrases are to be learned, teachers also need expertise in vocabulary teaching, and in helping learners to develop good strategies for their independent vocabulary learning.

2.7.11 Approaches to developing grammar

Grammar based approaches assume that grammar is the basis of language and that mastery of grammatical structures is a prerequisite for effective language learning and communication. Historically, a grammatical syllabus has been considered the basis of tutored language learning. Over the last 50 years, grammar-based methods have lost support, and many language programmes and methods have included little or no focus on grammar. The assumption has been that with language use, the grammar will be naturally acquired. Programmes have been more likely to exclude grammar entirely than to exclude vocabulary, which is usually seen as being more obviously communicative, meaning-based, or content-based.

However, in the last 20 years increasing evidence has shown that there appears to be a need to pay some attention to developing grammar. Students who have no grammatical focus or instruction at all, do not progress so quickly, and often do not reach the same ultimate levels of achievement. There has also been an increasing focus away from simplistic ideas of correctness of surface items (such as correct question forms, and plural endings on nouns and the present tense +s marker on verbs, for example), towards more understanding of how the whole grammatical system develops in a particular area (such as time, or pronoun reference, for example), and how meanings (such as temporal sequences, or comparisons) are developmentally expressed through grammar as well as through lexical, and pragmatic choices.

Much recent research in this area therefore justifies some focus on grammar, and explores how this might be done. It is an area of second language teaching which is much less accessible to the non-specialist language teacher than lexical development.
Ellis (2002) points out that there are strong, if not entirely fixed, developmental sequences for the acquisition of grammar. This has also been the focus of Pienemann’s (1999) work for many years, and it is now accepted in second language learning research that it is not possible for learners to acquire control of grammatical features until they have control of certain developmentally prior ones.

Bardovi-Harlig (2000), in a major study of tutored and untutored acquisition of tense, concluded that there is no doubt that instruction can be a positive influence on the acquisition of a targetlike tense-aspect system, and very likely increases the rate of acquisition. However, tutored learners still have to go through the same sequence of stages, and instruction seems to be only one variable among many and “may be best understood as a component of input. Where instructional input, motivation and input through L2 contact are combined, the outcome seems to be an advanced level of development and, eventually, corresponding targetlike form-meaning associations.” (p.405).

Richards (2002, p.49) examines some of the evidence which has emerged to show that communicative tasks, even with ad hoc intervention by the teacher to correct errors, may not result in acceptable levels of grammatical accuracy. Following Skehan (1996) he suggests a “constant cycle of analysis and synthesis...achieved by manipulating the focus of attention of the learners...and there should be a balanced development towards the three goals of restructuring, accuracy and fluency”. His proposals involve the integration of a focus on form with tasks.

Ellis (2002) also concludes that grammar instruction should be a part of second language teaching. Unlike Richards he does not support integration of grammatical instruction with communicative tasks. He concludes with the following summary (p.31).

He states that it is not being proposed that we revert back completely to a structural syllabus, that we teach beginners grammar, that we attempt to teach learners to use grammatical features accurately and fluently through intensive practice exercises. More controversially, he does not support teaching grammar communicatively (e.g., by embedding a grammar focus into communicative tasks).

However, what he does propose is helpful for guiding good practice. In the following quote he summarises what he does support.

It is being proposed that:

- We include a grammar component in the language curriculum, to be used alongside a communicative task-based component
- We teach grammar only to learners who have already developed a substantial lexical base and are able to engage in message-
focussed tasks, albeit with language that is grammatically inaccurate

- We teach grammar separately, making no attempt to integrate it with the task-based component (except, perhaps, methodologically through feedback)

- We focus on areas of grammar known to cause problems to learners

- We aim to teach grammar as awareness, focusing on helping learners to develop explicit knowledge.

(Ellis, 2001, p. 31)

Ellis’s proposals are easier for teachers to achieve than Richards’ as integrating a grammar focus with communicative tasks requires a high level of skill and language teaching expertise, which would be unrealistic for most teachers of NESB students in New Zealand. However, it is realistic to have a grammar component in the language curriculum, and this is a prime area of guidance that could be provided for New Zealand teachers in some form of curriculum guidelines for ESOL provision.

2.8 Views on language assessment for school age students

Research in assessment of second language adult learners of English has been prolific and has been represented by a somewhat discrete approach to language through language testing. Rea-Dickens comments as follows in her editorial for the special issue of *Language Testing* dealing with assessing young language learners: “In spite of considerable activity in the teaching of foreign or additional languages in the Primary school, it is only since the 1990’s that a research and development agenda for assessment has been more in evidence” (2000, p.116).

This is perhaps because for school age children, assessment of language proficiency is more complex and integrated with other concerns such as curriculum learning, developmental constraints and relation to cohort.

The Ministry of Education’s *ESOL Assessment Guidelines*, clearly communicate a broad and comprehensive view of language proficiency. Integrated assessment is “assessment that is integrated naturally into the classroom programme”; integrated-mode assessment is “assessment that incorporates more than one of the language modes” (1999b, p.11). A particular strength of these assessment procedures is in the recommendations that many of the assessment tasks should be based in mainstream classrooms, with curriculum texts and contexts.

However, these assessment guidelines relate to applications for funding for NESB students, and as a result of this are not as useful as they might
be. Firstly, the guidelines seem to integrate better with ESOL provision in primary than in secondary schools (see section 5.1 below). Secondly, once NESB students are no longer eligible for funding, these assessment procedures are generally no longer used to collect ongoing records. As the funding ceases after 3 years for most NESB students, they are not likely to be near ideal levels of English proficiency for academic achievement. There should be a comprehensive assessment policy and programme to monitor specific language competencies in NESB children throughout their schooling.

A specific analysis of what might constitute language proficiency is provided by Corson (1990, p.213). Corson identifies a list of competencies:

- Linguistic competence: the competence to use and interpret structural elements of a language
- Sociolinguistic competence: the competence to use and interpret language with situational appropriateness
- Discourse competence: the ability to perceive and to achieve coherence of separate utterances in meaningful communication patterns
- Social competence: empathy and the ability to handle social situations
- Sociocultural competence: familiarity with the sociocultural context
- Strategic competence: the ability to use verbal and nonverbal strategies to compensate for gaps in the language user’s knowledge of the code.

Competencies such as these (and their developmental paths) can be captured and elaborated on by descriptors. This is the approach taken in Australia (e.g. Bandscales, ESL stages17) and England.

However, Shohamy (1997, p.146) mentions a number of problems that have been raised in connection with proficiency scales in general. There is no firm empirical underpinning for scales, which have mostly been constructed by experts using intuitive judgments about the nature of developing language proficiency. In addition, they view language development as linear, when there is evidence that it is multidimensional with discontinuity and U-shaped behaviour. Spolsky (1995, p. 358) also critiques attempts to produce single or simple scales of proficiency,

---

17 Further examples in Australia include: the Australian Language Levels Guidelines, 1989; the Australian Language and Literacy Policy, 1991; the ESL Framework of Stages, 1991; ESL Scales, 1994; the ESL Companion to the English CSF.
especially if they are to be used for any high-stakes individual purpose. “Too often the tests are used to play Russian roulette with the test takers”. His view is that only relatively complex assessment procedures and profiles can give a true picture of language proficiency.

It is important to keep these critiques in mind, to avoid embarking on simplistic approaches to assessing second language proficiency, such as a single test, or a single scale.

Nonetheless, more complex scales, such as those used in Australia, have been developed on the basis of the performance of large numbers of learners in schools, and can be helpful guides for teachers about likely progress by NESB students in various language areas. In the absence of a clear view amongst teachers of what constitutes valid language proficiency outcomes for NESB students in schools, these can serve students well – particularly when used in a process of formative assessment.

In assessment of second language learners in schools, most attention has been paid to formative assessment. As Shohamy (1998, p.109) states:

> Recently there has been a growing use of additional procedures including devices such as portfolios, observations, peer-assessment, interviews, projects, simulations and self-assessment. Thus, multiple assessment procedures refer to the use of varied ways of assessing language and less reliance on tests, each procedure is aimed at capturing different aspects and domains of language knowledge, as it is assumed that language knowledge is exemplified differently in different contexts and situations.

Carrasquillo and Rodriguez (1996, p.33) set out six types of assessment procedures or techniques. The assessment procedures and instruments include: tests, interviews, protocols, checklists (such as rating scales and inventories), anecdotal records, and language samples (including homework, logs, journals).

These assessment types, together with five language domains, provide a framework to guide assessment practice. The five language domains are as follows: oral language proficiency, reading comprehension, content area mastery, written language ability and overall ability.

Rea-Dickens and Gardner (2000) report their case study research of nine schools in Britain involved in an Early Years Intervention Project to address low levels of achievement in English. The research focused on assessment of learners for whom English is an additional language.

We can infer the following from their study:
• High levels of support are needed in classrooms from trained teacher aides and others in order to free teachers to carry out detailed assessment of targetted learners

• Purposes for assessment should be varied (formative, summative, evaluative) and assessment procedures should suit the purposes

• While much assessment of L2 students is formative and carried out in the context of the class programme and with reference to class programme objectives, L2 students in school contexts are often also assessed by standardized tests designed on the basis of L1 student performance. Great care has to be used in forming any conclusions about L2 students on the basis of these tests, and if their language proficiency is very different from their L1 peers it may not even be appropriate for them to take such tests.

Cummins (2001) discusses the difficulties of assessing NESB children’s literacy skills, when only the L2 is taken into account. He recommends the development and use of bilingual testing so that true measures of students’ abilities can be gained. He also discusses the problem of over- or under- identifying NESB children who have developmental delays, rather than just being in the process of acquiring English. As a result, some may not get special help they need, and valuable learning time may be lost while teachers wait to see how the second language learning progresses. On the other hand, if assessed only in the L2, children may be considered to have some language or learning delay, and be treated accordingly and inappropriately, when L1 assessments may show no delay.

Similarly with writing, bilingual assessment may show a quite different picture from assessment in one language only. Escamilla and Coady (2001) discuss the pitfalls in assessing the writing of young Spanish speaking children in the United States. Students they studied often performed quite differently in their two languages, and many differences were not related to the sentence level differences between the languages. Some children were seen to lack logical text structure in their English writing. However, this reflected differences in Spanish discourse patterns, and their Spanish writing was considered well structured. On the other hand, applying English-based criteria relating to the relative importance of mechanics in assessing writing, resulted in over-estimating their Spanish writing, from a Spanish text perspective.

It is important to have adequate language assessments in order to track L2 students’ progress in language development. But data is also needed on which programmes offer the best outcomes, and student assessments are often used as indicators of this. Lynch (2001) discusses the linked issues of language assessment and programme evaluation. He points out that both language ability and programme effectiveness are complex
constructs, and difficult to operationalise and measure. Some aspects of language, and some programmes, may be more appropriately assessed or evaluated qualitatively, and quantitative measures may miss important information. He also refers to the type and degree of support that teachers may need to carry out innovations in broadening the approaches to assessment and evaluation.

He proposes (p.604) the following list of questions that need to be addressed:

1. What is the range of nonmeasurement assessment techniques that can be used for language assessment and programme evaluation?

2. What political and ethical issues arise for nonmeasurement assessment that differ from those for language testing?

3. To what extent is it possible to report qualitative, alternative assessment data as aggregated test scores without losing important assessment information?

4. How can nonmeasurement approaches to evaluation be used to address the issue of different stakeholders having different criteria for judging proficiency, achievement, and program effectiveness?

5. What procedures can be developed to resolve potentially conflicting interpretations of qualitative, alternative assessment data by different stakeholders or judges?

Lynch concludes by arguing that an effort to address these questions will logically include a combination of measurement and nonmeasurement techniques for language assessment and programme evaluation.

Both NESB student tracking and evaluation, and ESOL programme evaluation are required in New Zealand, and they need to be linked with Literacy development in general. Considerable development in the field of appropriate assessment is required.

2.9 Types of organisational arrangements for NESB students

Most students who need second language support fall somewhere on a continuum between the following two very broad categories proposed by Corson (1990, pp.178-179).

First, there are students with little or no knowledge of the second language who are newly arrived in the country. They need to acquire the
language of the new country rapidly for basic social communication so they can relate to what is going on in the classroom, school and community.

Second, there are students who are fluent in social communication in the second language but who have difficulty in academic communication. Often they have been in the country of residence for some time and might even have been born there, or they may be members of an indigenous minority group. Occasionally children in this category are wrongly identified in school systems as being below average in reasoning ability.

The children who fall on the continuum presented above are placed in any one or more of the programme options outlined below. These may not be exhaustive. As Corson, (1990, p.176) notes, “It is not easy to think of a possibility that has not been tried by a school system somewhere or other”, and by implication that is not necessarily covered in the literature.

Handsoncombe's (1994) summary presents the ideal when she states: “Instructional groupings are determined by their efficacy in promoting high levels of academic achievement, respectful and harmonious social relationships, and proficiency across a wide range of language functions, both receptively and productively”.

While we refer below to organisational arrangements in terms normally used in the literature it should be remembered that what is more significant than the programme types is how close overall programmes come to meeting the demands of school-based learning. In many cases in New Zealand schools, NESB programmes are intricately structured to meet as many needs, and fit in with as many constraints, as possible. They often include several different organisational arrangements, and the precise balance of these in the overall school context may provide an excellent language learning context for students.

2.9.1 Reception programmes

Reception units, or reception classes, (Genesee, 1999) are often placed in the school, on the periphery of the school, or outside the school. They are commonly used for newly arrived students. These students typically have very low proficiency on arrival, some may have had limited formal education and low literacy skills. These are also known as Foundation or Newcomer programmes.

The programme is intensive and operates for the whole school day. Such a programme usually uses a variety of teaching methods, including language experience activities aimed at academic growth and special-purpose English study relevant to subject areas.
The aim of the programme is to prepare the students as quickly as possible for integration into the school’s programme.

These programmes are designed “to provide intensive, specialized instruction for a limited period of time” (Genesee, 1999).

### 2.9.2 Free standing ESOL programmes

Free standing ESOL programmes (Carrasquillo and Rodriguez, 1996) are linked to the above in that they operate with entire classes of NESB students. Students are from diverse backgrounds. The aim is to meet the immediate communication and learning needs. Little or no reference is made to students’ first language. Subject areas are taught in English using an ESOL approach. Programmes are especially tailored to linguistic needs and cognitive strengths of the students.

### 2.9.3 Parallel or cooperative arrangements

A number of arrangements involve the ESOL teacher working alongside class teachers. When teachers plan, implement and evaluate the programme and share equal status, this can be seen as paired teaching (Corson, 1999, p.196).

When ESOL and class teachers do all but teach together, this can be seen as parallel teaching. This may be fairly close in reality to a reception programme, if such a programme is planned with close reference to a syndicate or class level team.

### 2.9.4 Withdrawal teaching

Withdrawal teaching is where ESOL students work outside normal classes in special small-group units. The grouping is usually done on the basis of age/class level or achieved English proficiency. Withdrawal is generally partial with students being mainstreamed for the remainder of the time.

Students may be involved in intensive immersion work or on blocks of specially prepared material based on their curriculum. Carrasquillo and Rodriguez (1996) make the comment that planning for this type of programme is rarely extensive – students may follow a unit of work but rarely is there a long term or comprehensive syllabus.
Corson cautions that some ESOL students can be disadvantaged by leaving the regular class if they lose touch with regular content or miss an opportunity to excel in some area of proficiency. Handscombe (1994) also states that in those instances where minority group children are grouped for instruction specific to their needs, attention needs to be paid to ensuring coordination of this instruction with other parts of the day. Withdrawal teaching can also reduce the variety of language situations available to learners.

Other support systems which may complement the above are discussed below.

2.9.5 First language support

First language support may occur when schools recognize the children’s first language as an important learning tool for gaining ESOL proficiency and use content materials prepared in the first language by ESOL teachers familiar with that language. Teachers may also make use of L1 resources.

Research is unanimous in advocating the use of students’ first language to access curriculum learning. Turner and Francombe (1995, p.51) reporting on the Northamptonshire Multicultural Education Service say that students in their early years of schooling there are supported by bilingual assistants who speak the children’s mother tongue, so that English language learning can be developed through fluency in the child’s first language. Some are attached to one school only, while others visit a number of schools on a peripatetic basis.

2.9.6 Peer support systems

Peer support systems or cooperative arrangements operate where the school employs a buddy system that teams the student with an English competent peer, or an L1 peer. This buddy is usually assigned to the new learner and works to provide not only in-class support but also social support outside the classroom.

2.9.7 Homework centres and study skills programmes

A number of schools have arrangements in which students are encouraged to complete school or homework tasks in the presence of tutor support.
2.10 Teachers and teaching

Effective general teaching is particularly important for funded NESB students who do not have the language background or parental background of education in New Zealand to make up for inadequacy in school provision of good learning conditions. As far as the effectiveness of teaching and the school environment in general is concerned, we rely on the findings in Kennedy and Dewar (1997), and a draft research synthesis by Alton-Lee (2002) entitled, *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students: Best evidence synthesis*.

The key findings from Kennedy and Dewar’s research are discussed above in section 2.1.

Alton-Lee states (2002, p.2) “that between 40 to 55% of variance in student performance is attributable to differences between teachers and classes, while only 6 to 19% is attributable to school level variables”. She gives twelve characteristics of quality teaching derived from research evidence linked to student outcomes. The characteristics are ones which often also mentioned in connection with NESB student learning and ESOL learning (e.g. Corson, 1988), and apply as much to these students as to any others. Because NESB students’ different language proficiencies may leave them somewhat marginalised in mainstream classes, or in special ESOL classes, they sometimes receive teaching which is quite different from the rest of their peers. While the teaching should be appropriate to them, it should not be less rigorous or of a lower quality.

Alton-Lee’s 12 characteristics of quality teaching are given below, as a guide to the teaching context into which specialist second language teaching methods should be introduced. (The full Executive summary from her report which elaborates on these characteristics is reproduced in Appendix 3.)

- Quality teaching is focussed on student achievement (including social outcomes) and facilitates high standards of student outcomes for heterogeneous groups of students
- Pedagogical practices enable classes and other learning groupings to work as caring, inclusive, and cohesive learning communities
- Effective links are created between school and other cultural contexts in which students are socialised to facilitate learning
- Teaching is responsive to student learning processes
- Opportunity to learn is effective and sufficient
• Multiple task contexts support learning cycles
• Curriculum goals, resources, including ICT usage, task design and teaching are effectively aligned
• Pedagogy scaffolds and provides appropriate feedback on students’ task engagement
• Pedagogy promotes learning orientations, student self-regulation, metacognitive strategies and thoughtful student discourse
• Teachers and students engage constructively in goal-oriented assessment.
• Quality teaching effects are maximised when supported by effective home/school partnership practices focused on student learning
• Quality teaching is optimised when there is whole school alignment.

Putting the above quality teaching characteristics for diverse students together with the good practice principles for language learning below (from section 2.5) we have an outline of what good teaching for NESB students would look like.

• Learners should be given explicit and focused instruction on all aspects of language
• They should be given opportunities to use language in extended contexts, as well as comprehend language
• They need opportunities to interact on meaningful material, especially with a teacher
• They need very extensive language learning opportunities
• Goals should not focus on correctness at particular points, which cannot be guaranteed to be in line with a learner’s readiness
• Opportunities to engage with the same material need to be allowed for many times, therefore a linear approach to language development or language teaching content is unlikely to be successful
• Goals for L2 learners should not be limited to performance in easier contexts, or on easier objectives.
It is particularly important to focus on high standards of outcomes for NESB students and not create climates which tend to limit their achievement. United States third graders in one study (Miller & Meece, 1999) who were frequently exposed to high challenge tasks said they preferred them because they felt creative and worked hard, whereas the low challenge tasks were boring. Students who were not used to the high challenge tasks doubted whether they would have the ability to complete them. A New Zealand NESB student reported that s/he stopped going to ESOL classes (Lewis & anon, 1998, p.4):

I think it’s a waste of time to go to ESOL because everytime I turn up to class I get to do something below my potential which was from the teacher’s plan...[we] require reliable and flexible teaching plan for different student and with different level of potential....

In order to make this teaching a reality, certain school factors are also important. Handscombe (1994) lists characteristics we would expect to find in a school which has opted for a “whole school” approach to the education of language minority students. These are as follows:

- Hiring decisions and performance appraisal of staff include an assessment of competence in working with language minority students. Promotion becomes contingent on the demonstration of such competence. Individuals who are bilingual and bicultural occupy positions at all levels of responsibility within the school.

- The entire school staff ... accepts the challenge of working with a diverse student population and is committed to building on that diversity, not minimizing it.

We need to examine what constitutes quality and competence for staff in teaching second languages. Quality of staff is determined or affected by a number of variables including competencies and qualifications, experience, and allocation of roles. Quality of staff is also linked to the support given to staff by senior management. Some of these issues are discussed in the following sections.

### 2.10.1 Teacher competencies for teaching English to NESB students

The teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) (also called Second Language Teaching or SLT) is a specialist field drawing on a number of disciplines including linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and education. It is an area where a theoretical and research history and its own specific pedagogy have accrued. Internationally, both of these areas are realised in pre-service courses,
and teacher development programmes at a graduate or postgraduate level.

It is helpful and necessary to identify the competencies and types of knowledge that proficient teachers in the area can be seen to possess. This allows us both to understand how programmes for NESB children differ from general literacy provisions and to analyse some gaps in current programmes for NESB children as seen in our survey.

Richards (1998, p 1-14) identifies six domains of knowledge for teachers involved in second language teaching. These are: theories of teaching, teaching skills, communication skills, subject matter knowledge, contextual knowledge, and pedagogical reasoning and decision making. They are discussed below.

2.10.1.1 Theories of teaching

Theories of teaching refers both to general theories of teaching and also to teaching theories specific to second language teaching. Theories provide a basis on which a programme is organised, and instructional practices used within it. As Richards states, “While general teaching theories ... have informed approaches to mainstream teaching since the 1960s, theories specific to the nature of second language teaching have been developed and have often formed the basis for specific methodologies of language teaching, ...such as the communicative approach” (1998, p. 2).

2.10.1.2 Teaching skills

Teaching skills are both generic and specific. The teaching skills that Richards considers to be basic and essential to second language teaching are: preparation and organisation of activities to encourage communicative interaction, judgement of proper balance between fluency and accuracy, and an awareness of learners’ errors and how to respond to them.

2.10.1.3 Communication skills

Communication skills are seen to be important in all teaching but in particular for second language learners. There needs to be input from teachers that provides a good model for students, that is understandable and that prompts responses from students. The kind of language typically used by experienced language teachers is well
documented and referred to as “teacher talk” (see Ellis, 1994, pp 581-583, for a detailed description).

2.10.1.4 Subject matter knowledge

Subject matter knowledge refers to “what teachers need to know about what they teach (rather than what they know about teaching itself)” (Richards, 1998, p.9). Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000) share Richards’ view that teachers need to have knowledge about language and language learning, and propose a similar list to his. For second language teachers this knowledge is diverse and complex. Richards lists the following areas which focus on understanding aspects of language structure: phonetics and phonology, English grammar and discourse analysis.

Other areas include: sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, language curriculum and syllabus design, TESOL methods, testing and evaluation. This set of subject matter domains (often referred to as Applied Linguistics) is at the heart of what makes a good teacher of ESOL different from other teachers in a school.

2.10.1.5 Contextual knowledge

Contextual knowledge encompasses a number of socio-cultural and individual factors relating to the society, its communities, schools, classrooms and individual students’ personal backgrounds, and how these may affect language learning and teaching.

2.10.1.6 Pedagogical reasoning skills and decision making

The area of pedagogical reasoning skills and decision making represents the synthesis of teaching skills and content. Shulman describes how this operates. This is the capacity of the teacher “to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students” (Shulman cited in Richards 1998, p.10). In a sense, it is the way in which teacher competencies are integrated and reflected in practice.
2.10.2 Areas of teacher development need

Areas for teacher development are often based on analyses of expert teachers’ beliefs. One such Australian study is that of Breen et al. (2001) who found that although 18 experienced ESOL teachers (some of children, some of adults) generated a large range of different principles (nearly 200), these could be grouped into five superordinate categories. These categories were: the learner’s processes of learning; the attributes of the particular learner; how to use the classroom and all its resources to optimize learning; the subject matter of the learning; and their contribution in their role as teacher.

The teachers also shared a number of common practices, but again the total number of practices was very large (over 300). In addition, individual teachers had their own personal repertoire of practices, associated with a given principle. Therefore when the researchers looked at a number of teachers who used the same or a similar principle in their teaching, the teachers chose mostly different practices to bring this principle into effect. The researchers’ conclusion was that the “individual teacher appears to have a personal configuration of pedagogic principles that is realized, in selective ways, through a set of favoured practices” (p.495).

They argue that this individuality in teachers’ professional thinking and behaviour suggests that it is important for in-service professional development to allow for reflective dialogue leading to personal outcomes. Similarly, in pre-service education, if the teacher’s particular association between principle and practice is not one that the trainee teacher is able to make sense of, it may be important to allow for similar reflective reorganization of principles and practice.

Wong-Fillmore and Snow’s analysis of teacher knowledge in the American context comes from the perspective that existing pre-service teacher courses and teacher development courses are significantly lacking, not in how they teach but in what they teach. They argue that the responsibility for student failure to achieve language proficiency lies firmly in this quarter. They claim that teachers and all educators need to understand the role of language in learning - Educational Linguistics. As Wong-Fillmore and Snow point out (2000), the percentage of second language speakers of English language and speakers of vernacular dialects is increasing and therefore expertise on language issues related to teaching and learning is important for all educators, not only ESL and Bilingual teachers.

Freeman (2001, p.608) comments that in many contexts, ESOL instruction is becoming more complex and demanding as schools admit learners who are more linguistically and culturally diverse. Therefore, teacher learning becomes the critical link in supporting this diversity through educational reform and systemic improvement.
This growing complexity is certainly true of the New Zealand school context, and teacher learning – with well planned systemic support and input – does seem to be a critical link to systemic improvement. This need constantly emerges either explicitly or implicitly from this literature review, and it is also a major theme in the school data reported in section 5 below.

Freeman clusters the research issues into two groups. The first group concerns teacher knowledge (as discussed in section 2.10.1 above), and the second concerns formal and informal teacher learning.

The research questions he proposes in this respect are:

1. How do teachers learn to teach ESOL learners? How do various designs of initial and ongoing training and development support teacher learning?

2. Specifically, how do various designs and practices in pre-service preparation prepare new teachers to teach under various circumstances? How do designs and practices in professional development support experienced ESOL teachers in different settings?

3. How do teacher standards and licensure shape classroom effectiveness and student learning in TESOL? Can anyone teach English?

These remain to be fully investigated in the New Zealand context, and will be an essential aspect of improving outcomes for NESB students.

Some relevant New Zealand findings have come from the report *The sustainability of professional development in Literacy*, the research for which was carried out in schools with high numbers of NESB students. Timperley et al. (2002, p.127) found that in the successful schools in their study there was a high level of openness and trust among the staff. In addition, the literacy leaders were fully supported and given time to do the extra work. Senior staff in these successful schools were “intrusive” (p.117) at the classroom level in monitoring how teachers were implementing the agreed strategy. Teachers accepted this monitoring because of the level of trust and openness and because they could see the results of the strategy in student achievement.

Timperley et al. (p. 129) suggest that guidelines for effective professional development, based on data, might assist schools and national initiatives to judge whether the resources put into professional development achieve their desired outcomes.
2.10.3 The roles performed by those involved in teaching NESB students

A number of different staff members have roles in putting into place provisions for NESB students. In New Zealand schools, there are often teachers who have responsibility for NESB students. These teachers may be called ESOL or NESB coordinators. Their roles may also be as Special Needs Coordinators or Literacy Coordinators. Kennedy and Dewar (1997) suggest that an ESOL coordinator in schools is an important factor associated with successful programmes. It may be that the ESOL Coordinators administer and monitor assessment, and in most cases they also take a role in teaching NESB students. ESOL Coordinators or teachers are often, particularly in primary schools, supported by teacher aides who provide support to students in withdrawal situations and also often provide in-class support. In most schools there is a member of the Senior Management who has a management role in respect of ESOL, or NESB students. In some schools, this staff member is closely involved with the teaching programme, and ESOL staff, in other cases, the role is more administrative in nature.

Arrangements and roles often differ in secondary and primary schools. Research on exactly what different staff do is scarce. One notable British study is that of Creese (2000), and section 5 below gives information from the present study.

In Britain, in secondary schools those involved with NESB children are often referred to as language specialists (Creese, 2000). Creese examines their relationship with the subject teachers noting they are often regarded as subsidiary or inferior. However he usefully analyses what they do that subject teachers do not. “Language specialists work with the few, they access the curriculum, they ‘simplify’ and interpret the words of others” (p.456). More specifically Creese relates what they do to what we know facilitates the language learning process. By making input comprehensible, they help students to notice the gaps between their interlanguages and the target language. By setting up opportunities for interaction, they allow for negotiation of meaning. Both of these processes have been seen to assist in the acquisition of a new language. In general terms Creese claims they act as facilitators rather than transmitters of knowledge (in contrast to subject teachers). They do this by asking questions in order to help students to arrive at an answer themselves. They seek to use comprehension and confirmation checks. (Creese, 2000, p.458-459).

In a number of countries, including New Zealand, there are bilingual staff who support teachers. In some cases, they are also teachers, but more commonly they have the status of teaching assistants.
2.10.4 Support for teachers

Again little research exists exploring the way in which teachers of NESB students are best supported. However, it is clear that New Zealand schools differ in the involvement of and support provided by the Senior Management Teams. One point of analysis is whether or not school policies acknowledge that NESB students are entitled to special provisions. Another area worth considering is the degree to which schools recognise the special knowledge and competencies required by teachers of NESB students in the form of promotion or special recognition.

A third area is the degree to which schools encompass NESB considerations in their staff meetings and planning sessions. As Handscombe (1994) points out team planning, including the sharing of information about children among team members, should be accorded high priority when organising the school’s timetable and allocating professional development funds. One of three factors identified as fostering literacy development in Australian schools is whole school structural support. It can be expected that this will also be an important factor in supporting teachers responsible for the language development of NESB students.

2.11 Summary

During the school years, first language learners of English are developing their own language knowledge and literacy skills very rapidly. NESB students have to learn more and faster in order to close the gap between their competencies and the expanding competencies of their English speaking background peers. The generally accepted norm is that NESB school students typically take a minimum of 5-7 years to reach a level of academic English language proficiency equivalent to their English speaking background peers.

Because of the magnitude of the language learning task, together with the difficulty of learning in all curriculum areas through the medium of a second language, it is important that NESB students experience the best possible language learning environment. This language learning environment goes beyond the mainstream classroom and includes the commonly experienced withdrawal situation. Both of these contexts require focused and direct language instruction. NESB students’ language learning also takes place through the uninstructed processes of language acquisition that may occur in the interactions with peers and others, and in experiences within and beyond the classroom and the school. The entire school day, plus homework and family time, needs to contribute positively to their learning.
This is most likely to be the case where there are well co-ordinated policies and programmes throughout the school, and the best possible teaching practices. Teaching practices should focus firstly on high and appropriate outcomes for NESB students, as for other students. NESB students and families should be aware of and engaged with objectives and feedback leading to such outcomes.

How are outcomes best achieved? Firstly with respect to the broader culture of the school, the students’ cultural and language backgrounds need to be recognised and embraced positively in all school activities, and by all staff, so that NESB students are as comfortably included in what takes place in the school as are English speaking background students. This refers to affective conditions for language and literacy development. Instructional conditions include the following: learners must have very extensive opportunities to use language meaningfully in extended contexts. This needs to include opportunities to produce language, as well as comprehend it, and to interact with others, especially teachers. There also needs to be direct and explicit instruction in language items, as the evidence now shows that learners progress further, and probably faster, when this is done. Instruction should be comprehensive in its coverage of language items. It should include a focus on many levels of language, not just be restricted to, for example, grammar or reading skills. The method of the instruction should not be linear, but return to previously met items on a number of occasions, and be responsive to learners’ needs and developmental sequences.

This type of language instruction demands high levels of skills from teachers, who need to have extensive and very specific knowledge about language. They also need to have the ability to analyse and respond appropriately to students’ language use, and to draw on a wide range of approaches and techniques to create favourable conditions for language learning. Curriculum area teachers as well as ESOL teachers need a high level of skill in order to maximise language learning opportunities for NESB students throughout the school day.

Skill in working with assessment processes and techniques for specific purposes is of particular importance. Teachers need to use assessment accurately to ascertain what each student’s competency is over a whole range of language uses. Assessment then needs to be ongoing to feed into the development of the student’s language learning programme. There is also a need for valid and reliable summative assessment to provide indications of student achievement, and programme effectiveness.

The extra learning burden of NESB students needs to be addressed not only in terms of the magnitude of the task of learning English, but also in terms of how educational institutions may best alleviate the burden to some extent. The best educational results for NESB students are likely to be achieved when students are able to develop and maintain literacy, and at least some aspects of academic learning, in their first language. This
means that oral language proficiency, which is the foundation of literacy and curriculum area learning for English speaking background students, is also available to NESB students as a basis for learning. However, further research is needed into the connections and interrelationships between L1 and L2 literacy for different students and at different ages.

Teachers of NESB students are challenged by the complexity of the demands placed on them. While support exists for teachers, there is a clear need for guidance at a level general enough for all teachers to refer to, irrespective of level of student, cultural and language background of student, and context of schooling. Such guidance could be in the form of guidelines or a matrix incorporating aspects of language competence, developmental pathways, and correlations to the English curriculum. Models for such innovation exist in Australia.

However, with respect to our research knowledge of language learning in the New Zealand school context, we cannot continue to depend on research conducted in other countries, such as the U.S., U.K., or Europe. While this has a role to play in our understanding of NESB students in New Zealand, we have a unique set of factors and conditions in this country that deserve independent research attention.
3 The context of the present research study

3.1 The goals of ESOL provision

The goals of ESOL provision as stated in the Ministry of Education’s NESB students: a Handbook for Schools (1999a, p.7) are to give “support in learning to communicate in English”. The Handbook also states that schools provide ESOL programmes to “help their NESB students learn to communicate confidently in English and cope with learning in the mainstream curriculum”. ESOL funding ceases when students have “acquired adequate skills in listening, speaking, reading [and] writing to function independently in a mainstream class in relation to their cohort” (ESOL Assessment Guidelines, Ministry of Education, 1999b, p.91). In practice, students are assessed on their performance on language based tasks related to curriculum areas in order to determine if their performance is close to “the achievement levels of their cohort. The ‘cohort’ comprises students of the same age performing at the ‘normed national’ level.” (p.6)

A typical statement of secondary school ESOL goals comes from one school’s policy on ESOL.

> It is essential for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) students, to receive specialised teaching programmes in order for them to fulfil their academic potential and to participate fully in the community. ESOL students require competence in listening, speaking, reading and writing English before they can learn effectively and confidently in the regular classroom. ESOL students require ongoing support, encouragement and guidance in order to make the transition to learning and living in a different cultural setting.

3.2 ESOL provision in schools

NESB students are part of the normal range of students that New Zealand schools cater for, and for the most part they are in mainstream classes following a mainstream programme.

Before 1998 there were various arrangements to give some extra support to NESB students with the lowest levels of English language proficiency. Since 1998 there has been a programme for ESOL provision which gives extra funding to schools on the basis of applications in respect of individual students (see Section 1).
Many schools always have a certain number of NESB students needing extra English language support and have permanent ESOL support programmes in place. Other schools have such students from time to time, and make special arrangements for those students when they enrol.

Many schools have NESB students funded by the Ministry of Education as well as some unfunded NESB students who, in the view of some schools, need extra ESOL support. NESB students who need support, but are not eligible for funding may have passed the benchmark for funding but not be fully independent in some aspects of English language proficiency, or they may have exceeded the number of years’ funding provided, or they may be IFP students who are self funding. Usually, if a school considers a student needs extra ESOL support, efforts will be made to give that student support of some kind.

The most common arrangements for ESOL support, not in order of frequency, are listed below. Often several of these are combined for various students. Some of this support may be given by bilingual staff.

- special resources and support from the mainstream teacher in the normal class context
- extra in-class support from another teacher or teacher aide
- withdrawal from classes for individual or small group support
- enrolment in timetabled ESOL classes as an option
- short periods in intensive, part-time or full-time, ESOL programmes
- individual support at various times in an ESOL or Learning Support Centre

Current ESOL provision is described in detail in section 5. In addition to what is described above, NESB students are supported by various other school initiatives.

### 3.3 Related initiatives

The initiatives listed below either support teachers in providing for a diverse range of students, or support the students directly. They encompass all students, but several of them have a particular focus on NESB students and the schools where they predominate.
The current national *Literacy and Numeracy Strategy* addresses literacy needs in general, but has a specific goal to improve the achievement of the groups with the lowest achievements in literacy. These include NESB students, and students from ethnic backgrounds other than European/Pākehā. The Ministry of Education’s Literacy Leadership programme\(^{18}\) includes a module on meeting the needs of NESB students. This like the other five modules includes a synopsis of recent research, case studies and suggestions for facilitation (Ministry of Education, 2000).

Other initiatives which are currently available or being developed for or by schools include the following list. All of these address NESB students’ education, along with non-NESB students. Some, including those related to assessment are likely to be particularly relevant for NESB students’ progress.

- Reading/writing Proposals Pool
- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Enhancement Initiative
- Information Technology – initiatives and programmes (e.g. Porirua Family IT Programme)
- Schooling Improvement Project (e.g. Flaxmere)
- School/ Community/ Iwi Liaison Project
- Resource Teachers - Literacy
- RTLBs – Resource Teachers – Learning and Behaviour
- Reading Recovery Programme
- Home-school Partnership - Literacy Initiative
- Other community-based programmes
- Books in Homes
- TESOL scholarships
- SEMO – Strengthening Education in Mangere and Otara
- AIMHI – Assessment in Multicultural High Schools

---

\(^{18}\) The Literacy Leadership programme is a part of the Literacy and Numeracy Strategy, and is a professional development programme for Principals, Literacy Leaders, and teachers. (See *Curriculum Update*, Issue 50, July 2002, p.6).
• ABeL – Assessment for Better learning
• Proposed English Language Intensive Programmes Centre
• Academic “catch-up” Holiday Programmes for Refugee students
• Innovations Funding Pool

In addition to the above programmes, schools and ESOL teachers have ongoing support and professional development available from the Literacy Advisers (ESOL) based in six regions, and the Refugee Education Co-ordinators based in 4 regions.

There is also NESB On-Line and NESB Forum which are web-based resources.
4 The present research study - methodology

This study investigates the way in which schools make use of the targetted funding which is part of these initiatives for ESOL provision in schools, and which has been operative since 1998.

4.1 Data sources

There were two major sources of data to inform the present study. These were verification reports and interviews in selected schools. The way in which these data sources relate to the research questions introduced in section 1.1 is discussed below.

The quality and scope of the answers to these research questions is limited by the scope of the study itself. The data for questions 2 – 9 come from analysis of the Verification Reports produced by the Ministry of Education as part of the process of administering the ESOL funding made available to schools, interviews in 23 schools, and responses from ESOL Advisers.

Although some limited observation of practices and materials forms part of this, it is not systematic or complete. Mostly the data must be considered to be self-report and loosely structured. The answers are therefore indicative rather than final, and the scope of the research questions, and the limited time available to investigate them (4 months), mean that a number of subsequent carefully planned research projects would be needed to more fully answer these questions.

Research question number 719 is a crucial question, and it was acknowledged early in the process that no firm data would be available to address this, and that a response to this question would need to be based on more subjective data. Section 5.8 explores this question and how it might be addressed in further research.

4.1.1 Verification reports

The schools’ processes for carrying out and recording NESB student assessments to support applications for ESOL funding, and their

19 How effective are the ESOL programmes / support the school provides for these students? What are the critical factors that make the programme/support effective?
provision of ESOL support for the students, are checked regularly by the Ministry of Education Verifiers. Their verification reports are one source of data for this research.

Schools have been verified since 1998. There were 352 verification reports in total as at November/December 2001 (35 in 1998, 93 in 1999, 119 in 2000 and 105 up until that date in 2001). They have been collected by one of three methods - visit (274), by post (70) and by telephone (8). Postal and telephone verification has been restricted to schools with relatively few funded NESB students. There has also been a staged approach of visiting first those schools with largest numbers of funded NESB students.

Data was analysed from 126 primary and 16 intermediate school verification reports. The verification data for primary and intermediate schools was restricted to reports from 2001 and 2002. This decision was made to restrict the sample size, and also in recognition of the fact that change is rapid in schools and data from verification reports of earlier years may no longer be applicable.

Fewer secondary schools have been verified - a total of 52 secondary schools in 2000, 2001, and up to June 2002. While it was acknowledged that change has been rapid, we decided to include the secondary school verification reports from 2000 in the analysis in order to have a large enough sample of reports. The resulting sample of verification reports numbered forty six.

Information from the verification reports was analysed under the headings listed below. Not all of the reports contained information relating to each heading.

- Enrolment procedures
- Referral from enrolment to ESOL assessment
- ESOL assessment
- Status list updating
- Funding
- Staff + qualifications
- ESOL scheme of work
- Reception classes
- ESOL classes timetabled
- Hours in ESOL class / student
4.1.2 School interviews

Interviews in schools were seen to provide different and more descriptively rich data. The selection of schools to interview was independent of the selection of verification reports. While observations from both sources are presented in section 5, interview data is not included in quantitative analysis.

Interviews were conducted in 23 schools by one of the two researchers. Usually the researcher was present in the school for a whole day, if that was convenient for the school. In each school, interviews had been requested with a member of Senior Management involved with ESOL provision, the ESOL co-ordinator or Teacher in charge of ESOL, other ESOL teaching staff including Teacher Aides, and Mainstream teachers with NESB students in their classes. In most cases the schools were able to meet most of these requests, depending on how staffing was arranged at the school. On average 4 staff members were interviewed per school.

Interviews lasted from 30 – 90 minutes, with the longer interviews being with the ESOL co-ordinator. In most schools, one or two mainstream or ESOL classes were also observed. Interviews followed an Interview Schedule which covered the topics of the Research Questions (see section 1.1). Notes, and in some cases audiotapes, were recorded at the interviews.

4.1.2.1 Sampling of schools for interviews

The objective of the sampling procedure was not to generalise data but rather to capture the diversity of arrangements in schools in a somewhat systematic way. To this end the approach to sampling was twofold. The initial choice of 25 schools to interview was considered sufficient for this purpose. However, there were difficulties in finding schools fitting the descriptors, in securing agreements to interviews, and in scheduling convenient dates for the interviews, within the time constraints of the project. As a result of this, only 23 schools were interviewed.

In identifying schools for the interview sample, an approach of stratified sampling was followed, in which a number of pre-selected descriptors
guided the choice of the particular schools to be interviewed (see Wallace, 1998, p.131-132, for an explanation of these approaches). The value of this latter approach is that it allowed for the descriptors or variables to constitute a number of different profiles. While not further pursued in the present study, it would be possible in future to compare responses and initiatives in schools with the same or similar profiles.

The descriptors were derived from an initial analysis of school lists, the verification reports and discussion with the verifiers. The descriptors chosen related to the size of the school, the decile ranking of the school, the Ministry of Education school region, and the predominant makeup of the funded NESB school population (not the whole school population). All schools have mixed NESB funded populations, but if the population was over 40% either migrant, refugee, or Pasifika, the school was categorised accordingly. Descriptors for the three different school sectors varied. They are outlined below. See Appendix 1 for details.

4.1.2.2 Descriptors for selection of sample of primary schools

The following are the three sets of descriptors for the sample of primary schools:

School Size  
small 150-349  
medium 350-574  
large 575-775

Decile rank  
low 1-3  
medium 4 -7  
high 8-10

Population  
Pasifika/Refugee  
Migrant

The first set of descriptors relates to the size of the primary school. This is an important factor in regional terms as most of the large primary schools are in the Auckland area.

Decile ranking is related to the composition of the school population. This means that there are few high decile schools that have significant numbers of Pasifika or Refugee children. Therefore high decile Pasifika or Refugee, and low decile Migrant options are not included.

In primary schools there appeared to be a distinctive pattern of population composition. Pasifika and Refugees were in many instances found in the same schools. This may be because primary schools are smaller on average and cater for a more localised population than intermediate and secondary schools. The categorisation of an NESB population as either Pasifika and/or Refugee or Migrant required a 40% threshold²⁰.

²⁰ The association of Pasifika and Refugee is demographically motivated. However pedagogically, we need to be guided by Corson’s (1999, p.172) distinction between new minorities and established minorities.
This set of descriptors generated twelve profiles. However not all could be filled exactly as schools fitting the profile did not exist or were unwilling to participate in the study. The 12 primary schools visited had the following profiles (see Appendix 1 for full details).

- Five low decile schools of different sizes, with funded Pasifika populations
- One low decile school with a refugee population
- Three medium decile schools of different sizes, with Pasifika, and/or Refugee populations
- Three high decile schools of different sizes, with immigrant populations.

4.1.2.3 Descriptors for selection of sample of intermediate schools

The following are the two sets of descriptors for the sample of intermediate schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile rank</th>
<th>low 1-3</th>
<th>medium 4-7</th>
<th>high 8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Pasifika/Refugee</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the selection of intermediate schools size was not included as a variable as intermediate schools tend not to vary a great deal in size.

The patterns of composition of the student populations begin to vary at intermediate level. Intermediate schools draw on larger geographical areas than primary schools, and are more likely to include a wider range of ethnic groups. The funded Pasifika population does not usually constitute such a large proportion of the total school population in intermediate (or secondary schools) because most of the two thirds of that population who are New Zealand born are no longer eligible for funding and disappear from the programmes.

Therefore our profiles on funded NESB population distinguish between predominantly Refugees or Migrants. While low decile intermediate schools can contain large numbers of Refugee children, high decile intermediate schools are likely to have predominantly Migrant children.

This set of descriptors generated five profiles for intermediate schools. However, only three were visited, and their profiles are listed below. The two profiles we were unable to arrange visits for were two medium decile schools, one with a refugee population, and one with a migrant population. We did however, interview a medium decile full primary school which had year 7 and 8 refugee and migrant funded NESB students.
The profiles of the three interviewed intermediate schools are:

- Low decile with a predominantly Refugee student population
- Low decile with a predominantly Migrant student population
- High decile with a predominantly Migrant student population.

4.1.2.4 Descriptors for selection of sample of secondary schools

The following are the three sets of descriptors for the sample of secondary schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School size</th>
<th>small up to 1000</th>
<th>large &gt;1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decile rank</td>
<td>low 1-3</td>
<td>medium 4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Pasifika</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools in the secondary sector are for the most part fairly similar in size. Therefore only two size variables were included in the descriptors.

Funded Pasifika students tend not to feature so prominently in the secondary school database, and if they do, large populations of funded Pasifika students are generally in schools separate from those attended by large numbers of refugee students. As in the intermediate school sector, a high decile Refugee option needed to be included. In addition to this, a low decile Migrant option also was observed and needed to be accounted for.

This set of descriptors generated eight profiles. However not all could be filled exactly, as schools fitting the profile were unable to be interviewed. In regard to size, the original profiles were for 4 secondary schools with rolls of less than 1000, and four with rolls of 1000 or more. The sample we interviewed contained one very small school with a roll of less than 500, one very large school, and six schools with rolls spread fairly evenly between 900 and 1550. Although different from the original intention, this gave a good sample of secondary school size. The other change from the original profiles was that instead of three medium decile and two high decile secondary schools, we actually interviewed two medium decile schools, and three high decile schools. The numbers of funded NESB students in medium decile and high decile schools is quite similar, and this change from the original profiles was not considered to compromise the purpose of the sampling, which was to capture the diversity of arrangements in a systematic way (see section 4.1.2.1).

The profiles for the eight schools visited were as shown below.

- Two low decile schools with a predominantly Pasifika population
• A low decile school with a Pasifika and Migrant population
• A medium decile school with a predominantly Migrant population
• A medium decile school with a predominantly Refugee population
• Two high decile schools with a predominantly Migrant population\(^{21}\)
• A high decile school with a predominantly Refugee and Migrant population.

\(^{21}\) One of these schools reported that they had quite a large number of refugee students being provided with support by the ESOL Department, as they had no funding because their years of entitlement had been completed at primary school.
5  The present research study - observations

5.1  General observations

In the discussion below, data from the 23 interviewed schools is interwoven with the results of the analysis of the verification reports from 126 primary schools, 16 intermediate schools, and 46 secondary schools. The views of Literacy Advisers: ESOL are reported separately in section 5.14.

The information in the verification reports relates to NESB funded students, although IFP students are likely also to be involved in the programmes described. The data was analysed in relation to decile rankings of the schools since we had expected that differences in ESOL provision would relate to decile differences. However, no important decile-related differences were evident in the information contained in the verification reports.

5.1.1  Primary and intermediate schools

In individual verified primary and intermediate schools the number of funded NESB students is as high as 121. However, high numbers are only found in the Auckland area. No verified Auckland school has fewer than 15 funded NESB students. In other areas the highest number of funded NESB children in a verified school is 23 and the lowest is 3.

5.1.2  Secondary schools

The number of NESB funded students attending the 46 verified secondary schools ranges from under 10 to over 200. The number of IFP students attending the schools ranged from none to 194. In 28 of the 46 schools, IFP students outnumbered NESB funded students. In most cases, if there are funded NESB and IFP students attending the same school, the programmes provided by the schools serve both groups of students.

The only difference that showed up in the data from the verification reports in relation to decile of schools was that a number of low decile schools were recommended to improve their assessments in relation to

\[\text{22 See section 9.2, Appendix 2.}\]
cohort achievement. There was a tendency in these schools to judge the NESB students in relation to the school cohort, thus over-estimating their English language proficiency. In other respects the information did not differ according to decile.

5.2 What are the assessment procedures that schools use and who administers these?

Questions related to the implementation of assessment are addressed in this section. However it is important to understand that a study that has assessment as but one of many areas to consider will lack the depth of analysis that is needed to understand fully the complexities of the topic. Models exist of research that focuses exclusively and in detail on assessment implementation. Two such notable studies are Breen, Barratt-Pugh, Derewianka, House, Hudson, Lumley and Rohl (1997) and Rea- Dickens and Gardner (2000). Both studies present case studies of schools. Breen at al. studied 15 Australian primary schools, and Rea- Dickens and Gardner studied nine schools in Britain.

5.2.1 Purposes of assessment

The original research questions were as follows: Which diagnostic practices in the ESOL guidelines do they use? What else do they use? Which of the diagnostic practices from the ESOL guidelines are easy to administer, and which if any are difficult to administer and why? Who carries out the assessment?

The discussion below deals with some of these questions but seeks first to clarify the fact that assessment of NESB students in schools is multifunctional, not just diagnostic.

The purpose of assessing NESB students in New Zealand schools appears to be fourfold:

1. To identify students’ eligibility for ESOL funding
2. To confirm students’ ongoing eligibility for ESOL funding
3. To assess how close students are achieving to cohort
4. To identify the ongoing English language development needs of eligible NESB students.
1, 2 and 3 are linked to students’ eligibility for funding or continued funding which is established by means of a score ‘benchmarked’ to cohort.

It may seem appropriate to assess eligibility for funding with reference to the cohort group. However, reference to cohort gives different information from needs assessment and does not satisfy the diagnostic needs for assessment either when students first enter into a funded programme or during their time on the programme.

When NESB students are assessed in relation to their cohort, teachers look at whether or not their performance on specific tasks is close to the performance of the national cohort. However when students are assessed diagnostically in the context of a second language development programme in a school, the focus is on the student’s own present performance, and the skills and language they need in order to participate in the curriculum, and in order to make progress in learning English.

This difference in the two types of assessment does not seem to be clearly identified in the ESOL Assessment Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1999b, p.3) which state that identifying the ongoing English language development needs should be done “in relation to the competence of their cohort group”. These two purposes (3 and 4 above) are conflated. The way NESB students are assessed in schools is better analysed from the point of the four distinct purposes outlined above.

To begin such an analysis, it is first necessary to provide an overview of the types of assessment materials and procedures used in schools and then use the purposes to frame the data presented below.

### 5.2.2 Different assessment materials and procedures

#### 5.2.2.1 Primary and intermediate schools

Primary and intermediate schools in the interview sample generally collate assessment data in a personal student portfolio. Some of these data in a small number of schools are computerized. Table 9 below presents the range of assessment material and procedures reported.

The following are a list of assessment procedures most commonly reported as being used by schools in the recently verified sample: running records, alphabet and word recognition tests, JOST (Junior Oral Screening Test), Record of Oral Vocabulary, Record of Oral Language, BURT, TOSCA, writing samples, School Entry Assessment, and 6 year observations.
A large number of assessment materials and procedures used for NESB are often the same as those designed primarily for English speaking background students (ESB) as Table 9 below shows. Assessment procedures designed particularly for NESB students are Diagnostic Oracy and Literacy Assessment in English, English On-line exemplars, and New Essential Skills. While the verification reports often mention the use of second language assessment procedures such as cloze or dictation, it is not clear that teachers understand what particular language items they are targeting through the procedure, or whether they regard these tests as global tests of language proficiency. Similar issues arise with portfolio samples, which commonly feature samples of writing. These also need to be referenced to L2 models of writing development.
Table 9: Different types of reported assessment material/procedures in 126 primary and 16 intermediate schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>for ESB</th>
<th>NESB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm referenced tests</td>
<td>N.S.W Testing Service English PATs TOSCA</td>
<td>Language based cognitive skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised tests</td>
<td>SEA*</td>
<td>Readiness for schooling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 year observations*</td>
<td>Readiness for reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOST</td>
<td>Oral language</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURT</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holburn</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETOS</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schonell</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROBE</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TORCH (Tests of Reading Comprehension)</td>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised procedures</td>
<td>Running records*</td>
<td>Reading skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of oral language*</td>
<td>Syntax and vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of oral vocabulary*</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High frequency list*</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels test (Nation)</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published collections of</td>
<td>PM Benchmark Kit</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment tasks</td>
<td>Diagnostic Oracy and Literacy Assessment in English (van Hees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Assessment Tasks (Massey University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English On-line exemplars New Essential Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher made tasks</td>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture dictation</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher collected samples</td>
<td>Curriculum samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While reading and developing literacy is a focus of early primary years (see Figure 1, in section 2.4), the assessment of reading is perhaps over represented in the types of assessment materials and procedures teachers use in primary schools and intermediate schools. This area also has the most evidential support in student portfolios. It may also be that teachers do what they know best, and that reading skills are accessible to them and therefore testable. This may reflect the ‘skills view’ of reading, which as Barton states “is closely tied in with the need to assess. Schools are required to be able to sort, grade, test and evaluate...Testing is always tied in with particular methods of instruction, and methods of testing strongly influence what is taught and how it is taught” (Barton, 1994, p.164).

In the areas of Listening and Speaking there was little evidence of assessment data, as compared with Reading. This is supported by observations in Teasdale and Leung (2000, p. 174). They state that the combined skill of speaking and listening “does not have its own curriculum methodology, space and materials; there is no clearly marked ‘speaking and listening’ lesson or curriculum time (this contrasts with the treatment of reading and writing...)” They claim that language teaching in this skill area and its assessment takes place across the curriculum. Most judgments of listening and speaking ability appear to be gleaned from observation during classroom activities, and done by the classroom teacher if s/he is involved in the assessment process.

5.2.2.2 Secondary schools

A large range of different assessment measures were mentioned in the verification reports for secondary schools. From the information given it is not possible to differentiate those used for placement in classes, for diagnostic purposes and programme planning, for completing ESOL Funding Application Forms, or for generating school records of achievement.

In the schools where mainstream teachers are involved in the assessments to complete ESOL Funding Application Forms, the main methods appear to be by mainstream classroom observation, performance on classroom tasks, often supplemented by records of performance on standardized tests (mostly PATs) and curriculum examinations and tests, plus cross checking with ESOL assessments.
All schools reported some assessment measures they used. Usually between 3 and 10 are mentioned in the Verification Reports for each school. The main assessment measures reported are shown below in Table 10.
Table 10: Assessment procedures reported in 46 secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream tasks and assessments</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School exams and reports</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National exams</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing samples and tasks</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running records</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary assessments and activities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral assessments including taped samples, interviews, Record of Oral Language</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening tests and activities including picture dictation and following instructions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitmans Tests</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Placement Test</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assessment procedures (i.e. DELTA, MIDYIS, YELLIS, PROBE, TORCH, PM Benchmark)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Practical English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit standards assessments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB Assessment Guidelines items</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Procedures (van Hees)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Assessment for identifying eligibility for funding

The time of enrolment is when most schools become aware of the need to apply for funding for NESB students. To begin this process, schools are required to sight and record documentation from students on enrolment that will confirm their eligibility to enrol at the school and receive ESOL funding. The Ministry of Education’s *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* (1999b, p. 86) then encourage schools to initially assess students in terms of the three broad categories established by the Ministry and listed in Part 2- Initial Assessment of *The Assessment Form – ESOL/AF*. These are as follows:
The student:

1. Understands only isolated words or simple repetitive slowly delivered messages
2. Responses are largely dependent on non-verbal cues – actions, body language, showing, pointing
3. Produces little or no spoken text (oral language).

If students meet two of these criteria, they are deemed to have minimal English. If not, schools would need to proceed with an initial assessment incorporating assessment in four modes as in Part 3 of *The Assessment Form – ESOL/AF* (p.87). Clearly this latter type of assessment requires more consideration and schools are encouraged to wait for a period of time before assessment is made on this basis.

Little information is available on how initial assessments are made in the verification reports, as a distinction between broad initial assessment and specific skill initial assessment is not made. However some schools do report who carries out initial assessment.

**5.2.3.1 Primary and intermediate schools**

In primary schools the classroom teacher or the ESOL teacher most commonly carries out initial assessment of students. In a small number of cases this is handed over to teacher aides.

In many cases, schools report that they observe children for a period of time before they are entered in the status lists. A number of schools in the Auckland region explicitly stated that this was on the advice of a NESB Adviser.

**5.2.3.2 Secondary schools**

Information on enrolment procedures was given in the verification reports for 45 of 46 schools, all of which were correctly checking and processing documentation.

Schools are also expected to have procedures in place that ensure they identify NESB students, and then assess their English language competency, and if necessary make an application for ESOL funding. 34 of the 46 schools had such referral procedures operating, often also involving checks with mainstream teachers during the year to ensure
that all potentially eligible students have been assessed. There was no information in the reports about the other 12 schools.

Information was given for 40 of the 46 secondary schools about who carries out the initial assessment of NESB students’ English language competency. This is usually used to place students in classes and programmes, as well as to apply for funding. The staff responsible for this were:

- Head of Department – ESOL: 15 schools. In 5 of these cases, the HOD ESOL worked with other staff such as Deans on the assessment process
- Other ESOL department staff: 14 schools. In 4 of these cases the ESOL staff worked with other mainstream teachers to carry out the assessments
- Head/Dean of International Students: 2 schools
- Head of Learning Support or Special Education: 4 schools. Most of these cases were in collaboration with other school staff
- Others carrying out the assessment were mainstream teachers (2), the Guidance Counsellor, a computer assessment programme, and school-wide Year 9 testing.

Most of the secondary schools in the interview sample had either a single placement test or a test package which they used on the student's arrival, together with an interview, to get an idea of competency and needs. Then they had a range of other tests and assessment procedures, including observation and collection of tasks and samples of work from ESOL and mainstream classes. These were used for formative and summative purposes and went towards student reports. The schools in the interview sample used the same assessment items shown in Table 10 of secondary assessment above.

5.2.4 Assessment for confirming eligibility for ongoing funding

Assessment for the purposes of confirming students’ eligibility for ESOL funding is essentially an evaluative and summative procedure. This assessment is summative in that teachers or others involved need to make judgements of learners’ achievement since the date of the previous returns; and evaluative in that teachers or others involved need to decide whether or not the students are performing below or near cohort group. Both of these aspects of assessment are combined in the process of making an application through submission of status lists to the Ministry
at six monthly intervals. The assessment carries with it “high-stakes decisions” (Rea-Dickens and Gardner, 2000, p. 237). If a student is assessed as higher than actual ability, additional language support may be either reduced or withdrawn.

The *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* (Ministry of Education, 1999b) make reference to the four language skill areas, and itemize a number of criteria to help teachers and others make these decisions. It also contains a number of samples of assessment procedures.

### 5.2.4.1 Primary and intermediate schools

Most schools in the interview sample made close reference to the *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* in making their returns to the Ministry, particularly the specifications of criteria and conditions for each of the four skills. They reported that they found the guidelines manageable and accessible, and reported that generating the documentation for the funding returns was helpful as a summative exercise.

One intermediate school ESOL Teacher reported that the school did not find the funding assessment a problem:

> The verification process is good. It gives you a shake-up to have national cohort expectations and it is good to focus on them. It is not terribly demanding, you can just sit down with the teacher and do it on the spot.

Suggestions regarding the contexts for assessment in the *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* most frequently make reference to mainstream classrooms and curriculum learning, particularly for listening, speaking and writing. It would therefore seem most appropriate that classroom teachers carry out the ongoing assessments. Many of the schools in the sample encouraged this, maintaining it was an important way to reinforce the notion that the classroom teacher ultimately had responsibility for the students’ learning.

In some of the primary schools in the interview sample the assessment tasks were conducted by the ESOL Coordinator (who may not necessarily teach the children) or by the ESOL teacher. In some schools, when assessments were made by the ESOL teacher, the assessment was verified by the class teacher. These schools often expressed a belief in the need for reliability of judgments, and that using one person consistently was the best way to achieve that. Other schools suggested that class teachers were too busy to do this effectively. However, class teachers carrying out assessment within their classrooms means that judgments related to a students’ achievement, and relation to the national cohort (both inherent in the assessment procedure), are much more likely to be reliable and valid.
The verification reports also contain data on whose responsibility it is to update the status lists which are submitted to the Ministry for funding of eligible students. Most frequently it appears that a member or members of the Senior Management Team (Principal, Assistant Principal or Deputy Principal) and/or the ESOL teacher is responsible for updating these lists.

5.2.4.2 Secondary schools

Verification reports for 43 of the 46 schools gave information about who is responsible for carrying out assessments for ongoing funding applications.

The Head or staff of the ESOL department were responsible in 35 schools. In 20 of these schools, there was also involvement and collaboration of mainstream teachers with the ESOL department in the ongoing assessments.

In 4 cases, the Head of Learning Support, Special Education, or International Students was responsible for the ongoing assessments, and in 4 cases mainstream teachers – usually English teachers were responsible for the assessments.

Schools need to keep up to date records of these assessments and of funding received for NESB funded students. The verification reports gave information about this for 38 schools. Various staff are responsible.

- In 25 cases the status lists are updated by a Head of Department – usually the Head of ESOL.
- In 8 cases it is an ESOL teacher who has this responsibility.
- Other people who do this are members of the Senior Management, the office staff, and in one case, a Teacher Aide.

5.2.5 Assessment for how close students are to cohort

As indicated above, the Ministry of Education returns require that students’ performance is assessed summatively according to a set of criteria but also assessed in relation to native speaking cohort.
5.2.5.1 Primary and intermediate schools

Most primary and intermediate teachers felt that they were able to do this well. They made use of a number of procedures, the procedures in the *ESOL Assessment Guidelines* (Ministry of Education, 1999b) being one source. However teachers at this level have a number of standardized test results to draw on, particularly PAT tests. A few schools also made use of external standardized tests such as those offered by the New South Wales Testing Service.

In addition to this, teachers are familiar with procedures in reading assessment which are age referenced.

5.2.5.2 Secondary schools

In interviews with secondary schools, it was made clear that they regarded assessing students for initial or ongoing funding as a completely separate process from diagnostic and summative assessment within the school programmes. Teachers said that for the most part it was obvious that students they were providing ESOL support for were nowhere near cohort performance as set out in the *ESOL Assessment Guidelines*. The only areas they are likely to reach cohort level are in letter-sound knowledge and writing conventions. Thus, they saw the assessment for funding as a relatively straightforward process of filling out the ESOL Funding Application Forms (ESOL/AF) mostly with 1 (well below cohort) or 2 (below cohort). In most schools the ESOL department coordinates this process and either uses its own knowledge of mainstream classes or consults with mainstream teachers.

One of the 8 schools in the interview sample, however, described the process as long and tedious because of the need to get mainstream teachers to fill in all the categories on the form for their large numbers of NESB students. This school had the same view as a number of other secondary schools in the sample that the ESOL/AF assessment was not useful for them from a teaching point of view. Conversely a number of schools in the sample reported that it was helpful to be continually reminded of the comparison with cohort level so that they did not begin to lower their expectations of the progress students needed to make, and to remind mainstream teachers of this as well.

Another school which also found the ESOL/AF assessments arduous and unhelpful to them diagnostically, said that in their view exactly the same information about closeness to cohort performance was shown by the PATs. All students did PATs and they had found a close match between these scores and eligibility for funding. This was a low decile school with 59% of the roll of Pasifika ethnicity, and all funded NESB students were also of Pasifika ethnicity. The funded NESB students were not sharply differentiated from the rest of the school population, and the school did
not find the PATs less appropriate for them than for the rest of the school population. The other low decile predominantly Pasifika school had a similar view.

These schools may be right in thinking that the funded NESB population is not sharply differentiated in English language performance from the rest of the school population of predominantly Pasifika ethnicity, including high numbers of non-funded NESB students. Such schools do, however, often rely on these norm-referenced PAT tests to give them an indication of how their students compare to the national cohort. These tensions are a good example of some of the difficulties involved in L2 assessment for various purposes, which are discussed above in section 2.8.

Some secondary schools in the sample had no difficulty carrying out the ongoing assessments for funding, and even found them useful. However, most felt that these assessments represented a time consuming process which they were not able to integrate into their teaching programme, and which was accepted only on the basis that they had to do it to access the funding.

There was information in the verification reports on how consistency was achieved in assessments for 36 verified secondary schools. One of the 36 schools was reported as not making consistent assessments. The usual approach reported to achieving consistency is for one teacher (often the HOD ESOL) to co-ordinate or moderate all the assessments. Other schools use ESOL staff discussion to achieve a consistent and common standard. These methods are tabulated in Table 11 below.

As well as maintaining consistency, schools need to assess NESB students accurately in relation to the national cohort. Secondary schools usually use a combination of the following ways of achieving this: mainstream teachers’ experience of the national cohort, ESOL teachers’ experience in the mainstream, norm referenced test results, and national examination results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One teacher coordinates and moderates</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL staff discuss assessments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assessment items are used</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accurately relating NESB students’ performance in English to cohort attainment level needed improvement in 14 schools out of 44 for which a comment was made. These schools needed to refine their processes usually by involving mainstream teachers more fully in the assessments. In several cases in low decile schools, reference was being made to the school cohort rather than the national cohort. The result of this is that students can be assessed too highly and miss out on funding for which they are eligible.

All the schools used some form of consultation with mainstream teachers, data gathering from them, or had ESOL teachers who were also teachers in mainstream curriculum areas, and were able to use their own knowledge of the cohort. Secondary schools also use the various standardized and norm referenced tests and assessments mentioned above in Table 10.

### 5.2.6 Procedures for ongoing assessment

Identifying ongoing English language development needs should not be conflated with assessment of the student’s relation to cohort. The former is a formative or summative assessment in its purpose, while the latter is normative.

While it is important for schools and teachers not to have low or unrealistic expectation of students, it is essential to view NESB students as having particular needs and developmental paths that are different from those who are speakers of English as a first language. This has been acknowledged in the work of McKay and others in Australia (for instance, see McKay, Hudson and Sapuppo, 1994) and discussed in the literature review. Such a perspective is more likely to result in an approach to assessment and monitoring that is more comprehensive and valid.

#### 5.2.6.1 Primary and intermediate schools

The ESOL Coordinator in a high decile intermediate school with a largely Asian Migrant population had as her reference point a syllabus framework. This teacher had recently completed a post-graduate diploma, including a paper in Language Curriculum Design. Movement through her programme was carefully monitored and documented with
reference to programme objectives that reflected an understanding of developmental pathways in language learning.

Another primary school which has been involved in a project to develop very comprehensive student records, portfolios, tracking, and individual and school objectives, has particular procedures in place which do this appropriately for NESB students as well as English speaking background children. In addition the school uses the NESB profile for ESOL to cumulatively record funding assessments with descriptive comments.

5.2.6.2 Secondary schools

There was information from 27 of the 46 secondary schools on records kept of funded NESB student achievement.

The verifier reported that comprehensive and cumulative records were already being kept by 6 schools, and that 5 schools were in the process of developing cumulative records.

Five schools were recommended to develop their record keeping more comprehensively and to keep ongoing records to make a cumulative profile of student achievement.

Eleven schools were keeping various other records of work samples, tests and assessments from the assessment measures described above in Table 10. In most cases the verification report did not specify what items were kept as part of student records.

One of the interviewed secondary teachers commented on the students who come from primary school and soon come to the end of their funding in year 9 or 10, although they do not yet have strong academic language proficiency. There is no long term tracking of these students so the data is unavailable on whether they ultimately succeed or not, and whether the three years of funded extra support was sufficient.

Another secondary teacher said that she would like to see records kept for all students on their ESOL list that track their progress in English and curriculum areas. At present, she said, all student files are kept by the Deans but no ESOL information is on them other than the verification assessments. One secondary school in the sample is currently involved in the ABeL project, and is developing better school wide assessment and records for all students.

As was the case with the verified school sample, interviewed ESOL Departments kept records of marks and scores, and a student portfolio containing various items, and some recorded progress in relation to ESOL objectives. None described systematic cumulative records of developing competence related to a model of developmental pathways.
5.3 Issues related to assessment

Many of the assessment tests and procedures used are not designed for NESB students.

In examining the nature of individual student data and the range of different assessment procedures used, it appears that functions of assessment (as defined by Rea-Dickens and Gardner, 2000) are not always clearly understood and distinguished by teachers.

Teachers must have an understanding of how to analyse students’ objective needs and how to plan an appropriate, sound and comprehensive language syllabus. It is not possible to assess adequately, unless one knows exactly what needs to be assessed.

Assessment for language development should be made with reference to comprehensive models of language needs analysis and language development. However with no reference to language specifications as in Australia or the UK, and no reference to objectives of a programmes based on sound needs analysis, assessment of ongoing student needs is often a piecemeal and ad hoc process in schools.

A number of interviewed teachers mentioned their need for a standardised tool for language assessment appropriate for NESB students in New Zealand schools. As yet no such tools have been devised.

5.4 How do schools identify the programme or support required by the NESB students? How do schools identify the needs of an individual NESB student?

This research question relates to needs analysis and could be reframed as: “How do schools analyse the needs of NESB students?”

Needs analysis is generally seen to cover two main domains - objective and subjective. The former relates to what the learner needs to learn the language for. It therefore includes but is not restricted to “an identification of learners’ target situations of use (setting, participants and mode of interaction), ... the functional goals they will be pursuing in these situations, ... an analysis of the communicative activities learners will need to perform in order to achieve their goals, and the linguistic forms by which these activities will be realised” (Tudor, 1996, p.72). The latter refers to an analysis of how learners learn best. As Tudor explains, this does not require a precise account. Rather it has more to do with the
recognition of individual differences and “the attempt to work with this
diversity in a flexible and constructive manner” (Tudor, 1996, p.98).

Many schools and teachers are well equipped to consider subjective
needs but not objective needs, which requires knowledge of aspects of
language (such as phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse and
vocabulary) and knowledge of the way in which language knowledge
develops over time.

Teachers’ understanding of objective needs are often restricted in schools
to a consideration of reading, reading skills, spelling, and vocabulary.
This is evidenced by the fact that many of the withdrawal sessions that
NESB students are involved in focus on reading (see the following section
for a detailed discussion of programme types). These are the main areas
of language development taught to the general primary school
population, and this focus is carried over to NESB students.

In secondary schools, teachers consider the students’ main needs to lie
in vocabulary, writing and reading, and to a lesser extent listening, and
this is reflected in the number of schools which report using assessments
in these areas (see Table 10 in section 5.1.2). No teachers interviewed
referred to a full needs analysis whether objective, in relation to the
curriculum, or subjective.

Assessments in some schools lead to a NESB student classification at an
English language proficiency level such as ‘elementary’, ‘pre-
intermediate’, ‘intermediate’, and so on. Students or classes at such
levels then work on published or school-produced materials typical of
these levels. In other schools, especially where the classes are organised
on the basis of year levels, the teaching may be more multi-level, and
address individual weaknesses as well as group needs.

Although individual help is often available in secondary schools, for the
most part ESOL support is through timetabled classes, which last a full
period of 50-60 minutes. Most of these classes run programmes based on
using English in reading, writing, speaking and listening, and developing
vocabulary and grammatical control through direct instruction, and
through incidental learning. (See section 5.5 below ).

Most schools in the interview sample have identified typical student
needs profiles through past experience, and have developed materials
and course plans to address these. The ESOL classes are usually kept
below about 15 students, and teachers are then able to address
individual differences as they arise. One school in the sample had not
had refugees with high needs before, but several had just come to enrol,
without warning from the Refugee Centre. Because these students lay
outside the school’s usual profile, teachers were thrown into a certain
amount of hasty planning of new approaches and materials.
One school commented on the interrelationship between assessment, school records, and identifying students’ ongoing needs. They keep records of individual achievement in curriculum areas, and the ESOL Department meets weekly to reassess ESOL provision for individuals. ESOL staff look at mainstream marks and comments and give extra or less help as necessary. They may move the student into an extra mainstream curriculum area, and put them up or down a level in ESOL classes.

5.5 What programmes do primary schools offer?

It is not possible to provide detailed accounts of the all aspects of the programmes offered to NESB children in schools for the schools in the sample as this depends on the occasion schools were visited and the classes observed on that day. In addition the interviewers relied on information provided or reported by the teachers.

With the verified schools, programme descriptions are brief and reported rather than observed. Programmes are described often in terms of time allocation and resources used.

5.5.1 Organisational arrangements

A large percentage (60%) of the primary schools favoured the system of withdrawing children for set periods of time during the week. A smaller number of schools supplemented this organisation with in-class support (27%). Schools that operated solely or primarily with in-class support accounted for less than 5% of the schools. One primary school in the verified sample ran a specific ESOL class, and one other operated with bilingual units. The verification reports for a small number of schools did not indicate what organisational arrangements were used.

It is noteworthy that in one school in the interview sample, the ERO report commented on a good distribution of in-class and withdrawal programmes.

A small number of schools operated Homework Centres: two intermediate schools and 5 primary schools. Five of the schools were low decile (decile 1 to 3). In one low decile school where interviews were conducted the bilingual teacher aide providing in-class support was also employed to manage the Homework Centre. Additional funding for this school came from a community liaison programme.
5.5.2 Time allocated to ESOL withdrawal sessions

In primary schools, withdrawal session length with NESB students was hugely variable as time tabling is flexible. The verified data was examined for information regarding session duration. Sixty eight schools in total reported an invariable session time for all students. These data are given in Table 12 below.

A further twenty six schools reported that they varied times according to different groups of students. Including this data, the range of time of sessions for 94 schools is from 15 minutes to two hours at any one session.

Table 12: Ranked allocation of ESOL withdrawal session time in primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session duration</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>(and %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 minute lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or 60 minute lessons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 or 45 minute lessons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or 35 minute lessons</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or 25 minute lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minute lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 12 above may give an indication of the nature of the teaching provided for students during their withdrawal sessions. The length of a session determines how much a teacher can exploit a topic, provide opportunities to integrate the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, or provide adequate practice opportunities and repeated exposure to language forms and vocabulary.

However, while not as satisfactory as more sustained sessions, regular sessions every day can achieve the above to a lesser extent. There is also huge variability in how often sessions are provided for students. In the verified sample, analysis of combined time and duration highlight low provision at one to two sessions of thirty minutes’ duration per week; and high provision at three sessions per week of up to two hours duration.
5.5.3 Types of approaches and programmes

The approaches or programmes that primary schools offer are of the following broad types: bilingual programmes, oral language programmes, experience based programmes, reading based programmes, and curriculum referenced programmes. How schools use these is described below. However the use of the word ‘programme’ needs to be qualified as few observed sessions were part of a comprehensive plan of work specifying language or other outcomes.

5.5.3.1 Bilingual programmes

Bilingual help in schools is generally thought of as part of the ESOL programme, and a means of facilitating comprehension in curriculum areas. A bilingual teacher, or more commonly a teacher aide, may take some or all ESOL sessions using both languages, or may use the L1 to explain and support regular class sessions. Bilingual development itself is not directly supported in schools to any extent, and is not seriously factored into learning contexts and goals as a permanent aspect of the student’s educational programme. In most schools, the bilingual experience is very limited unless there happen to be significant numbers of students from the same country in the same class who continue to work together in their first language. As mentioned above only one primary school in the verified and interviewed sample had bilingual units.

5.5.3.2 Oral language approaches

Oral language programmes are much more prevalent in lower primary areas, and with new learners of lower proficiency. Oral language programmes are most often conducted in small withdrawal groups. The sessions are often theme based (e.g. shopping, our local community), and may or may not be linked to curriculum topics. They aim primarily to develop vocabulary knowledge. Teachers work with children in labelling tasks, and in role plays to encourage children to use vocabulary productively. These, like many other types of programmes and sessions, begin with familiar oral routines such as greetings.

It is appropriate that these programmes are restricted to young learners with limited proficiency, as in themselves they are not sufficient to meet the conditions for effective learning of vocabulary. As outlined in section 2.7.10, students need to be exposed to, and process, much more than just the oral form of the word to truly ‘know’ a word. In addition there are learning constraints when dealing with similar types of words presented
at the same time. These constraints are outlined by Nation (1990, pp.45-46).

5.5.3.3 Experience based programmes

Like oral language programmes, experience based programmes are much more prevalent in lower primary areas. Experience based programmes seek to provide learners with experiences which provide the basis for language work or which are seen to provide the foundation for curriculum learning. These can operate in withdrawal organisational arrangements or can operate as whole class programmes. New entrant classrooms are likely to be where the latter occurs.

One school in the interview sample (a medium sized, low decile Auckland school with a largely Pasifika population) provides a new entrant programme which is neither strictly withdrawal nor intact class. New entrant children come into the room every morning of the week until lunchtime to take part in an experience based programme which focuses on providing the pre-school/readiness for school experiences that many of the children have not had. This same school’s withdrawal classes are also strongly experience based which allows for the integration of all skills. Students were observed talking about, drawing about and recording their experiences on a school trip.

Experience based approaches are extremely useful if the language generated by them is capitalised on in systematic ways, and ways which are guided by current research (see sections 2.7.10 and 2.7.11).

5.5.3.4 Reading based programmes

A focus on reading was predominant particularly in programmes for older primary children.

The range of resources used in the verified schools includes commercially produced reading programmes: Rainbow readers, Sunshine readers, and the Bannatyne reading programme. Together with this material, many schools made use of the Self Pacing Boxes. Less frequently used was the Jolly Phonics series. Schools did report, but infrequently, the use of Duffy Books, and Curriculum Concepts. Also the SRA series was used. In schools with large numbers of Pasifika children, teachers made use of the Tupu series, a series of L1 readers. Many schools with L1 resources encouraged children to take the books home. Observations of schools operating reading-focused withdrawal sessions indicated that there was frequent use of materials that had accompanying worksheets or taped oral material such as Rainbow Readers.
While there was a large range of reading material reported it seems that an important source of reading texts: the children’s own productive language (either oral and recorded, or written by the child) is overlooked in ESOL programmes. Corson explains the importance of this:

Part of the aim here is to ensure a match between the child’s language and the language of the text by presenting the child’s own accounts, recorded by a second party, for reading. The child starts with familiar meanings. Extensions of this come when other children’s accounts are included and when the teacher does some carefully constructed composing of reading material for use by the children.
(Corson, 1990, p.98)

There was infrequent observation of teacher-led extended discussion of reading material which would allow teachers to explore children’s comprehension of text. Shared books provide an excellent context in which this can occur. However it is likely that these materials are utilized in the class programme. Reading was not observed to be used as a meaningful context for productive language use. This can be achieved though the use of teacher made communication tasks.

A small number of schools reported the use of extensive reading as part of their ESOL programme, Again, it would seem that this is likely to be conducted in the context of the class programme. However, it is essential that extensive reading exists to complement other reading programmes as it is a critical source of language input for students of second language. Extensive reading should cover a wide variety of texts including those which present curriculum material in an accessible way.

A number of schools reported the use of parents as reading tutors in school programmes or the use of older more proficient readers in a Buddy reading scheme. Many primary schools indicated Reading Recovery was a supplementary programme for some NESB children.

5.5.3.5 Curriculum referenced programmes

Few schools offer a programme that is linked to the curriculum and specifically targets curriculum language. The practice of withdrawing small groups of students from a selection of different classes and class levels places constraints in terms of addressing curriculum learning as few classes work on the same curriculum material at the same time.

Focused curriculum learning is more likely to occur when schools opt for in-class support. This is more likely to happen at lower primary levels. This can be particularly effective when the class is relatively homogenous in terms of first language background and the school provides support in the form of a bilingual teacher or teacher aide. A medium sized, low
decile south central school with a largely Pasifika population operates a specific new entrant class supported by a bilingual teacher aide.

Another school (a small, low decile central north school with a largely Pasifika population) has responded to a teacher request in the lower primary classes to opt for in-class support which means that each of the five classes have almost a day of support from a teacher aide.

When numbers of children are small but schools have a more coordinated approach to curriculum delivery, it is possible for the teacher or teacher aide to have access to curriculum plans for her own planning and teaching. A medium sized school with small numbers of children from a wide range of language backgrounds operates successfully in this way, in the lower to middle primary levels. In this case the teacher aide, recognises the importance of students gaining access to the curriculum, something she stated she became aware of as the result of her completing professional development courses for credit. She focuses all her planning and teaching on this, after having teachers fill out a curriculum grid.

In this school the initiative lies with the teacher aide. In many others, classroom teachers provide clear guidance on what should be covered by teacher aides, particularly when teacher aides are providing in-class support.

One intermediate school did not work on curriculum themes, but rather chose to deal with a strongly discourse focused programme which would apply to all areas of the curriculum and is extremely useful in terms of its generalisability.

ESOL classes as reported in one verified primary school and as observed in one intermediate school also can operate successfully to parallel the curriculum learning in other classes. The observed intermediate school was an excellent realisation of Sheltered Instruction. The two ESOL classes, one at year 7 and one at year 8 each had their own full time teacher aide. The Principal of this school commented on the substantial commitment in staffing that this arrangement entailed. This arrangement was subsidised by other funding including that from IFPs.

5.6 What programmes do secondary schools offer?

School W is quite typical of a number of schools in its programmes and procedures. It has about 150 IFP students, just under 70 funded NESB students (half of whom are refugees), about 60% Pākehā students, only 4% Pasifika, and a roll of a little over 1100.
For funding purposes, the mainstream class teachers observe the students in class and enter scores on the ESOL/AFs. They have to be moderated by the ESOL Department as the mainstream teachers are reluctant to enter very low scores. Then for placement purposes, and programme planning, the students are given the school’s own ESOL assessment package, which includes the Oxford Placement Test (vocabulary and grammar), listening (following instructions, and dictation to the 2000 word level), and a writing task (sentence structure, grammatical features, and text organisation).

Students are placed in ESOL classes according to proficiency, and the rest of the time they attend mainstream classes. Those at Elementary level (see section 5.3 above) spend 10 out of 30 hours per week in ESOL classes. At the Pre-Intermediate Level there is a composite class of years 11-13 (IFP and funded NESB students). Most of these students want to go on to tertiary study, and they are doing NCEA literacy credits in the first half of the year. Unfortunately, the courses available to them for literacy credits do not really meet their need to develop English to cope with the curriculum. An important goal for them is to extend their vocabulary from 1000 to 2000 words. They have a number of reading, writing, listening, and speaking objectives, plus being active in group work, and developing research skills.

The next proficiency level is doing IELTS preparation and academic English study.

In this school the Refugee students have a number of special curriculum area classes with mainstream teachers who have done LTL (Learning through Language) professional development training. These classes are addressing gaps in the students’ previous education, as well as English language development. The refugee students also attend ESOL classes. There are also special ESOL Science, Commerce and Food Technology classes at Year 11 and 12.

This school was quite typical of secondary schools in having a number of timetabled options to meet different needs of different students. Because students study a number of different curriculum areas as well as ESOL, their learning context is quite fragmented, and they are largely responsible for integrating their own language learning with content learning.

They do however have some curriculum support in the form of help with written assignments, some cross-curricular links, and help with study

---

23 IELTS – International English Language Testing Service. The examinations run by IELTS, are internationally recognised qualifications. Passes at specified levels are required by many tertiary institutions before international students are accepted into courses, even if they have appropriate passes in their school curriculum subjects from an English medium system.
skills. Also, as in most schools with large numbers of NESB students, a number of curriculum area teachers have some expertise in second language learning across the curriculum. NESB students, especially at senior levels, are often grouped in mainstream classes, and skilled curriculum area teachers are able to provide some language support.

None of the secondary schools in the interview sample reported using in-class support as their main ESOL provision, although a small number of the verified schools did. The usual approach to in-class support in secondary schools is to place NESB students with skilled teachers as described above. However, section 5.5.3 below shows that a number of verified schools have in-class support as a supplement to their main ESOL provision.

Cameron and Simpson (2002) interviewed five ESOL teachers in Hamilton and five in Auckland, and found that the level of complexity of ESOL programmes was higher in the Auckland schools (with more NESB students) than in the Hamilton schools.

Other common forms of support are discussed below.

5.6.1 Reception classes

The verification reports gave information on reception classes for 20 of the 46 secondary schools. One had no reception class. The other 19 had some form of reception class, and some details were given for 12 schools.

The classes varied from a few hours a day to full time, and lasted from a few days to one year. Most seemed to be a maximum of about half a day for a “short period”, with students being progressively mainstreamed. The students in these classes varied from a few, only when there were students needing this, to 3 large classes.

In some of the schools in the interview sample there were senior classes which were composed exclusively of NESB students (mostly IFP) which worked on the curriculum and on ESOL as intact classes.

5.6.2 Organisation of ESOL classes and class content

Data from the verification reports was analysed on the ESOL classes and other support provided, the basis for the composition of classes, the amount of time students spend in the classes, and whether they do this instead of English classes, or other options. Information was given for 45 out of 46 schools.

Table 13: Organisation of ESOL classes
### Table 14: Amount of ESOL provision per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time scheduled</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6 hours of class per week</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours before school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 option</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A range available according to need – up to 9, 12, 15, or 24 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more options – according to need or choice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classes + withdrawal or in class support – unspecified hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawal or in class support only – unspecified hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five verified schools were reported to have some funded NESB students who were receiving no special support, other than what was provided by their mainstream teachers.
Schools that provide more than one option line of ESOL may direct NESB students to attend several options, or may allow them to choose several options. If students are doing ESOL during several option lines, this will mean that they are in mainstream classes for core curriculum areas, and most of the rest of the time they are in ESOL classes.

Information was given for 28 out of 46 schools about the content covered in the ESOL classes. The type of information supplied was quite diverse, and not amenable to very detailed analysis.

**Table 15: Content described for ESOL classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>No. of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course outlines, aims, language focus etc reported but not described</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening) + language items such as vocabulary, grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills + language items + themes or topics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum area support</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit standards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schools that ran skills-based programmes often also had some curriculum links, or individual support. Five of the schools seemed to offer mostly individual withdrawal or in-class support responding to individual needs, rather than timetabled classes. This is usually done in the junior years, and in schools where there are not many NESB students. Sometimes refugee students with high needs have a significant amount of withdrawal support.

The schools where interviews were conducted mostly reported their ESOL classes as being organised around skills plus vocabulary, and some focus on aspects of grammar and discourse. One important timetabling factor in secondary schools is whether NESB students follow the regular English curriculum as well as ESOL.

There was some information for 24 schools to show whether ESOL classes were scheduled instead of English, or instead of an option or options. Nineteen schools either scheduled ESOL classes always in an option line, or did so for years 9 & 10 (and sometimes year 11), with
senior ESOL scheduled instead of English. Five schools scheduled all ESOL classes against English.

5.6.3 Other school initiatives to support ESOL

All schools had some other initiatives to support funded and unfunded NESB students besides their main support from timetabled classes, withdrawal or in-class support. These are described below and listed in Table 16.

Most of these initiatives are targetted to NESB students, but some, such as Learning Support Centres, Homework Centres, Literacy Programmes, are school initiatives for all students.

Lower decile schools were more likely to mention Literacy Initiatives and other whole school programmes, mainstream curriculum area help, Homework Centres and after-school help.

The most frequently available forms of extra support in schools are: in-class support, various peer support arrangements, literacy and reading support, extra withdrawal (usually on a small group or individual basis), Homework Centres and after school tutorials, and curriculum help from mainstream departments including alternative classes.

These other initiatives and provision mean quite a rich range of support is often available to NESB students. Some of it, such as using Learning Centres, is on a self-access basis, which means that the benefit may depend on whether students have well-developed learning strategies. However, not mentioned here is that most secondary schools with numbers of NESB students provide considerable pastoral and academic supervision within the ESOL department. Students are guided to take advantage of support offered.
Table 16: Types of extra ESOL support by decile of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools in decile</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra withdrawal, as well as classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra ESOL classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of hours, lunchtime, classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of hours, lunch, individual support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support Centre, ESOL room etc available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school tutorials, Homework Centre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum help from mainstream, alternative classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified curriculum work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with exams, assignments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual help for students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other extra help from staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring, Buddy system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school Literacy focus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other special reading or literacy support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual information, liaison with families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, parents tutoring in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other initiatives mentioned by only one school each included:

Decile 8 - parent links, students encouraged to be involved in the whole school
Decile 6 – students of the same L1 are grouped together in classes, trips and introduction to NZ lifestyle

Decile 5 – Numeracy initiative

Decile 2 – Ethnic speech competitions, Piloting the Home/School Partnership programme, ran Parents as First Educators Seminar, Safe School Programme

Decile 1 – Pathways to Qualifications programme, AIMHI work on assessment, Samoan Social worker in school, multilevel class placements

One of the schools in the interview sample was involved in ABeL - Assessment for Better Learning.

5.6.4 School qualifications

Eight schools that were verified in 2002 were reported to have funded NESB students doing NCEA literacy credits in Year 11, and in most of the schools in the interview sample NESB students were doing NCEA literacy credits.

Schools where interviews were conducted seemed to be equally divided on whether or not there was enough choice of literacy credits suitable for funded NESB students. ESOL students were making up their NCEA required literacy credits from English, Communication, and ESOL unit standards – for example,

ESOL u/s 17143: Complete complex forms using ESOL

Communication u/s 10792: Write letters

Communication u/s 3503: Participate in a team or group to complete routine tasks

English u/s 8808: Read an inclusive range of written texts and record answers

English u/s 8811: Collect information using a range of oral, written and visual sources and methods

English u/s 8812: Produce transactional written text in simple forms.

A number of schools were critical of the ESOL Unit Standards, and said they were inappropriately limited to tasks which are too simple for students who were trying to improve their language competency to
function successfully in mainstream curriculum areas in the senior school.

One school similarly said that although they were doing the communication unit on writing letters, students found it irrelevant and an unwelcome diversion from academic English and curriculum support.

One low decile school found that their mixed year 11 English class (of funded and unfunded NESB students, IFPs and and some low achieving students) was not able to keep up with the year 11 schedule of assessments for NCEA. They had stopped doing NCEA English and had switched to one Unit Standard on preparing CVs and the Certificate in Practical English. This had become their syllabus for the rest of the year.

One verified school, and one school in the interview sample reported that the school was involved in Pathways to Qualifications.

Twenty four verified schools had IELTS (see footnote 19) classes, and 2 others offered some support. IELTS classes were mentioned for only 3 of the 13 low decile (1-3) schools, versus 11 of the 15 high decile (8-10) schools, reflecting the predominance of IFP students in the high decile schools. One school in the interview sample reported that a small number of NESB funded students had chosen to attend IELTS classes. This school also commented that there was a likelihood that some restricted courses at New Zealand universities would require IELTS or Bursary English as a pre-requisite for selection.

5.7 Are these programmes based on what has been established in the existing research as good practice?

5.7.1.1 Primary and intermediate Schools

In the primary sector particularly there are a variety of approaches taken to providing programmes for NESB students as seen in section 5.4. This can be beneficial in that students are exposed to a wide variety of different methods and techniques. No one approach can provide for all the objective and subjective needs that students have, and research remains equivocal about what is most effective at the level of approach.

However, while these programmes in themselves are based on sound principles they do not represent an integrated and comprehensive approach for students needing to both develop their second language proficiency and other aspects of literacy. The following appear to be the reasons for this.
• The fact that most schools use funding for withdrawal sessions makes it more difficult to work with reference to the mainstream curriculum

• The fact that these sessions are limited in time makes it difficult to exploit language in a way that integrates all skills

• The fact that neither the classroom teacher nor the teacher working in the withdrawal sessions has a common point of reference such as guidelines for NESB students makes it difficult to provide a programme that is comprehensive.

It should be noted that the decision to withdraw students is possibly the best decision given the level of funding available. However schools may need to re-think the way they programme the withdrawal sessions. The need for guidelines for teachers to follow is something that falls outside the scope of the current funding provisions and would require additional funding.

5.7.1.2 Secondary schools

One secondary school described their approach to ESOL in the following terms:

*The main process is acquisition of the second language by participation in the mainstream and in ESOL classes, but we support this with some consciously directed learning.*

The two lessons observed that day were “consciously directed learning” of past tense, and questions. Both classes were working on exercises from language learning textbooks, but there was also a high level of focussed interaction with peers and with the teacher, plus supporting explanations by the teacher built up on the board during explanation and discussion of items.

Lessons of this type are in line with research supporting a focus on form, and forms, in an interactive, negotiated context. In the particular way this is done, they conform to Ellis’s (2002) recommendation that focus on form should be explicit and parallel to communicative use rather than embedded in it, and that it should take place only with learners who have already learned basic communication in English. (See section 2.7.11 for a discussion of approaches to developing grammar.)

What was not observed was whether the mainstream classes offered a supportive context for language acquisition, which is an essential part of the model the school proposed. However, a physics teacher who had done LTL training, and who had a Year 13 class (with more than 50% NESB
students, most of whom are IFP students) said she tended to assist comprehension by working “piece-wise”. In the course of one lesson, she would have 3 segments of short explanation on the board, each followed by student work on a problem, during which time she worked individually with students and was able to spot who was lost.

This process can be interpreted in the following way. The teacher arranges frequent checks so that she is able to adjust the input, and interact with learners individually over it. This represents the type of context which research has shown is good for acquisition.

She said this process could, however, frustrate really bright students and she would just tell them to go ahead. A similar situation was observed in another school in a senior maths class where one NESB student was looking at his textbook but did not appear to be working on any problem, unlike the rest of the class. The teacher spent quite some time circulating around groups and individuals, working with them, but did not interact in any way with this student. When asked about the student, the teacher said that he was the top student in the class and he read the textbook and worked through problems in his head.

In the situations these teachers described, the ‘top’ student, and the ‘bright’ students, are left or directed to teach themselves with the aid of their textbooks. Such situations seem to raise issues for gifted students (whether NESB or not) when classes are adjusted to a slower pace which is less suited to their needs, and they also receive less individual teacher input and interaction.

Teachers in other schools described the ESOL learning as being mainly provided in ESOL classes with some support for mainstream curriculum tasks. All ESOL departments had designed their own programmes, primarily with a skills and vocabulary focus. As a result the language content was rarely fully addressed, and tended to be based on intuitive needs identification, rather than a full needs analysis in relation to curriculum and personal needs.

Teachers were aware of the lack of system in ESOL provision generally and many of them said that some form of national ESOL curriculum or proficiency guidelines, plus associated resources were needed.

Teasdale and Leung represent the teaching of ESOL in schools as having “weak instructional discourse, i.e. lack of teaching materials, a specific methodology and so forth” (2000, p.175). While not explicitly naming Britain, Australasia, and North America, they imply that these countries are within the scope of their criticism. The term ‘weak’ is not a
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24 Tudor (1996, p.130) defines these as the BANA countries, distinguished from the rest of the world in terms of curricula and approaches to teaching English language.
particularly appropriate judgement, but it could be concluded that the lack of specificity of instructional discourse, teaching methods and methodology is an important issue.

5.8 To what extent do the programmes reflect principles related to good literacy practice?

Literacy and ESOL are not best conceptualised in opposition to each other. Rather, the relationship between them is best represented as a cline, or an overlap.

5.8.1.1 Primary and intermediate schools

In primary and intermediate schools, programmes that focus on oral language and shared language experiences provide a sound basis for literacy.

Other more remedial reading-based activities and approaches such as Reading Recovery, work with letter sound relationship and other skills address the need for some children who need more specific instruction in these areas.

The approaches to reading observed and recorded are various. To truly assess the degree to which they reflect good literacy practice would require an in-depth analysis of how these programmes and activities complemented what was happening in classrooms. There is an indication that some schools provide what we would want to see: positive and rich extensive reading experiences; comprehension based programmes that operated to extend children’s understanding of more than just the literal level of text; tutor reading programmes not only with other children, but also with parents, to facilitate the match between how reading occurs in school and how it could occur in the home; and programmes that worked with developmentally appropriate reading texts such as those generated by students themselves.

Primary and intermediate teachers when interviewed on views about the relationship between ESOL and literacy, expressed the view that ESOL is broader than literacy. This is because when students first come to the school, the need to help them become aware of the school practices and routines is an immense task. The teachers see that they need a great deal of contextual knowledge about the children in order to help them do this. Pastoral care issues are perceived to be much greater for NESB students. This is particularly so for refugee students who have had little in the way of experiences with formal education. In fact, one teacher mentioned that
the funding for NESB students was not sufficient to support the time she gave to pastoral care issues in her medium decile school with 25 NESB students.

An ESOL teacher in an intermediate school that has been involved in a large scale school based literacy initiative since 1999, believes that ESOL students need to be targetted for their needs, as do students requiring help with literacy. If NESB students are not distinguished from low level readers they may be placed in inappropriate groups. In her school, NESB students are not included in reading groups which are run as part of the Literacy Initiative because the NESB students cannot participate fully in the discussions; they need special vocabulary help; and they are faster learners.

In essence this captures the important differences in literacy and ESOL provisions, and the relative strengths and weaknesses of students in such programmes. This also highlights a prevailing view of literacy provisions as being ‘remedial’.

5.8.1.2 Secondary schools

One low decile school with a primarily Pasifika population expressed the view that literacy and ESOL provision “shade off into each other”, and that ESOL provision should be a part of the literacy focus the whole school needs. This school considers that many of the students in school who were not funded or are no longer funded are not confident or successful in using English academically, and their needs are not significantly different from the funded students.

Other schools referred to the problem of students who had exhausted their funding entitlement without achieving a level where they could operate independently and make good progress in the mainstream. However, they all considered it important to differentiate ESOL provision from the literacy needs of students in the school, and regarded the targetted funding as essential for those students eligible for it.

One HOD ESOL in a decile 3 school with a 33% Pasifika population said that the school had a major focus on literacy for the past 2 years, with an hour per week of whole staff professional development. She felt that ESOL provision should be linked with literacy initiatives, but kept separate because it required different approaches and methodology.

A teacher from a decile 2 school, with a predominantly Pasifika population, said the targetted ESOL funding is very important in their school. The extra support it provides enables some students to make huge progress. She cited the case of a student who had arrived reading at a 7 year old level, and after 18 months was coping well in year 11 with
continued funded ESOL support. She did not feel that a generalised literacy programme would target that student’s needs accurately.

One teacher commented that literacy had the flavour of a programme for students who had failed to make expected progress with written language in the first instance. She said that many funded NESB students had no difficulties with literacy at all and had good skills in written language which helped them to learn English as a second language.

In summary, the view of teachers and Principals interviewed is that there is considerable overlap between the focus of a school’s literacy strategy and the focus of ESOL provision. However, this overlap is not complete, and there are differences which make it essential that both of them are to some extent separately addressed. This echoes the discussion in section 2.4 of the literature review.

In secondary schools, the best literacy practice would probably be strongly integrated language across the curriculum and ESOL programmes, with a focus on form and meaning in written language. Some schools in the sample had this as a goal, but had organisational difficulties with cross curricular links, and/or there was a lack of expertise across the school in working with form and meaning in written text.

5.9 **What critical factors make the programme/support effective?**

In the initial set of research questions the above was accompanied by the question: How effective are the ESOL programmes / support the school provides for these students? It is not possible to assess the effectiveness of ESOL programmes and/or support offered by the schools from this study (see Lynch, 1996, for a full account of how language programme evaluation can be properly undertaken). A diversity of variables related to the individual students, their home and communities, and other aspects of their context can account for developing, or not developing language proficiency. The measurement of that proficiency is itself complex, and not fully realised in schools at the present time (see sections 2.8 and 5.1). Therefore we restrict our discussion here to features of the schools and programmes offered, which are identified in the literature as critical to programme effectiveness.

In every one of the areas discussed below in this section on critical factors in programme effectiveness, there would ideally be thorough research projects undertaken and followed through to implement any changes needed.
First, we consider the views of teachers with respect to this question.

Two secondary school ESOL teachers expressed their views on the relative importance of factors that make for successful ESOL learning. One Decile 2 school with primarily Pasifika students gave the following factors: student personality and motivation; student confidence that they can succeed in learning. They also expressed the view that the main school contribution is to put them in a position to be able to succeed. A Decile 9 school with a refugee and Asian NESB population had similar views about the importance of the student characteristics: level of English on arrival; their own personal amount of work; availability of appropriate courses in the school; expertise of teachers; and resources.

A number of other schools mentioned the range of individual differences in NESB learners, and the very different rates at which they learn. Some of them expressed this in terms of their similarity to the whole school population – that NESB students show the same range of differences as any other group of students.

The main factors which staff interviewed in primary, intermediate and secondary schools thought were important in relation to the effectiveness of their programmes were the following:

- being able to identify student needs and student competencies accurately
- being able to plan a programme to address those needs and extend competencies
- having qualified and experienced staff with adequate knowledge and skills in teaching and language teaching
- having enough staff time to cover all areas of need
- having suitable resources
- being able to track student progress, and changing needs
- being able to integrate second language learning with other curriculum learning
- being able to put a planned programme into effect, within the constraints of the school environment
- having management support for effective programmes
- being able to add to knowledge and skills regularly.
One secondary Principal said that ESOL now had much more status in the school, and was a full Department, with all the associated recognition and expectations of professional skills. This was a change from a previously more marginal position, and it had come about largely as a result of the presence of substantial numbers of IFP students in the school.

A teacher in another secondary school commented that only those teachers who had, in addition to qualifications, experience in a Language School, were fully competent to plan programmes.

In primary schools, where teaching is not organised by subject taught, ESOL provision is also seen as an important area requiring professional expertise.

The Deputy Principal and a class teacher in one primary school gave the following factors contributing to effective programmes, in addition to the management roles of the Deputy Principal.

- Having a specialist trained ESOL teacher is paramount – it is worth every dollar
- Having basic resources
- Having experienced adaptable class teachers – it is a deliberate school policy to attract teachers like this. Applicants have very long interviews and are always asked in detail about teaching NESB students.

Corson (1990, pp.258-275) sets out the areas which a school might need to consider in developing a Language Policy across the Curriculum. This provides a checklist for what factors may be critical to the success of language programmes. The main headings he uses are:

A The organisation and management of the school

Staffing matters
Policy making, records and evaluation
The community
Minority students
- Teacher and school attitudes to minority languages
- Avoiding racial discrimination
- Approaches to the cultural characteristics of minority groups
- Withdrawal of minority groups
- Groupings of minority students for instruction
- Bilingualism and first language maintenance
Second language teaching
- Resources and materials for second language teaching
- The place of first and second languages
- Provision for second language support

**B Teacher approaches to language use**

Attitudes and awareness

**C The curriculum**

Pedagogy
Curriculum content
Evaluation and assessment

There are another 34 sub-headings, but only those under Minority Students and Second Language Teaching are shown. Corson says (p.258) that in the early stages of policy making any school would have to select the most relevant areas for attention. Nevertheless his headings show the large number of factors which may affect programme effectiveness. In the following sections we discuss a number of these areas.

**5.9.1 The inclusive school**

The teacher views discussed above do not mention a number of factors which are given prominence in Kennedy and Dewar (1997) and the *NESB Handbook for Schools* (Ministry of Education, 1999a). These are summarised under the chapter heading ‘The Inclusive School’ in the *Handbook*. Factors listed there are:

- Acknowledging and valuing cultural diversity
- Representing community diversity
- Involving the community in school life
- Building trust in relationship with parents.

All schools where interviews were conducted had, in their own ways, a focus on acknowledging and valuing cultural diversity within the school, and the ESOL staff often played an important role in this. Most schools mentioned the other three factors in various ways. However, most schools still found it a challenge to involve the community and all parents fully. For example, one school with considerable special needs expertise, a broad conception of special needs, and a policy of developing its multicultural links, was considering developing IEPs for NESB...
students as is done for other students with special needs. However, the teacher reported that they would probably not involve the parents (which is always done for special needs students) as communication with NESB parents is too difficult. Many staff referred to strategies they used, or programmes the school ran, to try to be more inclusive.

Haddock (2001, p.4) points out that community groups for schools to create links with “do not appear out of thin air, and there is little assistance available to encourage the initial development of these groups”. Many NESB students come from families and communities with low incomes. They frequently do not have the time or resources to be engaged in voluntary community activities. Even if they have the time, it may be too difficult or dangerous to go to evening meetings. Communities may need financial and other support to set up focus points which can be points of contact with schools.

In spite of the difficulties in fully involving the community, schools incorporated these factors to the best of their ability in how they approached the education of NESB students, and they often featured strongly in school information and policies.

One of the schools in the interview sample was complimented in its ERO report on good relations with its community, a large part of which is Samoan and Tongan, and also Māori.

Although these factors in effective programmes will not be discussed further, they should be kept in mind as established principles, still in the process of being implemented. One of the schools in the sample employed a home/school liaison person, who is also the principal ESOL teacher and bilingual support person and homework centre organiser. At least two of the schools are involved in the Home-School Partnership Programme, and among the other initiatives described in section 5.5.3, a number relate to community and parent links.

5.9.2 Quantity of English language input

The quantity of language input that learners from language backgrounds other than English, are exposed to is critical in providing them with models of language at all levels: grammatical, lexical and discourse. As Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000, p.24) explain, “The acquisition process can go awry when the conditions for language learning are not met, especially when learners greatly outnumber people who know the language well enough to support acquisition, as in schools and classrooms with high populations of English language learners”.

Input should be considered both within the classroom and in the general school environment. One indication of the quantity of English language
input is the composition of the school. Assuming that those children classified as Pākehā children are native speakers of English, we can assess the quality of input by examining the ratio of Pākehā children in schools to others.

The ratio of Pākehā children in schools is a particularly important consideration in Auckland schools. Over all schools in the Auckland Region, the percentage of Pākehā students is only 50%, whereas in the Canterbury Region it is 82%. This is typical of the South Island. North Island Regions other than Auckland fall between Auckland and the South Island in the percentages of Pākehā students (see School Statistics, [www.minedu.govt.nz](http://www.minedu.govt.nz)).

The following table compares the ratios of the verified primary schools in two regions: North and South (the schools are primarily in Auckland and Christchurch).

**Table 17: Average percentage of primary school student population who are Pākehā in verified school sample in two regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Northern Region</th>
<th>Southern Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>average % Pākehā students (number of verified schools in the sample)</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>average % Pākehā students (number of verified schools in the sample)</td>
<td>48 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>average % Pākehā students (number of verified schools in the sample)</td>
<td>64 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Table 17 indicate that there are differences both in different decile schools and in different areas with respect to the quantity of English we can assume children are exposed to both within the classroom in interactions with peers and outside of the classroom.

When schools have virtually all their students from NES backgrounds, and when most of the students are below average in literacy achievement, as is sometimes the case, the quantity and quality of English language input may not be ideal for language acquisition. In these cases, it would seem that the role of ESOL classes and programmes
in providing language input for learning in both an extensive and focused way is particularly important.

5.9.3 School management that enhances ESOL programmes

The relationship between senior management team, teachers, and teacher aides is an important factor in good programmes. Interviewed teachers regularly commented on the difference it made to them if the senior management were interested and supportive.

Teachers were also positive when they worked in schools where they were to some extent autonomous to make decisions. An unusual extreme case was where a Board of Trustees needed to be consulted for the spending of small sums of money on resources.

Teacher aides who were involved in professional development were enthusiastic and described as effective by the teachers. It was also important that they had opportunities to talk to the ESOL coordinator. One Teacher Aide commented on effective and clear lines of communication currently operating in her school from senior management to the senior teacher, the ESOL teacher and her. She said that this contributed greatly to the success of their programme.

A related factor which requires management support is the timetabling of meetings for teams of staff working with NESB students. One intermediate school had the ESOL Coordinator (who was employed as such on a fulltime basis) meet with teacher aides involved in the programme every morning for a brief meeting before school.

5.9.4 Teacher expertise in the provision of first language support

Of the interviewed schools, fewer than half reported that they had bilingual staff available to work regularly with NESB students, and then only for one or two languages. A teacher from one of these schools said that the bilingual assistants were essential to the students’ success, but that the school had limited funding available to employ them.

As well as any funding constraints, there are various difficulties in the way of bilingual teaching provision in New Zealand. Individual schools in New Zealand mentioned that it is hard to find suitable people to work as bilingual teachers or aides. An ideal arrangement might be for a cluster of schools to share one such teacher, but it would be difficult for schools themselves to organize a peripatetic sharing arrangement. Little pre-service training or professional development is available for teachers or teacher aides in bilingual strategies, although there are new initiatives in
this area in 2002. In addition, there is little agreement that teacher aides are the best way of providing for NESB students, and often not a lot of confidence in how to make their role useful and well integrated into the school’s programmes. Many of the bilingual staff who are employed in schools are teacher aides rather than teachers because there is an even greater shortage of bilingual teachers.

5.9.5 Teacher expertise in working with NESB students

New Zealand teachers of NESB students have available to them and are expected to take account of various guidelines and recommendations for good practice. The more general of these are discussed above in relation to the National Curriculum Framework (section 2.2 Language Policy). The more specific are contained in the NESB Handbook and Assessment Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1999a & 1999b).

In Kennedy and Dewar (1997) there are a number of findings on pages 3 – 7 which describe what were perceived by the teachers in their study to be important requirements for effective programmes for NESB students. Most of these relate as much to any other learning area as to ESOL, and many relate to the expectation that most NESB students and families will have less familiarity and possibly a less easy relationship with New Zealand schools than the average Pākehā student. Many of the requirements are similar to those suggested elsewhere for the education of Māori and Pasifika students, whose L1 is English, but whose cultural background is considered to be somewhat different from the experiences and expectations of most schools and teachers.

NESB Students: A Handbook for Schools (Ministry of Education, 1999a) is much more specific. It suggests in detail how the individual student’s background and situation is to be ascertained and taken account of in teaching. It gives specific guidance on the range of differences to be expected between NESB learners, the qualities of a good language learning environment, and what expectations should be held for NESB learners.

It also gives specific guidance and suggestions on the inclusive school, school policies and procedures, assessment, programmes and strategies, mainstream class programmes, professional development, and resources. There are examples of how various schools have developed programmes and procedures.

However, the difficulty of putting these guidelines into practice should not be underestimated. Two recent reports on a longitudinal study of young English language learners in Canadian public schools, give new insights into factors in working with NESB children that teachers need to take account of (Norton and Toohey, 2001; Toohey 2001). Three learners
discussed had different opportunities to engage in interaction and language learning in their schools as a result of how they managed to position themselves as social individuals in the classroom. Two of them, from initially somewhat marginalised positions as “ESL learner” and “ESL immigrant”, managed to reposition themselves with more desirable and powerful identities offering improved possibilities for shared interaction with the other students. The third, an Indian girl about whom some children made racist observations, was often defeated in disputes and marginalised, with reduced opportunities for participation in peer interaction.

It has been shown that teachers may contribute to these exclusions, probably unwittingly. V. Edwards (1999, p. 214) reports that in four multilingual classes of five and six year olds in England, teachers initiated fewer interactions with black than with white children and had fewer extended exchanges. Very carefully focussed teacher and school intervention is required to change these kinds of patterns.

Alton-Lee’s (2002, p.2) first and second characteristics of quality teaching take on particular importance with these findings in mind. These are that “quality teaching is focussed on student achievement (including social outcomes) and facilitates high standards of student outcomes for heterogeneous groups of students”, and that “pedagogical practices enable classes and other learning groupings to work as caring, inclusive, and cohesive learning communities” (see Appendix 3).

Schools certainly take seriously the responsibility to work well with NESB students, and have policies and some procedures which address this. The experience of the SEMO project shows that there are many challenges for schools in working in the best ways with all NESB students (Robinson et al, 2000, p. 131), as do the PISA results (section 1.7).

5.9.6 Expertise in planning a programme

Expertise in ESOL programme planning is very variable between teachers and schools. A minimum ‘good practice’ professional requirement for ESOL programme planning in a school is a formal tertiary qualification in TESOL. Many teachers responsible for planning programmes have no formal qualification, and varying amounts of specialist experience, and other professional development.

ESOL staff are in a demanding situation with a highly variable student population to plan for, and many organisational constraints. In addition, they have little guidance on programme planning, or syllabus.
The *NESB Handbook for Schools* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) provides the main source of guidance, but most of it relates to the teaching context – who does what with whom and for how long. The most specific advice there in terms of language learning is of the following type:

- each student has an English book where new vocabulary is recorded...(p.46)
- the aim is to improve their oral and written English...(p.46)
- improve their general use of English Language in a science context...(p.51).

Teachers interviewed for the present research study seemed to have a good understanding about what to do, or what would be desirable on the level of organization and context, but many seemed to lack more specific understanding of how to develop a language learning programme in terms of what language is to be covered, and what teaching and learning strategies can be utilized to make this happen, and how to assess learning for formative and summative purposes.

Many programmes that are in place for students do not reflect a broad and comprehensive view of language proficiency, and integration of language learning across the curriculum is understood as a priority, but not often fully developed. The expertise needed in this area is discussed in the next section.

Many programmes in the New Zealand schools in the interview sample are needs based only in a reactive sense that problems or lacks are dealt with as they arise or are noticed. A ‘good practice’ professional programme has at least a model or checklist of specific competencies required by the student. In this way they can be monitored whether they arise spontaneously or not.

Some of the schools in the sample (about 25-30%) do make reference to models of language, or models of language development when planning interventions for NESB students, and have programmes to address these.

For example, one teacher (Deputy Principal in charge of ESOL/Literacy) is currently doing a post graduate qualification in TESOL and has become aware that in ESOL provision the knowledge base for language analysis is hugely important. As a result she is reassessing the school’s programme and resource buying in this light, and is arranging to address the need to notice and target structural features through her school’s professional development programme.
Another school with a highly qualified Deputy Principal already had such measures in place, as well as a range of other aspects to the ESOL programme, and excellent student assessment and tracking.

Several schools had good writing programmes organised around genres or text types. They used grids of information to structure what could occur in each genre. Students worked on identifying the items in texts, individually and through group and class discussion, and proceeded to generate their own texts. The schools had a considerable amount of material to support the programmes.

The comments of one HOD ESOL in a secondary school suggest something of the range of expertise needed. She said that if new staff came into the Department with a degree, Teacher Training and ESOL training, they were still not capable of planning and developing an ESOL programme. She said that only teachers who already had experience working with intensive language programmes, in a language school, for example, were able to do this. She also said that in spite of her own expertise of this kind, she needed help in relating ESOL work with NZQA unit standards to the English Curriculum. Her experience suggests that the ability to plan fully professional ESOL programmes, plus the ability to work professionally with the National Curriculum, is not a commonly found set of skills.

In summary, the amount of expertise required for good ESOL programme planning is very high, and although some teachers have this, there is not enough expertise across the school sector, and not enough support for those who lack expertise.

5.9.7 **Expertise in teaching a programme**

The lack of expertise in programme planning discussed above often appeared to be reflected in a lack of expertise in teaching ESOL. However, this comment is no more than impressionistic as it is based on informal observations in around 30 classes.

The literature review (section 2.5 above) sets out the need for extensive language learning opportunities, interacting (especially with a teacher) on meaningful material, plus focussed instruction on language.

At least 50% of what was observed could not be described in this manner. Many of the programmes and classes were not working with highly meaningful materials, and the levels of interaction were low in many classes. Primary school ESOL classes are often reading-focused, using a stand alone text, which is not used as a precursor to curriculum content nor as a reinforcement of oral language dealing with curriculum content. There may be little interaction over the meaning of the text, and
little or no extension of the text into other activities. Frequently, students complete worksheets independently.

The same kind of reading was also observed in ESOL classes in secondary schools. Some ESOL teachers observed made considerable use of getting students to read out loud, without clear strategies for developing comprehension through even simple information transfer activities, and without having clear procedures for using the reading aloud to improve pronunciation. Students were seated in rows, and working as a whole class, thus preventing effective student-student interaction.

Other much more focussed and engaging classes were also observed. Even in the absence of a well planned programme, good teaching can provide students with excellent opportunities for acquisition of language. It was disappointing to see that so many classes were not getting these opportunities.

As discussed in 2.5 above, NESB students have to be learning language across the whole school day, and this must be considered part of their programme. Expertise in language teaching across the curriculum and throughout the mainstream is therefore essential. Consistent support for this has not been available to schools or within schools. The amount of support needed can hardly be overestimated. A survey in Britain of 150 newly qualified teachers (with a 49% response rate) showed that only 8% felt confident in their own knowledge about language on entering the profession, and 86% had received less than 5 hours input in their training programme designed to develop their knowledge and skills in working with pupils learning EAL (Edwards, J., 1999, p. 248).

Cameron (1999, p.176) reports on a two year intensive teacher education project with mainstream curriculum area teachers in English secondary schools. At the end of one year of intensive focus on language and classroom interaction, the teachers were enthusiastic but still found it took a long time to plan lessons with language development in mind. Cameron concludes (p. 178) that because of the size of the task of teacher education we may have to accept less than adequate expertise in mainstream teachers, but asks “how will this lack of language-sensitive expertise be compensated for in mainstream secondary schools?”

Cameron (1999, p.178) also makes a very important point, which is alluded to above in section 5.6.

A further assumption increasingly voiced over the last few years, is that, if classroom language is adjusted to be helpful to EAL development, this will be helpful to all pupils. I suggest this sounds dangerously simplistic, and that it should not be assumed, but researched. If teacher use of language is dynamic and sensitive to pupils at different stages in their additional language development, then it is unlikely that a single set of
adjustments would improve matters for all first language pupils, who themselves come into the classroom with differing language skills and experiences.

The mainstream teachers observed in our study made efforts to adjust their language to the needs of the NESB students, but did not use a wide range of teaching techniques to enhance comprehension or output. What was observed in these classes matched the findings of a small study of 12 mainstream classes, each with some NESB students, in a New Zealand secondary school (Keum & Lewis, 2000, p.5). The main activities in 12 Year 12 classes were in order of frequency – following spoken explanations, answering oral questions, following spoken instructions, completing worksheets, notetaking from teacher talk, correcting work by listening. All other types of activities occurred only once each. This does not represent an ideal language learning context.

One New Zealand survey of secondary mainstream teachers’ views of NESB students showed that a number of teachers in Hamilton thought NESB students took up a lot of class and teacher time (Barnard et al, 2001). Over 70% of them felt that some withdrawal from their classes was necessary, and only about 20% thought that more time to adapt the assignments or lessons, or have materials prepared by the ESOL teacher would be helpful. A later study (Cameron and Simpson, 2002, p.22) found that Auckland teachers, with greater numbers of NESB students, and more professional development experiences, were more skilled and comfortable with them than Hamilton teachers.

There is a need for development of ESOL and mainstream teacher expertise in teaching NESB students’ programmes, and for research and development over the school sector.

5.9.8 Expertise in assessing students

Teachers and schools keep thorough records of students’ progress in ESOL courses, but these assessments are often based on limited objectives or programmes. In addition the various purposes of assessment are not always clearly distinguished, nor are suitable measures always available to be used for the different purposes. (See the discussion above in sections 5.1 and 5.2.) Schools expressed the need for better tools for ESOL assessment.

Schools are just beginning to develop systematic, ongoing records of NESB student achievement. Mostly this is in schools which have been involved in whole school initiatives in relation to assessment and achievement. Ideally, explicit links should be created between national initiatives for better assessment, and ESOL provision and assessment.
5.9.9 Teacher qualifications and professional development

A number of avenues for teacher development were being followed in the schools in the sample and also recorded in the verification reports.

Traditionally teacher development is presented to teachers and they are magically supposed to implement it (Flores et al., 1998, p.34). Flores et al. propose that teacher development go further than presentation to include demonstration, observation and coaching. They suggest the inclusion of study groups in schools, but there is always the problem of sustainability. A number of schools in this study had been on a NESB contract in the past, but in areas of high staff turnover the skills gained to the school are lost and it is as if the contract never occurred. No doubt the individual teachers have taken their skills with them elsewhere, but the whole-school aspect of the development can disappear if key staff move, and they may not be in a position to implement the same initiatives in a new school.

Although there are cluster groups in existence which support professional development in groups of schools, none of the schools in the interview sample reported being currently involved in such arrangements. There seemed to be surprisingly little in the way of inter-school communication and sharing. The main avenue for this for ESOL teachers is through TESOLANZ participation.

5.9.9.1 Primary and intermediate school staff ESOL qualifications

The verified sample suggests that not a large number of teachers are involved in gaining qualifications. However this data may not report all cases of teachers engaged in further study related to ESOL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage or nature of qualification</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With ESOL (or equivalent) Diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ESOL papers as part of Diploma</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With certificate level qualifications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unspecified ESOL qualifications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual ESOL staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Primary and intermediate school ESOL staff reported qualifications from verified schools sample (n=142)
Schools in the verified sample did not indicate how many of their teachers were bilingual. However bilingual teacher aides are reported as being used in a small number of schools for ESOL programmes (as distinct from true bilingual provision in the case of one Auckland primary school). It may be that schools have bilingual teachers and teacher aides but that their language background does not necessarily match those of the NESB students, and therefore this is not reported as an asset. If the schools in the sample provide an indication of the percentage which have multicultural staff in either teacher or teacher aide positions, it seems that low decile schools in particular have a rich and diverse range of staff.

With respect to school support for professional development, an interesting contrast lies in Principals’ attitudes and expectations of staff. In a number of schools, the principals expected high levels of professionalism from teachers. They actively encourage teachers to gain qualifications and support this through paying course fees and if necessary releasing teachers. This manifests itself in a number of ways: the discourse of the school and the staff room, the numbers of teachers involved in professional development, the numbers of and commitment to contracts undertaken by the school.

A very small number of schools expressed views such as those of one Principal:

\[
\text{I don’t expect my teachers to do extra courses after school because they’re already so involved in things like sport on Saturday morning.}
\]

In a small number of the schools in the sample teacher aides were engaged in taking a professional development course. In one primary school with a relatively small number of NESB children, the teacher aide felt that this was an important source of support for her, in what she perceived to be an isolated context. She had recently been admitted into the Cert TEAL course.

5.9.9.2 Secondary school staff ESOL qualifications

Some information was contained in the verification reports about the number of staff involved in ESOL programmes, and their TESOL qualifications.

The information in the reports was not consistent – in some cases the actual qualification was reported, in other cases only that there was a qualification of some kind, and in other cases no information. When there is no information, it cannot be assumed that the teachers have no TESOL qualification – only that none was mentioned. Similarly, in some
cases it was mentioned that staff were bilingual, but some may have been so without this information being reported.

Some information about staff was given for 44 out of 46 schools and, within the limits of what was recorded, Table 19 below shows approximate numbers of teachers and teacher aides or assistants involved in ESOL support and their known qualifications. Even the teacher numbers are not exact as in some cases “several” teachers were recorded.

One school mentioned that ESOL teachers attend a local ESOL cluster group, and two schools reported that ESOL staff were involved in local and national TESOLANZ activities.

Table 19: Percentage (and numbers) of Secondary ESOL staff reported qualifications from a sample of verified secondary schools (n=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching staff</th>
<th>Percentage of ESOL teachers and HODs with ESOL qualifications</th>
<th>45 (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of ESOL teachers and HODs studying for ESOL qualifications</td>
<td>4.5 (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of teacher aides/assistants with, or studying for ESOL qualifications</td>
<td>19 (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of all ESOL staff who are bilingual</td>
<td>10 (n=17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table above covers those staff employed specifically on ESOL programmes, but does not include the 8 mainstream teachers with ESOL qualifications and the 4 mainstream bilingual staff with ESOL qualifications.

Tentatively, on the basis of the information in the verification reports, we can say the following:

- Approximately half of the ESOL teaching staff in the verified secondary schools have qualifications. However, some of these qualifications are relatively short courses such as the RSA or Cambridge Certificates in English Language Teaching

- Teachers predominate in secondary ESOL teaching, with teacher aides (most of whom are unqualified in ESOL) making up only about 20% of the teaching staff. Some of the teachers, and many of the teacher aides, are employed part time, but precise details are not available in the verification reports
• Given the complexity of the language development needs and context in secondary schools, the level of specialist ESOL qualifications is low at less than 50%

• Only about 10% of teaching staff are bilingual – most of these are teacher aides.

The 2001 Ministry of Education Census of Secondary Teachers paints a more encouraging picture but the figures are difficult to interpret. 501 teachers reported that they taught ESOL in years 9-13. 82 did not report their qualifications. Of the remaining 419, only 14% said they had no qualifications in ESOL. However, the largest group of teachers (38%) reported they had first year university ESOL qualifications or equivalent. They may be referring to a single linguistics paper or something of that nature, since ESOL teaching papers are not generally taught at that level. It is most likely that only those who reported a National Diploma (13.4%), Other Tertiary Qualifications (14.3%), or Post Graduate (4.8%) should be considered to be fully qualified.

Several schools reported difficulty in getting trained staff and said that advertisements had resulted in no ESOL trained applicants. One secondary school HOD, commenting on staffing difficulties caused by fluctuating numbers of students, said that she worked on a two thirds percentage basis. If the school generally needed about 6 ESOL teachers, then it was safe enough to employ 4 of the 6 on a permanent basis. In her view the way to deal with the shortage of qualified staff is to take on permanent teachers and offer them TESOL training.

5.9.9.3 Whole staff professional development in teaching primary and intermediate NESB students

Successful schools appear to be busy schools. A number of very vital schools are involved in several contracts such as Literacy and Numeracy contracts.

A large number of primary and intermediate schools indicated that they had within the last six years been involved in an NESB contract. Some schools indicated that they had done this twice. Clearly the more recent the experience the more likely it is that there is retention of principles and practices learned on the contract. The importance of sustaining such staff development is highlighted in schools which have had a large turnover of staff during this period. This is particularly true in cases where the ESOL Coordinator leaves and is replaced. It is interesting to note that in at least 20 of the 142 verified primary and intermediate schools the ESOL Coordinator is also the Assistant or Deputy Principal.
One school Deputy Principal was responsible for planning professional development and said that for classroom teachers it was but one of the many competing demands on their time. In this school 50% of the staff were new, having arrived within the last two years, and were also relatively inexperienced (within the first two years of teaching).

One notable example of staff professional development was the TEAM Solutions project for a selected number of intermediate schools. Such a project involving a cluster of schools with a very particular focus would seem to be a good initiative. Another example of a focused initiative is when advisers target particular techniques or methods for development in schools, such as the implementation of the Self Pacing Boxes.

5.9.9.4 Whole staff professional development in teaching secondary NESB students

Information on this was given for 29 out of 46 secondary schools. The main kinds are shown below.

Some schools were involved in more than one kind of relevant whole school professional development. In three cases it was commented that expertise from past professional development had been lost because of staff turnover.

Table 20: Types of NESB related professional development from a sample of verified secondary schools (n=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of professional development</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past, present or future LTL(^{25}) involvement</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMHI/ABEL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved with College of Education contracts and/or working with advisers - currently</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past involvement with Contracts and advisers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school workshops or slots at staff meetings on NESB run by school staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{25}\) LTL – Learning through Language – a professional development programme addressing NESB student needs in the mainstream through a language across the curriculum approach.
Note: * In the sample of 13 schools, two schools have an LTL trainer who takes a new group each year.

If the data from the verification reports reflect the true level of professional development related to ESOL provision and NESB students, it seems to be very scanty. Nearly all these schools had high proportions of NESB students on their rolls, but neither the level of whole school professional development, nor the numbers of ESOL qualified staff are very substantial.

All the schools in the interview sample had at some time been involved either with a Contract or with advisers. One is involved at present in ABeL – Assessment for Better Learning and expected there to be benefits for NESB students from this.

Several of the secondary schools in the sample said that not much had been offered recently as whole school professional development for NESB students, or that the school had opted to be involved in some other area. With many demands for whole school programmes such as Literacy, Numeracy, Information Technology, and programmes to address social or behavioural issues, ESOL teachers said that NESB needs are not often going to be the prime focus for the whole school.

With that in mind, the LTL model of a school facilitator who takes a group of teachers through the programme each year is a very attractive one. This maintains momentum, helps new teachers, and refreshes those who have done LTL some time ago. This approach is capable of preventing major loss of expertise through turnover if the school commits to it for the long term.

The commitment, however, is a problem for schools. One HOD Maths interviewed said that she and a Physics teacher had done LTL training 2 years ago and were supposed to come back and train groups in the school. They had found the LTL course valuable and enjoyable, were involved in ESOL support in the school, and wanted to run the training. However, other commitments in their departments and in the school had intervened and had prevented this from happening.

5.10 Issues related to programmes

The comments below from one school on programmes and planning reflect very common issues raised by teachers in many schools at all levels. The constraints of staff hours, timetabling arrangements, classroom conditions, and changing student needs mean that they are working under difficult conditions for effective programme development.
5.10.1 Withdrawal versus in-class support

One intermediate school teacher commented that they are always struggling to decide which is more effective. Currently they have opted for withdrawal, but they have found that it has to be regular or students do not integrate it into their learning.

They have five new students this term at a low level of English proficiency who have 25 minutes each day one to one with the teacher aide. The ESOL teacher takes small withdrawal groups for writing skills and oral language. However, it is difficult “fighting the timetable”, because the students are withdrawn from different classes and are all missing different things. This also makes it impossible to tie the ESOL work closely to students’ current curriculum work. The link has to be on a more general level. If all the classes in the syndicate were doing the same units at the same time, the ESOL staff would cancel withdrawal sessions and spend all their teaching time on in-class support.

When the ESOL teacher in this school arranges in-class support, she has found that it has to be very tightly organised with the class teacher otherwise there is a lot of down time for the ESOL teacher. It has worked well with debates and preparation, and other teachers reported that it is effective with writing because classes work in small groups and the classroom is relatively quiet. Under normal levels of classroom activity, there can be too much noise to communicate effectively with NESB students. She finds that the following factors make in class support effective: student activity; group work; and the teacher has planned the work with extra staff in mind.

5.10.2 ESOL planning

The ESOL staff in this school say they have to more or less rewrite the ESOL programme every term to fit in with the programme in the school, and current student needs. For example, the teacher aide is now working a lot with 5 new students whose English proficiency is very low, but next term they will probably be able to cut back on that support to some extent, and cover some other needs.

5.10.3 Curriculum: secondary schools

Most secondary schools in the interview sample reported that they wanted Ministry of Education help in developing an ESOL curriculum, and/or ESL proficiency scales, or benchmarks, or profiles of second
language development. Some commented on the unsuitability of referring to lower than typical age levels of the English curriculum to find objectives for NESB students.

In this they are backed up by the approach taken in Victoria, which is to “avoid searching for outcomes at lower levels of the [English] Curriculum and Standards Framework”. (www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/curriculumatwork/esl/es_assess.htm) The ESL Companion provides age and second language appropriate objectives for NESB students. (The issue of appropriate objectives is discussed above in section 2.6.)

In most secondary schools, ESOL classes are regularly scheduled classes against options, all of which have official curricula and supporting material. It is an anomalous situation that large numbers of ESOL teachers and learners are left without curriculum support. It is especially strange to reflect that while the NESB students are in their ESOL classes, their classmates may be just down the corridor studying other languages - French, Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Samoan, Māori – usually at far lower levels of achievement – and all with curricula and supporting material.

Language across the curriculum also needs support. One school reported the need for more mainstream curriculum related resources with a language focus that can be used interactively. An ESOL teacher was working in year 9 and 10 classes alongside the mainstream teacher on pair, group work and interactive learning, involving NESB students and the rest of the class. They found this approach worked well, and wanted to continue working in this way. However, they found themselves limited in this by a shortage of curriculum resources with a language focus designed for this kind of interactive group work.

5.10.4 The role of language in learning

One Principal commented that their previous year’s Dux had been a NESB funded student, and that English language proficiency is not a fully determining factor in academic success. This is a very important point in secondary schools where social and integrative goals in language learning do not play a big role. The important thing for most secondary school teachers is that the students succeed in their curriculum work.

The success or otherwise of the school’s entire programme for the student is likely to be judged in terms of success with the curriculum in chosen areas. English language development itself is not a matter of prime concern, and it is not usually expected that NESB students who arrive in New Zealand during their secondary schooling will reach native-like levels while at school.
5.11 How are schools funding their ESOL programmes?

How are schools spending their ESOL funding? Apart from ESOL funding, how else do schools fund programmes/support for NESB students? Are ESOL funds enabling schools to provide good programmes for funded NESB students?

In spite of increased funding for NESB students since 1995 when Kennedy and Dewar (1997) conducted their research, most schools in our sample still said that more money was needed to be able to cater for NESB students as well as they would like.

The funding situation is complex because schools are nearly always of the opinion that more funding would enable them to provide better education for all students – not only for NESB students. On the other hand, Education Review Office (ERO) reports on schools show differences between schools in how successfully they use the resources they currently have. Taking the best performing schools as an indication of what is possible, it appears that many schools ought to be able to improve their programmes and outcomes without an increase in funds. Although the ERO reports rarely comment in any detail on ESOL provision, the same is probably true in this area, as in whole school performance.

The National Administration Guidelines (see www.minedu.govt.nz) require all schools to develop and implement teaching and learning programmes to “provide all students in years 1 – 10 with opportunities to achieve for success in all the essential learning and skill areas of the New Zealand curriculum...” (NAG 1 i a). Schools are also required “on the basis of good quality assessment information, [to] identify students and groups of students...who are at risk of not achieving, who have special needs, and aspects of the curriculum which require special attention; [and] develop and implement teaching and learning strategies to address the needs of students and aspects of the curriculum identified....” (NAG 1 iii and iv).

Schools are therefore required, within their normal funding, to meet the needs of all students of whatever language, or other, background. This means that if special resources or teaching support are required to address NESB students’ needs this should be provided from the schools’ general resourcing, as part of what schools are required to do. The ESOL funding is therefore only an additional contribution to meeting NESB student needs in schools.

From the interviews, it appears that most schools do direct funding other than ESOL funding to meeting NESB student needs. However, rather
than seeing the responsibility to cater for NESB students needs as a core responsibility to be met from the general budget, with an extra contribution from ESOL funding; schools tend to view the ESOL funding as the basic funding for ESOL provision, with a need to supplement this from the school’s ‘own’ funds because of the inadequacy of the ESOL funding in relation to what they wish to provide for the students.

The views expressed below by schools about funding need to be read with these comments and tensions in mind.

5.11.1.1 Primary and intermediate schools

Most primary and intermediate schools, interviewed and verified, report that ESOL funding goes primarily to staffing. This may be direct, in the form of teacher or teacher aide time, or less direct, and focused into ensuring that class sizes stay small. Some schools try to achieve both.

Schools that can do both are often those who are able to supplement the ESOL funding through other sources such as decile related funding (TFEA)\(^{26}\). They may be low decile schools with large populations of NESB children (these factors result in an economy of scale), and with many teacher aides employed - not exclusively for NESB children. This could occur relatively effortlessly in schools that had a large number of Special Needs programmes, and had extra decile related funding. Teachers or teacher aides were often working in a number of areas, e.g. ESOL and Reading Recovery, which supported NESB students.

In one particular low decile school with a small population the junior teacher determined that smaller classes with in-class support from a teacher aide would be more valuable than any other arrangement.

5.11.1.2 Secondary schools

In secondary schools the ESOL funding, together with other funds the school has (such as the operations budget, International student fees and TFEA) is used to fund extra teachers or teacher aides to provide ESOL programmes and support, and to buy resources. In most cases, schools run programmes whose costs are not entirely covered by the ESOL funding.

---

\(^{26}\) The decile related funding, which schools usually refer to as TFEA, provides $329.88 per student in the lowest decile 1 schools, and this gradually reduces through the deciles to $62.40 in a decile 4 school, and no extra funding in a decile 10 school. (See [www.minedu.govt.nz](http://www.minedu.govt.nz)).
No information was given about funding for 24 of the verified schools, but the remaining 22 schools, and all the interviewed schools, supplement the ESOL funding from the rest of their budget. Eleven of the verified schools did this entirely or partly from fees from International Fee Paying students, as did the seven out of eight interviewed schools which had IFP students.

No teacher entitlement is provided for NESB funded students above the normal entitlement generated by the students’ enrolment in the school. This is generally used to cover the students’ enrolment and participation in their mainstream classes.

By means of what schools often described as ‘cross-subsidising’, all the secondary schools interviewed and verified (where information was provided) had ESOL teachers (or less often teacher aides) employed for .5 or more. Most of them had several ESOL teachers. None of the secondary schools in the interview sample considered the funding sufficient. One Deputy Principal commented that without the IFP students it would be impossible to cater adequately for the funded NESB students because of the relatively small numbers at each year level, and the range of different needs.

Although NESB needs come within the range of individual needs the school must cater for in the normal course of events, the schools tended to put limits on what mainstream teachers and classes can cater for satisfactorily. The ESOL funding cut-off score is generally seen as representing a point at which students can be in a mainstream class full-time without causing difficulty to the class or teacher, but not as a point where the student’s own English language development can be ensured without extra help. The funding is considered inadequate in this respect as well. In other words, the benchmark is considered to be too low, and for some students the cut-off point of three or five years funding is also considered to be inadequate.

Because the factors which affect teachers’ and schools’ ability to cope are quite numerous (see section 5.15) and because only resources and extra staff hours are addressed by the ESOL funding, the funding was generally seen as a source of extra help rather than the main factor in being able to teach NESB students effectively.

One secondary school commented that all their funding (ESOL and IFP) was going into providing ESOL classes (and resources) and it would be ideal to have more so that they could provide more in-class support.

Most schools have a number of initiatives not funded from ESOL funding that they regard as essential to supporting NESB students. One school said that they were running a mentoring system, a homework centre, good class ratios for mainstream and withdrawal, and community liaison activities, all out of general funds. These are time consuming and expensive to provide and they felt that the Ministry of Education should
provide funding (perhaps on the basis of Proposals as with the Innovation Funding) for solutions that schools developed for their own problems and contexts. This school felt that this would be better than ‘pre-determined solutions’ with attached funding.

5.11.2 Presence of International Fee Paying students

At March 2002 there were 60 schools which had more than 50 IFP students. These 60 schools account for 50% of the IFP students in the country. All except 2 are secondary or composite schools and most are in Auckland. (12 are in Christchurch and 3 are in Wellington.) In a number of these schools the IFP students are concentrated in Years 12 and 13 in sufficient numbers to reach or exceed 25% of the students in those years.

Some of these schools also have quite large numbers of NESB funded students throughout the school, but others have very few, or none.

In the secondary schools in the interview sample 6 of the 8 had more IFP students than NESB funded students. Of the verified secondary schools, 61% (28) had more IFP students than NESB funded students.

In the interviews, nearly all the schools said that they did not differentiate between students and treated all students requiring ESOL support equally.

The NESB students can benefit from being in a school with a substantial number of IFP students in various ways.

The larger number of students, and the IFP fees added to the ESOL funding, mean that it is possible to set up classes at all levels. The numbers are often large enough to justify and fund an ESOL homeroom or resource centre that is available to all the students. There may be enough students, especially in the senior school, to set up special ESOL curriculum classes, sometimes with bi-lingual teachers. When the IFP students are from the same L1 background as the NESB funded students, they are able to support each other more through language and friendship.

However, there are also disadvantages for the NESB funded students. Sometimes the schools become very focused on attracting and satisfying IFP students, so that their needs tend to determine the type of support offered. This is particularly likely to happen if IFP students substantially outnumber funded NESB students.

All the schools where interviews were conducted emphasized in our discussions the range of needs of all NESB students from whatever background, and their efforts to cater for these with different kinds of support.
5.12 Issues related to funding

The brief answer to research question 5 about funding is that schools spend their ESOL funding primarily on specialist ESOL staffing, which is directed mostly to small group withdrawal sessions, or timetabled options in secondary schools. In most schools the ESOL funding is supplemented by other funds, and other initiatives. Some schools organise ESOL provision better than others with similar funding. However, based on the findings from this project, it is considered that ideally NESB students’ language learning should be supported to a greater extent than it is at present in New Zealand. It would also seem that not only is extra support in the form of teaching time needed, but also extra resources and other systemic support for teachers and students.

The main issue related to funding is that good ESOL provision and NESB student support across the school cost more than the ESOL funding contribution. As discussed above in section 5.10, schools’ general funding is expected to go some way towards addressing the language needs of NESB students. The questions that have to be addressed are:

1. How much should schools do to support NESB students’ language learning?
2. How much would this cost?
3. What proportion of this should be covered by the schools’ budget other than ESOL funding?

Twenty non-refugee funded NESB students generate $10,000 ESOL funding a year, which is enough to pay about .2 of a teacher, or a teacher aide at up to about half time. If the NESB students are refugees, they generate more ESOL funding, but schools often find that refugee students have extra needs for family support and liaison, learning delays or other learning needs, and behavioural needs. These amounts of funding are not sufficient to provide fully effective ESOL provision. They can only be seen as a contribution. How much support is needed?

As discussed above in section 2, NESB students’ language learning needs to be supported for the whole school day, and beyond, if they are to achieve English language proficiency equal to the national cohort, and perform in curriculum areas to their fullest potential. Specialist ESOL help in small groups is typically provided for NESB students for less than one hour a day. The rest of the time, their progress depends on their own learning strategies (often guided in this by ESOL teachers), and on mainstream teachers being able to address NESB students’ specific
curriculum and language learning needs as well as those of the rest of the class - who may also have a variety of needs. This is an approach of necessity within budgetary constraints, and does not represent the ideal for NESB students.

Sections 2.10 and 5.8, in particular, have tried to set out the complexities of the tasks for teachers and schools in supporting NESB students. It seems unlikely that current levels of support for teachers, teacher skills, and teacher time available per student, are adequate to support the language learning needs of NESB students, even with the ESOL funding contribution. However, this research project is not able to answer fully the first and third questions above, which depend partly on policy and administrative decisions relating to the whole school system.

Nevertheless, data from the interviews and the verification reports do lead us to support strongly the retention of the targeted ESOL funding. For the most part, schools find the assessments and applications for funding not too onerous, and a number of schools even find the processes helpful in focusing their attention on NESB student achievement, and in giving the school feedback on their programmes through the verification visits and reports. Advisers comment positively on the effects of the processes associated with the funding (see section 5.14.5), and we have noted the schools’ efforts to improve their assessment and record keeping in line with the ESOL Assessment Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1999b). With further developments in ESOL assessment, and increased expertise in the schools, there is potential for assessment processes and the verification reports to continue to lead to improvements in ESOL programmes.

One final comment on funding relates to International Student Fees. The extent to which adequate ESOL provision in secondary schools depends on IFP students seems problematic, since it could disappear at any time, and affects the type of support provided. However, NESB students’ needs are not the only area of school activity to be ‘cross subsidised’ by IFP fees. The desirability of maintaining aspects of the national education system from International Student fees is also primarily a policy question.

5.13 Are there any other (English) language needs NESB students have?

Are there any (English) language needs NESB students have that schools have identified that are not being met by the programmes/support currently being provided by the school? If so, what are these language needs?
The schools in the interview sample mostly considered that because of limited funding, their programmes fell short of what is actually needed, and in this sense NESB students had needs that were not being met.

The main area mentioned as needing more support was in-class support in curriculum areas, or a greater ability for ESOL staff to work together with classroom teachers to establish linkages.

A few secondary teachers commented that it was difficult to extend NESB students’ academic language proficiency as far as possible, because students ran out of funding, and because of other day to day demands on teachers and the school.

5.14 ESOL and a bilingual policy

Some of the secondary schools visited had put together a programme of support that approximated to the approach Crandall (1997) considers to be the second most effective (see section 2.4 Bilingual Education Policy) – Late-exit bilingual education + sheltered instruction + second language instruction.

The students are relatively recent arrivals with a full education to that point in their first language, plus some prior learning of English as a Foreign Language. At school here, they receive second language instruction by ESOL teachers, and they are also taught by bilingual teachers in some content areas, who provide some bilingual language use, build on the first language knowledge, and also provide a form of sheltered instruction by using very explicit and visually oriented teaching methods.

It should be noted however, that some of the students in the class are from different language backgrounds from the content area teacher, and thus do not benefit from the bilingual aspects of the teaching.

Schools support bilingual development in principle, and use bilingual staff in some cases. However, there is no clear concept of what a “bilingual friendly educational context” might be like.

A bilingual friendly context in education should mean for NESB learners that the following things can be both differentiated and jointly facilitated:

- content learning expressed through language/s
- English language development and its use in curriculum areas
- ongoing L1 development and its use in curriculum areas.
The following points are relevant to the further development of a bilingual context throughout the school sector:

- ideally learning credit would be given in all the above areas
- L1 development and use should be a category reported on in school reports and records
- English language learning – especially at secondary schools – should not be seen as ‘catching up’ or something akin to remedial work, but as a full curriculum area
- the (English) Language curriculum should be refocused in a way that recognizes the multilingual context more directly. This could mean, for example, that for some students English would not be strongly associated with personal identity, affect and self expression, or it might share that domain with another language
- where students are learning concepts and procedures in curriculum areas, a bilingual friendly approach should be adopted so that good performance on learning tasks does not necessarily require good performance in English.

Schools are currently encouraged by the Ministry and supported to some extent in bilingual support (eg refugee co-ordinators, home language booklets for families Families Learning Together, Ministry of Education, 2002b). Other things that could be provided to support schools and students include:

- on line translators to translate homework that can be worked on with parents
- telephone access to bi-lingual advisers for parents, students and teachers
- Ministry of Education facilitation of access to purchasing textbooks in L1s – so that a school can buy them, or families can buy them to discuss and work on them at home
- access to L1 dictionaries and reference books
- access to L1 websites
- development of bilingual strategies as routine for teachers, so that it becomes normal for 2 or more languages to be used for academic tasks at any time in the classroom.
5.15 Views of ESOL Advisers

ESOL Advisers were asked for their views on a range of issues that emerged from school interviews, the verification reports, and the literature review. Their responses are discussed below.

5.15.1 Amount of support available

Qualifications, professional development courses, seminars and workshops, and support services were discussed in all schools where interviews were conducted. Of these, support services were of the most immediate interest to teachers because they provide support which is directly targeted to the current needs of their own school.

In nearly all schools one or more staff said that they would like more support from advisers. In many cases this was because they had experienced helpful input, and wanted more; and in a few cases teachers had not been able to get help from advisers, but wanted that kind of support. Help with development of systems and procedures (e.g. for assessment and record keeping), with teaching approaches, programme planning, and specific techniques were all mentioned.

Advisers themselves feel that more support time needs to be available to schools. The general opinion among them is that more advisers are needed in Auckland, where a whole team is needed to cover needs satisfactorily. Previously in Wellington only one adviser (with less than a full-time position for ESOL Advisory Services) was available, and this is also considered inadequate. In other regions, the main difficulty is that advisers are often not full-time on ESOL support. If the current advisers in these regions were full time, rather than having a number of other responsibilities, this would come close to meeting the needs as they perceive them.

One problem mentioned is that because of the primary literacy initiative, there are fewer ESOL Advisers in primary schools. One adviser said that “the issue of NESB students has been lost in the literacy push”. Nearly all schools when asked about literacy and ESOL said that although links were useful, it was important to differentiate them in order to retain the particular focus that ESOL provision requires.

One adviser made the point that the advisory services need to have spare capacity not just to respond to requests, but to develop initiatives and promote interest and awareness of them. Greatly expanded bilingual support services are needed.
5.15.2 Location of support services

Advisers all felt that the institutions they worked out of provided a suitable base for them. They commented on the value of being part of a team of other advisers and staff who they could “bounce ideas off”.

5.15.3 ESOL and Literacy

One view among advisers is that it is very important to integrate literacy and ESOL in a co-ordinated team approach promoting effective teaching and learning, while still working on specific focussed ESOL objectives. There is concern that this possibility which previously existed is being lost by having separate people in schools in charge of literacy and of ESOL, and by not including ESOL Advisers in Literacy Advisers meetings and discussions.

This view emphasises that at the end of a number of quite separate initiatives - Pasifika, ESOL, English language support, special needs, reading recovery, etc - there is often the same learner and her or his family. The argument is that if the initiatives are co-ordinated at all levels from the Ministry’s planning, through the Advisory Services, and the school’s planning, to the teacher, then it is not left to the individual teacher to do the work of integration when faced with the individual child. Schools usually have a school-wide focus on literacy (and numeracy), which is linked to student achievement, and school goals. If the development and implementation of literacy policies in the school do not involve ESOL staff as an integral part of the processes, then decisions regarding student achievement are likely not to take account of NESB students.

If on the other hand, as one adviser commented, literacy does encompass NESB students’ needs and ESOL provision, it is “an ideal area to explore such aspects such as teacher accountability for programme provision and student achievement, [and] the role of ESOL support personnel and teaching strategies that are empowering for all students.” The importance of language in gaining access to the curriculum for all students can be readily focussed on. This integration of literacy and ESOL enables schools to include ESOL support in ongoing whole school professional development on literacy, where a whole school focus on ESOL and NESB students alone might be difficult for the school to commit to. Precisely this latter point was raised by a number of interviewed teachers.

In this view, according to one adviser, “[t]he most effective practice results from skilled liaison between Literacy/ESOL personnel, with the
Literacy delivering the strategic focus and planning, and ESOL delivering the language challenges of the 7 curriculum areas”.

One adviser who believes it is vital that the ESOL department is involved in literacy initiatives to ensure that NESB students’ needs are included, also commented that the NESB module in the Literacy Leadership training programme is superficial and lacks impact in the total package. Another commented on the need to align knowledge of the specific English language demands of the classroom with the school’s Literacy strategy.

A second view expressed by advisers is that when the approach to literacy and ESOL needs is combined in a school they have sometimes both ended up marginalised, and unsatisfactorily provided for. They consider that the distinction needs to be maintained, although there should be links. Particularly in the early stages of second language learning, they feel, the process and needs are entirely distinct from the focus and scope of literacy work. Although both have the goal of developing language skills to participate fully in society and successfully in learning, the pathways are different. One adviser said that where there are links with literacy, it needs to be recognised that “meeting the language and learning needs of NESB students is a specialist area. Schools need to know that the teachers who are responsible for teaching, assisting and monitoring NESB students’ learning should be qualified in TESOL.”

Advisers see a significant danger when a narrow view of literacy is used, with specific reading and writing skills as benchmarks. If these are then regarded as the whole scope of NESB students’ English language learning needs, inadequate ESOL provision will result. In intermediate and secondary schools in particular, where there is a very large gap between NESB students’ English language competency, and the competency that is needed to comprehend and participate in what is going on in the classroom, they feel there needs to be specific ESOL instruction, as well as excellent mainstream literacy practices. In addition to language needs specific to NESB students, there are cross curricular, cultural and pastoral aspects to provision for NESB students.

Advisers also expressed the view that cross curricular considerations are of particular importance in secondary schools so that ESOL provision covers what happens for funded NESB students in mainstream classes, as well as in ESOL classes or sessions. Here, and in primary schools, overall school processes need to ensure that there are “good systems of communication between class and support teachers”. Schools are likely to do this best if it is a general policy, and strongly supported by management, rather than specific to ESOL support.
One adviser raised the need for Literacy Advisers to be available to work with formerly funded NESB students who have ongoing literacy/language requirements, as distinct from second language learning development.

Both the views elaborated above favour co-ordination and links between literacy and ESOL provision. The difference is one of emphasis and strategy. The first view sees the large literacy umbrella as the ideal place to co-ordinate language provision, including that for NESB students; and the ideal way of ensuring that ESOL provision is not marginalised. The second view sees the danger of NESB students’ specific needs being lost in a larger initiative, where ESOL provision is only a small section of the whole umbrella.

5.15.4 The role of advisers

Advisers saw their roles as being very large. They encompass all aspects of language development, throughout the curriculum and the school, and the teacher skills and school strategies needed to promote this effectively.

The following aspects were mentioned:

Programme planning, assessment procedures, encouraging LAC, subject support, resources, refugee student support, support for ESOL cluster groups, Teacher Aide training in small group and 1:1 teaching, NCEA and Pathways to Qualifications, ESOL unit standards, upskilling mainstream teachers, language acquisition, cultural awareness, language awareness, metacognitive strategies, literacy strategies (oral and written), reading, writing, oral language, visual language, vocabulary, listening and speaking, co-operative learning, learning styles, real beginners, helping support teachers and teacher aides make better links to curriculum, staff development in second language acquisition knowledge, helping with assessment for funding, in-service delivery - ECE to senior secondary, plus the prescribed outcomes for their job set by the Ministry of Education.

One adviser said she works towards a goal for each school. This may take some time to achieve because some schools require a ‘quick fix’ and some require a ‘kit’ to teach from. It may require a number of visits to engage staff and principal to work towards achieving student learning, and sorting out attitudinal issues. Although courses have been offered in the region for some time, it is not until schools are faced with a NESB child and family that they see the need for it.

5.15.5 Time allocation

Most of the advisers said they spent about 50% or more of their time responding to requests from schools, and the rest of the time on courses
or other work initiated by them. Several advisers try to reduce demands from individual teachers through clustering, and courses, rather than working with them individually. They find one of the most time consuming areas is helping new and/or untrained ESOL teachers as they try to plan programmes. A number of the advisers do not see working with individual teachers as very productive, and prefer to work with syndicate groups or in whole staff sessions to reinforce a shared responsibility in the school.

Advisers reported that clusters are an important feature of ESOL teacher support in about half of the regions.

5.15.6 Constraints on working effectively

The advisers were asked about any constraints on working effectively. Most of them feel that the scope of the job is too large and that this is the main constraint. One commented that some areas such as bilingual assessments really need an expert in ESOL/Special needs. Advisers working with secondary schools commented that with the new Code of Practice for IFP and the requirement for NZQA Course Approval, there is pressure for advice on these. In addition, NCEA has put extra pressure on teachers, and is under resourced in the ESOL area, in their view.

A few advisers mentioned reluctance in some schools to release teachers for professional development courses - some schools have a policy of only 1 day per teacher per year. A few schools are reluctant to share best practice as they see themselves in competition with other schools.

A third difficulty noted by advisers is that schools’ focus on IFP students, and other pressing school-wide issues mean that Senior Management are likely to find it difficult to focus sufficiently on permanent resident NESB students.

5.15.7 ESOL provision in schools

The following strengths of ESOL provision in school were mentioned by advisers:

- There is increasing confidence and quality of provision in many schools, supported by certainty of funding and a range of Ministry ESOL resources. Student profiles are kept in most schools, and a good focus is developing on tracking NESB student achievement.

- There is increasing awareness by management of ESOL needs, in some cases because of the presence of feepaying students in
schools and some schools have allocated management units to this area. Staff are taking a responsible attitude to their role and many engage in professional development

- The Ministry’s nationally coordinated approach is helpful and the verification process, which is part of this, is giving helpful feedback to schools

There were however, some weaknesses, problems or needs mentioned:

- Advisors felt consistency of provision could be improved in a number of ways which include, strengthening ERO scrutiny of ESOL provision, close monitoring of student progress, an increase in funding comparable with the level of other similar countries, (e.g. in Canada $CN 7,500 is given over 3 years for each student).

- The personnel issues which have a negative impact on some schools include a lack of understanding of NESB issues by Senior Management and the Board of Trustees and a need for a cultural safety focus with a strong Senior Management line against disparaging staff views on particular ethnicities. There are also serious recruitment and retention issues in many areas and the increasing number of foreign feepayers exacerbates these difficulties. In some cases IFPs are seen as getting priority over funded students, although in many cases the two streams are beneficial.

- Pre-service training does not seem to be adequately addressing the issues of meeting the needs of increasingly diverse student populations and there is still widespread need for in-service education this area., especially as it applies to knowledge about language acquisition and the language demands of the curriculum.

- Suggestions for resource development included more bilingual and L1 resource material, computer assisted language learning (CALL) materials and materials with a New Zealand focus.

5.15.8 Satisfaction with NESB students’ progress with English

The advisers were not entirely satisfied with student progress. They observed that NESB students’ progress is naturally variable, but that too many are not reaching their full potential. Even if they have come close too cohort, they could achieve more, but the funded support stops. They feel that the weaknesses listed above account for the deficiencies in NESB student progress, especially the lack of guidelines and accountability, good tracking of students, and staff expertise.
5.15.9 Adequacy of tracking and records

Some advisers felt that records and tracking were adequate but most felt they were variable. Overall, the opinion is that students are not tracked and evaluated sufficiently. Advisers say that there is little cross curricular tracking in secondary schools; the same information is usually kept for NESB students as for other students, which does not address English language learning appropriately; and there is a lack of information about educational and vocational goals, especially for refugee students. In the view of many advisers, there is a need for a Ministry of Education and ERO requirement to demonstrate NESB student achievement over time, and to formalise expectations for these students. Many saw the need for more career pathway advice for students.

5.15.10 Curriculum

Advisers were not asked about curriculum or guidelines, nor about IFP students. However, many of them mentioned these two topics.

Many advisers feel that guidelines for ESOL provision are needed to help teachers, and to give a focus for accountability. They consider that with current conditions (lack of trained teachers, large increases in student numbers including IFP students, NCEA, bilingual assessments etc) it is essential to have curriculum guidelines so that unskilled teachers are not planning in a vacuum, or using language course books. One adviser said that there need to be clear guidelines on whether ESOL is a subject or an intervention, what the course content should be, and a distinction made between English as a Second Language (ESL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL).27

A number of advisers commented that there is no nationally agreed on strategy, and no Ministry of Education recognition of the need for ESOL guidelines. Teachers “do their own thing”. This means that in some schools where there are poorly qualified staff working with NESB students the programme provided is at best hit-and-miss. Although a number of schools have good ESOL programmes, advisers have also seen some schools with no programme planning in place, and staff with little

27 The issue with this distinction is that permanent New Zealand residents are likely to have broader and more ambitious goals for their use of English (ESL) than some International students, who may limit their goals in English learning to academic English for a particular curriculum area, and restricted daily uses of the language (EFL).
idea of what to consider when developing programmes to enhance language development.

One adviser suggested that guidelines could be developed as a Ministry of Education contract, with curriculum specialists working with an ESOL advisory panel.

5.15.11 Influence of IFP students

Most advisers mentioned the influence IFP students are having on the provision for permanent resident NESB students. Although they say some benefits result, the focus tends to be diverted from NESB needs to those of IFPs.

One adviser commented:

*These students are directly impacting on the provision schools make for all NESB students*.... ESOL programmes are more EFL in nature in many secondary schools, and the resident NESB students have to make do. An example of how this impacts on resident students is the reluctance of many schools to offer NCEA compatible qualifications in ESOL areas. They rely on exams (Pitmans, IELTS etc) which may not be appropriate for resident NESB students..... School boards are making decisions based on money.... ESOL departments and mainstream teachers are not being supported at an appropriate level.... Most schools have no upper limit on numbers of international students and ignore pleas from mainstream teachers to stop recruiting students.... The pressures ...from international students make it difficult, too time consuming for some schools to apply for NESB funding ... [which] further marginalises the resident NESB students in some schools.*

Another said:

*It is difficult at present to get beyond the issues involved with International Education at many schools. Many schools tend to focus on their fee-paying students at the expense of their permanent residents.*

5.15.12 Teacher support and qualifications

The general opinion of advisers is that there is need for more in depth expertise at all levels – pre-service, in-service, ongoing professional development, and the level of Advanced Studies for Teachers. Views were expressed as follows:
Most advisers considered that the current levels and types of pre-service training are inadequate to equip teachers for meeting NESB needs. There needs to be more focus on ESOL and it needs to be compulsory.

There is a shortage of qualified and trained ESOL specialist teachers, and a better definition of the job of the ESOL teacher in NZ schools is needed. There needs to be more scope to get qualifications or to update them.

More in-service is needed for all teachers, and teachers need more time for new learning. There was also concern that are too many teacher aides in primary schools doing responsible work they are not trained for, although at the time the English Language Assistant professional development programme had not been implemented.

Some advisors felt that because the number and nature of professional development contracts varies greatly from year to year, advisors are not able to plan ahead because they are not aware of what contracts are planned.

5.16 Summary of findings

Through interviews in schools, an analysis of ESOL funding verification reports, and of the views of ESOL Advisers, the present study examines the range of responses schools have made to provide for the language needs of NESB students. These responses from schools are supported by the targeted funding for the NESB students.

Funding is provided at the rate of $500 per year for Migrant and New Zealand born students who meet the criteria, and for Refugee students $1750 per year for year 9 -13 students, and $1100 per year for Year 1-8 students, for their first 2 years. For the next 3 years Refugee students receive the standard ESOL rate of $500 per year. This funding initiative, with its attendant verification process has been in existence for 5 years.

It should be noted that funding for one Migrant or New Zealand born NESB student buys about 33 hours of teacher aide time per year (at a rate of $15 per hour), if spent entirely on staff time. It allows for about 20 minutes per week of individual teacher time, or about 1 hour a day in a class of 15 NESB students. These amounts of time can only be a very minor contribution to NESB student language learning in New Zealand schools, although as discussed above (sections 5.10 & 5.11) mainstream classroom teachers also have a responsibility for student language learning. It is in this context that we need to consider what schools and teachers have been able to achieve.
5.16.1 ESOL resourcing

- The ESOL funding, associated requirements for assessment, record keeping, and evidence of ESOL provision, plus the verification processes, make an important contribution to ensuring that NESB student English language needs are addressed in schools. The targetted funding, professional guidance and feedback from published material, and other ESOL National Team activities, and the work of the Verifiers, all play a part in encouraging and assisting schools to improve their English language provision for NESB students.

5.16.2 Assessment and needs analysis

- Schools and teachers recognise the need to carry out an initial English language assessment, and do this competently, using the information to apply for funding

- Some assessments lead to identification of student needs, particularly in relation to the national cohort, which are then addressed through ESOL provision. Mainstream teachers also identify some needs to be addressed

- Schools and teachers continue to monitor the progress of NESB students in a range of domains, some of which focus particularly on second language development

- There is a need for continued development of assessment practices and resources, so that assessment for different purposes is recognised and carried out appropriately. Improvements in assessing will give a basis for thorough needs analyses for NESB students, and for more comprehensive records of student progress in language development. (See sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).

5.16.3 Programmes offered

- In the absence of ESOL curriculum guidelines, teachers and schools formulate their own programmes on the basis of their knowledge about teaching ESOL. As a result, the programmes vary a great deal

- Nearly all funded NESB students are given extra targetted ESOL support
• Most schools and teachers at primary and intermediate level provide learning support and experiences for NESB students largely outside the context of the mainstream classroom

• Primary and intermediate schools, in particular, make extensive use of teacher aides

• Most secondary schools and teachers provide language learning experiences largely by means of timetabled ESOL classes

• There is some support given in-class, but schools find this more difficult to arrange because of restricted staffing resources, timetabling constraints, and difficulties in co-ordinating with mainstream class activities

• The content of ESOL programmes varies between schools and teachers, but most often has a strong focus on reading, vocabulary, or oral language in the primary school, and on vocabulary and the skills of reading, writing, listening, and to a lesser extent speaking, in the secondary schools.

• Some schools have developed a syllabus as their reference point for planning and implementing ESOL programmes

• Some bilingual teaching and support is available

• Many schools attempt to form links between ESOL programmes and curriculum learning areas, but this is an area of difficulty for schools

• Many schools also have difficulty keeping all staff fully up to date with language across the curriculum skills that include second language teaching and learning expertise. The level of skills among mainstream teachers in most schools is not high enough to address adequately the language learning needs of funded and unfunded NESB students

• NESB students’ ESOL programmes are supplemented by a range of other school activities and programmes which feed into language development

• Schools and teachers make use of a variety of resources and text material, some of which are designed particularly for NESB learners

• Programmes need to be developed on the basis of a more complete picture of the scope and nature of second language development. This would facilitate comprehensive plans of work specifying a full range of language outcomes linked to curriculum and other student needs. Teachers experience a need for curriculum
resources and support, including professional development and whole school initiatives, to enable them to develop and teach better programmes. The bilingual aspect of most NESB students’ language development is not yet well catered for in most schools.

5.16.4 Good practice in ESOL and literacy provision

Good practice, as identified in the literature is summarised in section 2.11. The following findings relate to various characteristics of good practice. Characteristics typical of good language learning practice are integrated here with characteristics of quality teaching for diverse students identified by Alton-Lee (2002).

5.16.4.1 Inclusive practices

Inclusive practices in all aspects of schools’ interactions with students and their families are an important characteristic of good practice for NESB students.

- Schools recognise NESB students and their communities as part and parcel of the culture of the school
- They have overt ways of welcoming students and encouraging families to participate in school life, and most schools have policies to extend their practices in these areas
- Some schools are developing the involvement of families in their children’s literacy and other learning.

5.16.4.2 Good literacy practices

Good literacy practices across the whole school are an important component of the all-day language learning that NESB students need.

- In primary schools, good literacy practice for NESB students would pay careful attention to individual language development in both (or all) languages, would involve families, and would create “learner-centred, language rich environments that are both linguistically stimulating and intellectually challenging” (Hudelson, 1994, p.151). Some schools already achieve this to a large extent
- In secondary schools, good literacy practice for NESB students would probably consist of strong integrated language across the curriculum and ESOL programmes, very closely integrated with
each other, and with a focus on form and meaning in written language. Some schools have this as a goal, but had organisational difficulties with cross curricular links, and/or there was a lack of expertise across the school in working with form and meaning in written text.

5.16.4.3 The context for good ESOL provision

Good practices in ESOL provision must occur in the overall context of “quality teaching for diverse students” (Alton-Lee, 2002, pp. 1-5). To maximise all-day learning for NESB students, the following are important characteristics of good ESOL provision in this context, which are realised to varying degrees in schools.

• Whole school alignment that focusses on producing good language learning outcomes for NESB students through all school activity is important. Some schools are aware of the importance of this, but have difficulties with implementation. Other schools have a more fragmented approach to ESOL provision, which may leave it separate, isolated, or even marginalised.

• Another important focus for NESB students is for schools to have good assessment that feeds back constructively into learning. In most schools, the choice of language competencies for assessment is somewhat random, and purposes of assessment are not separately identified. As a result, most schools are not readily able to use assessment to feed back constructively into all areas of language learning needs.

• All aspects of language development need to be systematically addressed, but this is not routinely done. Curriculum guidelines, plus increased levels of teacher expertise, would assist schools to do this better.

• The effective use of a variety of tasks designed to facilitate all aspects of language learning is essential, but schools do not appear to use a wide repertoire of language learning tasks. Language interaction and use, and curriculum links, could be extended through effective task design.

Development of teaching skills in effective use of tasks to promote language learning would assist NESB students’ learning.
5.16.4.4 Effective conditions for language learning

The opportunity to learn language needs to be effective and sufficient, and responsive to student learning processes. For this to be a reality, NESB students in schools need the following conditions.

- They should be given opportunities to use language in extended contexts, as well as comprehend language.
- They need opportunities to interact on meaningful material, especially with a teacher (In the school context, it is important that most of this meaningful material is curriculum related material in all learning areas.)
- They need very extensive language learning opportunities.
- Goals should not focus on correctness at particular points, which cannot be guaranteed to be in line with a learner’s readiness.
- Opportunities to engage with the same material need to be allowed for many times, therefore a linear approach to language development or language teaching content is unlikely to be successful.

These conditions are not uniformly present in schools, and not all schools appear to be aware of the importance of extended language use, and interaction, for NESB students. Schools may need more guidance in these areas.

5.16.4.5 Goals for NESB students

It is particularly important for NESB students that as Alton-Lee (2002, p. 4) states, “Pedagogy promotes learning orientations, student self-regulation, metacognitive strategies and thoughtful student discourse”. Low NESB student proficiency in English can easily lead schools to adjust general expectations to a low level.

- Goals for L2 learners should not be limited to performance in easier contexts, or on easier objectives.
- NESB student learning mostly needs to be accelerated to close any gaps between them and the national cohort.
Schools vary in how well they achieve the above, but there is considerable attention in a range of school initiatives (such as homework centres) to closing gaps and setting high expectations.

### 5.16.5 Teacher expertise

High levels of appropriate teacher competency in second language learning and teaching are needed - both for ESOL teachers, and for mainstream teachers. To maximise the language learning of NESB students, all curriculum area teachers, as well as ESOL teachers, need a good understanding of language, and an excellent repertoire of teaching techniques and methods. Many such techniques needed for language development across the curriculum exist, but it is not possible for most curriculum area teachers to elicit, sustain and extend student output without ongoing professional development in techniques for doing this.

- Most schools with numbers of NESB students have at least one teacher qualified, to some extent, in an area related to ESOL provision. However, the qualifications are variable, and some may need up-dating. Some teaching staff involved in ESOL provision have little or no training in the area
- Most secondary schools have some policies and professional development opportunities for staff which are aimed at extending language learning for all students across the curriculum
- Schools provide some ESOL professional development for teachers through involvement in contracts, through use of advisory services and through in-house sharing of expertise
- Some teachers are involved in furthering their knowledge of second language learning and teaching through pursuing qualifications in the area.

There is a need for a great deal more teacher and school expertise in all aspects of promoting second language development, and bilingual development. Given the other demands on schools, an approach to increasing their expertise in this area needs to be carefully co-ordinated with the full picture of their professional development needs and requirements.
5.16.6 Funding of ESOL provision

Schools fund the programmes discussed above partly through the ESOL funding, and partly from a number of other sources:

- Decile related funding (TFEA)
- Fees from International fee paying students (IFPs)
- ‘Top ups’ from Boards of Trustees from the operations grant and other general school funding
- Other initiatives operating in the school e.g. community liaison projects.

5.16.7 Constraints on effective ESOL provision

As noted in a number of places above, schools are aware of steps they should take to promote NESB students’ learning, or are attempting to put certain processes in place, which they do not fully achieve. The following are some of the most frequently identified constraints which schools or teachers experience as inhibiting their best performance.

- Having few additional sources of funding e.g. being a mid decile school, having few IFPs, being involved in (or eligible for) few other contracts or programmes which generate revenue or other forms of extra support
- Being in a situation of rapid change - both in terms of an increase in student numbers (when large numbers of NESB students, or international fee paying students, arrive without warning); and in terms of a decrease in student numbers (when the roll drops). These changes require schools to make quick decisions, or require them to suspend decisions about allocating funding
- Not having Senior Management or Board of Trustees understanding and support for the learning needs of NESB students
- Having a wide range of competing staff development needs - particularly acute when there are large numbers of new and/or inexperienced staff members
- Having limited expertise in ESOL planning and instruction, and having little access to professional support from qualified and experienced ESOL teachers or advisers; or little access to other resources such as teaching materials, or adequate room space
• Not having timetable and curriculum planning that complements NESB provision e.g. when teams in schools work on a diverse range of curriculum topics making it difficult for teachers to provide curriculum referenced programmes

• Working in isolation, as in the case of schools with small numbers of NESB students

• Having no extra support for the NESB students, such as access to other students or speakers of the L1

• Having large numbers of NESB students, with additional needs (e.g. literacy) and difficulties

• Having large numbers of NESB students, with a wide range of language and cultural backgrounds, and a wide range of levels of proficiency (including very low proficiency, and older non-literate students).

Some of these constraints are temporary for individual schools and teachers, but nevertheless critical for individual students affected by them. It may be possible for the Ministry of Education to address some of these constraints on good ESOL provision in a flexible manner, by developing strategies to address them for a limited period as they arise.

6 Synthesis and implications

As summarised in the previous section, the targeted funding for NESB students is used to enable a significant degree of support for NESB students. However, it is not sufficient to allow for support at the level provided by a number of other countries, such as Australia, Canada and the UK. The evidence and issues from the literature review (section 2.11), and the findings from this study (section 5.15), suggest both important achievements in ESOL provision in New Zealand, and important gaps in provision. We conclude that the following areas require attention.

6.1 Systemic needs

Our view, also expressed in the literature review and by teachers and advisers, is that ESOL provision is a wide-ranging, variable, and demanding area of required expertise for schools and teachers. Although there is now much greater support and structure than in the past,
further systemic support would enhance ESOL provision and student learning.

Two important gaps in systemic support are the lack of a New Zealand Language Policy, and the lack of curriculum guidelines, and the ensuing accountability, for ESOL provision. Specific needs in this area are:

1 **The continuation of ESOL funding and associated processes, and expansion of professional support and guidance provided for schools**

   The current ESOL funding plays an important role in ensuring that NESB students’ English language competencies are assessed, and for those students below national cohort level, addressed through programmes designed for them. Further support and guidance in how to carry out these processes would assist schools in achieving high standards in ESOL assessment and programme design.

2 **The endorsement of a Language Policy for New Zealand**

   This would serve to guide policy developments in school language learning now and in the future. Consistent links and flows could be maintained throughout the education sector – from early childhood learning to tertiary level, and with employment and national economic, social and cultural development goals. A language policy would serve as a consistent point of reference for initiatives generated by various groups or sectors.

3 **The development of a set of ESOL guidelines that can act as a national curriculum framework for ESOL in schools**

   The low levels of school professional development and qualified staff in TESOL mean that there is a need for support of this kind. Staff are not skilled enough to design excellent ESOL language development syllabuses themselves, and neither should this be done on an individual school basis. Guidelines or a curriculum statement need to be fleshed out with supporting materials and resources. Models exist in Australia, which could serve as useful reference points.

4 **The development of a greater number of resources for NESB students, particularly ones referenced to all essential learning areas of the curriculum**
While some resources designed for English speaking background students can be adapted for use with NESB students, teachers often lack the time or expertise to do so.

5 Increased attention to issues in language and literacy acquisition amongst organisations that play an important role in schools such as ERO

A greater focus by ERO on ESOL provision and outcomes in schools would be helpful to schools in assisting them to develop good programmes and evidence of outcomes.

6.2 Teacher and school expertise

Teacher expertise is a major factor in student learning. Cross-curricular learning, such as language learning (whether ESOL or Literacy), puts particular demands on teacher and school expertise. Although teachers have been supported for over 20 years in gaining TESOL qualifications, the recent rapid expansions of NESB student numbers in schools mean that the pool of qualified and trained staff needs to be enlarged and the level of expertise increased.

Staff expertise needs to be enhanced at management level, in teachers, and in teacher aides if they are to continue to play a significant role in ESOL provision. More TESOL knowledge is required from pre-service teaching qualifications, from ongoing professional development, and in the form of post-graduate qualifications.

The following initiatives are suggested:

1 A review of teacher development courses

The teaching of English to NESB students in schools is complex, and teachers require specific knowledge about the way language works and how learners learn language. A review of teacher development courses, including pre-service development, would be most effective with reference to the development of a set of ESOL guidelines.

2 Professional development opportunities for a greater number of teachers and teacher aides
Within the limits of the information, it appears that whole school professional development in teaching NESB students is very limited. To make a real impact on the teaching in schools it would appear that increased professional development needs to be planned, and in such a way that schools find it easy to incorporate it on an ongoing basis.

Teacher aides are hugely involved in direct provision of support for NESB learners in many schools, but lack training and knowledge.

3 Specific professional development in the area of second language literacy

Learning to work with text, to read and write, is different for NESB students than for monolingual English speaking children. Likewise it is different for Migrant students, Refugee students and New Zealand born NESB students. Remedial procedures used for English speaking background learners are not, in the main, appropriate for these students. Teachers and other staff need to be equipped with knowledge and skills in the area of second language literacy.

4 The representation of ESOL as an area of teaching expertise

A relatively low proportion of ESOL teachers appear to be qualified, and qualifications are variable in content. In attempting to increase the number of ESOL qualified staff, the marginal and uncertain nature of ESOL teacher employment in many schools has to be taken into account. In many cases ESOL teachers have no employment guarantee from year to year; this probably works against encouraging teachers to become well qualified in ESOL.

6.3 Information on NESB student outcomes

Very little robust information is available on how NESB students perform over the long term in New Zealand schools, whether in English language development or in curriculum areas. Without better information it is impossible to assess whether NESB students are achieving as well as they might, whether individual school programmes are effective for these students, and whether provision nationally is effective for them.
1 **Systematic tracking of NESB students’ progress and achievement during their schooling**

Little information is available on NESB student achievement. Without this information, it is not possible to judge if support provisions are adequate for these students. Systematic tracking of NESB student progress will require administrative processes to be established, plus the development of more tools for assessment, and expertise in using them.

2 **A comprehensive research study on how well NESB students are prepared to cope with the demands of tertiary education**

We lack local knowledge of the effects of our schools’ instructional approaches and methods. These come under scrutiny particularly as students leave school and enter tertiary study, as most students can be expected to do. Research is needed which looks at the level of proficiency NESB students have as they prepare to enter tertiary study, correlated with such factors as time in New Zealand, and ethnic and language background, and instructional practices the students have experienced.
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8 Glossary

EAL English as an Additional Language
EFL English as a Foreign Language
ESB English Speaking Background
ESL English as a Second Language
ESOL English for Speakers of Other Languages
ESOL/AF ESOL Funding Application Form
IELTS International English Language Testing Service – see footnote 19
IFP International Fee Paying (student)
L1 a person’s first language, learned with the family
L2 a person’s second language
LAC Language across the Curriculum
LBOTE Language Background Other Than English
LEP Limited English Proficiency
LTL Learning through Language – Professional Development Programme
NESB Non-English Speaking Background
SLA Second language acquisition
SLT Second language teaching
TESOL Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
First Generation Students who were born in New Zealand, but whose parents were not born in New Zealand (PISA)
Native Students who themselves, and at least one of their parents, were born in New Zealand (PISA)
Non-native Students who themselves, and their parents, were not born in New Zealand (PISA)
9 Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1 Sample of interviewed schools

**Primary schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of school</th>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Funded NESB</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150-349</td>
<td>350-550</td>
<td>575-775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓1</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓1</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓3</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓3</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓3</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓3</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓4</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓4</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓6</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓10</td>
<td>✓2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intermediate schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile ranking</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Funded NESB</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Decile ranking</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Funded NESB</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1000</td>
<td>&gt;1100</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ &lt;500</td>
<td>✓ 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 Secondary School Verification Report Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>No. schools of region</th>
<th>Roll under 1000</th>
<th>Roll over 1000</th>
<th>% Pasifika 1</th>
<th>% Other 2</th>
<th>Funded NESB</th>
<th>IFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auckland 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.28</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.52</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.63</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auckland 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.74</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Auckland 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manawatu 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auckland 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manawatu 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Auckland 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>41.59</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note 1: The verification reports were done from 2000 up to June 2002, but the data on schools comes from the ESOL database as at June 2002.

Note 2: The numbers of IFP students are figures supplied by the Ministry of Education, as at March 2002

Note 3: Pasifika includes all the students shown in the School Details page of the ESOL Data Base as being of the following ethnicities – Cook Is Māori, Fijian, Niuean, Other Pacific Is, Samoan, Tokelauan, Tongan

Note 4: Other includes all the other ethnicities other than NZ European/Pākehā and Māori – i.e. Chinese, Indian, Other, Other Asian, Other European, South East Asian. These are figures for ethnicity – not for language background or use. Only some of these students will speak a language associated with their ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auckland 1</th>
<th>Manawatu 1</th>
<th>Waikato 2</th>
<th>Auckland 1</th>
<th>Manawatu 1</th>
<th>Wellington 1</th>
<th>Wellington 1</th>
<th>Wellington 3</th>
<th>Wellington 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>42.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The verification reports were done from 2000 up to June 2002, but the data on schools comes from the ESOL database as at June 2002.

Note 2: The numbers of IFP students are figures supplied by the Ministry of Education, as at March 2002.

Note 3: Pasifika includes all the students shown in the School Details page of the ESOL Data Base as being of the following ethnicities – Cook Is Māori, Fijian, Niuean, Other Pacific Is, Samoan, Tokelauan, Tongan.

Note 4: Other includes all the other ethnicities other than NZ European/Pākehā and Māori – i.e. Chinese, Indian, Other, Other Asian, Other European, South East Asian. These are figures for ethnicity – not for language background or use. Only some of these students will speak a language associated with their ethnic background.
9.3 Appendix 3 Executive Summary from Alton-Lee (2002)

Executive Summary

Quality teaching is identified as a key lever for high quality outcomes for diverse students. The evidence reveals that between 40 to 55% of variance in student performance is attributable to differences between teachers and classes, while only 6 to 19% is attributable to school level variables.

This best evidence synthesis has produced twelve characteristics of quality teaching derived from a synthesis of research findings of evidence linked to student outcomes. These are:

1. **Quality teaching is focused on student achievement (including social outcomes) and facilitates high standards of student outcomes for heterogeneous groups of students.**

   **Research-based characteristics**
   
   - Teaching is focussed on raising student achievement (including social outcomes).
   - Quality teaching facilitates the learning of diverse students and raises achievement for all learners.
   - The teacher establishes and follows through on appropriate expectations for learning outcomes.
   - The teacher establishes and follows through on appropriate expectations for the pace at which learning should proceed.

2. **Pedagogical practices enable classes and other learning groupings to work as caring, inclusive, and cohesive learning communities.**

   The learning community concept has arisen out of the research literature and denotes both a central focus on learning and the interdependence of the social and the academic in optimising learning conditions.
Research-based characteristics

- Pedagogical practices create an environment that works as a learning community.
- Caring and support is evident in the practices and interactions of teacher(s) and students.
- Pedagogical practices pro-actively value and address diversity.
- Academic norms are strong and not subverted by social norms.
- The language and practices of the classroom are inclusive of all students.
- Teachers use class sessions to value diversity, and to build community and cohesion.
- Teaching and tasks are structured to support, and students demonstrate, active learning orientations.
- Teaching includes specific training in collaborative group work with individual accountability mechanisms and students demonstrate effective co-operative and social skills that enable group processes to facilitate learning for all participants.
- Students provide help to each other with resource access and provide elaborated explanations.
- Pedagogical practice is appropriately responsive to the interdependence of socio-cultural and cognitive dimensions.

3. Effective links are created between school and other cultural contexts in which students are socialised to facilitate learning.
### Research-based characteristics

- Teachers ensure that student experiences of instruction have known relationships to other cultural contexts in which the students have been/are socialised.
- Relevance is made transparent to students.
- Cultural practices at school are made transparent and taught.
- Ways of taking meaning from text, discourse, numbers or experience are made explicit.
- Teaching recognises and builds on students’ prior experiences and knowledge.
- New information is linked to student experiences.
- Student diversity is utilised effectively as a pedagogical resource.

#### 4. Teaching is responsive to student learning processes.

**Research-based characteristics** are specific to curriculum context and the prior knowledge and experiences of the learners.

- Teachers have knowledge of the nature of student learning processes in the curriculum area, can interpret student behaviour in the light of this knowledge and are responsive, creative and effective in facilitating learning processes.
- Examples of teaching approaches that are intended to exemplify this characteristic are the dynamic or flexible literacy models, the numeracy strategy focus and the Interactive Teaching Approach in science education.

#### 5. Opportunity to learn is effective and sufficient.
Research-based characteristics

- Teaching provides sufficient and effective opportunity to learn.
- Management practices facilitate learning (rather than emphasising compliant behaviour or control).
- Curriculum enactment has coherence and interconnectedness.
- Curriculum content addresses diversity.
- Quality teaching includes and optimises the effective use of non-linguistic representations by teacher and students. (This assumes the concurrent and rich use of oral language and text as central to literacy across the curriculum.)
- Students have sufficient and appropriate opportunities for practice and application.

6. Multiple task contexts support learning cycles.

Research-based characteristics

- Task cycles match developmental learning cycles of students.
- Task cycles enable students to engage in and complete learning processes so that what is learned is remembered.
- Optimal use is made of complementary combinations of teacher-directed groupings, co-operative groups, structured peer interaction and individual work (including homework) to facilitate learning cycles.

7. Curriculum goals, resources including ICT usage, task design and teaching are effectively aligned.
Research-based characteristics

- Curricular alignment: The use of resources, teaching materials and ICT is aligned with curriculum goals to accomplish instructional purposes and goals.

- Curricular alignment optimises rather than inhibits critical thinking.

- Pedagogical strategies are evaluated in relation to curricular goals.

- ICT usage is integrated into pedagogical practice across the curriculum.

8. Pedagogy scaffolds and provides appropriate feedback on students' task engagement

Research-based characteristics

- Tasks and classroom interactions provide scaffolds to facilitate student learning (the teacher provides whatever assistance diverse students need to enable them to engage in learning activities productively, for example, teacher use of prompts, questions, appropriate resources).

- Teaching develops all students' information skills and ensures students' ready access to resources when needed to assist the learning process.

- Students receive effective, specific, appropriately frequent, positive and responsive feedback. Feedback must be neither too infrequent so that a student does not receive appropriate feedback nor too frequent so that the learning process is subverted.

9. Pedagogy promotes learning orientations, student self-regulation, metacognitive strategies and thoughtful student discourse
Research-based characteristics

- Teaching promotes learning orientations and student self-regulation.
- Teaching promotes metacognitive strategy use (e.g. mental strategies in numeracy) by all students.
- Teaching scaffolds reciprocal or alternating tuakana teina roles in student group, or interactive work.
- Teaching promotes sustained thoughtfulness (e.g. through questioning approaches, wait-time, and the provision of opportunities for application and invention).
- Teaching promotes critical thinking.

10. Teachers and students engage constructively in goal-oriented assessment.

Research-based characteristics

- Assessment improves learning.
- Teachers and students have clear information about learning outcomes.
- Students have a strong sense of involvement in the process of setting specific learning goals.
- Pedagogy scaffolds and provides appropriate feedback on students’ task engagement.
- Teachers ensure that their assessment practices impact positively on students’ motivation.
- Teachers manage evaluative climate, particularly in context of public discussion, so that student covert or overt participation is supported, scaffolded and challenged without students being humiliated.
- Teachers manage evaluative climate so that academic norms are not undermined but are supported by social norms.
- Teachers adjust their teaching to take account of the results of assessment.

11. Quality teaching effects are maximised when supported by effective home/school partnership practices focused on student learning.
Research-based characteristics

- Home/school partnerships that have shown the most positive impacts on student outcomes have student learning as their focus.

- When educators enable quality alignments in practices between teachers and parent/caregivers to support learning and skill development then student achievement can be optimised.

- Teachers can take agency in encouraging, scaffolding and enabling student-parent/caregiver dialogue around school learning.

- Quality homework can have particularly positive impacts on student learning.

- The effectiveness of the homework is particularly dependent upon the teacher’s ability to construct, resource, scaffold and provide feedback upon appropriate homework tasks that support in-class learning for diverse students and do not unnecessarily fatigue and frustrate students.

12. Quality teaching is optimised when there is whole school alignment.
Research-based characteristics

- The school maintains an 'unrelenting focus on student achievement and learning'\(^\text{28}\).

- There is whole school alignment and coherence across policies and practices that focus on, resource and support quality teaching for diverse students.

- Pro-active alignment across the school supports effective inclusion of diverse students within the school community.

- Whole school alignment optimises opportunity to learn, particularly in language immersion, literacy, ICT, social studies and health.

- Whole school alignment enables a common language, teacher collaboration and reflection and other synergies around improving teaching.

- Whole school alignment minimises disruptions to quality teaching and sustains continuous improvement.

---